

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 27 OCTOBER 1966

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

Answers:—

(1) "There are no provisions in the 'Co-operative Housing Societies' Acts' dealing with the conversion of leasehold land to freehold land."

(2) "Section 31 of the Acts provides that subject to the Acts and the rules of the Society the business and operations of a Society shall be managed and controlled by a board of directors. In this connection Model Rule 14 for a Co-operative Housing Society reads as follows: 'The Board may accept or reject an application for membership or for additional shares and need not assign any reasons for its action.' I would be prepared to take the matter up with the Townsville Co-operative Housing Society to ascertain if they have had any applications from members desiring that their leases be converted to freehold and the action taken by the Society in such cases and whether any special circumstances have arisen."

APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO PROSPECT

Mr. Coburn, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) What action is a prospective applicant for a prospecting lease of a mineral lode required to take?

(2) What are the costs of and the general conditions appertaining to such a lease?

Answers:—

"It is not clear whether the Honourable Member refers to a mining lease or an Authority to Prospect. Broadly the following data applies:—

(1) "If a mining lease, the applicant should first peg the ground then apply on the prescribed form to the nearest Warden. For an Authority to Prospect he applies by letter direct to the Minister."

(2) "For a mining lease he deposits survey fee and rental as prescribed in the Mining Acts. General information concerning Authorities to Prospect is contained in a leaflet issued by my Department and I now table for the information of the Honourable Member a copy of such leaflet. A complete Answer to this Question would be voluminous and if the Honourable Member desires such he might care to direct a letter to me."

Paper. Whereupon Mr. Camm laid upon the Table of the House the leaflet referred to.

PURCHASE OF LAND BY OVERSEAS INVESTORS

Mr. Graham, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an advertisement in the *Winnipeg Free-Press*, Manitoba, Canada, dated August 3, 1966, headed "Australian Land Boom", addressed to investors, brokers and ranchers and

THURSDAY, 27 OCTOBER, 1966

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. D. E. Nicholson, Murrumba) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

QUESTIONS

FREEHOLDING OF LAND BY MEMBERS OF CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETIES

Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Have Co-operative Housing Societies, operating under the statutory authority of this State, any power to prevent home-buyers from converting their home allotments from leasehold to freehold?

(2) If not, will he cause inquiries to be made into the actions of the Townsville Co-operative Housing Society, which is preventing home-owners from taking advantage of the freeholding legislation as passed by this Parliament?

reading "Prime land for farming, grazing or hold for profit. These prices will never be repeated. All land less than \$10 per acre. Many American and European firms have already bought . . . Don't miss the opportunity of a lifetime. Minimum purchase 100 acres. Terms. Further information from National Charter Association, 8730 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverley Hills, California, U.S.A.?"

(2) In view of the Government's declared policy relating to the freeholding of land and the possibility that the advertisement could result in a great influx of overseas capital for the purchase of land, which possibly may be situated in Queensland, would the Government raise any objection to the purchase of these lands by overseas investors?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "I am not aware of the advertisement in the *Winnipeg Free-Press* referred to by the Honourable Member. Broadly, however, I can say that, provided a prospective purchaser is eligible and otherwise qualified to hold any particular type of tenure under the Land Acts, there would be no objection as a matter of policy to registration of transfer of interests in lands held under the Land Acts. As far as the purchase by oversea investors of lands held as freehold is concerned, it is most unlikely, other considerations apart, that substantial areas could be acquired from existing owners at prices within the range purported to have been stated in the advertisement."

SALE OF FIREARMS

Mr. Hanson, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has his Department any knowledge of the number of firearms sold annually in Queensland?

(2) Is there any co-operation between his Department, sports stores, rifle stores or any other retail outlets with regard to the recording of sales of firearms? If not, is any action contemplated by his Department in this regard so as to protect the public interest?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "Yes. Sales of concealable firearms are recorded. Sales of other firearms are not required to be recorded."

PUBLICITY, SMOKING AND INCIDENCE OF LUNG CANCER

Mr. Hanson, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) In view of recent statements by Dr. Emmerson Day and many other eminent authorities that it is now positively

accepted that smoking is the chief contributor to lung cancer, what significant action has been taken in recent years to acquaint the public, particularly students, in regard to this dreaded disease?

(2) Is he aware that in New South Wales a kit on smoking is supplied to schools which sets out a number of illustrations, lessons and examples?

(3) Is any service of a similar nature available in Queensland schools?

Answers:—

(1) "Since as early as 1959 the Queensland Health Education Council with the approval of my Department, has conducted through the schools a campaign to make young people aware of the dangers of smoking. Lesson material was prepared for the guidance of teachers and a pamphlet was produced for distribution to the pupils. The Health Education Manual prepared by the Health Education Council and the Department of Education in collaboration introduces the dangers of smoking to school pupils in the upper grades, while 'Tobacco and Smoking' is one of the topics included in the Junior Course on Health in Secondary Schools. Here attention is drawn to the smoking habit and to the dangers arising therefrom. Following upon the demonstration of smoking machines at the Royal National Show in Brisbane in 1964, the Health Education Council was given approval to use these machines in all secondary schools. The campaign, with eight machines, will take about three years, but many schools throughout the State already have been visited. The smoking machine demonstrates very effectively the extent of the combined effect of cancer producing tars and nicotine in smoking. For the information of the Honourable Member, the Assistant Health Officer at Gladstone recently took one of these machines to the State High School, Gladstone, where demonstrations were given to the students at that school."

(2) "No."

(3) "No."

MECHANISED MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT, RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) What are the types and the dates of the introduction of mechanical equipment now in use on the Railway permanent way?

(2) In respect to comparative figures of employees, to what extent has such mechanical equipment reduced employment in the maintenance section?

Answers:—

(1) "The introduction of mechanical equipment to the permanent way dates back to 1953. It would be difficult to list and identify for the purposes of answering

the Honourable Member's Question, the variety and type of mechanised maintenance equipment in use throughout the State, e.g. Tampers, Power Jacks, Ballast Regulators, Adzing Machines, Drills and Saws, Bulldozers, Graders, Liners and Spike Pullers."

(2) "Since 1953 there would undoubtedly be a reduction in the number of employees in the Maintenance Branch due to the introduction of this equipment and for other reasons. For the information of the Honourable Member, the number of employees in the Maintenance Branch as at June 30, 1953, and June 30, 1965, was 6,939 and 6,316 respectively."

ANNUAL REPORT, COMMISSIONER FOR RAILWAYS

Mr. Thackeray, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

When will the annual report of the Commissioner for Railways for 1965-66 be tabled?

Answer:—

"The Annual Report will be tabled shortly."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1964.

The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1965.

Regulations under the Queensland Marine Acts, 1958 to 1963.

By-laws Nos. 956 to 960 inclusive, under the Railway Acts, 1914 to 1965.

Report of the State Stores Board for the year 1965-66.

FORM OF QUESTIONS

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not in order in asking whether a statement in a newspaper is true or false. The question does not appear to be entirely in order, and I shall have a look at it.

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) having given notice of a question to the Premier relating to the provision of a television set in the billiard room for the convenience of hon. members who may wish to view the running of the Melbourne Cup—

Mr. Nicklin: The hon. member should ask Mr. Speaker that question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! For my part, I assure the hon. member the answer is "No".

STAMP ACTS AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer—Treasurer): I move:

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1965, to make further provision with respect to the payment of duty on sales and purchases of marketable securities, and in other particulars, and to amend the State Government Insurance Office (Queensland) Acts, 1960 to 1965, in a certain particular."

Motion agreed to.

BEEF CATTLE ROADS AGREEMENT BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Camm, read a third time.

SUPPLY

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES—FIRST AND SECOND ALLOTTED DAYS

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1966-67

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CHIEF OFFICE

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis—Minister for Education) (11.18 a.m.): I move—

"That \$784,811 be granted for 'Department of Education—Chief Office'."

Before dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Education, the Police Department and the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, I should like to take the opportunity of paying tribute to three great Queenslanders who have died since these Estimates were last discussed in this Parliament. I refer to three men who perhaps contributed more to education in its first century in Queensland than any comparable group one could name.

I refer to the late Mr. J. D. Story, the late Roman Catholic Archbishop of Brisbane, Sir James Duhig, and the late Director-General of Education, Sir Herbert Watkin. I think it appropriate that we should record in the annals of this Parliament our appreciation of the great services rendered by these three men to education in Queensland.

The late Mr. J. D. Story gave almost a century of service to this State. He had a remarkable career. He was born in 1869 and was 97 at the time of his death. One of the amazing features of his career was the fact that he held high and responsible

positions at a very young age. He, like Sir Herbert Watkin, joined the Education Department at the very early age of 15, without the benefit of high education. But these two men, through their own ability, energy and initiative, rose to occupy the highest position in the department.

At the age of 35 Mr. Story was appointed acting Under Secretary of the Department of Public Instruction. Two years later, at the age of 37, he became the permanent Under Secretary of the Department of Public Instruction, the position now known as Director-General of Education. During the years 1906 to 1920, when he served as head of the Department of Education, there occurred some of the greatest changes that have taken place in education in Queensland. That period has been referred to as the golden age of education. Perhaps a great deal of his work was done in association with Sir James Blair, who was then Minister for Education.

It was during that period that State high schools were established throughout Queensland. Before Mr. Story was head of the department only private schools were available for secondary education. It was he who started the State high school system. He started the rural school system; he started vocational training; he also was largely instrumental in the foundation of tertiary education in Queensland. For over 50 years he served the Queensland University as a senator, and later as vice-chancellor. It falls to the lot of few men to be the initiator of both secondary and tertiary education in any State, or in any country.

While still a young man Mr. Story was appointed Public Service Commissioner, a position which he again held for almost a generation. On relinquishing that position in 1939, when past the normal retiring age—and when most people are prepared to sit back and review their life's work—he undertook in an honorary capacity the vice-chancellorship of the Queensland University, a position which he again held for another generation.

Here was a man who, one might say, for almost a generation was head of the Department of Education, for almost a generation was public service Commissioner, and after retirement and for another generation, held the post of vice-chancellor of the Queensland University in an honorary capacity. During most of that period of 50 years he was chairman of the finance committee.

They were great and fruitful years in the development of tertiary education. By his leadership and ability Mr. Story was able to inspire the small academic staff, which gradually grew with the establishment of more departments. He was able to inspire intense loyalty from his members and win great respect from the public for the university. So I think it only fitting when a man has given the best part of a century

of service to education that we should have our appreciation recorded in discussing these Estimates.

Another great Queenslander—one who was educated in Brisbane, at "The Terrace"—was the late Sir James Duhig, the former Roman Catholic Archbishop of Brisbane. He was known as "James the builder", not only for the many churches he built but also because of his great interest in education and his earnest endeavour to provide educational facilities for those of his own church in almost every parish. He made the expansion of educational facilities for Roman Catholic children one of his prime aims, and he succeeded to the extent that, of the 73 parishes in Brisbane, 66 have parish schools. In the area of his diocese outside Brisbane, 29 of the 32 parishes have parish schools.

He virtually achieved his objective of having a parish school in each parish. In what was his archdiocese, which now extends from Childers to Gatton, and down to Coolangatta, almost 42,000 primary and secondary school-children attend Roman Catholic schools. The ultimate effect of his great school-building programme is that it is now almost true to say that he achieved his greatest aim, namely, that no Catholic child in the metropolitan area has to travel more than a mile to attend a Catholic school.

It is not only in the field of primary and secondary education that Sir James Duhig deserves a place in our thoughts. He was a member of the Queensland University Senate for almost as long as Mr. Story. He served for half a century. Whilst he was a member, during all that period, he made a great and notable contribution to the work and development of the university senate. He gave encouragement in all fields of education.

I think it was due to his close friendship with the late Sir Reginald Halse, former Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane, that there grew up an understanding among the various churches—other churches come into this—that was a distinctive feature of education in Queensland in the last decade. Nowhere in Australia is there a better appreciation by each of the groups of the work that the others do. That was due largely to the understanding and co-operation and, I suppose, to use the modern term, the ecumenical attitude of these great churchmen whom Queensland was privileged to have for so long.

A third notable person, with whom I was perhaps more closely associated than any of the others, is Sir Herbert Watkin, who started teaching as a pupil-teacher without the benefit of high-school education, who, through his own industry, study and ability, rapidly gained promotion and served as assistant teacher, head teacher, principal and inspector. He ultimately became Director of Education, perhaps in the period of education's most rapid growth. His greatest

love, of course, was the classroom. He was essentially—first and last—a teacher. Wherever possible, in moving around the State on his administrative duties he got in front of a class and took the lesson. Nothing pleased him more than the classroom atmosphere.

Not only did Sir Herbert make a valuable contribution to the advancement of education, and in the department itself, but he, too, served for a very long time as a member of the university senate, as deputy chancellor. He served on many other cultural organisations. He took a keen interest in the arts, and on his retirement from the department he accepted the task of chairing the committee set up to advise on the development of technical education in New Guinea and Papua. It was a great shock to all who knew him to hear of his untimely death. For half a century he gave of his best—and his best was a very good best—in the interests of the young people of Queensland. It is not often that in the one period three great men in the field of education suddenly are no longer with us.

In paying a tribute to those who have passed on, I should also like to pay a tribute to the great many voluntary workers in the field of education. I do not know of any other social field—I might say "field of social welfare"—in which so many people are prepared to give up so much of their time without thought of remuneration—in a purely voluntary capacity—to advance education.

Those hon. members who are associated with anyone who has been a member of the senate of the Queensland University know the great amount of time required to attend senate meetings and committee meetings, and to read the voluminous correspondence sent to members of the senate week after week so that they can keep up to date with developments and movements in the university. So there are these people who willingly and gladly accept appointment to such bodies.

In recent years we have had appointed a Technical Education Advisory Council and an Agricultural Educational Advisory Council. Those two groups of men, only recently appointed, have worked exceedingly hard during the last two years. It is this Government's view that on the vocational side of education it is not our job to tell industry, commerce, or trade what their students should know; on the contrary, it is our job to find out from industry what is required and then endeavour to provide those facilities.

The same applies to the apprenticeship field. We have Apprenticeship Advisory Boards and Apprenticeship Committees in various cities. We have a Conservatorium Advisory Board, a Board of Adult Education, a Library Board, Trustees to the Art Gallery, a Board of Junior Studies, a Board of Senior Studies, a National Fitness Council, and a Queensland Ballet Council. Those are some

of the State-wide organisations whose members serve voluntarily, year after year in the interests of education.

Then, of course, we have the thousands of parents and citizens' organisations which work week after week, the mothers in the tuckshops and the fathers in the working bees and in other fields of activity, taking an interest in their schools and helping to provide some of the extras that are not provided by the Government. I claim that we have a better education system because the parents are required to provide something. I should not like to see the day when the parents stayed at home and said, "Schooling is the Government's responsibility. Let it provide everything. We will send our children along, and that will do," because a far better education system prevails when the parents are brought actively into association with the head teachers and the teachers. When parents work for the school, and their children see them taking that interest in the workings of the school, the children are likely to become better students and better citizens. So there are these many thousands of people attached to the schools throughout the State working in a voluntary capacity.

Then there are bodies, such as the Crèche and Kindergarten Association, and, acting in a different field, the Arts Council, again with many members voluntarily giving a great deal of their time. There are service organisations, and those hon. members who travel in their own districts know that members of service organisations spend a great deal of time doing something for the kindergartens, the State schools, and the high schools, or for some bursary or scholarship, or something else that will further education in those areas.

In paying tribute to all of those people, I should like to mention my own and my department's appreciation of the coverage that Press, radio, and television give education. There is no dearth of opportunity around this time of the year, when speech nights are held. If an indication is given to those mediums that a speech night is to be held, an article containing the meat of the speeches is published for the information of parents and citizens.

Having dealt with public co-operation, let me say that perhaps the greatest thing that the Government has done in the field of education is that it has given equality of opportunity to all children, irrespective of where they live or the economic circumstances of their parents. Of course, that cannot be done 100 per cent. It is obvious that children at Birdsville cannot attend a university or an institute of technology there. Clearly there are some limitations, but, as far as is reasonably possible, children today have been given equal opportunities, wherever they live and whatever may be the financial position of their parents. Certainly this is so for the bright ones, as the scholarships that are now

available overcome the disabilities previously suffered by children of parents who could not afford to give them further education.

The most significant achievement, although not the only one, has been in the field of secondary education. There was a type of equality of opportunity for children up to the age of 14 years, or at primary-school level. No longer is it considered satisfactory to give the children of Queensland equal opportunity only at this level; it is now felt that they should all have the chance to obtain further education. Some of the things that have happened at the secondary level, such as the abolition of the Scholarship examination—

Mr. Coburn: That is one of the best things you ever did.

Mr. PIZZEY: At least it gave all children the opportunity to receive secondary education, whereas previously the opportunities were limited. The raising of the school-leaving age to 15 and the introduction of a five-year secondary course are very important changes that have taken place.

Another thing for which the Government can claim credit is the introduction of transport services for secondary-school children. In spite of repeated requests, Labour Governments refused year after year to provide any transport to secondary schools unless a rail service was available. There are now 228 secondary-school services, catering for 12,000 children. Almost as many children have been introduced to the field of secondary education by means of transport services as were in the schools of Queensland when this Government took office.

Mr. Mann: That was nine years ago.

Mr. PIZZEY: If the hon. member wants figures, let me say that in 1957 the population of Brisbane was 543,000. Today it is 658,000, an increase of 21 per cent. During the period in which the population of Brisbane increased by 21 per cent., the Government increased the places available for secondary-school children in Brisbane from 5,600 to 19,700.

Mr. Hanlon: What about the increase in the relevant age-group?

Mr. PIZZEY: It certainly was not 100 per cent.

Mr. Hanson interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Port Curtis knows the rule governing interjecting by a member from a seat in the Chamber other than his own.

Mr. PIZZEY: In 70 Queensland towns no facilities for secondary education were made available by the Labour Government. Children in those towns just did not get any. The increase in the number of places from 5,600 to 19,700 excludes Grade 8. If that grade

is included, the figure is 28,300 places. However, I want to be fair and confine the comparison to the four-year course previously and the corresponding four years today.

Under Labour, there was only one high school with an oval. When Dr. Felix Dittmer looked like being beaten in an electorate on the south side of the river, the Labour Government rushed in and built an oval at Cavendish Road High School. That was the only one it built.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PIZZEY: You should have seen the attempt that was made to build an oval there, Mr. Hooper. It was just a piece of level ground.

During the years that it has been in office, the Country-Liberal Government of Queensland has had very valuable assistance from the Commonwealth Government in the field of high schools, and 23 Commonwealth science blocks have been built. This movement is progressive, and science blocks are being provided first at the schools that have the greatest number of Senior and sub-Senior classes. In recent years, too, a textbook allowance has been introduced. So I say again that the present equality of opportunities for education is something of which the Government can be proud.

As a matter of fact, if one looks at the buildings and remembers the schools that existed under Labour, one sees that many of them have had to be replaced. The hon. member for Belmont knows that 80 per cent. of the Cavendish Road High School, which was built by Labour, had to be pulled down and rebuilt almost completely, and the same may be said of many other schools. This Government can say with pride that 80 per cent. of the high-school places in this State have been provided by it.

Mr. Bennett: You can say it, but nobody will believe you.

Mr. PIZZEY: It is true.

Mr. Lloyd: Built on land that Labour resumed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PIZZEY: In country areas, only about eight of the existing high schools were built originally by Labour, and almost every one of those has had to be rebuilt almost completely. Bundaberg High School has been rebuilt almost completely; Maryborough High School has been extensively renovated; and the high schools at Gympie, Nambour, Southport and Dalby have been rebuilt almost completely by the Country-Liberal Government. Almost all high schools in the metropolitan area and an even greater proportion in country areas have been provided by our Government, despite the fact that the population has increased by about 20 per cent. in the last nine years.

Let us take the provincial cities. The hon. member for Toowoomba East knows very well that the two high schools in Toowoomba were built by the Country-Liberal Government. Admittedly, the high school at Harristown was functioning previously with an enrolment of about 250.

Mr. Bennett: They were planned.

Mr. PIZZEY: They were all planned, according to the hon. member for South Brisbane; they were planned for the next 20 years. I have not been able to find any of the plans.

The hon. members for Ipswich East and Ipswich West know that the two high schools in Ipswich were established after the Country-Liberal Government came to office.

Mr. Donald: They were built, but you were only following our programme.

Mr. PIZZEY: That is not correct.

The hon. members for Townsville North and Townsville South know that the two high schools in Townsville have been built since the Country-Liberal Government took office.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind hon. members on both sides of the Chamber that the Minister is entitled to bring his Estimates before the Committee and that, in turn, they are entitled to speak on the Estimates. I ask them to refrain from consistent interjections.

Mr. Lloyd: May I ask you a question? Why are you in so much more trouble than we were?

Mr. PIZZEY: I will tell the hon. member why. How could Labour be in trouble in staffing schools when it did not have any? Labour did not have any trouble in staffing high schools in Brisbane because there weren't any. In other words, it provided secondary education for a select few in the community.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PIZZEY: I intend to take my time over this, because it is quite an impressive story.

Mr. Sullivan: We will back you up, too.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PIZZEY: One hears hon. members opposite saying that the State has not advanced because country towns are the same as they were under Labour, that there has not been any change. If that is so, why were not these facilities provided before? Let us have a look at the new schools in the country, outside the metropolitan area.

High schools have been provided at Toowoomba, Mount Lofty, most of the one at Harristown, the two at Ipswich, Rockhampton, Rockhampton North, the greater part of both schools at Townsville, and both schools at Mackay. New schools have been provided, where there was no secondary education at all, at Thursday Island and Redcliffe. Is there any reason why there should not have been facilities for all those years at a place like Redcliffe? If a Redcliffe lad wanted to attend high school he had to come to the metropolitan area. To continue the list, new high schools have been provided at Pine Rivers, Clontarf, Mareeba, Trinity Bay, Atherton, Malanda, Gordonvale, Innisfail, Tully, Home Hill, Bowen, Proserpine, Mirani, Sarina, Longreach, Charleville, Biloela, Monto, Gayndah, Isis, Hervey Bay, Murgon, Kingaroy, Wondai, Maroochydoore, Cooroy, Caloundra, Caboolture, Kilcoy, Beenleigh, Beaudesert, Stanthorpe, Boonah, Miami, Oakey, Chinchilla, Cleveland, Gattton, Roma, Goondiwindi and Pittsworth. They are all new high schools built by this Government. At some of those places there were high tops, or, as they are called, secondary departments, but now children have an opportunity to proceed to matriculation level in all of those centres.

Now let me refer to 70 country centres where no facilities existed—where for 40 years Labour was prepared to allow the citizens to have their children leave school at the age of 14 without any facilities at all for secondary education. In all these towns—a number of them western towns—there would not be anyone over the age of 23 who has lived there continuously and who had an opportunity for secondary education, unless of course his parents were wealthy enough to send him away to school.

It is almost incredible that these electorates were represented by Labour men for almost 40 or 50 years, and in some cases by Labour Ministers for a long period. What was Labour's objective in denying western people the opportunity for secondary education? Obviously they had no problems in staffing schools; they simply said to western boys, "To hell with you; you can go without a school; we are not interested."

I well remember the Honourable Francis Michael Forde, with a pile of papers inches thick in front of him, pleading with his own Government for a high top at Hughenden.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. PIZZEY: It is a story the hon. member does not like to hear.

I think we should have recorded in "Hansard" for the benefit of these people—and as a reminder to them—that in these 70 country centres, for the first time, this Government gave their children the opportunity of a secondary education. The towns are: Thursday Island, Ravenshoe, Babinda, Biggenden, Collinsville, Pittsworth, Yeppoon, Crow's Nest, Clermont, Emerald, Hughenden, Jandowae, Miles, Cloncurry, Inglewood,

Millmerran, Oakey, St. George, Texas, Theodore, Cooroy, Cunnamulla, Mirani, Mitchell, Tara, Wandoan, Winton, Imbil, Kenilworth—

Mr. Bennett: Are we going on a Cook's tour again?

Mr. PIZZEY: Yes, definitely.

To continue the list: Rosewood, Bell, Caloundra, Dirranbandi, Gordonvale, Home Hill, Julia Creek, Kilcoy, Lowood, Mundubbera, Surat, Yarraman, Injune, Allora, Aramac, Baralaba, Calen, Cecil Plains, Clifton, Goomeri, Kilkivan, Killarney, Laidley North, Miriam Vale, Mt. Larcom, Proston, Richmond, Rosedale, Springsure, Tambo, Taroom, Wallumbilla, Wondai, Alpha, Dimbulah, Eidsvold, Moura, Quinalow, Woodford.

Why was that? There is no answer. The previous Government just did not care.

Mr. Hanlon: Before 1957 the numbers in the age-groups in many of these centres would not have qualified the centres in accordance with your present requirements.

Mr. PIZZEY: In the great majority of them the numbers in the age-group were sufficient to establish secondary educational facilities. The hon. member would not say that Springsure has grown much in recent years. This Government has provided these facilities and opportunities for the children of the West.

Mr. Houston: What do they do when they pass the Junior examination? Is there any work for them?

Mr. PIZZEY: There is work, as there was before. There are opportunities for appointment and promotion. Many of them enter the Public Service. Many take positions in larger towns. Previously very few Aboriginal children had the opportunity to obtain a secondary education. In the time of the previous Government only 13 Aboriginal children in the settlements and missions were attending high school.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for South Brisbane to please discontinue his persistent interjections. If he does not, I will have to deal with him.

Mr. PIZZEY: Today 302 boys and girls on the missions and settlements and Torres Strait Islanders are attending high schools or boarding schools at Government expense. In Labour's day one would never see a photograph such as I am holding. It depicts Torres Strait Islanders and Aboriginal children who are being boarded at Government expense at Charters Towers.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. PIZZEY: Labour had 40 years to do something about it, but they did nothing in all that time.

We realise that there were still some problems facing those who lived remote even from small country towns. The only way they could be assisted was by granting them some allowance. The Treasurer announced in his Financial Statement that we would be paying a special allowance of \$4 a week to children who are compelled to live away from home if they want to attend a secondary school. This payment of \$4 a week will give parents a reasonable chance to send their children away to high school. It will not enable them to send their children to the more costly boarding schools. Many of the hostels in the western areas charge something like \$9 of \$10 a week. Of course, it costs a certain amount to feed and clothe a child at home. The \$4 payment is not subject to a means test.

The \$4 allowance, together with the other allowances available under the means test—the living-away-from-home allowance and the former Scholarship allowance—will entitle some parents to a payment of \$6 or \$7 a week. Where we cannot provide secondary education to Senior standard, we are providing 300 post-Junior scholarships for those children who cannot attend sub-Senior and Senior Classes daily. From an examination of the figures of children attending secondary departments and living in remote areas, it would seem that probably 300 are as many as would be justified in proceeding to Senior standard. The Senior courses are not easy. Children with a 6C of 7C pass in Junior would not be able to cope with the Senior courses, but those who show any ability whatever will be able to win one of these scholarships, which will be worth \$5 a week.

Mr. Bennett: I could name specialists on the Terrace who got less than a 7C's pass in Junior yet they are outstanding surgeons today.

Mr. PIZZEY: That is so. There are always exceptions. But should we allow 1,000 through on the chance that half a dozen will become outstanding people? This will always be the case. We could all name some who were outstanding at school but failed in the first year at university, and the reverse is also true.

Much has been said about the physical facilities at our schools, or the provision of classrooms. Nearly 2,000 classrooms have been provided and, over all, more than \$100,000,000 has been spent by this Government in providing school buildings in the primary, secondary, and tertiary fields.

We have been particularly appreciative of the very valuable help given by the Commonwealth Government in recent years. Anybody who has seen the new science blocks must realise that they afford very fine facilities for the teaching of education at the higher level. One of these blocks is to be opened at Kedron on Saturday, I think; the Cavendish Road block was opened several months ago, and blocks are rapidly nearing completion in

many other parts of the State. The Commonwealth says we have been a little too extravagant, that we have done a little too well, but we thought that we should take longer to get through all the schools and give them something that allowed an easier transition from the high-school level to the university level. The facilities provided in many of these science blocks will allow science masters to ease the children into university.

Mr. Murray: The one at Kedron is superb.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. PIZZEY: They will get them. They certainly will not have to wait 40 years as they did under Labour—and even then they did not get them.

In many high schools there are subject masters, specialist teachers, and teachers of music, art and physical education. There is a greater variety than ever before in the choice of subjects in the larger high schools. This has caused problems in staffing. Nobody denies that there are problems, but they are common in high schools in every part of the world. Staffing problems are common in every Australian State, in Britain and in America. I have previously indicated to the people one of the basic reasons for this problem, namely, that high-school teachers today must be at least 21 years of age, which means that they must have been born before 1945. Therefore, high schools throughout Australia and the world are being staffed by people born somewhere between 1929 and 1945, which covers the depression period, the post-depression period, and the war period. In all countries this was the period of a diminishing birth rate. In those years some countries had their lowest birth rate in history. Things were stagnant; there was no movement or development, but all industries—not only education, but also commerce, trade, and industry itself—in all professional fields have to draw from that very small group to provide for the vastly increased numbers that are now coming forward as a result of the high birth-rate after 1945.

Mr. Hanlon: You use this birth-rate factor in defence when we are running towards your goal line, but you do not want anybody to pick it up when you are running towards our goal line.

Mr. PIZZEY: I do not know what the hon. member means.

Mr. Hanlon: You use this factor when it is an advantage to you, but you dismiss it when we say it was a factor in the increase in the number of secondary students.

Mr. PIZZEY: It is a factor.

Mr. Hanlon: You use it as a factor in the lack of teachers, but you did not recognise it in the number of students.

Mr. PIZZEY: We could easily have avoided the difficult situation we are now in if we had refrained from providing educational opportunities for all Queensland children. That is something the Opposition did when it was in office. That argument may be valid in places like Alpha or Springsure, but it is certainly not valid in Redcliffe or Brisbane. There is no validity in the argument when, until 1952, there was only one high school here, namely, the Brisbane High School.

Despite all this, there are still too many large classes. Nobody denies that. But let us look at the over-all situation. A recent census conducted by the department gave the following result—

40 per cent. of high-school classes have fewer than 30 students.

60 per cent. of high-school classes have fewer than 35 students.

80 per cent. of high-school classes have fewer than 40 students.

95 per cent. of high-school classes have fewer than 45 students.

The other five per cent. have more than 45 students. Of course, that does not help the 200 or 300 classes with more than 45 students, but we must get things into their correct perspective. More than half the classes have fewer than 35 students. Despite the tremendous increase in the number of facilities we have provided in our period of office, something like five-fold, we have reached the situation where 80 per cent. of the classes have fewer than 40 students.

But we are not satisfied. In recent years we have offered fellowships to the university, special scholarships for one year, and teacher scholarships which can be applied for by all who qualify. A thousand more apply than qualify. People have great aspirations and want to qualify and become teachers. Admittedly a great number prefer to accept Commonwealth scholarships to take a professional course at the university, and others take positions in the Commonwealth or the State Public Service, or in commerce or trade. We will still probably be in a position at the end of this year to offer teacher scholarships to all who qualify.

Our entry standard is the highest in Australia. Although it is not the same as matriculation standard, it is a higher standard than we had years ago. Judging from Press reports and some comments, one would think we are lowering our standards. Not very many years ago a person could win a scholarship with 6 C's in the Junior, and he would go to the Teachers' College for a year.

Mr. Houston: How did they turn out?

Mr. PIZZEY: Like the one the hon. member for South Brisbane mentioned, some were excellent. But some were not so good. Some of the bright students, the ones with high passes, are not first-class teachers.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. PIZZEY: Is the hon. member for Salisbury advocating a return to the pupil-teacher system in this State? He seems to think we should go back to that standard. Surely he knows what is wrong.

Mr. Sherrington: You must admit they do a good job.

Mr. PIZZEY: Of course they do. But today they need to be more highly qualified to handle the new type of education, both primary and secondary, that is rapidly permeating the system in Queensland and in other States.

I pay tribute to Grade 8 teachers who transferred from the primary schools. There was not a great deal of difference in many of the subjects, but with the revised syllabus much work and study had to be done before they could cope adequately with the new responsibilities they accepted when they moved into the high schools and took over not only Grade 8, but Grade 9, and sometimes Grade 10. They were largely experienced teachers, and principals everywhere were appreciative of the excellent work they did. Many did not have high academic qualifications, but they had experience and understanding of children and were a good influence in the staff situation.

In recent years we have been able to continue the employment of all married women who could teach at high-school level. We have not, for good reasons, been able to do that in primary schools. In high schools, however, all married women who have had satisfactory service have had no trouble in obtaining appointments, provided vacancies have occurred in their districts or towns. I am not saying that every woman who taught and wished to continue has been appointed, because not all had satisfactory service. However, what I have said applies to the great majority of them.

Mr. Houston: You seem to suggest that you were glad when some of them got married.

Mr. PIZZEY: There are always some, I suppose, who are not quite up to standard. That might apply to politicians, too, so that when there is a redistribution of seats the electors are glad to get a new member. In every large body of 8,000 or 10,000 people, there are always some who are not perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: That applies in all walks of life.

Mr. PIZZEY: That is so.

We have endeavoured to assist principals of the larger high schools by providing more clerical staff and laboratory assistants. We would like to carry this assistance further, but here again it is a matter of determining priorities in the spending of money. If there is another \$250,000 to spend, someone has to determine whether to employ, for example, an additional 250 clerk-typists or another 140

teachers. As far as is possible we are endeavouring, as money becomes available, to relieve the administrative burdens on the principals of high schools and the head teachers of the larger primary schools.

It has been said that teachers' salaries are a deterrent to obtaining staff at high-school level. Although the salaries in Queensland may be below those payable in some other States, when a person graduates in Science or Arts and receives a Diploma of Education, he begins, at the age of about 22 or 23, on a salary of \$3,646, which is approximately \$70 a week. That is as high a salary as a graduate can receive on entering the teaching service in other States. During his years of service he can then rise without further examination, as he is already qualified, to Class I.1, and then to deputy principal and principal. The salary of a Grade I principal is \$6,800, or \$130.35 a week.

Those are some of the Government's significant achievements in the field of secondary education, although I would not say that they alone are the most important. The most important achievement is probably to be found in the attitude within the schools. The development of secondary education and the provision of facilities for it is proceeding concurrently with what might be called a revolution in schooling in this State. It is perhaps not as spectacular as other developments in terms of statistics, but it is more fundamental and important for the ultimate welfare of our nation.

I point out that the changing scene in education has not merely been one of rising numbers and the physical provision of accommodation for them. A revolution is occurring in the very processes of education. It is therefore essential, in these times of greater awareness than ever before of the importance of education, that the public should know this. For many years it has been true to say that the major objective of both primary and secondary education has been the inculcation in pupils of a knowledge of those facts deemed necessary for their future lives as citizens and for their chosen vocations. Educators were able to agree within reasonable limits on those skills that students should master and those facts that they should learn. It was easy to do that, because it was known what knowledge one would require to do a certain job and what one would require to know to pass a certain examination. One could look at an examination paper ten years ago and say, "The paper for the examination this year will be much the same," and much the same content of study would be required.

While there has undoubtedly been a considerable amount of wastage of effort in education in the past through students learning facts by rote methods and forgetting them almost as soon as they left school, such a state of affairs was not considered critical in a society that was reasonably stable and in which the same pattern of occupations and skills existed from year to year. I venture to say that most hon.

members sat for examinations—perhaps the Junior, perhaps the Senior—and that about a fortnight after having sat for them they would have got about 30 per cent. for the papers for which they sat. It seemed to be the pattern of those days to learn to reproduce facts for an examination and then forget the subject matter the next morning.

This is no longer true. Changes in society generally, and in the skills required for almost all trades and professions, are occurring so rapidly that it is becoming increasingly difficult to predict just what knowledge and what skills the student of today will require for his occupation of tomorrow. In the past, a trained engineer knew within reasonable limits what he was likely to need to know in the 20 years after he qualified; he does not know that today. The explosion of knowledge, the rapidly expanding frontiers in almost all disciplines, make it virtually impossible for any man to be master of one field, let alone of more than one.

Since we can no longer hope to predict what facts the citizen of tomorrow will need to know, and since it is impossible for the student to master all of the facts associated with even one subject, there is a changed emphasis in learning in both primary and secondary schools. This changed emphasis, expressed simply, is on the development of an understanding of the basic principles or structure of each subject and on the development of a true problem-solving approach. The aim is so to prepare our students that they can meet new situations and problems and apply their basic understanding towards adequate and satisfying solutions.

All of this will mean different approaches in both the teaching and the examining aspects of education. It is a challenging, interesting and rewarding, but far more strenuous, task for both teacher and student to seek for understanding instead of accumulating, through rote learning, a host of facts. This does not mean, of course, that knowledge as such is decried. Rather is it seen in a broader perspective, allied by its application and analysis to the prime task of solving; of meeting new and possibly undreamt-of situations in an intelligent fashion.

Those hon. members who have children or grandchildren in a primary school, particularly in the lower grades, will already have observed these changes in approach in the teaching of mathematics. No longer does the child begin his study of mathematics by the rote learning of tables of number facts: rather, by observation, activity, and discovery, does he experience those aspects of relationships that are fundamental to the understanding of mathematics, even at the most advanced levels. He is concerned not only with the relationships of number but also with the development of an understanding of the world of spatial relationships and measurement.

At primary schools, too, in some schools this year, and in all schools next year, he will be following a science syllabus the prime object of which is to enable him to observe accurately and to understand, appropriate to his age and development, the relationships that exist in the world of things, both living and non-living, that form his environment.

In secondary schools, for the past three years he will have been following a course of study that is at once much broader and more searching than the more formal and rigid curricula of earlier years. Hon. members will find, if they look at his examination papers this year, questions that in many respects are considerably different from the type of questions that they themselves faced when they sat for Junior. These questions, cast in the spirit of a modern curriculum, aim to measure the student's understanding of his subject and his ability to apply his understanding to the solution of problems possibly new to his experience.

Mr. Houston: It will put a far greater burden on teachers.

Mr. PIZZEY: Certainly. This type of question is a reflection of the new methods of teaching, which will, we believe, serve the student far better in the days to come.

At the upper secondary-school level, new curricula are beginning to emerge. In 1967, a chemistry course known as "Chem Study" will be introduced to Queensland sub-Senior students. Throughout this course, the emphasis is also on the development of understanding of those basic relationships that exist in chemistry and on the fostering within the student of the spirit of scientific inquiry and of the discipline of the scientific method. Similar emphasis will be found in other new Senior courses such as mathematics, physics and biology.

All of this adds up to the fact that particularly important changes are occurring in the process of education. None would realise that better at this moment than the teachers. They realise that they would have to re-learn, with a new system of approach, if they wanted to come back to teaching. At all levels there is emerging a renewed emphasis on the development of understanding of the basic structure of the various subject areas so that students might be able to apply this insight into as yet un-met applications.

Many other changes will undoubtedly occur in our schools in the future. In the application of science and technology to the classroom, the media of programmed instruction, closed and open circuit television, language laboratories and even computers will be among the more spectacular changes. These, however, are surface changes. They constitute teaching aids and techniques designed to assist rather than replace the teacher in his fundamental task of preparing the student to take his place in an increasingly complex society.

With these new approaches naturally there will be in some cases inadequacy among teachers, and there is a great need for in-service training. This is now being undertaken on a considerably increased scale. I think I have dealt sufficiently with secondary education for the time being, unless any questions arise during the ensuing debate.

I should now like to speak at some length on primary education. Some people think that with the emphasis on secondary education, primary education has tended to be neglected. That is not so. The building programme has been equally spectacular in the primary field as in the secondary.

Mr. Sherrington: How do you account for having so many temporary classrooms?

Mr. PIZZEY: Some of them are quite good. They are better than many of the classrooms left to us in 1957 as a legacy from Labour.

Since coming to office, we have spent something like \$28,000,000 on capital works at primary schools—that is a considerable sum—and something like 1,800 new primary classrooms have been provided. In addition many schools had to be remodelled; hundreds more have been adapted and remodelled to meet modern requirements. Some remain to be done; Townsville South has yet to be done.

Not only has there been quite a development in the provision of buildings; there has also been an expansion of school-transport services, and something like 23,000 children are now being carried to school. Today 735 school-transport services are operating, as against 369, carrying 9,800 pupils, in 1957.

In this field of school transport our Government recognised early in its term that many people were carrying their children to school at their own expense. We have been able to give some assistance to those parents who have to drive their children more than 3 miles to school. Last year something like \$90,000 went to parents to assist them in their petrol costs for driving children to school. We are now spending five times as much on primary-school transport as was spent in 1957.

I do not need to mention the provision of septic systems and fencing or the change in the general environment of schools. As the hon. member for Townsville South has been interjecting, the Labour Government did not even put concrete floors underneath the schools. Year after year when I sat on the other side of the Chamber I asked for concrete floors underneath schools. If the Labour Government ever did it, it was only in Labour electorates.

Let me now have a word to say about class sizes. Let us look at the facts. In 1957 there were 198,857 pupils in primary schools; today there are 198,000. In other words, there are fewer children in primary schools today than in 1957 because we have

taken out Grade 8. The increase in enrolment has not yet caught up with that move. In 1957, when there were 198,857 pupils, there were 5,542 teachers; in 1966, with 198,000 pupils, there are 6,389 teachers, or in other words, something like 800 more teachers for the same number of pupils.

Hon. members opposite say that the class situation has not improved, that it has deteriorated. They have no argument. The true position is quite obvious. These figures are statistically recorded. In 1957 the mean class size in primary schools was 35.9; it is now 30.9, an improvement of 5 fewer in the mean class size. Our target is 26 by 1975.

Mr. Muller: What is all the noise about big classes?

Mr. PIZZEY: There are big classes but, at the same time, there are many very small classes. Although there are still some big classes, on the average they are now smaller than at any time in our history.

Mr. Houston: How many schools have been closed?

Mr. PIZZEY: What has that got to do with it? It does not alter the fact that today there are 800 more teachers for fewer children.

There are still some very difficult situations. For instance, how do we overcome the problem of a school with 40 or 45 children in all the classes? No Government would be in the financial position of being able to double the number of teachers. No Government could afford to split all the classes into classes of, say, 22 and 23 and thus have to double the number of teachers. The only way to overcome the difficulty is with composite groups—by taking 15 out of one class and 15 out of another and putting them together to form a composite grade. In many cases teachers do not like composite grades.

Mr. Houston: You are fostering them now.

Mr. PIZZEY: I am in favour of composite grades, and I make no apology for it. The hon. member for Barcoo taught composite grades for all his teaching life.

Mr. Houston: Parents will not send their children there if they can avoid it.

Mr. PIZZEY: The parents have to be educated to do so, and I would hope to get the support of hon. members opposite in educating parents to accept composite grades. No-one can speak with more experience than the hon. member for Barcoo, for he had composite grades all his teaching life. I suppose the hon. member for Maryborough also had many of them, and I taught composite grades for most of my teaching career.

Mr. Houston: Are you saying they are better?

Mr. PIZZEY: I am not saying they are better, but if the classes are made smaller, and the children are chosen, they are quite satisfactory. We do not want the intellectually weakest unloaded into composite grades, and I am sure that head-teachers do not do that today. Provided a wise choice is made of the children and the class is kept small, a composite grade can be a very good grade. Today, with more individual teaching and more reliance on children working without the teacher standing in front of the class laying down the law as has been the custom in the past, composite grades can be highly exciting and a worth-while experience for the children. The hon. member for Clayfield should know of a very peculiar case concerning the one-teacher school at Ascot. There is a waiting list at this school. Parents enrol their sons and daughters on the day of their birth so that they can attend this one-teacher school. It stands in the grounds of the ordinary school at Ascot. This is the particular type of education that these parents feel will afford most benefit to their children.

Mr. P. Wood: I do not think we can get a better school than a good one-teacher school.

Mr. PIZZEY: That is so, but we cannot be sure of staffing every one-teacher school with teachers as highly qualified as the teacher at Ascot. If they are not staffed by excellent teachers the teacher may stay with a child for the greater part of his primary-school life, but in the larger schools the child has a chance of having a variety of teachers over a period.

I think we must have composite classes, and I make no apologies for that statement. We must educate the people so that they will understand that a teacher can quite competently cope with a small group in a composite grade, otherwise there is no way of ever getting class-sizes down to 35 or 40 pupils.

Mr. Houston: That is a defeatist attitude.

Mr. PIZZEY: The hon. member's attitude is that a class of 40 is too large and there should be another class. If there was a class of 36 he would have two classes of 18.

Mr. Houston. There would be nothing greatly wrong with that, either.

Mr. PIZZEY: How unrealistic can the hon. member be? He would bring us to the stage where he would tax the nation out of existence.

The supply of teachers is largely bound up with the facilities and opportunities for training teachers at colleges. Let us again look at Labour's record. Labour did not build one teacher's college. They took over an intermediate school, converted the classrooms, and called it the Kelvin Grove

Teachers' Training College. That was the only teacher-training facility available in Queensland in 1957. We still have the school there, but over the years we have added several new wings that are more suitable for teacher training. We have also built a new teachers' training college at Kedron Park and a new domestic science teachers' college at Kelvin Grove, which is equal to any in Australia.

Mr. Aikens: When are you going to build a teachers' training college at Townsville.

Mr. PIZZEY: We have announced that it is our intention to build two, one at Townsville and one at Mt. Gravatt, in Brisbane. The land has been acquired at Townsville, and I should like to thank the Townsville City Council for making a grant of the land for the teachers' college and the university. I should not mind seeing a similar gesture further south. The Townsville City Council showed admirable public spirit.

We will start on those new colleges next year, but we badly need finance and help. All States need help in teacher training and in building. They need help if they want to extend the course to three years, because that increases the cost by 50 per cent. We hope that eventually we will get help from the Commonwealth in this tertiary field, just as we are getting it in the technological and university fields. Even if we do not get help we will still have to go on with it because we have already planned for recruitment until 1975, when we hope class sizes will be down to a reasonable level.

By then we will have 212,000 primary-school children, no more than we had three years ago, but we hope to have 8,000 teachers instead of the 5,600 teachers we had four or five years ago. We expect to have 81,000 secondary-school children and over 5,000 secondary-school teachers. During that period there will come up for consideration the question whether there should be a three-year instead of a two-year training course. The three-year training course is becoming generally accepted in principle by all States and most other countries. But how fast we can proceed and how our time-table can be met will depend on the amount of money available.

Mr. Aikens: Will there be a training course for university lecturers and readers?

Mr. PIZZEY: There is a short pre-year, in-service training scheme in Brisbane.

In Townsville we hope to provide boarding accommodation as that will be one of the great problems facing students from outside Townsville. It will not be easy for them to find accommodation in Townsville because of the growth that will take place there and the demands that will be made on accommodation by Service personnel and others. It will be more difficult for teachers to get "digs," or accommodation, in Townsville than

in Brisbane, so an essential part of the teachers' college in Townsville will be a residential block.

I shall not deal with the subjects being taught in primary schools. Some other Government members may be able to give information on that matter at a later stage.

Recently we have received assistance from the Commonwealth in technical education. We would not have been able to make the tremendous advances we have without the Gorton money, the Martin money, and now the Wark money. Senator Gorton is the Federal Minister in charge of education, and the other two men, through their committees, looked into the needs of the nation in tertiary and technological education.

On the technical side the Government is responsible for the training of tradesmen, technicians, and technologists. The training of tradesmen has long been carried out at the old Central Technical College, and technical colleges that were appendages to high schools in provincial cities throughout the State. It is no longer deemed satisfactory to have a technical college, if it is of any size whatever, as an appendage to a high school. To have adequate and efficient administration and instruction, a technical college should have its own principal and men skilled and knowledgeable in the trades. So we have separated most of the technical colleges from the high schools and given them their own principals, almost their own charters, one might say, and within four or five years practically all of them will have the various shops, such as plumbing, electrical, motor, and carpentry, required for teaching the various trades.

Mr. Aikens: You want to arrange for all apprentices to be accommodated at technical colleges. Many in provincial cities are taking correspondence courses.

Mr. PIZZEY: There should not be many doing correspondence courses when the full development is realised. It will never be possible to provide training in every town for watchmakers, for example, or optometrists. Some trades have only very few apprentices. There could never be facilities for training in the printing trade in each provincial town. Apprentices in this category are brought to a training centre once a year for specialised training.

Mr. Aikens: But you don't do that. You bring in only the new ones, not the old ones.

Mr. PIZZEY: In a year or two all will be brought in. In most change-overs, the old system gradually passes and the new one is introduced.

Mr. Aikens: And the old ones are kicked in the teeth.

Mr. PIZZEY: In any change-over there will always be some who are disadvantaged. There will be new and growing technical colleges in almost all major provincial cities.

In some cases, arrangements are made for apprentices to travel to larger centres. It is uneconomic to retain a small technical college at Mt. Morgan, for example, and apprentices are now transported from there to Rockhampton. Apprentices are given far more satisfactory training by the provision of better facilities in larger towns.

Technical colleges are very expensive undertakings. The heat-engine laboratories at Rockhampton and Townsville alone cost about \$500,000. They are more for the training of technologists than tradesmen. Each of the other centres for training in plumbing, electrical work, woodwork, etc., cost about \$150,000 or \$160,000.

Mr. Coburn: Would you put a technical college in a town the size of Ayr?

Mr. PIZZEY: We will put them where there are sufficient students in each year of training to warrant the appointment of staff. Obviously, staff could not be appointed to teach three students. The needs of all parts of Queensland are watched, and, wherever there are sufficient apprentices to justify the establishment of separate colleges, they will be provided. However, we have to be sure that there will be a continued demand for training. A building costing \$200,000 cannot be provided if after three years there will be no apprentices to be trained.

In Brisbane there is a movement away from the Domain, and efforts are being made to get rid of the huts that have remained there from the post-war years. I hope that within two years they will all be removed. The move is from the central area of Brisbane to peripheral technical colleges; the two now being built are at Eagle Farm and Yeronga. The next will be at Ithaca, and then one will be required on the eastern side of the city to serve the eastern suburbs.

Mr. Sherrington: You might get around to Salisbury then.

Mr. PIZZEY: They will be placed where the apprentices live. No longer is it necessary to consider the location of industries, because apprentices are trained during the day and do not have to go to their classes from work. They now leave home and go direct to technical colleges for a day's training, so no longer is it necessary to give consideration to industrial areas. Our interest now is in where apprentices live, and transport facilities.

Mr. Houston: You want one on the south side at Wynnum.

Mr. PIZZEY: In that direction.

Mr. Sherrington: What about Salisbury? There are 19,500 people on the electoral roll, so there must be a large number of apprentices.

Mr. PIZZEY: The hon. member for Salisbury has complained that the Government provides these facilities in electorates held

by Government members, merely because Yeronga happens to be one of them. What does he say about the fact that the Government is building two institutes of technology, one in the electorate of the hon. member for Toowoomba West and the other in the electorate of the hon. member for Rockhampton North? They are being built where the facilities are suitable and where they will give most benefit to the people of those cities.

Mr. Lloyd: The Commonwealth told you where to put them.

Mr. PIZZEY: The Commonwealth did nothing of the sort. I assure the hon. member for Kedron that the Commonwealth gave us no subsidy for these sites; therefore, they had no say. Certainly, we showed the Commonwealth where they were being established, but we have not received any subsidy on them.

The Government has a responsibility now for the training of tradesmen, technicians, and technologists. A motor-trade school is needed on the northern side of the city, but at present the motor-trade school on the south side can cope with the requirements. At Kangaroo Point, across the river from Parliament House, a graphic arts school is being built for the printing trade, which is one of the most expensive trades to provide for.

Mr. Houston: Is private industry assisting in any way by providing equipment?

Mr. PIZZEY: It has promised some equipment.

Mr. Sherrington: They won't "come good".

Mr. PIZZEY: They will "come good", but their contribution will be only a fraction of the total cost.

Mr. Houston: The trend overseas is for industry to assist.

Mr. PIZZEY: Yes. Industry has assisted in the motor-trade school. Cut-away engines and various other pieces of equipment have been provided when new engines have been introduced, so that students can be taught about automatic gears, and so on. They have been given not only to the college in Brisbane but also to colleges in provincial cities.

The training of tradesmen is being catered for adequately, and I appreciate the extensive help that the Commonwealth Government is giving. It is providing over \$1,000,000 a year, and it seems that that amount will be available indefinitely until trade schools are adequate to do the job that is required of them.

Separated from these are the technological institutions at a tertiary level. This is a new trend in Queensland. It developed in other States long before it developed here, because they were industrialised earlier and required a greater number of technologists

and technicians. In the past year, a rebuilding programme has been under way next door to Parliament House for the Institute of Technology, and over \$4,000,000 will be spent there in the next three years. In addition, more than \$1,000,000 will be spent at Toowoomba and over \$1,000,000 at Rockhampton in providing facilities for similar diploma courses in provincial areas. These will provide opportunities mainly at the tertiary level; but they will provide also for technicians at the post-Junior level.

There is much more I could say about the Institute of Technology, but I think I will leave it till later in the debate. I will make only one point at this stage. There has been a suggestion in some quarters that institutes of technology should be miniature universities, that they should be like embryonic universities in provincial cities. The Commonwealth Government has made it plain that the money it makes available is not to be used for that purpose. Its Committee on Advanced Education, which was headed by Dr. Wark, had this to say—

"Arising from some comments made by individuals in the course of our inquiries in the States, we cannot too strongly emphasise that a college of advanced education is not to be confused with the type of college, generally known in America as a junior college. Such colleges do, in fact, present courses with recognised end qualifications, but they are confined to pre-university and technician training. We point out that the colleges which we hope to develop in co-operation with the States will offer professional level courses in their own right. Their ability to do so is already well-recognised by a wide range of employers and professional institutions."

These institutes that we are establishing will be recognised professionally. The Public Service and the teaching service have agreed to recognise them. We are offering 100 fellowships for diplomas in science or industrial chemistry, and those who qualify will be able to join the teaching service after they have had a year's professional training on an equal status with those who obtain a science degree at the university. They will be able to do a four-year fellowship course and come in with equal professional status to those who come from the university. I think these are new and wide opportunities that are being opened up for young Queenslanders to adopt a different type of tertiary education—perhaps with more of a practical bias, more at the level of workshop floor-manager.

Between engineers and top technologists and the tradesmen level there has always been a gap. That is where the technicians will come in. There are different types of technicians. There are technicians who are offshoots to engineers. Every engineer and every technologist usually requires four, five, or six technicians, men with advanced

training to work under the direction of the engineer. There are no problems in the fields of civil and electrical engineering, and there is no problem in the field of biological science in the laboratories; but there is some difficulty when one gets to the mechanical field, because the upgraded tradesman who becomes a foreman feels that it is his prerogative to take charge of the men who are tradesmen. I believe it is here that there is a field of opportunity for the technician who will train for two years after Senior and will come in more on the side of the engineer.

Mr. Houston: When will he learn to use tools?

Mr. PIZZEY: Many of them will take the opportunity when they leave the college with a diploma equivalent to a technical Senior. They will have only two years' college work to do, and many will realise that it is better to have the trade qualifications as well as the technical qualifications. The Commonwealth Public Service is already looking for this type of qualification.

Mr. Houston: Are you going to advance the idea of continuing training after the first year?

Mr. PIZZEY: An expert advisory committee is meeting regularly and discussing these problems. We have a fluid situation. There is nothing static in education. We do not say, "This is what we have; it is the best we will get and it will have to stay for eight or 10 years". These things are being continually reviewed. Proposals are put up and examined. We are careful not to jeopardise anyone's future but, as we should be, we are watching curricula, procedures, and methods—what is happening in other countries of the world—and rejecting what we think is undesirable and accepting what is good. We continually have these meetings of experts in the various trades and professions.

Mr. Houston: I hope you take their advice.

Mr. PIZZEY: Largely, we do. Sometimes it requires a great amount of money to act on their advice, and the matter has to be deferred because we just cannot find overnight the wherewithal to suddenly implement what they suggest.

In the field of agricultural training a similar revision is being undertaken, and next year at the Queensland Agricultural College at Gatton there will be two levels of courses—one a two-year course after Junior and the other a fellowship course after Senior. The post-Senior course will be of either three or four years. Those that come out from this course will have equal professional status with engineers and other diplomates coming from technological institutions.

Some hon. members have visited Gatton College, where we have a complete rebuilding programme under way. It will cost something like \$3,000,000 before it is completed. Accommodation has to be rebuilt. Dining

facilities have been rebuilt. They are as good as one will find anywhere. The new lecture rooms and science laboratories are first-class. However, it will take a few more years yet to complete the programme. Within a reasonably short time Gatton College will be as fine an agricultural institution as could be found anywhere.

Mr. Aikens: Are you going to confine it to Queensland students, or are you going to let bookmakers' sons from New South Wales come in, as the Labour Government did?

Mr. PIZZEY: We have long since stopped that practice. We allow in students from Papua and New Guinea, and from some of the developing countries. I think it is only right that we should. I am referring to Colombo Plan students and others. Unless there are vacancies we will give priority to Queensland students. Any Queensland student who passes Junior in certain subjects can attend there next year and undertake a two-year post-Junior course. I do not think there will be any vacancies. There are enough Queenslanders to take advantage of the good accommodation available. If we were offering some of the old accommodation to the Southerners, I do not think they would want to come.

Mr. O'Donnell: They would come for the meals.

Mr. PIZZEY: They would come for the meals and the cheap board.

Mr. Muller: Are you increasing the capacity?

Mr. PIZZEY: The capacity will be increased by reason of the fact that there will be fewer at the tertiary level than previously. At the same time there will be more at the post-Junior level, but we expect only a small number to start at the diploma level.

At the pre-Junior level we have 23 high schools offering an agricultural Junior. This takes in only the fundamentals of agriculture. It provides a background to agriculture for students living in the rural areas—and not only in rural areas, because our largest enrolment is at the Corinda High School.

Mr. Houston: Are you going to extend that course to other metropolitan schools?

Mr. PIZZEY: Not at the moment; not while we can adequately cater for those who require it.

As the hon. member for Gregory knows, we are providing a school to enable boys to learn something of the pastoral industry in a two-year post-Junior course. It is modelled somewhat on schools in South Africa that have been very useful in giving young men basic training before going to work in the pastoral industry. The first intake will be next year. Already we have the maximum number enrolled. This boarding school accommodates 48; we already have 48 enrolled, and there is a waiting list. Any

doubts we had about a sufficient number being interested in this course have been dispelled.

Mr. Davies: Any staff problems?

Mr. PIZZEY: Quite a few of the staff have been acquired—but not by us; by the board. We have given the board a certain amount of local autonomy. This will be an experiment in giving a great degree of local autonomy.

I do not intend to deal at length with the university. We will come to that later on. Of course, our next big programme will be the transfer of the university college at Townsville to its permanent site across the river, and the full development of the university at St. Lucia. We are not able to continue to provide the high annual increase in expenditure to the university that we have in the past. We can do that only at the expense of other fields of education. We think this is a period for consolidation (and growth, too), but not tremendous growth as has occurred in every university in Australia since the post-war years. All universities have been told that they must consolidate a little. They will not be able to spend as fast as they might think they should.

Mr. O'Donnell: Is there any levelling-off at the university?

Mr. PIZZEY: I think there will be, but St. Lucia has not yet been developed to its full capacity.

Mr. Aikens: Don't you think there is a need to put the cleaner right through the old, archaic university system?

Mr. PIZZEY: I think that could be a very interesting subject for debate here one day, and I should like to hear the hon. member's point of view on it. It is a very difficult situation. All universities throughout the world have the problem in administration of sorting out the very capable, dedicated and efficient, from the not so capable and inefficient. Some universities appoint staff for only five years and if, at the end of five years, a staff member is not satisfactory they find it easy to terminate his services.

I assure hon. members that the second university in Brisbane has been put back only a year or two in the time-table until we achieve full development at St. Lucia.

I wish to point out in these introductory remarks that this Government has led the way in giving assistance to non-State schools. We have always had a form of assistance here that is not available in other States—what I might call an aided grammar-school system. All major provincial cities have their grammar schools which got considerable help from the Government for work of a capital nature as well as an annual grant. They were allowed to run their organisations, and had local autonomy in managing their schools. That is a very good system. If any group came to me and said, "We want to

start a grammar school at Warwick, Bundaberg, or Maryborough," I would welcome the idea. As the hon. member for Maryborough knows, the grammar school at Maryborough ran into financial difficulties and the Government had to take it over. That was a great pity because grammar schools provide a very important and useful part of our secondary-education system. We have also been able to give greater assistance to other non-State schools. The abolition of the Scholarship enabled us to pay fees to all secondary students in Grades 8, 9 and 10. Last Christmas the Government announced its proposal—which it has implemented—to pay interest on loans for science accommodation in non-State schools.

Mr. Aikens: Have you taken out figures to show how much the Government has paid in cash in 12 months?

Mr. PIZZEY: I have the figures, and I can give the hon. member a list of schools if he wants them. They are for publication. It will probably total about \$150,000 by the end of the 12 months. The Commonwealth provided numerous classrooms in many parts of the State. At the beginning of next year an allowance of \$15 a student will be paid to all schools.

The non-State school system has its problems. On the whole, numbers in classes are very much larger than in State schools. We will certainly be getting the spill-over, because they face the same difficulty as we do in staffing schools and providing accommodation. Last year I believe there was a spill-over of 10,000 pupils into the New South Wales State education system. This spill-over was partly responsible for the critical accommodation situation at the beginning of the year. The private sector of the school system was incapable of coping with the vast numbers that wanted to enrol, and they had to be accommodated in the State-school system.

That caused tremendous problems at the beginning of the year. However, it is not surprising when we remember that the non-State schools have the same difficulty in getting staff. They have large classes which, in many cases, are far larger than the classes that would be acceptable in our own schools.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.]

Mr. PIZZEY: I do not intend to detain hon. members much longer in surveying the service that education has given in recent years. Having dealt with the primary, secondary, technical, and tertiary fields, I shall now mention briefly a few aspects of the special education service this State provides.

The Government realised soon after it took office that this was a field that required a specialist officer in charge, and we formally made the special education branch a separate branch as in the secondary, primary, and technical fields, and we put an experienced and capable officer in charge. Since that

time there have been many interesting developments in this field, which largely looks after the unfortunate children in the community, namely, the physically handicapped and the mentally retarded. Also under that officer comes indirectly the kindergarten association. It is run by the Crèche and Kindergarten Association, and the Government, with its considerable financial help, is in close liaison with that association. All citizens realise that there is an obligation to look after the unfortunate in our community, as well as the fortunate.

But looking after the physically handicapped and mentally retarded children is not the only job of this particular section. It is almost the nerve centre of new developments. It also has a research organisation where capable, highly qualified officers continually keep abreast of what is happening in other States and countries. They study modern trends and advances and bring them to the notice of departmental heads. The research and guidance section has made an invaluable contribution to the advancement of education in Queensland.

There has been an enormous growth in kindergarten work because of the financial encouragement this Government has given. There were 23 kindergartens operating in 1957; now there are over 100. The grant has increased from \$13,600 in 1957 to \$122,000 at present. That does not take into account the special \$100,000 grant made last year to assist in the establishment of a Crèche and Kindergarten Association training college.

Possibly more important than the assistance given to pre-school children is the help given to children who are slow learners. Only a small percentage of slow learners were provided for before this Government took office. They are not all provided for now—we should like to be able to move more quickly—but tremendous progress in the opportunities given to slow learners has been made since 1957.

Mr. Davies: One would expect some improvement over the years.

Mr. PIZZEY: One would expect some improvement consistent with the increase in population, but the rate of improvement shown has been very much better than that. In 1957 there were 500 places for slow learners. Obviously there were many more for whom places could not be found. Today 1,600 places are available—three times as many. The number of slow learners has not increased by 200 per cent.

Mr. Davies: We appreciate what has been done.

Mr. PIZZEY: In 1957 opportunity schools were restricted to four or five centres. They now exist in 19 places, and the number will increase next year. Concurrent with increased opportunities for slow learners has been an increase in the opportunities provided in high

schools for children less qualified academically than others. I would not call them "slow learners".

Mr. O'Donnell: You did then.

Mr. PIZZEY: I did not.

Mr. O'Donnell: You just said you would not call them "slow learners".

Mr. PIZZEY: They are not slow learners in the way in which that term is used in opportunity schools. They are children who will benefit by a special form of secondary education. Many children have successfully undertaken the modified course to Junior standard and have been placed in industry. An interesting fact is that the community has taken a great interest in opportunity schools, and I should like to pay a tribute to businessmen, manufacturers, and others in the community who have gone out of their way to provide opportunities for these boys and girls.

Mr. Donald: They are doing a splendid job.

Mr. PIZZEY: At the opportunity school at Darling Point many have become welders, and many have taken up other trades. Much of our success in providing opportunities for them is due to the close co-operation of the Commonwealth Employment Service and the business people in the community.

Mr. Murray: Does the State provide any opportunities for them?

Mr. PIZZEY: Not many, no. Most of our positions require much more skilled work, but, where possible, we help in some fields, such as building. We cannot assist very much in the ordinary clerical and professional fields. I repeat that industry has been particularly co-operative in placing these people.

The Government has provided better accommodation and schooling for deaf and blind children. Three years ago the school catering for the blind was separated from the school for the deaf. Each school has its own peculiar problems in educating youngsters with these handicaps. At the school for the deaf a classroom block as modern as one could find anywhere was opened a year or so ago. I invite hon. members to inspect it. It was built with acoustics in mind, and the children are taught in small groups. Some of them are completely deaf, and even in that field there has been a complete change from the old method of teaching by the manual method.

What has happened at this school is only the first step in a construction programme that will cost about \$750,000. The first residential block is nearing completion. As all hon. members realise, the wooden buildings that served the purpose for many years are a very real hazard, and evacuating children of varying ages and degrees of deafness

in the event of fire, would be a great problem. As soon as the old wooden buildings are replaced by brick and concrete structures, the happier we will be.

The school for the blind, of course, as the hon. member for Norman knows, has its own classrooms and its own teachers.

Mr. Bromley: I think you are doing a fairly good job there.

Mr. PIZZEY: Yes, a good job is being done there, and a rationalising of the old buildings at Buranda is now being carried out. All these things are to the advantage of the children.

The number of speech correction officers has almost trebled—it is about 25 now—and they are doing a very good job in overcoming the defects and deficiencies of children.

The Department of Education conducts schools for the various spastic centres, and it also makes teachers available for children who are hospitalised for varying periods. The State has to accept educational responsibilities in many fields.

The department cannot get enough guidance officers, and it is very difficult to hold those that it has. It would like more. However, guidance services have been extended to country high schools, whereas previously they were restricted largely to city schools. Regional guidance officers have been appointed recently in Toowoomba and Townsville, and the department is attempting to continue and expand special education services concurrently with the advances that are being made in other fields of education.

Mr. Mann: Are you going to say anything about the police?

Mr. PIZZEY: I will deal with police matters later in the debate on the Estimates.

In conclusion, I should like to examine the expenditure on education. I know that the Opposition's argument will consist of a recital of comparative per capita expenditure on education in an attempt to show that Queensland is lagging behind the other States. Hon. members opposite used those figures extensively during the last election campaign as being the only criterion of Queensland's standard of education. Of course, much more than the expenditure per capita is involved.

Mr. Lloyd interjected.

Mr. PIZZEY: Surely the hon. member is not going to suggest to me, that because the Victorian Government has to pay \$160,000 an acre for land and the Queensland Government has to pay only \$10,000 an acre, Victoria immediately has a better system of education? Many factors are involved in the expenditure per capita. Take, for instance, the question of equal pay. The Government of New South Wales

is moving towards equal pay—it is its policy to do so—and it will achieve its aim over a number of years. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the question may be, the fact that the teachers in New South Wales will get equal pay does not necessarily mean a better system of education for the children or a better standard of education. The fact that Governments in southern States have to pay more for classrooms and equip them with central heating does not mean that they have a better system of education.

I point out, too, that some States include in their expenditure the interest and redemption on capital works. The Government of Queensland has spent about \$100,000,000 on school buildings. If it had to amortise that out of its own funds and provide the interest and redemption in its Education Vote, the expenditure per capita on education would rise very quickly. It is done with hospitals. If a hospital board borrows money from the Government to provide more hospital accommodation, it shows that amount of money as capital expenditure. Therefore, it is very difficult to get expenditure that indicates comparable standards.

Let us look now at the tax reimbursements that Queensland has received. Between 1948-49 and 1956-57, Labour Governments spent on education an average of 10·9 per cent. of their Budgets; between 1956-57 and 1965-66, Country-Liberal Governments have spent an average of 16·74 per cent. of their total Budgets. Country-Liberal Governments have been prepared to set aside a far higher percentage of the total moneys available to meet the educational needs of the State than were former Labour Governments in the preceding 7 or 8 years.

Let us take expenditure from Consolidated Revenue. Since 1956-57, expenditure on education from Consolidated Revenue has been increasing by 10·35 per cent. annually, yet the Consolidated Revenue Fund itself has been increasing at the rate of only just over 8 per cent. In other words, each year expenditure on education has been progressing at a far greater rate than have the sums available in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Our rate of expenditure this year will be 51 per cent., which is far higher than it was in 1957—about 42 per cent. of tax reimbursements.

We have reached the stage today where half the money we receive by way of tax reimbursements is spent in the field of education. This is almost 10 per cent. higher than was the case when this Government took office.

Let us now examine some other comparisons of increased expenditure. The figures I want to give relate to increases between 1958-59 and 1962-63. Some of these will have changed in the interim, no doubt; ours will have changed, because in

1964 we brought the 8th grade out of the primary and put it into the secondary, so the position would have altered somewhat.

Net expenditure on education from Consolidated Revenue funds throughout Australia increased by an average of 51.9 per cent. in that period. Queensland's expenditure on education increased by 52.48 per cent., slightly above the Australian average. Net expenditure on education per head of population from Consolidated Revenue increased over that period of five years on an average of 33.9 per cent. throughout Australia, whereas Queensland's expenditure increased by 38.49 per cent.

On secondary education, in the same period the Australian average increased by 80 per cent., Queensland's by 121 per cent. That would be when we were taking education to the far-flung corners of the State and providing equal opportunity for all children, wherever they might live. Our increase is much higher in secondary provision.

For primary-school transport the Australian average increase was 43 per cent., whereas ours was 79 per cent. From the Loan Fund the Australian average increased by 45.8 per cent., ours by 45.9 per cent. So we are holding our own with the average increase in expenditure throughout Australia.

Those are not my figures. They are not supplied by my department. As a matter of fact, they were used by the Western Australian teachers in their journal when they were complaining about the treatment teachers in Western Australia received as compared with those in Queensland.

My purpose in giving these figures is not to try to prove that we in Queensland lead in some fields, but to prove that there are many ways of looking at expenditure on education. After all, the real criterion is the end product from the schools. The fact that a State spends more money does not mean that it has a better system. Two people might have equal salaries and one wife might spend more than the other, but that does not mean that she runs a more efficient home than the other. That is the argument that some members are trying to use.

A naval recruiting officer recently said that, because of our high standard at matriculation level, the Navy looked to Queensland for recruitment.

I do not deny that there is a lot to be done—there always will be much to be done in this field—but I can say that everything possible that can be done has been done. Each year new and better ways of providing education are found, and as money and resources become available different educational systems will be introduced if, after a thorough examination, it is considered that they provide something better in the interests of the children.

Everyone can see many ways of spending a great deal more money on education. Some of our problems are the result of not

having enough money; some arise from the fact that there are not sufficient young people of quality coming along to fill the highly-skilled professional positions available in all sections of the community.

I think the Leader of the Opposition made a point at the week-end when he said that there is no magic source of money. The State is doing all it possibly can from the sources available to it. The only way we can have more money available is for more money to be provided by the people of Australia. I do not think it is necessary to tax the people more. People say, "All that is necessary to get more money for education is to increase taxation". All that is really necessary is for the people of Australia to save more, and to be prepared to lend more for all the public services that are required.

The people of Australia prefer to spend money on "this and that" rather than save it and invest it in their nation's future. Year after year since 1950, or earlier, Australian Governments have spent hundreds of millions of dollars of tax money on capital development. If the people of Australia lent the money required for all capital works of the States and the Commonwealth, there would be so much more of their tax money available that I am sure there would be plenty to reimburse the States to do many things that these people are now asking to be done.

I wonder if all those people who complain bitterly that not enough money is being provided for education support Commonwealth loans. I wonder how much they have contributed to the development and growth of this State. If they consider that all these things are necessary, they are the people who ought to be saving and lending.

Mr. O'Donnell: Don't you think you should appreciate the fact that they are complaining? There was a time when they didn't even bother to complain.

Mr. PIZZEY: I am appreciative that they are complaining, in that they are taking some interest. But I wish they would tell the whole story. The simple story is that the people of Australia have to redirect some of their spending.

Mr. Mann: Do you want to argue that if people do not subscribe to Government loans they cannot expect to get money for education?

Mr. PIZZEY: I am saying that if more money was saved and lent, the Governments of Australia would not need to use taxation money for capital purposes. It is obvious that if we construct a building that is to last for very many years, generations of the future will benefit from it. Therefore, we should not be paying for it today out of taxation; its cost should be a charge on future generations. For the last 10 years not enough money has been saved and subscribed to Commonwealth loans. Year after year money is taken from taxation to enable

the Commonwealth and the States to carry out capital works programmes so essential for the development of Australia. The answer to the problem, of course, is a realisation by the people that if they want these extra services they must be prepared to provide them, either by lending to the Government for capital works or by taxation.

Despite the problems that still arise, I think hon. members generally in their hearts would agree that we have come a long way in education during the last decade or so. We are offering far wider educational opportunities to all Queensland children, and we have improved the lot of teaching staffs throughout Queensland. I do not want to go into all the details of what has been done for teachers in the various little things that count. However, good accommodation has been provided in the western towns, and extra security has been given to teachers' wives and families by a greatly improved superannuation scheme. Teachers have been awarded increased wages, which, whilst perhaps not as high as those in other States, are a considerable advance on those that they enjoyed 10 or 15 years ago.

In many fields the lot and the status of those in the teaching profession have advanced considerably. Teachers are taking a more intelligent and professional interest in their own service. They attend seminars, and there are in-service and in-training schemes. They have formed their own organisations, which not only press for better conditions but discuss geography, mathematics and the sciences. Teachers from the special schools meet regularly on Saturday mornings on a purely professional basis to lift the standard of their profession.

We do not hear about all these things; we hear only of the occasional meetings convened by those who carry resolutions that they will strike for a day, have a sit-in, or do something else. The hundreds of cases of teachers working industriously to better their professional status in the community are not widely reported.

In conclusion, I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the senior officers of the department, who carry a very heavy load. From some of the comments that are printed one would think they do not understand what teaching is, and that they know nothing about the department. Almost all of them have been overseas. We read that they are in-bred and know only Queensland ways; all but one of them has been overseas on fairly lengthy study tours, and I hope that the Government continues to send them overseas.

Mr. O'Donnell: Where was that printed?

Mr. PIZZEY: The hon. member has read it repeatedly, and it is said that that is why they are in-bred.

It is unlikely that this Government, or any Government, will ever reach the ultimate in education needs. In Labour's day we used to hear statements to the effect that Queensland

had the best education system in the world. How blind those people were to the real facts of the situation! We do not say that; we say we are up among the best; we are improving year by year, although we will never have enough money to do all the things we should like to do. Our standards and aspirations are forever changing. As money becomes available, this Government will see that the children of Queensland get the very best that the State can provide in the way of educational opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I desire to inform hon. members that, on the Chief Office Vote, I propose to allow a full discussion on the whole of the ramifications of the department (Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds, and Loan Fund Account) and then to confine the discussion to each particular Vote.

For the information of hon. members, I point out that the administrative acts of the department are open to debate, but the necessity for legislation and matters involving legislation cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (2.44 p.m.): I join with the Minister in his praise of the three deceased gentlemen, namely Archbishop Sir James Duhig, Mr. J. D. Story and Sir Herbert Watkin, for their contributions to education in this State. In outlining their history at some length, the Minister did a good job. On behalf of the Opposition I join with him in those sentiments.

We would all agree that the Minister's speech today was quite academic. He went to some length to try to prove—mainly to himself and his own supporters it seemed—that this Government is doing much more than previous Labour Governments did in their time in office. When I look across at the Government benches and see the type turned out, I wonder if something was wrong with our education system. Of course those were the exceptions. My predecessors did all that was possible in the circumstances when they were members of Labour Governments.

I do not want to take any credit from the Government for the improvements it has made; but should it not have made improvements—as the Minister said it is nearly a decade since it came to office. Surely we should not stand still over that period. Surely the challenges that came should have been met by the Government. I claim, however, that many have not been met in the way we would desire. Without taking away anything from what has been done, I say that many things that should have been done just have not been done.

The Minister himself hit the nail on the head when he said that the mere spending of money is not proof that something has or has not been accomplished. We have many examples of money being spent on a project that has turned out to be a failure.

We know that of two people given exactly the same amount of money one could come up with material assets and the other could waste it. In that respect I agree with the Minister, and, therefore, in judging the Government we must look at the results, not at how many buildings have been erected or how many teachers or how many classes there are. The final product is the youth of today after they pass through the various schools and colleges. It cannot be denied that we have our problems. If our standard of education has increased as tremendously as the Minister suggests we would expect to have much less delinquency, fewer social problems, and less crime.

Mr. Pizzey: Do you think the home has no responsibilities?

Mr. HOUSTON: I let the Minister speak without interruption. We should also expect that the financial return of each family would be of such magnitude that only the head of the family would have to work. The facts are that delinquency is on the increase.

Mr. Chichen: Only in Queensland?

Mr. HOUSTON: It has increased in Queensland as it has elsewhere, and I condemn the present Government for not making Queensland the State with the least delinquency. The Reverend Kidd, well known for his work in Lifeline, recently reported that each day one child in trouble went to them for assistance. What an unhappy record when we find that among the product of the education system, our youth, crime and the need for help are on the increase.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: Government members do not like it. They do not like the truth. All they like to boast about are the bricks and mortar they put down somewhere. But these are the results of the Government's education system. In the last nine months 1,163 boys and 254 girls were before the courts. What a proud record! Where do these crimes start? I know the Minister says that we should blame the parents, and in many cases I admit the parents are not free of blame, but our education system is such—I will prove this and so will other members—that the child is showing a tendency not to have a purely academic mind, and in far too many cases is allowed to become a failure in his early years. He goes through life as a failure and looks to other outlets to show that he has something to offer his fellow man and those with whom he associates. More of that later. The Government cannot deny that there has been a 20 per cent. increase in delinquency in the last year. Those are facts given by Government Ministers.

Mr. Muller: This has nothing do to with education.

Mr. HOUSTON: Of course it has. Why are these people going wrong? Is it because they are highly educated, because they have a place to live, and because they know they are wanted in this community? Of course not, they are outcasts; they have been thrown to the wolves from their early days.

Mr. Pilbeam: Why don't you indict the churches as well?

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister is also Minister in charge of police and native affairs. He spoke on education for 2½ hours in a purely academic way and tried to tell us that prior to 1957 no-one in this State was educated. We are supposed to be a mob of "nongs." I am proud to know the heads of the Department of Education. They are doing a very good job, and they were educated in the days of a Labour Government. They are the ones to whom the Minister is entrusting further development in education. If hon. members opposite want to condemn an earlier system, let them look at those who were educated under it. Look at the Minister; he was a teacher under a former system.

Immorality is increasing, and so is illegitimacy. It is to be regretted that we also have problems with young girls who find themselves in trouble. Surely an education system should be able to teach young people how to steer away from these things. Packs of youths are roaming the streets attacking women, and this morning's newspaper carried the report of damage done by school children to the interior of a church.

Mr. Muller: You cannot blame the system for that.

Mr. HOUSTON: If these things happen, of course the system can be blamed. Raising the school-leaving age is all very well, as long as children are also educated to recognise their true position in society.

There is something wrong with our present system. I advise hon. members opposite to look at the syllabus. How many know what is in it? How many know the subjects taught, and how they are arranged? Quite often, because of the choice of subjects available, many children at secondary schools are taught nothing about various aspects of health. Children, both boys and girls, are being taught the functions of the human body, but nothing about health and morality. Hon. members opposite say that they have no responsibility in this matter. Of course they have. If we were the Government, I can assure the people that we would take positive action to overcome these things.

Mr. Muller: Just what do you mean?

Mr. HOUSTON: I shall tell the hon. member. First of all, the syllabus should be revised by those who appreciate the fact that many students have differences in their make-up. The Minister stated that the Government has provided more opportunity

schools and special courses. I have no quarrel with that. It is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough.

If the Minister would talk to people with practical knowledge in this field, he would be told that if a child is a failure in earlier years, in second or third grade, nothing much can be done about it, and because of many factors the child is a failure from then on. Amongst other things, the teacher has not time to get to understand the child and, by becoming a true friend to him, ascertain his weaknesses and what is worrying him, in order to make a useful citizen of him. I am not blaming the teachers. I have had some teaching experience (with older students, certainly) and I know that in large classes it is not possible to devote the necessary time to the problems of each child. Some are unable to cope with the work, even with modern methods. The Minister mentioned the Cuisenaire method of teaching mathematics.

Mr. Ramsden: Will you answer a question?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, not at this stage. The hon. member can make his own speech. I have only 25 minutes in which to reply to a speech of 2½ hours. I commend the Government on the introduction of the Cuisenaire method; I think it is very worth while. However, children who are slow in learning mathematics are still slow under the new method, and the position is being aggravated because it has been introduced not throughout the State but only at some schools. This causes great difficulty when the parents of a child who has started learning mathematics under the Cuisenaire method are transferred, and the child has to attend a school where Cuisenaire is not being taught. That is wrong. A number of people who have come into my electorate have told me that their children were attending schools in which the Cuisenaire method was used and are now attending a school in which it is not used and, consequently, are completely confused. That is what I am complaining about. It is evidence of bad management. Hon. members opposite are making a great deal of noise because I am bringing out some home truths.

The question is asked, "What should be done?" I believe that every child in Queensland schools should be taught something about book-keeping and the problems associated with hire purchase. They should certainly receive instruction on the aspects of health that affect their growing-up. Things such as these have been neglected for too long, and I am sure that other hon. members will speak of other things that should be taught in schools. I am very strongly in favour of attempting to overcome the problem of delinquency, which throws a great strain on the nation and the State. Additional police are needed because it exists. If the problems associated with youths growing up could be overcome,

fewer police would be needed and additional money would be available for education.

Mention has been made of the large classes in Queensland schools. The Minister does not agree with the Queensland Teachers' Union and other people who have said that classes are far too large. But they are too large.

Mr. Pizzev: I do not disagree. I said they are smaller than they were when Labour was in office.

Mr. HOUSTON: Of course they are. The Minister wears a type of suit different from the one my grandfather wore. That is not the answer to the question. The classes are still too large and something must be done about it.

The Minister said that all the student teachers on offer last year were absorbed into the teaching profession. I am not arguing about that. I do not disagree with the factual information given by the Minister. I accept his word because, from that point of view, he is quite an honourable man. But I do not think that all the available sources have been tapped.

Technical courses and classes and colleges have been set up in various parts of the State, and the Minister is talking about setting up another training college in the North. I cannot see why training colleges cannot be established in various centres, and I believe that the Federal Government must come to the party. In the last few years it has given about \$3,000,000 for the building of science blocks. They are magnificent buildings and are very well equipped; but only a few schools are getting them. The Minister said that each school will eventually get its turn. However, if that \$3,000,000 had been spent on establishing training colleges at Rockhampton and other towns on the coast, I am sure there would have been more applicants for positions as trainee teachers. In touring the State, I have met many families who have said, "We are not sending our boy and girl to Brisbane to become teachers." In other words, potential teachers are influenced by their parents not to come to Brisbane, and I do not blame the parents for adopting that attitude. If I remember correctly, the Minister said that about \$500,000 was being spent to provide an engineering laboratory in one of the provincial cities. Why cannot a similar sum of money be used to set up training colleges? They would not be the most expensive feature of the State's education system.

Mr. Pizzev: Each college would cost about \$2,000,000.

Mr. HOUSTON: That may be so, but at least one could be built from the \$3,000,000 provided by the Commonwealth Government for the building of science blocks. If that Government wishes to help education

in the State, it should not attach strings to the money it makes available. The Minister knows, as we do, that the Queensland's education problem is different from that of other States. It depends largely on the development that took place prior to this point of time. It also depends to a large extent on the relationship of areas and the ratio of private schools to public schools. Therefore, the State Government should say to the Commonwealth Government, "Give us the money and let us work out a priority." I do not think the Minister will deny that if he had \$3,000,000 he would increase the training colleges throughout the State.

Mr. Campbell: You do not agree with the science blocks?

Mr. HOUSTON: Don't talk nonsense! The hon. member should go back to his fowls. To say that we are doing other than advocating a correct system of priority is so much nonsense. It is not much use having well-equipped science buildings if no trainee teachers are available for them. Let us first get the trainee teachers. We can then reduce the number of students in classes and thus allow more individual tuition of students. This, I believe, would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Hodges: If you had had more than one teacher training college in previous years we would be in a better position in regard to teachers now.

Mr. HOUSTON: I quite agree. I am not arguing about what happened before I came into Parliament in 1957. As a matter of fact, we sacked the Gair Government.

Mr. Ramsden: We did.

Mr. HOUSTON: Don't be stupid! The point that annoys us on this side is that everything the Government does is tainted politically and calculated to gain some political advantage. I would not mind if the students did not suffer. The Minister spoke at length about the changeover from the Scholarship system and the transfer of 8th Grade to the high schools. When the Government asked for a report on secondary education, the Australian Labour Party put in a submission and agreed that the Scholarship should be abolished. With that we have no fight at all. We are in perfect agreement with the Government on that.

Mr. Coburn: But you did not do it.

Mr. HOUSTON: I agree, but if the hon. member wants it that way I can rake up many things that hon. members opposite did not do. Nor did they do it when the Moore Government was in power. However, I am talking about the present. We did not do it, but when we had an opportunity to express our views we said, "Abolish the Scholarship." That is as far as I will go. Whether or not it was wise to transfer 8th Grade to the secondary schools is, of

course, a different matter which could be argued at length. Unfortunately, I have not the time in this debate.

Mr. Muller: We did not have any secondary schools at all in the country.

Mr. HOUSTON: We hear a lot of talk about higher education. The Minister says that we have only one agricultural college near Brisbane because there is no demand for another. That is true. It is equally true that prior to 1957 there was no great demand for secondary education in this State because anyone who approached an employer to get a job would be asked, "Have you the Scholarship?" If he said he had, he would be employed. I know that this situation definitely applied in the electrical trade. The same employer is now demanding a Junior pass.

The amazing part is that prior to 1957 a student with a Scholarship pass then had to qualify in a college course that was far harder than the one we are now setting for our apprentices with Junior passes, and far superior, too. Hon. members opposite cannot deny that.

I am not against sending children to secondary school. This has been brought about, not so much by the desire of the Department of Education as by the demand of the public and the employers that the youth of today be educated to that standard. Hon. members opposite cannot prove that the proportion of people going into the different callings is any different today from what it was formerly, but it is obvious that the level of education on the academic side has risen.

When speaking about teachers' complaints the Minister said that there was a lot of noise but not much ground for it. The teachers have plenty of ground for it. The best test is whether or not we are losing teachers. We are losing them fast.

Mr. Carey: Are you in favour of their going on strike?

Mr. HOUSTON: That is not the issue at all. When the Minister was on "Meet the Press" he made the same reply, so the hon. member should not buy into something—

Mr. Carey: I asked you whether you were in favour of it.

Government Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HOUSTON: When the Minister was asked about solving the problem, he came back with the magnificent reply that time would solve it. What a way to tackle it! Let us get action. The first step would be to approach the Commonwealth Government for a greater grant to this State.

The Minister indicated that the Government is doing something about the shortage of teachers. What do we see in the Budget?

Mr. Muller: You are making a very weak speech.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member stayed and listened, anyway. In the union journal the president of the Queensland Teachers' Union suggested that 824 more teachers were required—570 at the primary level and 254 at the secondary level. Provision is made in the Budget for a further 210 primary-school teachers and 162 secondary-school teachers. The Government has not been prepared to make provision this financial year for the number of teachers required.

The Minister made many statements about the way in which schools have been improved over the years. I have in mind a school in an inner Brisbane suburb which still has the old sanitary pan system. Every time we make approaches to the Department of Education for a septic system for this school, and it has an enrolment of 1,000 children, we get the same reply: either not enough money or the priorities are not right, or some other make-believe excuse. The Minister complained about the lack of concrete under some country schools during the time of the Labour Government, but surely in this modern day and age there should not still be primary schools in the suburbs of Brisbane with the pan system. And in some cases the disposal service is undertaken within sight of a class-room while the children are in class. That sort of thing is still going on yet the Minister gets up and says that it happened only under a Labour Government. We are trying to be realistic. We know that it takes time to do all that is necessary, but it is not in the interests of education for the Minister to spend two and a quarter hours dissecting what the Labour Government supposedly did not do, and telling us what this Government has done.

(Time expired.)

Mr. LONERGAN (Flinders) (3.10 p.m.): This is one occasion when I am especially happy to take part in the debate. It is not necessary to support the remarks of the Minister, but I do so in voicing my appreciation, and the appreciation of the electors of Flinders, for what he has done.

The Leader of the Opposition made the sort of speech I expected him to make. It was totally different from what we would expect from Jack Duggan but, after all, he had the ability and experience which comes only after many years in this Chamber.

A point made by the Leader of the Opposition was that whereas the Minister spoke for two hours he had only 25 minutes in which to reply. It would not have made a bit of difference if he had been given eight hours, because hon. members opposite cannot defend the indefensible. They have not a leg to stand on. We on this side have every reason

to be proud of what we have done in education. Never in my life have I heard such a motion of censure of a section of our Public Service, the teachers—by inference and innuendo—as that presented by the Leader of the Opposition. If he had wanted to move a motion of censure or criticise the teachers, he should have come out in the open. That is what I would expect anyone to do. However, the hon. member chose to do it in a very subtle manner that did not deceive anyone.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. LONERGAN: The hon. member has a very slippery hold on his position now. He would know that better than I do. The hon. member for Townsville North is peering over his shoulder, wanting to step into his position. The position would be different if it were the hon. member for Townsville South. I would say he would be an able leader, as he has done something for Townsville.

I commend the Minister and, in the short time at my disposal, I propose to mention some of the things done in my electorate by this Government. Anyone who has taken an interest in politics can think back over the years when the Flinders area, which at other times had different names, was represented by Johnny Mullan, Arthur Jones, Dick Riordan and last, but not least, Frank Forde who was a Minister in the Federal House for many years and Prime Minister for a few days. During the short time he represented Flinders I concede that he devoted himself conscientiously to the job. Unfortunately, it does not matter how well an hon. member applies himself, if he has not the backing of his party and the Government he achieves nothing. I give Frank Forde credit for battling to get secondary schools in my area but, unfortunately for the kiddies, owing to the indifference of the then Labour Government, his representations fell on deaf ears.

The Leader of the Opposition said that they sacked the Gair Government for its neglect. I point out that they never sacked the Gair Government. The left-wingers did not sack it because if Labour members had stuck together the Gair Government might still be here, much to the detriment of Queensland.

Mr. Houston: How do you work that out? If they were still here they might have the confidence of the people.

Mr. LONERGAN: I ask the hon. gentleman to look at the decimated ranks of the A.L.P., the disorganised rabble, the leaderless legion. That is the only way to describe it. The hon. gentleman is only a temporary leader. The skids are under him. It will not make any difference because those who have the ability to lead the Opposition have not the patronage of the Trades and Labour Council.

When we became the Government the standard of our schools and of the very few teachers' residences we had was a disgrace. Fortunately that is now an unpleasant memory. Many of the young teachers who are now complaining about their conditions could not realise the conditions that existed prior to 1957. They did not have to go to far-western areas and teach under intolerable conditions, or live in substandard accommodation and work in drab, unattractive schools.

It is a matter of considerable satisfaction to me to be able to quote figures which the Opposition cannot deny. It is easy for an hon. member to endeavour to destroy another hon. member's speech, but no-one can get over facts and figures. In the last nine years of the Labour Government, from 1948 to 1957, £105,000 was spent on buildings, and that included teacher accommodation. How the picture changed when we became the Government. In the first nine years of our Government, from 1957 to 1966, £677,000 was spent on high schools, high school tops, new primary and secondary classrooms, and teacher accommodation. We were the first Government to build residences for high-school principals. We are proud of that.

In western areas where hotel accommodation was not available, single teachers were faced with the problem of finding suitable accommodation. It was not provided, and they had to hunt around and secure it with private families. Fortunately that also is something in the past. For single men employed at one-teacher schools in my area and many others the Government has provided excellent accommodation, and today they have no worries in that regard.

When I was elected there was not one high school top in Flinders. The former member made many representations to have one built in Hughenden. After my election I approached the Minister for Education and he readily agreed to build one there. As a result many children, whose parents are on a fairly low wage and could not afford it, are now able to receive secondary education. Today, we have three high-school tops in my area. That is one reason why I rise to voice my appreciation of what the Minister has done for education in Queensland. The vote cast for the Government at each election indicates the extent of the people's approval.

Many people work behind the scenes in the interests of schools, and I would be failing in my duty if I resumed my seat without paying a tribute to them. The Leader of the Opposition, no doubt through oversight, did not give any credit to parents and citizens' associations which do so much for the primary schools of Queensland today.

Mr. Low: And secondary.

Mr. LONERGAN: That is quite true. Usually nothing but co-operation is received from head teachers. However, there are

exceptions, and at present there is one in my area. I shall not name the school or the teacher, although I shall probably bring it to the Minister's notice if I have not already done so. It is annoying when an active and conscientious body of people working for the good of a school does not receive from the teachers the co-operation to which they are entitled. Believe me, one would have to go a long way to find a more active association than the one in the town to which I refer. I hope that this unsatisfactory position will be rectified before long, so that the parents and citizens' association will again rally behind the school, as it has in the past, and the happy state of affairs that existed for so long in this township will be restored.

Mr. Davies: Would you like the teacher transferred?

Mr. LONERGAN: That was quite common in the days of the A.L.P. Government. If anyone sneezed or stepped out of line, he would be on his way; he could start rolling his swag. I said in this Chamber only the other day that the A.L.P. ruled by fear.

Before I resume my seat I should like to make a plea for a new building for the School of the Air at Charters Towers, and also a new transceiver, as it is called. The Minister well knows that at present the radio equipment of the Royal Flying Doctor Service is being used, and consequently it is not possible to get enough time on the air to cater for the number of children enrolled. I appreciate what the Royal Flying Doctor Service is doing for the School of the Air, and I pay a tribute to Mr. Vern Kerr, the technician, who has been most helpful over the years. I believe that what I ask would cost from £20,000 to £30,000 (although I cannot see why), and I ask the Minister to endeavour to make provision in his Estimates next year for a new building and transceiver at Charters Towers. Unfortunately, because of the limited time available, a large number of children who are waiting to go on the air cannot be enrolled.

A new classroom is badly needed at the primary school at Hughenden, and I hope that the Minister can meet the request that I have made to him to provide one. Being a conscientious Minister who is interested in the welfare of the children, he visits schools, says "Hello" to the children, and takes a personal interest in the state of the buildings, so I am sure he is well aware how urgently a new classroom is needed.

There is another point that I do not think I should allow to pass unchallenged. The Leader of the Opposition said that the greatest number of delinquents was to be found among the children who failed in their examinations, although I do not think he was referring to the real no-hopers. I point out to him that a report in "The Courier-Mail" last Monday showed that two highly educated young people had forfeited their bail after being arrested for disorderly conduct on the occasion of the visit of the President of the

United States of America. They were trainee teachers, which proves, I think, that not all the delinquents in the community are uneducated.

I have to leave for the North shortly—naturally, I am happy to be going—

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Hear, hear!

Mr. LONERGAN: I am sure that the hon. member for Tablelands agrees with me when I say that it is God's own country. In conclusion, I express my appreciation of the work that the Minister has done for the young people of Queensland. The Opposition could talk for the rest of the year and not destroy the factual case that he has presented in introducing these Estimates. The Minister is very approachable and helpful, and I am sure that he treats all hon. members with the same consideration. It is a pleasure to be associated with him.

Mr. Mann: A nice man.

Mr. LONERGAN: The hon. member for Brisbane is right. The State is fortunate to have such an able man in charge of the Department of Education, and I hope that he will carry on the good work in the years to come.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) (3.28 p.m.): I am sure all hon. members were very pleased to hear the sincere and well-deserved tribute paid by the Minister to the late Mr. J. D. Story, Archbishop Sir James Duhig, and Sir Herbert Watkin, whose passing has left the State much poorer. Their record in the field of education in Queensland well merited the words of praise that he bestowed on them.

In my opinion, this debate should have been kept on a non-political level, and it would have been if Government backbenchers had not made an onslaught on the Labour Party's record when in Government in this State. Unfortunately, the Minister tended to join in—no doubt it was in the excitement of the moment—and, therefore, I changed my notes and now intend to show, once again, that the Labour Party, during very difficult years, had a magnificent record of achievement in education. As a matter of fact, I think the Minister was at his worst at the end of his speech, when he endeavoured to convince the Committee that no money was available in Queensland, or in Australia, to provide the things that are needed.

I join with the Leader of the Opposition in acknowledging the good work that has been done in the various sections of the department and over the length and breadth of Queensland. Much has been achieved—we acknowledge that—but we believe that if greater sums of money had been available and if there had been possibly wiser use of the moneys that were available to the State much more could have been done in Queensland.

Before I proceed to discuss the Estimates, I should like to pay a personal tribute to the men responsible for the various departments administered by the Minister. They are experienced men; they have travelled the world and they are well fitted to assist the Minister in his administration of the various departments.

Those remarks extend also to men like Pat Killoran, who is in charge of the administration of the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. I have seen Mr. Killoran at work at the very efficient stations on the Torres Strait Islands, and he is well fitted for the work.

For many years now the Australian Labour Party, both State and Federal, has urged for a complete inquiry into all aspects of education, at all levels from primary to university. For some reason or other the Commonwealth Government has opposed this request. As a matter of fact, in 1945 Mr. Robert Gordon Menzies, at that time Federal Leader of the Opposition, also urged for such an inquiry. When he became Prime Minister, however, the suggestion dropped right into the background.

We believe an inquiry is necessary and we regret that this State Government does not urge for one. We know that the Minister realises—in fact, all the Cabinet does—that there is a tremendous shortage of money and that the Government is not able to do all that it desires to see done in the development of the State. I said in a recent speech that the Minister is in charge of one of the most difficult departments in the State, but within his own ranks he meets with a great deal of opposition, and it is currently believed that many Liberals in the Government believe that too much money is being spent on education. In other sections on the Government side there is an atmosphere of complacency—we might say smugness—and for the Minister to say that all is well in this State while there are classes that are too large and certain other things not done that he would like to see done, is only an endeavour to create an atmosphere of satisfaction and, with a Federal election coming up, indulge in propaganda for the Federal Government. He does that by saying, "Well, money is not available; we do not expect it to be available. The Commonwealth Government is doing all it can."

It is a pity that the Government does not face up to the situation as is being done by the Minister for Education and other leaders in New South Wales, who have protested strongly at the shortage of money made available by the Commonwealth Government. We disagree with him when he says that all is well in the primary section. We believe that the Commonwealth Government is not interested at either primary or secondary level, and I intend shortly to make some quotations to prove that assertion.

At this stage, I say frankly that I believe the Minister is very sincere in the administration of his department. He is very

experienced, and no doubt head and shoulders over anyone else in the Government who might lay claim to his portfolio. In regard to representations that I have made to him on behalf of the people of Maryborough, I appreciate having received a sympathetic hearing. I have not always been successful, but I have received a sympathetic hearing in my representations on behalf of the educational centres in that city. I appreciate also the construction of two science blocks and the alterations and additions, and the construction of new wings that are to be commenced shortly in relation to technical education. I appreciate what has been done in the various schools, but on the over-all picture of the State we must admit that there is a shortage of experienced and trained teachers and that the students must suffer as a result of the shortage of adequate classrooms and the over-crowding. There is a great problem in providing sufficient trainees.

When it is all boiled down, it comes back to the question of money. If members of this Government were prepared to front the Federal Government boldly there would be greater possibilities of our achieving satisfactory results. After the people of Queensland rejected the Federal Government candidates in 1961, some financial help immediately flowed to this State. That could happen again.

I feel that this Government has let education down very badly by adopting an air of complacency and contentment towards the lot it is handed by the Federal Government. I do acknowledge what has been done in this State. No child has been turned away because there was no room in a school, even though there were overcrowded classrooms. Neither was any child turned away when the Labour Party was in Government.

Mr. Bromley: There have been from opportunity schools.

Mr. DAVIES: That is very interesting. I leave that for the hon. member to deal with.

In New South Wales today the Government is renting halls, using hallways, passageways and all kinds of accommodation—anything at all—to accommodate school-children. The problem had been tackled by the New South Wales Labour Government, but the new Government in that State has had to cut down considerably on its education budget.

The urgent desire for further knowledge is common throughout the world; it is something we should be happy about. However, it poses problems that must be faced up to. To say that this country cannot afford to do what is necessary to help young people to acquire knowledge—even up to the adult education programme—is an attitude to be regretted. It could be adopted only by parties whose outlook is that of the Country and Liberal Parties in this State.

Education should have top priority in this country. There is no way of catching up a year or two in the life of a young person who misses education at a certain age. It is

difficult to say what stage in a child's life is the most important for the development of its personality. Some say that up to the third-grade age is the most precious period. The vocabulary acquired up to this stage generally determines future progress. However, it is all very debatable.

There is a refusal to recognise that there is in existence a situation that is causing very much discontent in this State amongst people who are thinkers. No-one can tell me that they are all fools. Because of their loyalty to members of the Government some people refuse to face up to the situation. Premiers and members of other Governments in Australia are facing up to the problem.

We had further proof that there were problems at the last Liberal Party State Convention, when a motion was carried calling for the appointment of a committee of inquiry into the weaknesses of the education system in this State, despite a plea from the Minister for Education that the appointment of such a committee was unnecessary. That motion was carried unanimously. It listed several points of reference for the committee of inquiry, namely, salaries paid to the teaching profession in Queensland; scholarship allowances paid to trainee teachers; the method of teaching and the matter taught to trainee teachers; tertiary problems of overcrowding, incompetent academics and irresponsible students.

Evidently the Liberal Party considers these to be serious problems, but no voices have been raised. It seems that the Government is not interested, and a sorry situation will develop in which the nation will not have enough able people with training.

Mr. Murray: Did you attend for the Maryborough Branch?

Mr. DAVIES: This is a newspaper report of the Liberal Party's State Convention, at which it called for a special committee of inquiry into the education system. No insults, cheap remarks or snide statements by Liberal members in this Chamber can cover up the position.

Mr. Gavin Semple, a high-school teacher, a man with a stable outlook, an intelligent person and president of the Queensland Teachers' Union, distributed a pamphlet demanding better education. This type of propaganda was never indulged in by State school-teachers during Labour's administration. Statements like the ones in the journal that I have here were never found in the "Queensland Teachers' Journal" under Labour's regime, and teachers were not afraid of reprisals. Public servants were transferred into the wilderness by the Moore Government, but hon. members opposite cannot cite one case of victimisation of public servants in this State by the Labour Government. Now we find "Publicity Material" in the journal which has never before appeared in the history of this State. Never have we seen pages like this in the journal! In the short time at my disposal I have not time

to read all of what appears, but as the Minister referred to teachers' colleges I will refer to some of the comments that appear herein. It says—

"Kelvin Grove Teachers' College was built to be a high school . . ."

It then continues—

"More Staff Rooms are needed; seminar rooms do not exist; there are no special rooms for Geography, Languages, Language Laboratories, and the 'Film' or 'Audio-visual' room does double duty as an ordinary lecture room."

Later, it continues—

"The ratio of students to lecturers is far too high—absurdly high when compared to the ratio existing at the Queensland University. This means, of course, more highly qualified lecturers are needed."

"Staff meetings are held in double lecture rooms."

"The Principal's own office is ridiculously small. Library facilities are shockingly inadequate."

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. DAVIES: It is a pity the hon. member for Condamine did not urge the Government to do something about library facilities in this State.

I am glad to see that at last the Minister has taken notice of the necessity to provide relieving staff, and I believe that he intends to provide some relieving staff next year. The Minister and members of the Government say, "Everything is all right in Queensland. If there is anything wrong we can't do anything to help." The Country-Liberal Party is in charge of the Commonwealth and the State, yet the Minister said it is impossible to get money unless the public invests more in the public loans. The Minister was at his worst when he discussed this matter.

In fairness to previous Labour Governments, I draw attention to the fact that Labour governed this State during two world wars and a world-wide depression, and that for several years after the last war there was a shortage of man-power and materials. In spite of all this, we did a magnificent job in facing up to the unprecedented upsurge in population. Under this Government from 1956-57 to 1963-64 school population increased 27 per cent. From 1949-50 to 1956-57, under Labour, it increased 41 per cent. We had a much greater upsurge in school population than this Government has had. As to records of expenditure on education, from 1949-50 to 1956-57, under Labour, there was a greater percentage increase than under this Government in a similar period.

I remind hon. members of some other figures. In 1946, 7,628 students sat for the Scholarship standard for secondary education, whereas before Labour left office the number was 15,123. We had the serious problem of providing for the upsurge of school population at the primary-school level. The

Minister was one of the first at that time to recognise what was achieved in this State. I remind him of one or two of his statements at that time which were appreciated very much. On 30 October, 1956, the Minister said—

"I should first like to pay tribute to the work of the Chief Office of the Department since 1951. They have introduced a sense of humanity into the Department that was lacking previously. I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Powell during whose term of office the most rapid development of secondary education in this State has taken place since high schools were first established in 1910-15. The problem of teacher shortage has been transformed during the last five years but it has not yet been solved by any means."

The number who sat for Junior jumped from 4,442 in 1946 to 7,938 in 1956, and the number who sat for Senior increased from 1,492 in 1946 to 2,212 in 1956. During these years Labour organised a tremendous building programme when there was a shortage of materials and man-power, and people on the South Coast were screaming because they were not allowed to build holiday homes. There was an increase in primary enrolment from 120,000 to 200,000 between 1944 and 1956.

Mr. Hodges: What year was this?

Mr. DAVIES: From 1944 to 1956. The Labour Government faced up to the problem in a magnificent manner. For the benefit of the hon. member for Gympie, I suggest he read the political history of this State. Many members are sitting in this Chamber today as a result of the division that took place between two factions of the Labour Party and have not studied the period to which I refer.

In the 1955 Annual Report of the Department of Education the following statement appears—

"In this State the difficult period in Secondary accommodation and staffing will commence in 1959 and will continue into the 1960's. Steps are being taken to meet this problem in the secondary school."

I leave it to other speakers on this side of the Chamber to deal with other aspects of Labour administration.

In the years between the war and 1957 Labour was planning a school transport system in this State, but many local people opposed this social activity; it received a hostile reception. The same happened when agricultural experts went into the Burnett area and the Darling Downs area and said that contour farming should be practised to prevent erosion. They were laughed at. Finally they persuaded one person to let them carry out that practice on his farm, and farmers gradually saw the results. Now there is hardly a farm on the Darling Downs or in the Burnett area that is not contoured. The same applies to herd-testing.

Many people today consider that school transport has gone too far. I suggest that when the Labour Government is returned—and it must be eventually—a committee of inquiry should be set up to look into the transport system. I admit that it has some advantages. But it also has some disadvantages.

Mr. Muller: What will it inquire into?

Mr. DAVIES: The system as a whole. I for one certainly consider that it has been extended too far. People had good reasons, years ago, for opposing strongly the closure of schools. The Labour Government has been unfairly condemned because it did not have a wide transport system. It took time to convince parents of advantages of a transport system.

The same remarks apply to high schools. One might as well go back to the period from 1860 to 1910 or 1915 and ask why high schools were not provided in that period. As I indicated to the Minister, there must be constant advancement, and for failing to do now things that should be done, the Government would later be condemned. Prior to the defeat of the Labour Government, we went through a difficult period. We opened high schools at Brisbane, Banyo, Indooroopilly, Kedron, Mitchelton, Salisbury, Camp Hill, Cavendish Road, and Wynnum. There has been a tremendous increase in the number of children of secondary-school age, and the Government has done no more than meet the demand. It could not have done anything else. The children could not have been left in the streets. The demand has simply been met, even if there is considerable over-crowding.

The Government has decided to take certain measures in an attempt to overcome the shortage of teachers. The Opposition regards this as totally inadequate. The following is a table showing the number of departmental teachers being trained per 10,000 of population for the years 1962, 1963, and 1964 in various States:—

State	1962	1963	1964
New South Wales ..	15.9	16.5	17.4
Victoria	21.3	23.2	27.4
South Australia ..	24.4	26.4	28.5
Western Australia ..	17.6	16.3	15.6
Tasmania	17.2	17.9	20.1
Queensland	10.6	13.1	14.6

Those figures are taken from the February edition of "Education News" for 1964, 1965, and 1966, and the table on p. 262 of the Commonwealth Year Book.

The following are the numbers of secondary-school teachers in training expressed as percentages of the number of full-time secondary-school teaching staffs—

	Per cent.
New South Wales	46
Victoria	50
South Australia	64
Western Australia	40
Tasmania	21
Queensland	28

The figures show that for some unknown reason the position in Queensland has not been dealt with as well as it has been in the other States.

In the amount spent on the training of teachers, Queensland is far behind the other States. In 1962-63 New South Wales spent \$7,384,000, Victoria spent \$9,694,000, and Queensland spent only \$1,544,000.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CHINCHEN (Mt. Gravatt) (3.53 p.m.): I associate myself with the Minister's expressions of sympathy on the passing of three great Queenslanders, namely Mr. J. D. Story, Sir Herbert Watkin, and Sir James Duhig. Undoubtedly they will be examples to our young people for many years to come.

Today the Estimates of the Department of Education are before the Chamber, and it seems to me that the Opposition can find little to criticise. This year the amount to be spent is \$8,680,000, or 15.1 per cent., more than the vote for last year, which indicates a movement in the right direction. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition is not in the Chamber, because I hate speaking of people in their absence; perhaps he will come in. Never have I heard in all my life a more intemperate speech than the one that he made. He blatantly attacked young people and referred to the increase in delinquency. I challenge his figures in this regard.

He said that delinquency is growing in Queensland, and he blamed its growth on education. In fact, he cast a reflection on the Department of Education and the teachers in this State. I do not agree with the figures that he gave. There is at present—there always has been—a small percentage of young people who create problems of this sort. The Press has given publicity to their activities and tossed the question of delinquency about, and there is an inclination on the part of members of the public to think that the percentage of these young people is higher now than it has ever been. If one compared the figures for this decade and the preceding decade, I think it would be found that the percentage was very similar. In my day they were known as hooligans, but they were not glorified as they are today.

If the Leader of the Opposition had had as much to do with the young people of his electorate as I have had to do with the young people of my electorate, he would know that

there are many young people doing magnificent work in church clubs, youth clubs, and so on. They can get to their feet and speak, and they express themselves much better than we did in our day. I have a great admiration for them and for what they are doing.

I am very sorry that the Leader of the Opposition attacked young people in that way and, furthermore, that he said that delinquency flows from the education system under which they are brought up. He knows as well as I do that children spend only about six hours a day in school. I do not think it is the responsibility of the Department of Education to train children morally. It should teach them discipline and a number of other things; but it is the responsibility of parents and the churches to educate young people in morality. Surely that is done in the early years of a child's life. Educationists cannot be expected to accept such a responsibility.

As I said, I am very sorry that the Leader of the Opposition made such an attack. He had no grounds or reasons for doing so. He plucked something out of the air in an effort to embarrass the Minister and the Government, but his attempt failed miserably.

Education is a big subject. More people are interested in it today than ever before, not because of any failure on the part of the Government but because educated people will naturally be interested in education. I do not think this could be expressed better than it is by the Director-General of Education, Mr. Murphy, in his excellent, very beautifully-expressed and very comprehensive annual report. He said—

"It is probably inevitable that the more highly educated a community becomes, the greater is the public awareness of the advantages of education, and consequently the demand for more and better education facilities. The extent of public interest in education at the present time can in a very real sense be taken as a measure of the educational progress during recent years."

I fully agree with that statement. There is an awareness of education in the public mind because more and more people are becoming educated. We all want our children to be better educated than we are, and education has progressed very rapidly in the last 10 years.

The hon. member for Maryborough said a short time ago that Queensland is not spending enough or doing enough in the field of education. I ask him to examine carefully the figures quoted by the Minister, which are very significant. In the last four or five years of Labour's term in office, it was spending from 11.8 per cent. to 14.22 per cent. on education from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. There was not very much money available, admittedly, but that was the highest percentage it could spend on education. The Country-Liberal Government is spending 19.26 per cent. of the much greater amount of money that is available

from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. As I said, the figures are very significant. They show the importance the Government places on education in comparison with the importance that the Labour Party places on it, and that should be kept in mind.

There seems to be quite an emphasis placed on the number of teachers available. We all know—the Minister has told us—that the trend is in the right direction; class numbers are declining and, when one considers the large number of children involved, one must realise that for some reason or other people want something done overnight that just cannot be done. The explosion in post-war births had a big effect on the situation and increased the number of young people to be educated.

The number of professional people in our community today is low because of the war years and the depression years. It is interesting to note that that position exists in every profession, although it does not show up in every profession. School classes can be measured against teachers in terms of 20 to 1, 35 to 1 or 45 to 1, but we cannot measure the number of architects in the community by what they are doing. They simply work longer and harder to take up the slack. Engineers and all other professionals are in short supply, but the progress made by this department is remarkable. When we consider that the number of primary pupils will be flattening out by 1970, this will give us a chance to catch up. The programme that will give us the teachers is already in operation, and we are fortunate indeed in the work done by the Minister and his department in this direction.

When I came into this Parliament three years ago I made a speech on the philosophy of change and the necessity for us in this State to develop a philosophy that would allow us to accept change, not because change itself is good but because we cannot have progress without change. We can see evidence that this has been happening last year; the Minister has been bold enough and big enough to bring about changes. It is easy to settle for the status quo, as has been done for 40 years. Everybody was happy because there was no demand, but much has happened in the last 10 years under this Government, not only in the provision of school buildings, furniture and teachers but in changes in the system of education itself. One could take as an example the Cuisenaire system and in-service training. It is exciting to look at what is happening in this direction and at the introduction of new mathematics and science syllabuses in the primary divisions. These things have probably taken years to work out. It probably took years to produce the new syllabuses in these two sections alone, but it does not stop there. There are new subjects in special courses in the Junior sections at high schools. These are very important to people who do not possess the abilities of the

majority. These special courses were designed to cater for such people, and they have been extremely well accepted.

We read in the report of the evaluation of a non-graded plan. This, of course, is a scheme that has been operating in several overseas countries, both on the Continent and in some areas in America. The effect will be known later. It is a new approach in thinking in this State. When one thinks of the basis on which this Government had to operate 10 years ago, when there were virtually no high schools and we had no technical colleges or technological institutes, when all we had was a system of education fundamentally based on the old Scholarship examination—what a basis to try to work from!—it must have appalled the Minister to have had to attack this problem. But he has done it with great success.

Mr. Coburn: And with great courage, because nobody else would tackle it.

Mr. CHINCHEN: That is so.

I compliment the Minister for bringing about these wonderful changes that have been revolutionising education in this State. The whole of life in this State, and the people's approach to life are entirely different due to a great extent to this bold step taken by the Minister and his department. When the history of this State is written, one of the great men to be recognised will be the present Minister for Education.

Technical education interests me greatly because I came from Victoria, where technical education is very highly developed. I imagine that technical education in Victoria would be 30 or 40 years ahead of that in this State. Victoria divorced technical and high-school education about 40 years ago. Technical education was not heard of in Queensland until a few years ago. We have to realise that until recent years the need for technical education did not exist to a great extent in Queensland. The need was not there until this Government built a backbone of secondary industry into Queensland. What has been done is quite a romance—the two have gone side by side, industrialisation and the development of technical educational facilities.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. CHINCHEN: The hon. member for South Brisbane knows as well as I do that but for secondary industry in this State, during the recent drought Queensland would have been completely bankrupt. Secondary industry has carried the State through. Now we are witnessing a great development of technical education throughout the State.

Probably not many hon. members have taken the trouble to look at what is taking place lower down George Street. I have been there and have studied the plans. The building programme for the near future is really amazing. I spoke to the Director of Technical Education about it. In addition

to the work on the Queensland Institute of Technology, during 1965-66 construction work was carried out at the Central Technical College; Eagle Farm Technical College; Bundaberg Technical College; Cairns Technical College; Mackay Technical College; Toowoomba Technical College—

Mr. Lloyd: None of this was done until the Commonwealth Government came to the party.

Mr. CHINCHEN: It is not all Commonwealth money.

Work was carried out on the Rockhampton Technical College; Queensland Institute of Technology, Darling Downs; Queensland Institute of Technology, Capricornia. Provision is made in the 1966-67 Estimates for further work on the Eagle Farm Technical College; Kangaroo Point Technical College; Yeronga Technical College; Mackay Technical College; Rockhampton Technical College; Brisbane Technical College; Bundaberg Technical College, and Maryborough Technical College. The amount spent last year on this work exceeded \$1,250,000, and in 1966-67 \$3,500,000 will be spent on technical institute and college buildings.

This is a magnificent thing to see. It has been brought about only by the efforts of the Minister and his department. There is now a realisation of the need for technical education in this State. These things are happening. The institute itself will be operating on a much fuller basis from the start of next year. I am interested to know that staff has been recruited from all States of the Commonwealth. I am sure everybody will be agreeably surprised when they learn the calibre of these people.

I take the opportunity to make one or two suggestions. I have a number of State schools, including two high schools, in my electorate—and, of course, the new university site. I am disappointed, of course, that there will be a delay of a year or two in the construction of the new university. I can well imagine that the Australian Universities Commission knows what it is doing and that in the long run we may get the new university on time.

On my own observations, and from some of those made by friends in the teaching profession—and I use the word "profession" advisedly, for I think teaching is a profession which should be highly paid and highly respected—I have a few suggestions to make. Teachers carried a tremendous burden during the period of change in the education system. I greatly respect what they are doing and hope that their conditions, financially and materially, may continue to improve. I also have a great respect for the department, which is doing a wonderful job. However, I believe that communications are vitally important, whether in industry, the State or a department, and I think that communications in this department could be better oiled. There should not be such a strict, totalitarian attitude in the department,

which should operate as a closely knit team. For instance, I suggest that inspectors should act as advisers, not as assessors. Inspectors should visit the schools and sit down with the head teachers and discuss their problems with them.

Mr. Houston: That is what they do. That is part of their job.

Mr. CHINCHEN: I see this job in an entirely different light.

I believe that a head-teacher should be able to assess his own staff. If he is unable to do so he is not the right man for the job. I do not believe that an inspector should act as an assessor on a prepared lesson entirely different from those that normally pertain. An inspector's job is to go to the school, get close to the head-teacher, find out all the problems, and discuss them with him. I favour more discussions of a close, friendly nature rather than departmental letters, and it must be remembered that for some reason a few people hesitate to write to the department. The system would work better if communications were a little better oiled to bring about closer teamwork from the top to the bottom. I should like to see greater movement by people at the top of the department out into the schools. That is difficult, but it is advisable and would be a move in the right direction.

I was fortunate enough to attend one day of the seminar of principals held on the Gold Coast, and I was particularly impressed with the atmosphere and what I saw. It was a wonderful move, and more conferences of this type would help to improve relations throughout the department. I favour the group-discussion system, with the attendance of people at all levels. In this way we could create an atmosphere that would help enormously the whole education system.

When people are raised under a system they know the system and how it works, and carry on in the same way.

I think that what has been done is magnificent, but I again suggest that communications from the top echelon to the lower echelon could be smoothed out considerably and would thus help enormously in removing some of the doubts that exist. If people can air their problems in the right places they are much happier as they feel that their comments have got to the right ears. If they cannot, they have a feeling of discontent.

Mr. Houston: Whom are you having a go at?

Mr. CHINCHEN: I am not having a go at all.

In the old days the Army had brick walls separating the different ranks, but they do not exist today. It is possible for a sergeant to have a man-to-man talk with a colonel, and in this way he can sort out his problems. This movement has been started by the holding of the seminar, and I only hope that it continues at a faster rate.

I should like to see more travel, not only for senior people but also for those at the more junior levels. They must see what is going on. I know it is being done, but I should like to see some acceleration. There should be more overseas trips. I see no reason why people from interstate or overseas cannot be injected into our system at the various levels. The senior members of the department must recognise the benefit of that.

I compliment the Minister on what has been done this year, and in other years. He has now held this portfolio three years longer than any previous Minister. I compliment the department and the teachers on the work they are doing in the interests of education in this State.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (4.16 p.m.): I commence my speech with the following quotation from "The Courier-Mail" dated 4 October—

"Probably for the first time in his memory, there was, during 1966 a prevailing atmosphere of dissatisfaction and discontent in all matters of education."

Those words were spoken by Mr. G. Ward, principal of the Indooroopilly High School in his 13th annual speech at his school's speech night on 3 October this year. Coming from a man who has apparently had considerable experience in the teaching profession, those words are worthy of note. To a great extent they counteract the speech of the Minister, who outlined what had been accomplished in education in this State. A senior teacher with many years of experience and 13 years as principal of a high school is constrained to say that never in his memory has he seen so much dissatisfaction and discontent in all matters affecting education.

The Minister emphasised the work that had been done by his department in providing facilities and buildings, particularly high schools. We consider that the matter of staff transcends the matter of school buildings. We are not alone in that opinion; we have the support of the Minister, who, at the annual speech night at the Salisbury State High School, said—

"The provision of school buildings and physical facilities was a secondary problem to that of providing teachers."

We have a falling off in the number of pupils at high schools who are going on to Senior. No doubt some of them have been discouraged during the years leading up to Junior. They would have seen the effects of inadequate staffing in our high schools, which must have been considerable and consequently raised doubts in their minds as to the desirability and value of proceeding to Senior after passing Junior.

The latest figures available show that only one quarter of those who sat for Junior at the Kelvin Grove High School last year continued their studies to Senior level. The same

situation prevails at the Banyo High School, where the number sitting for Senior this year is down by one third compared with the number who sat for Senior last year. That is the position, despite increased enrolments at secondary schools.

There is perhaps a reason for it. I think that young people in secondary schools today are becoming a bit "browned off" after two years, and this trend will probably be accentuated from this year onwards when the first of those who entered high schools at Grade 8 standard proceed to the Junior examination. At that stage they will have completed three years at high school instead of the previous period of two years. I think that after the Junior examination this year there will be a higher percentage of what might be called "drop-outs".

Mr. Sullivan: Why do you think that?

Mr. MELLOY: Because only a quarter of those who sat for the Junior examination after two years at high school proceeded to Senior standard. With those who have been at high school for three years, including a year in Grade 8, I feel that there will be a greater inclination to drop out.

Mr. Sullivan: Do you think it was a mistake to do away with the Scholarship?

Mr. MELLOY: No; that is another matter altogether. What I do not agree with is the transferring of Grade 8 from primary to secondary schools. I think that children should have remained at primary school for the Grade 8 year, and spent two years at high school to attain Junior standard. Young people, some 12 years of age, now leave primary school and mix at high school with entirely different types of children. They are older, some up to 18 years of age, and have developed physically and psychologically to a much greater extent than have those at primary schools. As I have pointed out to the Minister before, some Grade 8 pupils in high schools reach a stage of premature sophistication in their early years.

Mr. Sullivan: There would not be Grade 8 students 18 years of age.

Mr. MELLOY: No. I said that Grade 8 pupils are associating with young people 18 years of age at high schools. These very young students soon adopt the manners and practices of girls of 15, 16, and 17. One sees them dressing up, using lipstick, and attending dances, and it is impossible to judge whether they are 16, 17, or 18.

Mr. Sullivan: Don't you think that parents have a bit of responsibility in this?

Mr. MELLOY: They have, but it is equally well known—

Mr. Sullivan: They have the first responsibility.

Mr. MELLOY: That is true, but it is well known that parents do not always concern themselves with their children, which is one

of the causes of delinquency. Once children get to high school they are introduced to all sorts of things, including the use of lipstick, dressing up after school, attending dances that the older pupils attend, and generally engaging in an undesirable form of premature sophistication.

Mr. Miller: That does not happen at the Toowong High School; I should like you to know that.

Mr. MELLOY: I cannot accept that; I think it happens at all high schools. The hon. member cannot answer for every child at the Toowong High School, any more than I can answer for every child at the Banyo High School.

The Minister has spoken of the development of education services during the period in which the Government has been in office. This has been a natural and logical expansion along with the development that has taken place in every other branch of governmental administration. It is happening in every State of Australia. It is not peculiar to Queensland or to the Department of Education in this State.

What is the Minister's attitude to the question? He admits that there is a shortage of teachers, but he says, "That is nothing. There is a shortage of teachers in every Australian State". I accept his analogy and apply it to the building of schools. I say, "The Government has not done anything out of the ordinary. Similar building is being done in every Australian State". The Government of Queensland has shown no peculiar virtue in that respect; as a matter of fact, the education system in Queensland is lagging behind the education systems in other States.

Let us look at the circumstances surrounding the development of educational services in Queensland. Since 1957, according to the Government, there has been record development in industry, unanimous assistance from the Commonwealth Government (I am speaking generally now, not only of education), good seasons, record wheat crops, record wool clips, unprecedented production of coal, bauxite, copper, and sugar, and a record intake of immigrants in the State. As I have pointed out, it is natural and logical to expect all these things to tend to increase financial and social development, but none of them is attributable to the administration of the present Government.

Mr. Sullivan: What are you talking about—record wheat crops? Don't you know there has been a drought for five or six years?

Mr. MELLOY: There has been one drought since 1957 and the Government's finances have gone down the drain. The development that has taken place in primary industries, secondary industries, the mining of coal, bauxite, and other minerals,

and the increase in the number of immigrants have made the extension of educational facilities not only desirable but absolutely essential. The building of additional schools was a natural consequence of the development of the State. It would have been done if an Australian Labour Party Government had been in power, and I suggest that the Country-Liberal Government has had everything in its favour for the logical development of Queensland. It has not been the result of the implementation of Government policy; it would have taken place under any Government. In spite of this, the Minister for Education seeks to take credit for this Government for all the development that has taken place, particularly in education.

Let us look at what happened when the Australian Labour Party was in control of the Treasury benches in Queensland and at what it had to contend with in the years before the Country-Liberal Government came to office. What happened in 1929? There was an economic recession or depression, which lasted from 1929 to 1935, and every person in the State had to struggle to exist. It was a very difficult and trying period for the Government. As a matter of fact, in about 1931, a Government that had had only one term in office threw in the towel. It just could not cope with the situation, and the Australian Labour Party came back in full force to take over the reins of government, as it always does in times of crisis, not only in this Parliament but in the Federal Parliament.

In 1935, after the depression, there was a high level of unemployment, but no Government could have expanded services. It was a period of rehabilitation for industry and for the people generally. The unemployment was caused largely by private enterprise, which the Government lauds at every possible opportunity and says is preferable to Government enterprise. Private enterprise fell down on the job in the industrial development of this State.

That took us up to 1939. I am outlining this period to indicate the difficulties that beset the Government of Queensland in the development of the State and to compare the position then with the high prosperity period that this Government has enjoyed over the last nine years.

From 1939 to 1945 we were engaged in the Second World War, so who could be blamed for any failure to expand facilities in that period when every resource of the country was devoted to the war effort? How could we be expected to build high schools and things of that nature during that period? That is what the Australian Labour Party had to contend with from 1939 to 1945.

From 1946 to 1949 there was a period of rehabilitation, when we were again faced with the effects of war in that it was a building-up period, and that was when the Australian

Labour Party proved itself. In those post-war years Queensland developed as it had not developed from 1929 onwards.

In 1949 came the greatest blow of all to Queensland with the return of the Liberal Party Government to Canberra, and we have suffered ever since. Despite the claims of the present Government, the Federal Government is still hamstringing the development of Queensland. The cry all the time is that we do not get sufficient money from the Commonwealth Government to develop the State.

The Minister said that many high schools have been built, but how many primary schools have been closed in the same period? Certainly some facilities in regard to transport were provided. But if there were 10 to 12 children attending a school that was closed, I think it would have been preferable to leave the school available in that district. This closing of facilities while the population is increasing is consistent with the policy of this Government. This year we have experienced record crime, yet there are fewer police stations.

Mr. Bromley: And the police are overworked.

Mr. MELLOY: That is so.

Getting back to the number of children sitting for the Junior and Senior examinations, I should like to quote some figures. In 1961, 19,003 children sat for the Junior examination. Of those 19,003 who sat in 1961, only 6,000 sat for Senior in 1963, a drop-out of 66 per cent.

That is the problem facing young people today. They have the fear in their minds that if they do not leave school and go to work after Junior they will miss out on employment. And it is a very real fear, because many young people today go on for Senior and then find that they can only get jobs similar to those that were available to Junior certificate-holders two years earlier. They think, "Why should I go on to Senior if I can only get the same job then as I can get now after Junior?" In 1962, 22,363 sat for Junior and in 1964, the number who sat for Senior was 7,643, another drop-out of 66 per cent.

This trend will have to be corrected. We are continually hearing about the development and mechanisation of industry, the need for educating young people to meet the demands of such mechanisation, and the advances in technological and industrial development.

I now wish to refer to several matters included in the Estimates. I am more than agreeably surprised with the development that is taking place at the Queensland Agricultural College at Gatton. I am very pleased to see that provision has been made for an additional 14 instructors this year. The new lecture theatres are magnificent buildings. There will be additional inducement for young people to attend Gatton when they know that sufficient instructors are available.

With the increasing use of television in schools, I was very disappointed to see that only \$3,870 has been provided for "Visual Education, Radio in Schools." I do not think that sum will meet the demands in the next 12 months. I expect tremendous development in the educating of children through the medium of television, development undreamed of even five years ago. If we are to make full use of the medium of television in educating children, we must provide the necessary equipment. Certainly that amount is nowhere near enough.

There has been a tendency on the part of the Government to direct all the available finance to the establishment of new high schools, and to neglect high schools that were built eight or nine years ago. The Banyo High School has been in need of an administration block for the last six years. It has been on the planning board for that period, but we never seem to be able to get the project any further. On my latest approach to the Minister I was told that finance was not available this year to proceed with it. In addition, the playgrounds have been neglected for the last six years.

I have made frequent representations to the Minister about the grounds of the Nudgee Beach State School. There is a swamp within 30 yards of the school building, but despite inspections by various officers of the Department of Works, and many promises, we are still waiting for the Department of Education to fill in this area, which is a menace to the health of the children and restricts the available playground area. I hope the Minister will give sympathetic consideration to this matter in the very near future.

Cribb Island State School, which has an enrolment of about 300 pupils, lacks a parade ground and septic system, although the schools on each side of it have a septic system. Nudgee Beach State School, with only 25 to 30 pupils, has a septic system, and so has the Pinkenba State School. Despite many inspections and promises, the Cribb Island school is still waiting for a parade ground and septic system. Boondall State School has a similar problem with its grounds. They are in a shocking condition, but the department has made no attempt to do anything about them.

In the Estimates for the Department of Native Affairs the Item "Incidental and Miscellaneous Expenses" is causing me a little concern. In 1955-56 the sum set aside for this Item was \$125,622. This year the Estimates provide \$366,555. I have no doubt that there is a good reason for the tremendous increase of \$240,000, but there is nothing in the Estimates to indicate the reason for it. It could cover a multitude of sins. I should like to know what are the sins, or the virtues.

Mr. SULLIVAN (Condamine) (4.41 p.m.): If I were to observe the correct rules of debate I would spend some time in refuting statements made by the previous speaker.

However, I believe that any charges made against this Government by the hon. member for Nudgee were anticipated by the Minister when introducing his Estimates and, even if he did not cover some of the matters, I am sure he will deal with them when summing up the debate.

The hon. member for Nudgee said that at a couple of speech nights he attended recently school principals indicated some dissatisfaction. How different is the attitude in my electorate. On Thursday, Friday and Monday, the week before last, I attended three speech nights. The attitude of the principals was indicated in their annual reports, and from them it could be seen that teachers, students, and parents have nothing but praise for what this Government—and particularly the Minister for Education and his departmental officers—are doing for the education of our children.

It sickened me to listen to the criticisms levelled at the Minister for Education. If hon. members opposite were sincere they would have cheered every statement he made when presenting his Estimates. Even our greatest political opponents will agree that we have done a remarkable job in developing education in Queensland. I commend the Minister and his departmental officers. As a member of the Government I have a wonderful feeling of security, which is so different from that of hon. members opposite, who recently had to elect a new leader and deputy leader. They had to come up with a couple of "roughies". The Premier has indicated that he will retire next year. How reassuring it is to know that we have the Minister for Education, Mr. Pizzey, who has done so much and has proved himself in the administrative field. As Premier of this State he will continue the excellent work he has done while Minister for Education.

I commend the Minister for his references to the three deceased gentlemen, Mr. Story, Sir Herbert Watkin, and Archbishop Sir James Duhig. All too often men who have done much for the public are forgotten, but the Minister's statements about the great work done by these grand gentlemen will be on record, and will be available for future generations. They were golden men in the golden age of education. There is no doubt that by expressing our appreciation the Minister will win the favour of people in all walks of life.

I am deeply grateful to the officers of the department who have administered Government policy and have achieved so much in the nine years we have been the Government. I think, in a debate such as this, it is incumbent on a member to relate what has been done in his electorate and to bring to the notice of the Minister and his departmental officers anything that still needs to be done. The Minister has given us the story State-wise. I support him by saying that what has been achieved State-wise has been achieved in a smaller way in the Condamine electorate.

The Minister said that prior to the advent of this Government secondary education in country areas was, in the main, the preserve of children whose parents could afford, by some sacrifice, to send them to boarding schools. This applied as much in Condamine as in any other country electorate. Because of Government policy and the untiring efforts of the Minister, who realised the need for better education, 98 per cent. of the children in my electorate have secondary education facilities per medium of the school transport services. It is important for children of that age to be at home with their parents at night where they can study under supervision in their home environment with proper discipline.

We were not satisfied with 98 per cent. The Minister indicated this morning and the Treasurer pointed out when introducing his Budget that we are assisting children who live in remote areas by subsidising to the extent of \$200 the cost of their boarding away from home. Country people appreciate this.

Mr. O'Donnell: I asked for that five years ago.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The hon. member may have. He is a responsible person and I hope he did. He would possibly have supported what we put up to our Minister. I am fair in this regard. In my electorate there are only four areas where this will apply. That is as it should be. I appreciate the concern of the hon. member for Barcoo, whose electorate is more far flung than mine, and the concern of the hon. members for Gregory, Flinders, and Roma, who were vociferous in our Party meetings back in my early years as a member. That is something that this Government has given us.

Last Saturday week the Minister for Main Roads opened a swimming pool at Jandowae. It would not be there had it not been for the policy of this Government—it was actually the Minister's brainchild—to subsidise local authorities in the building of swimming pools in small country towns that could not afford them. I am grateful, and on behalf of the people of Jandowae I thank the Minister for his assistance in providing a swimming pool in Jandowae where the children will have an opportunity to learn to swim.

These are the things this Government has done. They are the things that have helped the Government to stay in office. I have increased my vote by 5 per cent. each election. I do not say that that is solely the result of the representation I give; I give some credit to Government policy. If we had a policy that was not acceptable to the people, I feel that we would lose rather than win votes. People everywhere are most appreciative of what the Government has done in the field of education.

When he speaks on these Estimates, the hon. member for Gregory will no doubt state what a wonderful thing the pastoral college that has been established at Longreach will be for lads who want to follow this industry. It interests me because there will be boys from my electorate, and others similar to it, who will avail themselves of the opportunity to attend it. That the college is to be administered by a board of practical men is most important, because they know the problems of the area and what young lads should be taught.

I believe that Mr. John Park was a good selection to head the college. He was in charge of the Junior Farmers or, more recently, Rural Youth. His selection is an excellent one. He is a very dedicated man, and I am sure that hon. members on both sides of the Chamber will follow the development of this college.

Much has been said by members on both sides about the development that has taken place at the Queensland Agricultural College at Gatton. The Minister outlined the courses available. I believe that what he said is most important, because not all who go to the Queensland Agricultural College want diplomas. A lad can have two years' training, then return to the land and apply what he has learnt without gaining a diploma.

I believe that a very appreciative attitude towards the Department of Education has developed in recent years, particularly through secondary education. I pay a tribute to the work done by parents and citizens' associations in assisting the principals and teachers of schools. In my electorate it pleases me greatly to go to speech nights and other functions at schools where I see the splendid relationship between the principal and staff and the parents and citizens' association. This makes a story in itself, and I am sorry that I have not time to tell it in full. At the Chinchilla High School, the parents and citizens' association, assisted by a subsidy received from the Department of Education, has helped to provide at this very new school a magnificent playing area. Whilst this type of co-operation continues between parents and citizens' associations and principals and staffs, the education system will assuredly improve.

In his contribution to the debate the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt dealt at some length with technical education. I want to develop that theme a little further, because I am proud of our record in this field. The training of technicians is of great importance in the State's industrial development, and technical education should be available to all young Queenslanders who desire it. One thing that concerns me is the absence of an apprenticeship for diesel mechanics. In primary and secondary industry today the diesel engine is fast taking the place of petrol and kerosene engines. I understand that consideration is being given to the establishment of such an apprenticeship course at the Technical College.

In recent months the need for training of diesel mechanics has been brought to my notice by reputable men in my area who are engaged in mechanical work, and I have had the opportunity to discuss the matter at some length with the President of the Queensland Institute of Diesel Engineering, Mr. McCabe. I have compiled some figures that I think are interesting, and if I put them before the Committee the Minister and his departmental officers may consider providing an apprenticeship in diesel engineering in this State.

There are about 10,000 diesel-powered pieces of earth-moving equipment in Queensland and about 60,000 diesel tractors on rural holdings. There are many times this number of diesel-operated buses and trucks, stationary engines, trawlers, and diesel locomotives both in the Queensland Government Railways and in the canefields. Per capita, Queensland is the biggest user of diesel equipment of all the Australian States, and it might surprise hon. members on both sides of the Chamber to know that there is not one properly qualified man to service this equipment worth many millions of dollars. Inefficient and piecemeal maintenance of that machinery is increasing costs in primary industries and road-making and is retarding the development of the State.

Despite the facts that I have given the Committee, Queensland has some highly skilled diesel fitters and mechanics—some of the most skilful in the world—but the cost of training these men, which has been borne by industry and by Government departments, has been astronomically high. Individual fitters have spent a great deal of money on textbooks and correspondence courses and have burnt the midnight oil to achieve their skills. The main distributors and Government departments conduct their own schools, and one firm spent over \$30,000 last year and is budgeting for an even higher expenditure this year. The combined costs must be staggering, and they are passed on to the consumer.

Mr. Sherrington: Who wrote that?

Mr. SULLIVAN: I wrote it myself; but I will be honest and say that I have had discussions with members of the Queensland Institute of Diesel Engineering. I do my own homework. I do not send up to the hill and then read out in this Chamber what is sent to me, as hon. members opposite do. I tell the story so that the Minister and his departmental officers can consider it.

Manufacturers are supplying very sophisticated equipment for carrying out private testing, but much of the equipment is idle. Because of the lack of trained operators, repairable components are being scrapped. Reputable garage-owners have told me that because men skilled in the servicing of diesel pumps, diesel tractors, and so on, are not available, many parts that could be repaired have to be replaced, thus increasing the cost of maintenance.

There is no quick cure for this situation; but the Queensland Institute of Diesel Engineering, which comprises 200 men in all branches of the industry in Queensland, and which knows the planning of the relevant parts of both the motor mechanics' course and the fitters and turners' course at technical colleges, believes that skilled instructors are available in Queensland. If those men require any further information or knowledge, the institute is prepared to make instructors available to them. It is prepared to co-operate with industry and provide, free of charge, further instructional equipment, such as parts and cut-away sections, to the various firms and Government departments. It can be seen that the cost to the Government, and therefore to the community, will be negligible compared with the gains that will accrue from such a scheme.

It is conservatively estimated that there will be about 30 apprentices in the first year. The institute would be pleased to have a member on any administrative apprenticeship advisory council, and it is prepared to have discussions with the Minister and departmental officers at any time. I make that suggestion and recommendation because I know that the Minister has indicated that with the development that has taken place in our technical education he is prepared to keep in step with changing times. I hope that, as a result of bringing this to the notice of his department, we may be able, in the near future, to look forward to an apprenticeship course for diesel mechanics.

I have recently been advised that the manual training block at the Chinchilla school is in this year's programme and that tenders are being called very shortly for the erection of that wing. I am most appreciative, and I express appreciation also on behalf of teachers, the pupils and the people of Chinchilla, because whilst we have had technical training facilities at Chinchilla they have been situated three-quarters of a mile from the high school. I know there are other schools that do not have these facilities at all. When these facilities are established we will have a technical training section at the Chinchilla High School of which we will be very proud and for which we will be very grateful. The people of the district are worthy of it. It will be the result of the policy of our Government of making the best educational facilities available to children in country areas.

I have to put to the Minister, too, a request to have something done to improve the facilities at the Warra State school. I am aware that the Government can only do what the money available to it will allow, but I feel that Warra has been slightly neglected over the years and, if it is at all possible to fit it into the programme this financial year, I am sure the people of Warra will be most appreciative.

As this debate on the Estimates of the Department of Education develops, I am certain that the praise of the Minister and the officers of his department will ring out on many occasions from members on this side. I think, too, that many members opposite are appreciative of what is being done but, of course, they apparently are not prepared to stand up in this Chamber and say so.

Mr. Ramsden: They have to toe the party line.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The hon. member just beat me in saying so.

There are certain people within the Teachers' Union who are trying to stir up strife, and, of course, hon. members opposite have to support them. In spite of the supposed dissatisfaction that exists among some teachers, I have not had any complaints of it. I am around my schools on speech nights and there is very little dissatisfaction in my area. Recently I was guest speaker at a seminar of Jaycees in Dalby at which the Teachers' Union secretary was the other speaker. He is quite a decent fellow; he is not a radical by any means and I was able to convince him, along with all the delegates from the whole of the Darling Downs who attended this Jaycees' seminar, that things are not nearly as bad in the Department of Education as some Teachers' Union officials would have us believe. Some teachers will tell you that they have never had it better; others will tell you that they have never had it worse. Perhaps those who say that they have never had it worse are being instructed to say that—I do not know.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Hon. members opposite representing city areas do not come in such close contact with the teachers as we do in the country areas. I have every respect for the teachers. Those who know them personally find that they appreciate what we are doing throughout the State. I am sure that we are not up against any crisis, as hon. members opposite try to indicate. No doubt when the Minister answers their criticisms he will be able to convince hon. members opposite that what I am saying is true.

I do not have any problems concerning the Police Force. We are very pleased that we have a very good body of men serving our area.

Mrs. JORDAN (Ipswich West) (5.6 p.m.): I believe that these Estimates are the most important that come before the Committee. Education, good or bad, is the basis of all thinking. I am sure that all will want to see good education, and progressively better and better education. I am sure that everybody appreciates what education means to our State and, indeed, to all nations right around the globe. Nowadays people have a much greater appreciation of what education means to the future of

their children, and of the altered attitudes and thinking towards what is required for the forward movement of our State, and Australia as a whole.

In bygone days people did not ask so much in day-to-day living. There was not the density of population or the complexity of requirements so necessary in this scientific and technological age, when more and more specialised knowledge is a positive "must". Times have changed, perhaps slowly in some years, and then quite explosively in recent years. This is applicable not only to Queensland—it is world-wide—and Queensland needs must follow the pattern or be left behind. That, I submit, would be obnoxious to both sides of the Chamber, and to our people as a whole.

I am sure that many people in this State are concerned about the fact that Queensland spends less on education than any other Australian State. I will not give the figures because they are already in "Hansard". The hon. member for Toowoomba East gave them to us in his Budget speech.

To hark back to what the Labour Party did, or did not do, in bygone years is similar to comparing the horse-and-buggy days with the motor-car era of today. Every year brings more advancement and more improvement. Maybe before too many years have passed the motor-car will be outdated. Just as transport has changed so, too, have education and educational requirements. There is little use in being destructively critical of the past. No Government is ever able to satisfy everyone. One has only to compare the numbers in the classes when I went to secondary school and the numbers today.

The Minister spoke of the increase in the number of pupils. Take the Ipswich Girls' Grammar School as an example. When I sat for Junior there were 16 pupils sitting for that examination and only eight sitting for the Senior examination. Of course, they were the depression years, and statistics and requirements of those days cannot be used as a reasonable or fair comparison.

For many years, because of the declining birth-rate the call for increased educational facilities was not so great. Many schools, particularly high schools, had room for many more students, both teaching-wise and accommodation-wise. There were empty spaces, not bursting seams, as today. It is little use being destructively critical of the past and comparing it with what happens today. Let us get on with the job today with our sights firmly fixed on the future.

I am particularly pleased about three things that have evolved and become apparent. First, I am pleased that the Commonwealth Government has changed the attitude it held for so many years in not coming into the education field and that it has now allotted money to assist the States, more particularly in the provision of science blocks for secondary education. This is concrete

evidence of recognition of Commonwealth responsibility, and it is at least a start on the path to giving further assistance to the States and to Queensland in particular, with which we are more concerned. This will, I hope, lead to further involvement and greater assistance by the Commonwealth. In the past the assistance went mainly to the university, but after the publication of the Martin Report a new outlook on, and support for, tertiary education developed, and the Commonwealth Government agreed to give assistance for technical education. This appears to be attributable to a greater appreciation by the Government and people of the social importance of education and an acceptance of the need to improve it in all its forms. We now see the Commonwealth Government coming in and giving assistance to secondary schools, particularly for science blocks.

Second, I am pleased with the State Government's decision to spend more money on education in its allocations this year, the greatest increase being in the new field of technical education. This indicates that the State Government also realises that education has a high priority. Once that is admitted and decisions are taken accordingly, more and more can be expected much more quickly than hitherto. I am not saying this to the Department of Education and the Government for political reasons, but for the sake of our children. I think they are the ones we have to be most concerned about. We must always keep in mind our children and their future, and what a good education can do for them. To them, every year lost in providing a better education is a year lost forever. It may alter the attitude towards adult life of hundreds of children. I am concerned about them, and the Labour Party in Opposition is very concerned, just as every parent should be concerned.

In the third place, I believe that we can be very grateful in that we have so many dedicated "Professional Educators" at the top of our education service in Queensland, in all spheres of education, and numbered among many of the principals of our State high schools and other secondary schools.

At this time of the year we have a spate of speech nights and we hear many speeches by the professional educators, who use such nights to try to instil attitudes of interest in learning into both students and parents. All told, I have six high schools in the electorate of Ipswich West. They include the Ipswich State High School, the Boys' Grammar School, the Girls' Grammar School, the Ipswich Technical College and St. Mary's and St. Edmund's High Schools, as well as nine large State primary schools and the Ipswich State Opportunity School. All these schools have large enrolments.

Perhaps I am fortunate in that the electorate of Ipswich West has been well served with educational facilities. Because of that, I am perhaps not as critical of this department as some other hon. members are. We

are very fortunate that the Ipswich State High School already has its science block and, as a consequence, the students have much better opportunities and varieties and curriculum. The Ipswich State High School held its fifth speech night last night. From fewer than 100 people at the first speech night, it now has 923 students. As I said, it has been most fortunate in that there has been consistent development of school buildings since the school was opened five years ago, and it has been fortunate in getting one of the first science blocks in the State. The principal, Mr. J. A. Sparkes, is a very dedicated man. He takes a special interest in his pupils and advises them as to their future and on the courses that are suitable. He is very receptive to approaches from parents. I must pay him special tribute for that.

The growth of the high school, and indeed of the whole residential area around it, has been fantastic. The land for this high school was acquired by the Labour Government in 1949. So Labour did look ahead and did prepare for future needs. I say this because I know it, and what happened in my area has happened in other areas. So that Labour did prepare for high schools in the future, and it did look ahead. Sixteen years after the purchase of the land, the high school was opened. Requirements have changed and attitudes have altered. It is ridiculous to use the yardstick of past decades as a criticism of what Labour did. Maybe Labour in Government would have done as well, if not better, taking all things into consideration and taking into consideration altering attitudes of the people as a whole towards education.

My criticism is that not enough is being done quickly enough, and further, that there is a restriction on the freedom of the public-school teacher at any level to speak out, offering criticism on education. They are the very people who know, from practical experience, what is required and can offer constructive suggestions. I am sure that most of them are so knowledgeable and dedicated, particularly dedicated, that there would be very little destructive criticism. This is a field of knowledge that can arouse great public interest in educational practices and policies, and a field that can be of great benefit to the advancement of education of our children in this State.

The Department of Education has, to a great extent, leant on the dedication of these professional educators and has given them little encouragement. Many teachers stay with the department because of their dedication when they could receive higher remuneration outside. Indeed, it is this question of adequate remuneration that I believe is the main cause of the acute shortage of teachers in the department. It is little wonder that there is unrest in the Queensland Teachers' Union—unrest such as I have never known before. If the teachers are concerned in such numbers as they appear to be, then

there must be cause for concern. The teachers themselves are cognisant of many things that need attention.

It is a great pity that the Federal and State Governments do not realise the need for increased teacher training, both by the provision of more training colleges and the introduction of a longer period of training; and also the need for more in-service training for those who are already teaching.

With altered curriculums and methods, this is very necessary, and (as I said in my speech during the Budget debate) in my humble opinion in-service training is important enough to merit the closing of schools for a week now and then to enable teachers to receive concentrated training. Teaching methods have altered; knowledge has increased; and subjects have changed priorities. Many teachers have been in the teaching service for years, and such training would be of great assistance to them, and particularly to school children. The cost would be money well spent.

I read somewhere recently that it had been said that we in Australia put "cars before kids" and, in terms of money relatively spent, this would appear to be so. Again I think that we have our priorities wrong. It should be "kids before cars", and the education of our children should have a very high priority.

At the Ipswich State High School speech night last night we were very fortunate to have as guest speaker Dr. A. M. Fraser, principal of the Queensland Institute of Technology. It was particularly fitting that he should be the guest speaker at a high school in an industrial city such as Ipswich. What he said was very interesting, and I know that he interested a number of boys in proceeding to the technical field. He gave a lucid picture of the pattern of the three steps of tradesman, technician, and technologist.

I am personally extremely pleased that this new sphere of education has been developed, especially as I represent an industrial electorate in which many tradesmen have been trained over the years—and trained exceeding well—at the Ipswich Railway Workshops. I feel that the Government's policy of giving repair work on diesel rail-motors to private enterprise is a very backward step.

The hon. member for Condamine referred to the absence of an apprenticeship course for diesel-engine mechanics. For quite a number of years the Ipswich Technical College has given attention to the training of those required by the Railway Department in this field. They are trained under an apprenticeship to the trade of fitting and turning, and much of their training relates to diesel engines.

There has been much wastage over the years because some scholars have taken academic courses unsuited to their capabilities and capacities. The new field

covered by the Institute of Technology will alter this situation and give more opportunities for those who lean more to the practical skills. There are many parents who thrust their children into courses beyond their capabilities, resulting in failure and frustration. There are, too, parents who lack the capacity to encourage their children to attain greater heights in education. The important thing for teachers and parents is to be able to light the spark of interest. Often in the past, by rigid attitudes and parrot-like teaching, the spark was extinguished before it had a chance to glow.

In this technical field, a number of students travel to Brisbane from Ipswich several nights each week to study, and they do that after completing their day's work. They are acquiring an education the hard way. There is no easy way of acquiring it, but working during the day and studying at night is, I believe, the hardest way of all. However, it does produce sincere students who really are interested in their future and really want to learn. If they were not, they would throw in the towel very early in the piece because of the difficult conditions under which they have to study. I appeal to the Minister to endeavour to make available even part-time facilities for evening students at the Ipswich Technical College.

It is also a matter for regret that the Department of Education has seen fit to discourage people from attending the hobby classes at the Ipswich Technical College. The fees have been doubled—I am not going to complain about that, because costs have increased—but what really is important is that the requirement is now 14 students, with a hard core of 12, whereas previously it was eight, with a hard core of six.

Mr. Pizzey: Don't you think they should pay their way?

Mrs. JORDAN: I said that I am not complaining about the cost.

Mr. Pizzey: We must have the numbers to make them pay their way.

Mrs. JORDAN: The Minister will find that people will come forward if the course is provided. If it is discontinued, it is very difficult to get sufficient people together to support a request that it be reopened.

I repeat that I am not complaining about the additional fees; if people want such courses, they must pay for them. However, there are people who look for classes of this type for their children. When my boy was attending primary school, he went every Saturday morning to a hobby class at the Ipswich Technical College. That was long before he proceeded to secondary education and long before he became interested in engineering, as he is now, and a number of his school friends also attended the class. I still have in my home furniture that he made at the classes, and I value it. I certainly would not replace the bookshelves and little side tables with modern furniture. In

my opinion, a hobby such as that is wonderful for boys. It gives them something to do and something to think about instead of running round the streets getting into trouble, as many are doing today. I am very disappointed that these classes are to be discontinued.

I wish to deal now with the need for the establishment of standards in school libraries and for more Government assistance to school libraries. The view that a library is simply a room with books in it and that a librarian is a person who issues the books for reading for entertainment has been a popular one for too long. On the contrary, the world's store of knowledge is growing so rapidly that teachers cannot hope to impart even a portion of what many children may need to know. It is becoming more and more necessary for children to be able to read and learn independently of their teachers, to gather knowledge and continue educating themselves, not only in childhood but in a way that sets a pattern throughout their lives. In childhood they need guidance by trained librarians, and libraries should contain books to enable them to supplement their studies. Libraries should be a source of books and other material to enrich the school studies, and librarians should provide guidance in reading and what to read and help pupils to understand that the school library can be a centre of educational activities from which both teachers and students can benefit. It should be the heart of the school.

In Victoria, Western Australia and New South Wales much more emphasis is put on this conception of school libraries, and the Departments of Education in those States support and develop them accordingly. Queensland has not yet realised, to any extent, the need for improvement in school libraries. The Brisbane Girls' Grammar School, with Mrs. Needham as librarian, is developing this attitude, but that school is one of the few in Queensland to do so.

Parents and citizens' associations are doing something towards helping in this direction, but they already have a heavy burden. I think we all know, as members of this Parliament, just how much of a load the parents and citizens' associations carry in helping towards providing facilities at schools, and I feel that this matter of providing library assistance and librarians at high schools should be done inside the structure of the Department of Education and the educational system itself.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (5.31 p.m.): This debate commenced today with a very complete and comprehensive, and thoroughly interesting, review of education in this State by the Minister. It was a great pity that it should have been followed by so remarkable, intemperate and almost uncouth an outburst by the Leader of the Opposition on what is a very vital subject. Mind you, I am not in the least averse to argument and discussion on this subject

because there is no doubt that there is much ferment in the field of education in Queensland at present. It involves parents and teachers in hot discussion. Perhaps the children, the subject of it all, are the least concerned. Of course, it is inevitable that some aspects of this discussion might touch the Minister and his senior officers, but I still think it is a good thing. I think they will also recognise that this discussion is worth while, even though it does touch an exposed nerve at times.

I can remember that for years it was an axiom of politics that one could not win an election on an educational issue. Whether that was so or not—it probably was not, as are so many of the things we used to take for granted in politics—it certainly does not hold true today. Although at many levels teachers may be dissatisfied with circumstances, parents also should be concerned about the future of their children; this is good, because it tends to focus attention on the subject of education. It also tends to focus the attention of political parties on this most vital of all community services, the preparation of our children for adult living.

There can be no doubt that the Government has a splendid record in this regard. Every suburb, every centre, provides quite tangible testimonials to the fine educational achievements of this Government, with the aid of the Commonwealth. There has been a tremendous surge forward in many aspects, such as university education and secondary schooling, and the abolition of the Scholarship examination, which resulted in many more children going on to secondary school. There are all the new aspects of the curriculum, and last, but certainly not least, there have been many new tutorial methods.

These are huge changes and great advances, and I think that as far as the Minister is concerned, he is unfortunate because the scope of all these advances tends to be obscured by two factors. The first, of course, is the pressure of numbers; that is the pressure that is exerted on every phase of education, no matter what is done, as the numbers of students rise. The other is the fact that the period in which we live is an era of fantastic change. This makes constant and huge demands for adaptation and change both in curricula and in teaching techniques.

So we have the unfortunate paradox that while more is being done for education every year, people are not satisfied—and rightly so. No matter what is done, it will never be enough. I take it that the Minister and his officers will recognise this and accept it philosophically. Whilst they may feel at times that there is great ingratitude, nevertheless they must take it in their stride. There is a field in which is required adaptation,

flexibility and enthusiasm that will not hesitate to make changes as they become necessary. We have to introduce innovations to make sure that our education system never lags behind education.

It has been said that the sum total of human knowledge doubled in the decade between 1950 and 1960. I do not know whether this is true, but even if it is true only in part it serves to emphasise dramatically the enormous problems that now face educationalists.

I think we have to ask ourselves: what should be the basis of learning? To what end do we direct our programmes? How do we ensure that, in an age where technology is becoming more and more specialised with every year that goes by, boys and girls will learn that the great ends of life are not served by gaining purely material things? In other words, it seems to me that with living becoming progressively more complicated as we have more things to live with, the question to decide is what we live for.

Education must play a part in teaching us what we live for and how best to use all those things that science and technology are pouring into our laps. So I would say that the aim of education is not merely to supply children with knowledge; it must also aim at raising the general level of understanding in a community. I would say that this matter of the fundamental aims of education brings us right up against the major problem. Here, common to most States—and probably common in many countries—we have had a system which for decades has been geared to the concept that every child who starts school at the age of five years must inevitably finish up at the university—that every boy and girl, step by ordained step, must follow the path which leads to the university campus at an age of 18 or 19 years. Of course this is neither true in fact nor desirable in theory. Thank goodness this is so. Some of us have an academic mind, some of us have not. Thank goodness we are all different.

This concept of education in this State—something which was started many years ago—has tended to put education into something of an academic strait-jacket. We are only now beginning to struggle out of that strait-jacket. We have had a system of education with a very heavy emphasis on uniformity, and a system of examinations to ensure that there was uniformity. In my view the effect of this has been to exaggerate at all levels of education the role of memory. If a child can remember the main elements of the curriculum from one year to another, from one examination to another, he or she will finish up in due course with a pretty fair scholastic record, but in actual fact this has very little to do with learning in its proper sense. It has nothing at all to do with cleverness in its proper sense. So I say that one of the major acid tests to apply to any system of education is: does it help boys and girls to think? I wonder if ours does enough.

I do not think it does sufficiently. Certainly it has improved appreciably over recent years—markedly so in the last two years.

Mr. O'Donnell: Do you say you are capable of thinking, in spite of your education?

Mr. PORTER: It is quite obvious that the hon. member is not capable of appreciating what I am endeavouring to say. I am making no attack on his party at the moment, but a few more interjections from that side may lead me to say something about the past.

I suggest that our education system tends to put too much emphasis on young children gulping down facts. I think there is some appeal to creativity at the very early primary stage. The new mathematics method is a very noticeable improvement in this direction. However, as children move along in the later primary stages they soon find out that it is necessary to gulp down facts, and when they move to the secondary school there is precious little to stimulate their taste buds for thinking. The way we have to prepare under our matriculation plan there is precious little time to stop and think, or to stimulate classes or individuals with research projects. Perhaps the concurrent type of matriculation examinations planned for the end of 1968 will help in this regard.

We have moved, and very rightly so, to the position where all children can now sup at the table of secondary schooling, and that is most desirable. This being so, I think it is more than ever desirable that we should recognise that different children have different digestive capacities for learning, and also that there are differences in each individual at different stages. In other words, there should be a very wide variety of items in the educational menu. I think we must get away from any pervasive uniformity.

Mr. O'Donnell: What you are saying is at least 30 years old.

Mr. PORTER: I know it is old, but the whole trouble in our education system is that we are struggling out of the barren, dark policy that the Labour Government adopted for so many years. That is our greatest problem.

To a large degree the capacity of schools to teach and of children to learn is inevitably and closely bound up with the quality of the teaching staff at all levels of education. It is here, in this field, that much of the present discontent in education is engendered, and it is here that a great many of our present problems could be solved.

Mr. Davies: Can you tell us how we will get more money?

Mr. PORTER: I will tell the hon. member if he will only be patient.

Education in Queensland—and we are not alone in this—suffers quite heavily from a continuing lack of properly trained teachers. I use the words “properly trained” in their simple, literal sense. If we are to overcome

this deficiency quantitatively and qualitatively we must cope with the real problems of teacher prestige and professional status and, of course, adequate rewards. I put "adequate rewards" as third on the list in teacher wants. In turn, this requires that we must face up to such questions as decentralising decision-making in education. If I may put it this way we must have academic freedom at all levels, especially in the middle level. I hope I will not be misunderstood when I say that we should treat education as being much bigger than just another Government department.

It is generally agreed that one of the hallmarks of any profession consists of the freedom it enjoys to mark out and control its own destiny and to study its own codes and professional practices. Neither in this State, nor, perhaps, in any other State, does education enjoy that right at the present time. The Public Service status of teachers in Queensland and in other States is not paralleled in England and America. This means that our teachers become subject to very heavy—and I think quite undue—emphasis on seniority and on conformity with established methods and practices. Our teachers are certainly not encouraged to deviate.

I know the problems that could arise if we allowed freedom of deviation from accepted methods, but education, in its best sense, will need this. I very earnestly suggest to the Minister that the training of teachers should be removed from the control of the Education Department. In other words, we should ensure that the employing authority in education is not also the teaching authority. I believe this would be a very real step towards a professional status, and a higher academic level. I know that the Minister has this in mind, but its coming depends on practicalities. The principle has been quite well canvassed, and has been well received in Australia.

I believe that the Australian College of Education in a report towards the end of last year strongly urged this procedure. I understand that New South Wales is moving, in part at least, towards this end. The Martin Report suggested an independent authority to teach teachers. The British Robbins Report, of course, went a little further and recommended that the training of teachers should be founded in colleges incorporated in a university school of education.

All of us recognise the dimensions—and they are enormous dimensions—of the problems posed by the great expansion, in recent years, of secondary-school students. I think the expansion simply outstripped the available supply of good qualified teachers. I suppose perhaps inevitably the tendency was for the gap to be bridged by lowering qualifications. But this is rather fatally easy to do when the employer is also the teacher, for then we can quite neatly tailor supply to demand. Even if the lowering of standards for teachers

is necessary as a short-term measure—and I say "even if"—most certainly it should always be considered in the light of its grave long-term disadvantages, because at a time when all the fields of knowledge are visibly expanding and when university courses are becoming more and more demanding, it seems a great pity that our schools should find it increasingly difficult to prepare girls and boys adequately for entrance to the university. The first-year failure rate in universities is, of course, prime proof of this.

It seems as though, having deliberately prepared an educational system with this narrow academic end, that is, entrance to the university, we are even preparing to fail on this narrow criterion, so I make this earnest plea for the earliest consideration of separation of teacher-training from teacher-employment. I believe that would solve many problems.

"In-breeding" was mentioned today; and a very distasteful word it is. But of course our Department of Education has for many years tended to obtain its top staff from those who come from the system, and they in turn prepare people to go back into the system.

Mr. Davies: Is this a vote of no-confidence in the Minister?

Mr. PORTER: It is not indeed.

Mr. Davies: It sounds like it to me.

Mr. PORTER: In that case the hon. member is either not listening, or he has not the capacity to understand. I said at the start that a tremendous amount has been done in a field of such change and variety that no matter how much is done it will never be enough. The Minister involved in administering this portfolio has a record that would be magnificent in any other portfolio. He is still subject to some recommendations for improvement. But it is certainly not criticism.

So I think that this separation would shift to other shoulders some of the problems that now rest on the shoulders of the Minister. I think that even hon. members opposite, even the hon. member who has been making such persistent interjections, would agree that we should avoid a system where the teacher is told precisely what to teach, and in turn he tells the children precisely what they have to learn, so that both the teacher and the children tend to be recipients of pre-digested information which they have to assimilate on order and regurgitate on demand. To me that is not an education system, and I should hope that we would do all possible, as we are already doing, to steer ours away from that. The adequate training of teachers is a huge problem; I freely admit that. It is easy to stand here and make recommendations for the future, but is it difficult to find ways in which recommendations can be put into effect.

I believe that if a separate teaching authority were established—I should like to see it set up by statute—it might well attract Commonwealth aid, which we need for education purposes. But I want Commonwealth money without the loss of any of our sovereignty in the field of education. I think this might be one way in which Commonwealth aid could be brought to the field of education, with control still remaining with the State. Although the Federal Government has all its other commitments, it has done a great deal in the field of education—ininitely more than any other Government has done in the whole history of Federation—and I have no doubt that it will do more in the future.

In the training of teachers, I do not know if the two-year course at the Teachers' Training College can turn a student into a good professional teacher. That, of course, seems to be fairly well agreed. I think this system also tends to fan the discontent caused by the division between teachers who have had university training and those who have not. What is very badly needed at the moment is a strong, unified teaching profession. At the present time, one year of university study plus one year at the Teachers' Training College admits teachers on probation to the staff of a secondary school. I doubt if that is good enough. I should like to see a separate teacher-training authority established by statute, and I would hope that it might attract Commonwealth financial aid.

I should also like to see the end of the bonding system and the problems involved in it. Although that is not something that can be done overnight, I should like to see at least the prospect of it. I think it would have a great deal to do with providing the professional status and attitude that teachers, at least in my experience of them, seem so desperately to require.

I think the Minister and his officers will agree that we must always set our sights on adequate teacher-training, not on any stop-gap objectives. We should also have the clear aim of bridging, as soon as possible, the present gulf between those who have been university-trained and those who have been trained through State colleges. We need money for education; let us try to get it, if possible from the sources I have mentioned. At present the States divert on an average about one quarter of the annual expenditures to education. The Commonwealth, however, spends only about 3 per cent. of its budget on education, and most of that is spent at the tertiary level. There is obviously a great deal that the Commonwealth can do if it wishes to do it.

We in this State might well have been spending a great deal more of our income on education had we not been wedded for so long to this peculiar concept of a so-called

free hospitalisation system. That is another white elephant that we have inherited from previous Governments.

I have said before—and I say again—that with the step towards providing teachers with status, prestige, and independence, many of the problems presently causing agitation in the field of education in this State would be resolved. I think we could then look forward to a fully staffed teaching service in which teachers stayed because the rewards were adequate and in which their sense of vocation could be very well fulfilled. We would then have a teaching profession with the required academic depth at all levels, which it does not have now. We might even consider introducing sabbatical leave for senior teachers, and we would then be assured of a continuation of the highest professional competence in what I think is the most vital of our community services—preparing our children to lead useful and happy lives.

Having said all that, I repeat that in no sense is it criticism. I recognise well the enormous problems that are involved in carrying out any type of recommendation calling for substantial change in education as it is currently being implemented in this State, but I believe that recommendations should be made. I have endeavoured to put forward some useful recommendations that are in line with educational thinking on the highest level in all States. I hope, therefore, that later in the debate I will not hear anything that I have said being twisted to suggest that it is a vote of no-confidence in the Minister, or something to that effect. It is not.

(Time expired.)

Mr. P. WOOD (Toowoomba East) (5.56 p.m.): I regret that the hon. member for Condamine is not in the Chamber, because I wish to comment briefly on some of his remarks.

The hon. member spent fully five minutes of the 25 minutes available to him telling the Committee how well he knew personally the teachers in his electorate and how frequently he visited the schools in the Condamine electorate. I say to him that I spent 12 months at the largest school in his electorate, in the capacity of either senior teacher or acting head teacher, and I did not see him once in that period. My service in that school, the school at Chinchilla, extended from March of one year into March of the next year, and it included the activities at the end of the year, when many hon. members representing country electorates usually visit schools. I think that the suggestion made by the hon. member that he knew the teachers in his area personally and that they had told him they had no cause for complaint and no feelings of discontent should be exposed for what it is.

When introducing the Estimates this morning, the Minister spent some time in boasting of the expansion that has taken

place in secondary education in Queensland during the term of office of the Country-Liberal Government. I want to say that I think his boasting was justified; but I add that, but for a change of political fortunes in this State, a Labour Minister could well have been making the same boasts.

Mr. Dewar: Not on previous evidence.

Mr. Bromley: You were educated under a Labour system.

Mr. Dewar: In spite of it.

Mr. P. WOOD: In discussing the Estimates before the Committee I think it is appropriate to pay a tribute to all the people throughout Queensland, in whatever capacity they are serving, who are working for the improvement of the education system. I include in my tribute all the officers of the Department of Education, from the lowliest to the highest. In whatever capacity they are serving, wherever they are serving, they are giving great service to education and to the children of Queensland.

I believe that complacency about education in Queensland must be overcome. It exists not so much within the system of education itself as in the minds of the general public. Most members of the public—and I have made these remarks before—were raised under the present system of education and, because of that, it is difficult for them to see the system as anything but good. Opinion polls in Queensland and in southern States suggest that electors are more concerned about education than they are about other issues. I suggest that it is a rationalisation, that people believe that we should be concerned about education above all other issues. Speaking generally, I doubt whether that really is so.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. P. WOOD: I was saying that I believed there was complacency in the general public concerning our education standards. Considering our high living standards it is hard for the general public to understand the future danger that lies in a deficient educational system. Throughout history the strongest nations have been those with the highest standard of education, and our best capital investment is in education.

I regret to say that Australia does not match the educational levels of the most advanced countries in the world today. I think we need a change of attitude towards education, a change of attitude in those who administer the education services and a change of attitude in the general public. This will not be easy to achieve. The Minister this morning took exception to the term "in-breeding" but I think it is a term that can validly be used. It is not easy to change attitudes in a system that does encourage in-breeding. We have State-trained teachers who are supervised and examined by those who have already gone through the system.

The department should advertise in other systems for senior officers.

The exchange of teachers between Queensland and the other States and Queensland and overseas countries should be extended considerably. Queensland is constantly losing teachers to other States, the Commonwealth, the armed forces and to overseas countries. I do not see any reason why it should be one-way traffic.

Mr. Pizzey: It is not one way; we have hundreds of teachers who were trained in other States.

Mr. P. WOOD: That may be so, but I do not think we are getting as many as we lose to other places. We are making slow progress in overcoming the teacher shortage.

Before I enlarge on that I will repeat what I said a moment ago, that we should encourage teachers to travel overseas. I am pleased that the senior officers of the department have been able to make overseas tours, and I hope this policy will continue. I think nothing but good can come from it. I think also that teachers and head teachers also, whatever their standing and classification, should be encouraged to travel overseas. At the moment I do not think any encouragement is given to the ordinary teacher to travel overseas. I see no reason why a teacher who spends three years overseas and teaches for two years of that period, or one year of it, cannot be allowed a classification increase, if he is due for one, according to the time he was teaching while overseas. It would be easy to show how much time he was occupied in teaching while he was away.

At the moment, a teacher who travels overseas loses any classification increase that may be due to him, even though he might have taught for one, two, or more years while he was away. The experience he would gain while he was away would be most valuable but it is not recognised by the Department of Education.

As I said, we are making slow progress in overcoming the teacher shortage and, at the present rate, it will be many years before the desired ratio is reached. Taking my figures from the annual report, from 1964 to 1965 there was a 2 per cent. increase in the children attending our schools; in the same period there was a 3.6 per cent. increase in the number of teachers in the schools. I do not intend to predict exactly how many years will pass at that rate of increase, before a satisfactory ratio between teachers and pupils is established. Up to August 1965 1,521 teacher resigned from the Department of Education. In the same period in the same year 1,088 were admitted to the Department. We are losing more teachers by resignation than we are gaining by admissions from the colleges. Teacher trainees cannot match resignations. We have to rely

on re-admissions of teachers to the Department—mainly married women. The Minister will admit the serious difficulties the educational system would be in if we did not have these married women.

Mr. Muller: Would not many of the resignations be of women who marry and leave the service?

Mr. P. WOOD: Yes. We have to rely on their coming back later to keep the teacher numbers up.

Mr. Hughes: Do you object to employing married women teachers?

Mr. P. WOOD: No, but the number of trainees coming out of colleges should be closer to the number of teachers resigning. With 1,521 resigning last year and 1,088 coming out of colleges, there is too much of a gap. It is difficult to know how the department can improve its recruitment of teachers. Following the 1965 Senior examination the department offered 2,750 scholarships to teachers' colleges. It could get only 1,033 of those accepted. My figures are taken from a reply the Minister gave me to a question. Probably the department recruited all students who gained the minimum qualifications. If I am wrong the Minister will correct me. The department probably recruited all the teachers it could. A total of 1,033 accepted scholarships after the department offered scholarships to 2,750 students.

Mr. Pizzey: Most Senior students apply for everything about the place.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am giving the Minister's own figures. If the department offered 2,750 scholarships—

Mr. Pizzey: It did, but you would know that almost everyone sitting for the Senior examination puts in for everything.

Mr. P. WOOD: I hope that the Minister will tell me in his reply whether he could have got more than 1,033 who did accept. If more students had accepted perhaps more scholarships might have been granted.

The Minister has planned to offer 300 extra scholarships for next year. I am wondering whether he would have taken them if he could have got 300 this year. They may not be available.

There are two ways to gain more recruits for the teaching service and to retain those already teaching.

The first and most obvious way is to pay better salaries. The Government will say that that is a matter for the Industrial Commission. I do not want to speak at length about that. It is on the other ways that I want to spend a few minutes. It is in these other ways that the department can take positive action. It can improve its attitude towards teachers; it can improve the professional standing of teachers; it can improve teaching morale considerably by giving teachers more freedom—by allowing them

more initiative in the classroom. Both the primary and secondary syllabuses are very full and very comprehensive. There is scope in the primary syllabus and in the secondary syllabus for a teacher's initiative—for a teacher's own ideas to be developed—but both the syllabuses are very full. When a district inspector visits a school he conducts an examination to ensure that all requirements of the syllabus are fulfilled.

There is a well-worn path to promotion in the Department of Education. It is not a path that has encouraged initiative, new ideas or enterprise on the part of the teacher. The teacher who wants to develop his own ideas, or the teacher who wants to depart from the well-worn track laid down, is running the risk that he will not subsequently obtain the promotion he wants. I find that the hon. member for Toowong was speaking on similar lines. Freedom of action should be given to head teachers and staff teachers.

For a short time I taught in London, and as a matter of interest I will relate my experiences. On my first day at the school I met the head teacher who passed the normal courtesies with me. I was then shown by a staff member to my classroom. I had to teach children of 11 or 12 years in the primary school. I point out in advance to hon. members that practices vary tremendously from school to school in London. There was nothing at all in that room to indicate what I should teach, or how I should go about my teaching. The head teacher assumed that I was a professional person who knew the requirements of the children in front of me and it was my responsibility to decide what I should teach them and how I should teach. That is a very free system and I do not suggest that we should necessarily afford that degree of freedom in our Queensland schools. However, we should strike a compromise between that very free system and the very tight system that applies to teachers in our education system.

Another important matter is that the people who pass judgment on our education system are also those who administer the system. Those who administer the system are obliged to defend it and this can lead to some dangers in that when criticism occurs it will be dismissed, or excuses will be made, because those who are responsible for the department have also to pass judgment on it. Hon. members will appreciate the difficulties that can arise. We have in our system a dichotomy. We have two branches in our system and both branches do not necessarily work together. The executive section of the Department of Education and the teachers may not be working towards the same end, and that is unfortunate. I feel that the public relations between the Department of Education and the practising teacher, wherever he or she may be in Queensland, is at a very low level. To many teachers the Department of Education is an anonymous, soulless organisation. I make it quite clear that the dislike of the department does not

extend to departmental officers. Wherever I have been I have found that departmental officers, whether in head office in Brisbane, or regional offices in the country, are invariably highly regarded and respected. But there is a dislike of the department as some anonymous mass above the teachers and this has been well illustrated by teacher resentment, and teachers' talk of strike in recent months. Teachers feel that there is no communication between them and the department. I think that Ministers have their public relations officers—and they probably need them—but some firmer action should be taken to establish a better relationship between the teachers and what they refer to as "The Department". When they refer to "The Department" they do not speak of it in very kind terms.

In this debate we have heard a great deal about over-large classes. I have figures for Toowoomba classes that I will quote if I have the time, to indicate the percentage of over-large classes there.

I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members the conflicting statements made about the effect of the birth rate on our class sizes. If the Minister is correctly reported in today's "Telegraph", he said—

"The Education Department had to draw on people born from 1929 to 1945 for its teachers. In this period there was a diminishing birth rate, and now there was a rising birth rate."

That was in explanation of the difficulties experienced in class sizes. Yet the same Minister, when interviewed on a TV programme on 16 October, was reported in the "Telegraph" of 17 October, as saying—

"He predicted that the falling birthrate allied with tapering sizes in classes would ease the burdens on schools."

In one instance we are told that the birth-rate is falling and that it will ease our educational problems; in the other instance we are told there is a rising birthrate and that it is increasing our problems.

Mr. Pizzey: There is no inconsistency there. It is starting to fall now, as you know.

Mr. P. WOOD: The Minister, as reported in the "Telegraph" said—

"In this period there was a diminishing birthrate and now there was a rising rate."

With all the money we spend, with more teachers, with better teachers and with better facilities our major concern is the teaching that goes on in the classroom. Money is important; facilities are important, but the most important single factor is the professional work of the teacher. The Minister and his department must do all that is possible to promote the professional status of teachers. Not everything that is possible is being done.

In the first place the department should do more to show that it trusts its teachers. There are bound to be a few rogues amongst

10,000. But too often teachers feel that they are not trusted by the department and that is a tragedy. Teachers will not see themselves as professionals unless they are able to act as professionals in the schoolrooms. Teachers who are free to participate in education policy-making will be better teachers. Teachers should have some degree of autonomy and independence in regard to education matters. The union must eventually assume the responsibility for establishing confidence in the integrity of its members. This necessarily will be a long-term measure. The department must relax its iron grip on teachers. Before this can ever happen, teachers must be better trained. Three years at the teachers' college will be necessary.

I am sorry I do not have longer to spend on the next subject, namely, in-service training. Facilities for in-service training will need to be vastly improved. I am sorry that the Minister spoke so briefly on this subject. He said there was a feeling of inadequacy amongst teachers and he went on to say that there is an increased need for in-service training. I hope to hear more of that in this debate.

I heard an officer of the department refer to the new mathematics programme as a revolutionary new idea. District inspectors, I am pleased to say, were given one week in which to familiarise themselves with this revolutionary new idea of mathematics teaching. Teachers themselves will be obliged to have just one day of instruction in this new mathematics programme. Let me quote a few remarks from the instruction given to teachers in connection with seminars on in-service training in the new mathematics programme. It says—

"Schools with more than three teachers must remain open."

In large schools only a fraction of the teachers who in time will be teaching this new mathematics system will be able to go to the seminars. It says further—

"Attendance at a seminar is voluntary. No expenses will be met by the department."

Teachers who are faced with what has been described by a departmental spokesman as a revolutionary system are not allowed expenses to attend seminars. That is entirely unreasonable. One day at a seminar on a revolutionary mathematics programme is completely unrealistic.

I asked a question not long ago about in-service training in opportunity schools, and I was given an answer that filled almost a column of "Hansard". I compliment the author of the reply. But it indicated that the department sponsored little in the way of in-service training. I hope that the Minister will give consideration to a considerable extension of in-service training. I should like to see a system in the future—I suppose it is a long-term measure—under which teachers

with two or three years of practice after leaving the teachers' college can have six months—on full salary of course—at some permanent institution on in-service training and post-graduate training, to allow them to learn more about their profession.

There is a gap between educational theory and research on the one hand and classroom practice on the other. One of the marks of a professional is the possession of specialised knowledge. I am not sure that teachers after leaving the teachers' college acquire all the knowledge they can acquire. Class I teachers in 1959 numbered 2,209 or 27 per cent. According to the figures contained in the Minister's report, in 1965, 24 per cent. of teachers were in Class I. Over a period of years there has been a decrease in the number of experienced senior teachers proceeding to Class I. I think it is a matter of concern that so many teachers remain on the Class II.1 classification because they have not gained what the department recognises as proper professional and academic qualifications. Of 9,714 teachers, 1,128 have degrees or diplomas. That represents just 11 per cent. of teachers, which is far too low. Whilst I was not able to get the percentage of teachers with degrees and diplomas, 19 per cent. of teachers throughout Australia have degrees.

(Time expired.)

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (7.36 p.m.): I preface my remarks tonight on the Estimates of the Department of Education by expressing a degree of disappointment at learning that the Estimates of each department are debated and scrutinised in this Chamber only every second year. As Parliament is the custodian of, and the body entrusted with the spending of, public money, a review each two years is, in my opinion, not frequent enough. I believe that by grouping like Estimates it would be possible to consider them annually. The Federal Parliament, whose responsibilities are, of course, much more onerous, and with much wider ramifications, succeeds in debating each of the Estimates each year. I feel that it would be possible to arrive at that situation in this Parliament by the grouping of like Estimates. If necessary, sittings could be extended, and that would not be a bad thing; in fact, I am sure it would be to the good. I make a plea to those entrusted with the proceedings of the House to look carefully into this matter, because I promise them that this will be, for me, an annual grouch.

Having said that, I should like to say that I believe it is useful from time to time to consider the strength of the Public Service. It is interesting to note that the staff of the Department of Education has, quite rightly, shown an appreciable increase in the last few years. Similarly, there has been an increase in the strength of the Public Service as a whole. I have never been one wedded

to the idea that Ministers should be empire-builders, and the strength of the Public Service should be looked at closely from year to year.

In 1964-65 there were 27,462 people in the Public Service. This year there are 30,470, which is an over-all percentage rise of 10.96. That may or may not be justified, and I think the figures warrant critical examination from year to year. The teaching profession is, of course, in a different position. When I see that there has been an over-all increase of 13.93 per cent. in two years, I find myself with no argument at all. The staff of the Department of Education increased from 14,617 in 1964-65 to 16,654 in the current year. That is an increase of 2,037, or the percentage rise that I have already indicated. One could have no quarrel with that as long as one could be certain that the greater part of the increase was in fact in teaching staff. I believe that to be so.

I make those comments as a broad approach to subsequent Estimate debates. For my part, I am critical of the fact that all departmental Estimates are not debated each year and I shall be watching critically the growth of the Public Service from year to year.

The Estimates that the Committee is now debating are undoubtedly the most important and most vital of any of the departmental Estimates that will be considered during this session, because there are few issues these days closer to the heart of the community at large, few issues arousing more attention and interest, than education. We live in a sophisticated society; we live in a society that demands higher standards than ever before.

I refer the Committee to a comment by Professor Butts in his work "Assumptions Underlying Australian Education". Although hon. members may find themselves in agreement with the professor only to a degree, I think it is a useful comment to relate to the Committee.

Mr. P. Wood: He says there is no sense of adventure in Australian education.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: That is the comment to which I am about to refer. He said—

"Australia needs a great educational revival and awakening of interest in education. Somehow the fires of educational enthusiasm and aspiration for a better education must be kindled. I miss a widespread feeling of ferment and dissatisfaction or criticism. I do not see a bubbling up of ideas and experiments. I do not sense that strong professional organisations are constantly at work promoting discussion and exchange of ideas, criticising practices and theories and stimulating new procedures and new probing."

That, of course, is an over-all observation. It does not attach itself to the Queensland situation alone, nor should it be implied that it does. But I think the professor's comments

are worthy of some consideration. I do not agree entirely with what he says, because I believe that greater thought is being given to education these days. However, it is a reasonable proposition to put to the Government that, no matter how outstanding its record may be and no matter how proud it may be of that record, it rests on its oars at its peril.

We have an impatient community that demands increased facilities in the field of education and insists on getting those facilities. It is useful to ponder the reasons why there is today a greater demand for higher standards of education than ever before. The demand could, of course, be attributed to the improved society in which it is our privilege to live, and no-one, not even my good friends opposite, would contest that proposition. There is greater affluence in society and, as a consequence, people have not only the right but also the ability to pay for higher standards of education and, therefore, better job opportunities. Whereas not many years ago a person who aspired to a professional career might have been considered the exception, people who aspire to, and indeed earn, professions today are very much the rule, and that is a good thing.

Also, the demand for a higher standard of education is brought about by the realisation that in the world of tomorrow there will be few places indeed for the person who does not have some standard of education. The point cannot be emphasised too much—I think it should be emphasised and re-emphasised—that we are fast approaching the stage in our society at which the unskilled and the uneducated will be not only unemployed but also unemployable. There is a firm recognition of this fact by society; there is a firm recognition of it also by Governments.

A point that possibly has not been recognised as much as it should be is that there is need for people to be educated not only in terms of employment and professional pursuits but also in terms of enjoying their leisure. This may sound a slanted angle, and I want to develop it a little. The Leader of the Opposition, in a different way, touched upon the same problem this afternoon. He attempted to tie in the incidence of crime and vandalism with deficiencies in the State education system. If he could have shown that the incidence of crime and vandalism is unique to this State, he may well have established his case. But the fact is that the problem that he touched upon is, of course, a problem in all parts of the civilised world today.

Mr. Porter: It is greater in other States.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: As my friend from Toowong points out, it is greater in other States, and it is attributable not to the deficiencies in the education system in total although one could say attributable to it possibly in part. But it is attributable to

the different circumstances in which we live, and I think the sooner we recognise the fact that shorter hours, more leisure and longer leave all create social problems that sooner or later we have to wrestle with, the better. I should establish the point, in case my comments are misconstrued and misrepresented, that I do not argue against this trend. I stand four-square behind the fact that the workers will, and must, enjoy shorter working hours, longer leave and improved conditions.

I do not argue with that proposition at all, but the proposition that I establish is that if there is not an improvement in the standard of education in society, then we come to suffer from these social problems. Therefore, I put the proposition to the Committee that there must be a higher standard of education, not only in terms of pursuit of professional ambition but also so that we have the cultural and intellectual background to use our increased leisure properly, wisely, and well.

Having said that, one should refer to the financial document that we are considering and look at some of the greater variations in the figures that have been presented to us. The over-all increase in the budgeted amount for educational expenditure this year runs to the sum of \$9,241,356, or an increase of 12.97 per cent., and the substantial variations in the money Vote come in such items as textbook allowances, which this year runs to a figure of \$528,336, the university, from a figure in excess of \$8,000,000 to one in excess of \$9,000,000, showing an increase of \$1,250,000, interest grant to non-departmental schools, running from nil to \$73,000, technical education, running from \$2,500,000 to a figure in excess of \$3,000,000, and the Institute of Technology, showing an increase over all of \$764,892.

The latter two Items I have mentioned, namely, technical education and the Institute of Technology, are deserving of some comment. There has been a significant change of emphasis in recent times. I do not think I am doing the Minister or the Government any injustice when I say that in the early years of this Government heavier emphasis was placed upon the furtherance of secondary-school education. This had to be. As a consequence of the population explosion in the immediate post-war years, we were faced with many extra thousands of students who had to have provision made for them in secondary education. Knowing that first things have to come first and recognising always the financial problems that beset a State, the Government tackled this section of its problems, and I believe it tackled them with remarkable and telling effect.

But having to some degree met that problem, it is now shifting its emphasis back to this particular field of technical education and the Institute of Technology. Again, this is, in fact recognising a deficiency in our department that was touched upon by the Martin Report. Of course, the Government has been aware of this criticism; the increased

Vote to which I have referred indicates that this section of the Martin Report has been noted. One should read this out, because it ties in with this increase in the money voted for the Institute of Technology.

The Martin Report tells us—

“Technical education in Queensland has lagged behind that of some other States and, as pointed out in Chapter 5, diplomas in engineering are available only on a part-time basis.”

In another paragraph it is pointed out—

“The Committee understands that the Queensland Government intends to establish an Institute of Technology in the Central Technical College and to provide full-time diploma courses in different branches of engineering.”

The following paragraphs says—

“The Committee welcomes this evidence of the realization of the need for more full-time diploma work in Queensland, and suggests that the foundation of a Queensland Institute of Colleges might be of assistance in planning this new pattern of tertiary technological education. The Central Technical College could well be one of the most important constituents of the proposed Queensland Institute of Colleges.”

It is useful to ponder for a while upon this particular money Vote and acknowledge the fact that this matter, referred to in the Martin Report, has received its due share of attention.

Mr. Mann: You are admitting that we need more money than is provided?

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Of course we need more money. We recognise that fact. Certainly in our lifetime people will never be completely satisfied with the amount of money being spent on education. We have a long way to go. The important thing is that the money is being properly and wisely spent, and that there is an expanding programme. There can be no doubt about the expanding programme.

It is useful to refer to the wastage in teachers that the hon. member for Toowoomba East mentioned. It is hardly necessary to say that a good deal of money would be saved if this wastage could be arrested. Part of the wastage is represented by those in the category “Leaving the District or State” for which a total of 135 females is shown. It is obvious that these females would include those young girls who, these days, regard it as their right to take a look at the world before they marry.

Mr. Pizzey: They could never afford to do that in years gone by.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: That is true. That is a type of wastage that probably will never be arrested. It is one wastage that will accelerate. Although the wastage is

to be regretted, this part of the wastage is one that we will never arrest and, looking it realistically, possibly we do not want to arrest it.

The university “work-out” that was held earlier this year and received publicity registered certain criticisms of the department. I have looked at these criticisms and tried to understand some of them. As some of them deserve some comment, I wish to refer them to the Minister tonight, not in any carping fashion but, I should hope, in the general tone of this debate, in constructive form.

The particular criticisms that I refer to are—

1. There is no general, overall plan for education in Australia.

2. The transfer system is felt to be mis-used.

3. In the present inspectorial system, the inspector is supposed to perform two functions—

(a) to help a teacher with advice on specific problems and provide for the exchange of ideas, and

(b) to “rate” the teacher—to uphold standards in the education system. Many teachers do not feel free to confide in the inspector; consequently it is felt that the function of the inspectorial system is merely to uphold the authority of the department.

4. Teaching regulations and Public Service regulations deprive teachers of any type of free discussion about, or comment on, any part of the education system.

I think these are useful points, and I hope the Minister will deal with them in his reply.

The hon. member for Toowong and the hon. member for Toowoomba East, when referring to departmental employees, both used the term “in-breeding”. This is a criticism that one meets whenever one discusses educational problems. Whenever one discusses education with students and teachers one finds this continual reference to what they describe as “in-breeding”.

I think it is useful to declare oneself on this. I do not believe in the principle, “seniority at any price”. I believe that there should be a reward for seniority. If a person has served for many years, I suppose that, to a degree, his service must be recognised. However, if a person working alongside him has worked for a shorter time but, by study, application, and more initiative is a better-qualified person, in my book there is no doubt that he should receive promotion when promotion is in the wind.

Mr. Pizzey: That is the principle adopted by the department.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I thank the Minister for his assurance.

Returning again to the matter of in-breeding, there is a great need for the infusion of overseas experience and talent.

I now wish to pay a tribute to those people who serve on parents and citizens' associations. The Minister referred to them in his speech. I believe it is a fair comment to say that they are unselfish and dedicated to the schools that they support and serve so well. One can only hope that their numbers will be greatly increased; it is rather pitiful to see the all-too-few in number attending the meetings.

A problem has been referred to me concerning the publishing of results of public examinations. I am informed that when results are published in the daily Press in other States the students' names are not published, but a number representing the name is printed. This number is known to the student and the Department of Education, but not to the world at large. I am told that this saves students and parents much embarrassment and heart-burning. I ask the Minister to investigate this matter and give it his serious attention.

I now return to the hallowed 3½ square miles comprising the electorate of Chatsworth. We look forward to an early solution to the acquisition of 12 acres of land for the Camp Hill High School, and hope that in the not-too-distant future we may see a sporting ground on that acreage.

I wish the Minister well in his aspirations to create an ever-expanding educational facility in this State. I congratulate him on what has already been achieved, and the Government on a job that, to this point of time, has been well done.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (7.58 p.m.): It is perhaps unique that we, as parliamentarians, are forced to discuss in a short 25 minutes three very important aspects of this State's development that really should be allocated to separate portfolios. But, because of an accident of the times, in that the police administration has been duck-shoved from one Minister to another, and eventually landed back in the lap of the Minister for Education, we are forced to discuss these important matters in 25 minutes. In proper circumstances, if Ministers with capacity handled these portfolios, we would have two separate periods of 25 minutes to discuss them.

Mr. Hughes: You have had two hours in the Address-in-Reply debate and the Budget debate.

Mr. BENNETT: For the information of the hon. member, I spoke for my full hour then, and that was inadequate.

The point I wish to make is that during the conduct of the debate today I heard one hon. member on the Government side say, no doubt with some degree of knowledge, that this is the last time that the Estimates of this State will be presided over by the present Premier. I can only say that it will

be a sorry day when the Minister for Education slips into his shoes, for he has clearly indicated that he is uninterested in Police Force administration. He has obviously manifested that attitude from time to time. He has posed as an expert in the education field and, in the last 12 months or so, he has crashed badly in that field. He has created extreme dissatisfaction in most fields of the educational world in this State, from university level down to primary school. That lack of interest was made manifest today when he devoted a paltry five minutes to Police Force administration, when in fact it is in the same parlous position as the Department of Education.

I say that with some degree of conviction, because as far back as 17 May this year I wrote a letter to the Minister warning him of the troubles that were lying ahead. He either just ignored the letter or found the answers to my submissions too difficult to answer, or alternatively, the administration of his office is so poor that perhaps the letter has not yet arrived. However, I shall put it on record.

Before doing that, I must say that in matters of this nature the Minister for Works and Housing does reply promptly and courteously, and normally satisfies me and many others that he is not withholding information, but on the contrary is endeavouring to carry out the duties of his office with fairness and integrity. I sincerely hope that if there is to be a vacancy for Premiership, that Minister will win the battle for leadership as I believe he is fast doing.

The letter I refer to is dated 17 May, 1966, and after five months remains unanswered. It reads—

"The Hon. the Minister for Education,
Brisbane.

Dear Sir,

"I should be pleased if you would kindly reply to the following questions as I desire to have the information for my record purposes:

(1) Why is Queensland's expenditure on education both per head of population and per student consistently 20% below the Australian average which, in turn, is one of the lowest of the developed countries?

(2) Why are Queensland teachers the lowest paid in Australia?

(3) Why are Queensland teachers so poorly trained? (The Martin Report recommends that within the next few years the length of the minimum courses of preparation for teachers should be increased to three years).

(4) Why are there no plans to implement the Martin Report in Queensland?

(5) Whilst 50% of Victorian teachers are graduates and 33% are graduates in New South Wales, can you explain why the Queensland percentage has fallen to 25%?

(6) Why is there no real benefit for our secondary-school teachers to have a University Degree?

(7) Why must school teachers pay their own University fees?

(8) Why must they study for the University Degree in their own time?

(9) Why is the work load on teachers so high, whereby certain teachers are required to give 40 lessons per week whilst the maximum in New South Wales is 28?

(10) If a teacher has the initiative to travel interstate or overseas to further his education, why is he not credited with that experience instead of losing seniority thereby?

(11) Why does Queensland spend the lowest amount of any State on training teachers?

(12) Why are the salaries and qualifications of lecturers at the Queensland Teachers' College so poor?

(13) Why is it not possible to enter teacher training at one's own expense instead of being forced to be bonded to the State?

(14) Why is there an embargo on married women teachers, particularly at a time when there is a shortage of skilled teachers in Queensland?

"I should be obliged if the reply could be made as early as possible."

In fairness to the Minister I thought they were questions that he would find difficulty in answering.

Mr. Pizzey: You did not expect a reply.

Mr. BENNETT: I certainly did, and I was most insulted and righteously indignant when I did not get one. The Minister, who is normally very vocal if he can say something that he thinks favours the Government, retired into silence in relation to that letter.

On 26 July of this year I wrote another letter to the Minister for Education in these terms—

"Dear Sir,

"I write again and refer to my letter dated 17th May, 1966, seeking information on the various aspects of education and teacher employment in this State.

"Again I do not appear to have received the courtesy of any acknowledgement or reply to this letter and surely you and the Department have had ample time to prepare the information. In fact it has taken over two months already which is not a good indication of departmental efficiency.

"Kindly let me have a reply as soon as possible."

Again the response to that letter was strict silence.

In spite of the Minister's bragging when introducing his Estimates today, it is perfectly obvious that there are many aspects of his administration with which he is unable to cope. He did not even do me the courtesy of replying to my letters.

Mr. Pizzey: Why aren't you the Deputy Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. BENNETT: One does not need to be Minister for Education to know the answer to that one. It is really very simple. For the benefit of the Minister for Education, whose intelligence is not very keen, I am not Deputy Leader of the Opposition because I did not get enough votes. However, I feel quite sure that if I had to suffer the indignity of sitting on the Government benches, I would doubtless get more votes than the Minister for the filling of his portfolio.

It is important that the Estimates of the Police Department should also be dealt with, or at least some aspects of Police Department administration. The report of the Commissioner for the 12 months ended 30 June, 1966, gives no real reason for comfortable satisfaction. First of all, it is clear that the strength of the Police Force cannot be maintained at its approved level. It is also perfectly obvious that its numerical strength is insufficient to cope with the demands made upon its services.

Mr. Hughes: Do you think that is singularly strange to this State, when most countries throughout the world have the same problem?

Mr. BENNETT: That is not correct.

Mr. Hughes: There are many vacancies in every other State.

Mr. BENNETT: The third defect in police administration in this State is that police officers, with their skills, training, and experience, are not being used to the best advantage. I intended to deal with some aspects of the activities of the Licensing Branch, for instance, whose officers are rushing round the city like busy bees endeavouring to discover trivial offences that are not worrying the community at all. On the other hand, the staff of the Criminal Investigation Branch are over-burdened with unsolved serious crimes with which they have not the necessary strength to cope. That is why there are today so many crimes unsolved. That point may be dealt with later by my colleague the hon. member for Brisbane, in whose electorate so often the Licensing Branch operates against activities that have no serious effect on the community. These police officers would be better employed if they were transferred to the Criminal Investigation Branch to investigate the real crime in the community. One Minister has already said that crime in Queensland has reached record proportions.

The reason for the difficulty experienced in obtaining recruits for the Police Department is manifestly clear. Labour has been lambasted so much for what it did during its term of office that I say quite proudly that the Australian Labour Party can explain with satisfaction to a fair audience and a decent-minded jury that the efforts of Labour Governments over the years were outstanding for the times in which they were carried out. Never at any time did a Labour Government have to lower the level of physical fitness and physical capacity, as the present Government has done, to get recruits for the Police Force. The Country-Liberal Government is prepared to take virtually anybody, regardless of his physical standard, provided it can get him into a uniform.

Mr. Hughes: Are they all poor physical specimens?

Mr. BENNETT: Even though the required physical standard is at its lowest level, the hon. member for Kurilpa would still be rejected.

The difficulty in recruiting men arises from the dissatisfaction that exists within the Police Force. Many transfers made during the last 12 months have been unexplained. When I have questioned the Minister about them, he has either been evasive or, alternatively, has said that they were part of departmental routine. Not one policeman, whether he is for or against the administration, accepts that answer as true. All the sudden transfers of men with years of experience have been made for a departmental reason that is perfectly clear to the Commissioner, who is making them, but is perplexing and worrying to the men who are carrying out their duties.

I have had occasion—I think it was since the last meeting of Parliament—to ask why a prominent detective from the C. I. Branch, Detective Buchanan (commonly known as “Buck” Buchanan), was transferred to Ipswich, and it is perfectly clear that the Minister’s answer did not give the real reason. Detective Buchanan had had a row with the Commissioner of Police. The Commissioner became peeved and irritated and angry with Detective Buchanan, who was described by the Commissioner’s representative in one appeal as a top-line detective and the top homicide detective in the Queensland Police Force. He was sent to Ipswich, where his abilities as a detective were wasted. At a time when violence was rife, when a record number of murders was being committed, when human life was in danger in Queensland, Detective Buchanan was banished to Ipswich, put into uniform, and no doubt spent a lot of his time on traffic duties and other incidental duties performed by unformed police officers. Of course, he realised the error of his ways. He was made to understand that a policeman cannot afford to disagree with the Commissioner, who at all

times is supported by the Minister. Right or wrong, the Minister backs him up and looks after him.

Mr. Ramsden: Wise or unwise.

Mr. BENNETT: I could add that, too—wise or unwise.

Mr. Ramsden: It is your usual expression.

Mr. BENNETT: Detective Buchanan, who is skilled in winning the confidence of suspects, and is even more skilled in winning the confidence of the Commissioner of Police, had a few drinks with the Commissioner at Bundamba Racecourse and arranged for himself to be re-transferred to the C. I. Branch, as a good boy who would behave himself. The Commissioner never explained officially the reason, but it was obvious to all the police who saw the two of them hob-nobbing at the Bundamba Racecourse and drinking beer together that that was where the re-transfer was arranged. It is because of treatment like this that I say if a policeman can get the ear of the Commissioner he can get a satisfactory and suitable transfer. In fact, he can get rapid promotion, as did Inspector McNicol, whose rapid promotion surprised everybody, but whose friendship with and knowledge of the Commissioner was undoubted.

I was dealing with the reason for failure in recruiting in spite of the lowering of standards. Another reason is that there is a differentiation in treatment of policemen who get into difficulties. There are those who, in the course of duty, get into trouble, and I could name two, who of course are only examples. One was Constable Edward George Dundas, who got into some trifling difficulty departmentally and it cost him \$854 to try to clear his good name. The trifling complaint with which the Commissioner charged him was one that could have well been dealt with by the Commissioner personally by way of a caution.

This young constable—and he is very young—was on traffic duty directing traffic on one occasion when a little boy came up with a purse containing a £5 note and some other money. The constable, at the depot from which he operated, made a correct report, noted it in his notebook, and made five copies of his report on the handing over of the purse. There was no strong-room or other proper place for the keeping of articles of that nature such as a safe, so he placed the purse in a drawer and waited for the owner to claim it. Subsequently he went on leave and during his absence the £5 note disappeared from the purse.

Nobody was charged with stealing the £5. Whoever was responsible for its disappearance is unknown to the Police Force administration, but Constable Dundas was charged with failure to obey a Commissioner’s memorandum, the number of which I could give the Committee, which says in effect that when lost property of that nature is handed

in a notation must be made in the policeman's notebook and signed by the person handing in the article. The failure in duty by this young Constable Dundas was in the fact that he failed to get the boy's signature in his notebook.

Incidentally, the Commissioner's memorandum was never shown to him. There was no proof that at any time he knew of its existence. In order to prove knowledge of any memorandum in anybody's mind, surely that memorandum should be signed, or the initials of the person obliged to read it should be appended to it.

However, Constable Dundas was departmentally charged, the charge being investigated over two days. He was convicted because the Commissioner, in the most farcical method of dealing with a man one could conceive, levelled the charge. The Commissioner does not hear the evidence. On the evidence that is taken he decides whether the person is guilty or not guilty, and convicts and fines him. He is a prosecutor, judge and jury in these matters, and of course, having charged a man he must get him convicted too. In this case that is what he did.

The matter was taken on an appeal lasting one day, also to a tribunal which has had its teeth pulled in regard to appeals since the last amendment, as I mentioned when the amendment was going through. The only union representative who can now sit on appeals is a sergeant who is due to be promoted to commissioned rank, and his promotion to commissioned rank depends on his favouritism with the Commissioner of the day.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: To make it quite clear, I will name him. He is Sergeant Johnson, who at the moment is going flat out to become one of the Commissioner's officers.

However, the essential point is that this poor man made, at the worst, some trivial mistake in the course of his duty, through, as he says, not knowing that the memorandum was there. But even if he did, a little failure cost him \$854 and the Police Department was not prepared to help him. Although he is a young man about to be married, he does not know whether or not he should get married in the circumstances. If the Commissioner wishes, under the rules of the Police Force administration, knowing that this officer owes debts of that magnitude that he cannot immediately meet, he can dispense with his services. He has done it before today.

I could name another police officer who was taken on trial before a jury. What Constable Ready did was in the course of his duty. He was assisting a senior officer who was arresting a man named Brown in the Valley. Because it was Constable Ready's obligation and responsibility to do so, he went to the aid of the senior officer so that

the senior officer would not get hurt. It was getting rough and tough. He was eventually taken on trial in a civil action for damages. Eventually the jury returned a unanimous verdict that he was not guilty of malicious assault, wrongful arrest, or anything of that nature. He was completely cleared. He cleared his name, but it cost him, if my memory serves me correctly, in the vicinity of \$3,500 to do so. The department has not stuck by him. It says, "Pay it yourself".

Is that not one reason why the Police Force is not getting recruits? Obviously if this young constable in the future sees a brawl he will walk around the block to avoid again getting himself into difficulty. He knows that the Commissioner will not stick by him. As it is, he will be saddled with a debt that will bankrupt him and his family. On the other hand, it is a different story if a man is a pet of the Commissioner. I named a man the other night in Morgan's case. He was an off-duty policeman. What he did was not in the course of his duties. He should have been looking after his dog at a time when it attacked a man who was trying to protect a woman from it.

Mr. Lee: Is that the man who rushed into a shovel?

Mr. BENNETT: That was the case where the man collided with the shovel. At that time that police officer was not carrying out his duty, and he was not justified in the attack he made, but he was protected by the Commissioner of Police. It was a civil matter. The Commissioner of Police took out a complaint for him, went to court for him, and paid expensive fees for him. It did not cost him one penny, yet Constable Ready got into this financial difficulty because of litigation following what was held to be a lawful arrest. Constable Ready is now saddled with a debt of \$3,500. Admittedly he was awarded costs against the other side, but the other side might not have the money. In the meantime he is not being paid. He has to wait for his bill of costs to be taxed, and in the meantime he could be declared a bankrupt. That is one of the reasons he would be dissatisfied with the Police Force.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (8.23 p.m.): There are times when it is prudent to be silent, and there are occasions when one feels impelled to express one's views. This is one occasion when I am compelled to rise to express my feelings of gratitude to the Minister and his officers for the very excellent job being done by the Department of Education.

I listened to the last two Opposition speakers with considerable interest. I did not agree with all that the hon. member for Toowoomba East said but, as he was a teacher, I respect his views. He certainly has had experience in teaching, which many of us have not had. Nevertheless, it has not

been my experience that there is any ill-feeling or ill-will between teachers and the Department of Education. From my observations, I feel that generally the teachers are a contented and are a happy body of public servants.

The hon. member for South Brisbane prefaced his remarks by saying that 25 minutes was not sufficient to discuss these Estimates. Following that statement he indulged in destructive criticism, without spending two of the 25 minutes in putting forward something helpful.

Mr. Bennett: Is that the thanks I get for defending you when they threw you out of Cabinet for your defalcations?

Mr. MULLER: That, too, is typical of the hon. member. I remind him that Parliament House was never intended to be a place in which to wash dirty court-linen. We establish our courts to dispense justice, and if anyone has a grievance he is entitled to take his case to the law courts and be heard. But it should be finished in the court. It was never intended that any disgruntled legal practitioner should use Parliament House as a coward's castle to vilify honourable members of the Police Force.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order under, I think, Rule 115. The hon. member's insinuation is insulting to me. I have never appeared at any time for any of the persons mentioned. As a matter of fact, I very rarely lose a police appeal. I did not act for any of them. The statement is offensive to me and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell): Order! The hon. member for South Brisbane has said that the remarks are offensive to him and I ask the hon. member for Fassifern to withdraw them.

Mr. MULLER: If they are offensive to the hon. member, in keeping with parliamentary practice I am obliged to observe your ruling, Mr. Campbell, and I withdraw them. However, I say to the hon. member that if he uses the privilege of coming here to vilify members of the Police Force—and today he devoted the whole of his time to caustic criticism—without giving them an opportunity to reply, I say in plain Australian that I do not believe half of what he said. If the hon. member is offended, I will probably offend him a good deal more. In the bush we call men of his type sourbellies. Some people call them dingoes. This is not the first occasion on which he has done this. He has come here repeatedly with the intention of making a speech on a particular subject and has devoted his time to another purpose. I hope that there may be some chance of revising the Standing Orders to prevent such action.

If there is anything wrong in this department, for heaven's sake let the hon. member have the guts to get up and tell us what should be done. He did not make one

practical suggestion. Instead of dealing with the education Vote he dealt with members of the Police Force. If he wants to get square with these officers, let him have the courage to go outside the walls of Parliament House and make his statements.

Mr. Bennett: You are not a Minister any longer. Let the Minister answer.

Mr. MULLER: It does not matter what I am. I still have plain common sense, and a sense of fair play. If the hon. member for South Brisbane wants to make these charges, let him get out on the road and make them. I guarantee that he is not game to do so. I ask him not to use Parliament House for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. I will accept that challenge. I will debate this subject on the platform outside with the hon. member, anywhere and at any time.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. Bennett: I accept his challenge.

Mr. MULLER: The hon. member should adopt the role of a man, and not be a gutter-snipe throwing bricks from the other side of the fence.

I have watched the progress of this department for a number of years. I think the Premier will remember that when I came here in 1934 the education Vote was approximately £2,000,000. I am sensible enough to know that £2,000,000 in 1935 was quite a different matter from £2,000,000 today. However, it is not just a matter of what money is spent in this department, or in any other department; it is a matter of how we spend it. Just before the present Minister took over—if my memory serves me rightly, in 1956—the Vote for education was about £10,000,000. After we took office I well remember the Minister making plans as to how he proposed to reform this department. I must confess that I never imagined that the reformation that we see today could have been brought about in such a short space of time.

If there is one department in which there have been spectacular achievements it is the Department of Education. This department should not be regarded as a political football. I have always given credit to the Labour Party and its Ministers for what they did for education. It is not an easy matter, and many things have to be done. Nevertheless we must remember that the rise in the standard has been spectacular. We have to grapple with many things in education. Many of us think that mathematics, English, and geography are all-important. But I agree with a statement by Sir Herbert Watkin that our chief objective should be to try to make good citizens of our children.

The Leader of the Opposition said that it was somewhat disappointing to see that while we had lifted the educational standard we still had a number of delinquents. We had them before the educational standard was raised, and I suppose we will have them in the days to come. In deference, I say that some of the present delinquency is due to the higher standard of education. If we are to grapple with our future problems we must have educated minds. If some people misconduct themselves, how can we blame the Department of Education? When I travel through my electorate, and others, I am impressed by the gentlemanly and lady-like behaviour of our boys and girls, particularly at high schools. Never has the standard been so high. A few fall by the wayside, and there are means of assisting them other than by criticising the Department of Education. Children have opportunities today that they did not have before.

I can appreciate the position of members of the Opposition today. Their job is to find any weakness in the department, and I give them full marks; that is their job. If they can find anything wrong, they should put their fingers on it. I have listened, and I know how difficult it is. But they must remember what has been done in the last eight or nine years. The Minister said that when this Government assumed office high schools in country districts were non-existent, and so they were. In days gone by, if a parent wanted to send his child to high school he had to send him to a boarding school. In most cases parents could not afford to do that. In my electorate—I know it applies to every other electorate as well—almost every child now has easy access to primary and high schools. That is a wonderful achievement, even if it does cost a bit of money. I have three high schools in my district, at Beaudesert, Boonah, and Brassall, and there is a high-school top at Rosewood. The whole of the State is in a similar position. Children never before had such opportunities.

The organisation of the transport system to primary and secondary schools is so complete that every child can use it. In a great many cases, although they have to travel 20 miles they get home in the afternoon as early as they did when they were educated in the smaller centres.

I think there are even more advantages in the provision of school transport services. In addition to providing access to high schools, it has been made possible to establish district schools where previously there were three or four small schools. I have a few district schools in my electorate, and I know that other members, particularly from country electorates, also have them in their areas. Children from 8, 10, or even more schools are taken to one central school, as quite naturally we call them, and they attend a school of 200 or 300 children instead of 9, 10, or 12. That in itself is an education

for them, as they have the opportunity to mingle in their studies and sport with so many other children.

Another important aspect is safety. We are very proud of our improved roads, and quite rightly so. However, there is a great danger to children walking to school along highways used by vehicles travelling at a considerable speed. I am very worried about children walking along them. I am sure we were all appalled to hear of the accident in Ipswich last Sunday in which Mr. and Mrs. Hayden lost a little child who was trying to run across the road. I am not blaming the driver of the vehicle or anyone else for what happened; I merely mention it as something that could happen every day. As I travel the roads I see children running across them without looking where they are going, and when that happens an accident is always likely. When children are picked up and taken to school, the parents' minds are relieved.

However one looks at it, the way in which education services have developed has been dramatic. Today children begin their schooling at kindergarten. I attended a kindergarten function only last Saturday. Children are taken in to kindergartens at three years of age and are trained during their very young life. From there they graduate to primary school, then to high school, and finally to university. If that is not service, I do not know what is.

The hon. member for Maryborough suggested a review. I do not know what he intends to review. In fairness to the Minister and the Committee, he might have pointed to some weaknesses in the system. As he was a teacher, he would perhaps be in a position to make some recommendations that might be helpful. All he said was that it was time to review the whole system. He did not say what might be done, and I think it is a compliment to the department that he could suggest nothing to review. We appreciate that he has given this question a good deal of thought. After all, each of us has to respect the opinions of those who have a specific background in any department, business, profession, or walk of life.

Although teachers today have one or two little grievances, I can only say that as I have moved around I have never in all my life seen as many happy, confident and contented teachers as I now see.

Mr. Bennett: You don't look very far, then.

Mr. MULLER: At least I attempt to look ahead. The hon. member for South Brisbane does not; he jumps in without looking at all.

The point is that in days gone by there were teachers who complained. When I first became a member of this Assembly, a number of teachers were complaining about their salaries. Is it not only human for all of us to think that we are underpaid? If people think they are underpaid, they have

access to the Arbitration Commission, and a number of people do think they are underpaid.

There are teachers and teachers, and some teachers may have a grouch about being transferred to the Outback. It has been suggested that the department's attitude is, "If you don't toe the line, you will get your marching orders". But one has only to watch the teachers in the Department of Education to see how quickly some rise in their profession and how some never do. In instances in which teachers are not temperamentally suited to teaching, I think it might be wise to give them a job to which they are better suited. I suppose the same could be said of people in other professions. After all, none of us can be a Jack of all trades. Although teachers may pass examinations and reach the required standard, in many cases they lack the ability to impart their knowledge to children.

Mr. Bennett: Are you attacking the teachers?

Mr. MULLER: No, I am not attacking the teachers. I am saying that if a teacher cannot do his job, he should be given a job to which he is more suited. As the hon. member is unable to do his job in Parliament, I think he should be replaced by someone who is able to do it.

Mr. Bennett: They haven't thrown me out yet as you were thrown out.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell): Order! I warn the hon. member for South Brisbane that if he continues to interject I will deal with him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. Bennett: He is attacking me, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. MULLER: I assure you, Mr. Campbell, that I did not know the hon. member was so thin-skinned. If a man throws bricks, he must expect to have some thrown back at him.

Mr. Bennett: I am quite prepared to cop the bricks. It was you who told me to be quiet, Mr. Campbell, not him.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! That remark is a reflection on the Chair. I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. Bennett: It was not intended to be a reflection, Mr. Campbell, I assure you. I was not complaining about being told to be quiet.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Bennett: I accept your ruling, Mr. Campbell; I do not know what you mean by it.

Mr. MULLER: In the interests of peace and harmony, I will leave the little boy alone.

Mr. Bennett: If I am told to be quiet, I will be quiet. But if the hon. member for Fassifern is going to indulge in personalities, I am going to say he is an old fool.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MULLER: I do not think I should resume my seat without mentioning the co-operation of parents and citizens throughout the State in the work of the Department of Education. One has only to attend speech nights to see how happy and contented the people are. I was unable to attend the speech night held at Beaudesert recently, but my colleague the hon. member for Logan, Mr. E. G. W. Wood, was there, and he told me that the work of the department is held in very high regard by the parents and citizens in that area. That testifies to the wonderful work the department is doing and shows that people are really appreciative of the opportunities their children are getting and the progress they are making.

Finally, let me say to the Minister and his officers that I think they are entitled to all the credit that may come to them as a result of the wonderful effort they are making.

Mr. MANN (Brisbane) (8.44 p.m.): I do not intend to speak about the Estimates for the Department of Education, because the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Toowoomba East have covered that field very well. I wish to say a few words about the Police Department.

Before the Minister for Education entered Parliament, he was a teacher at the Central Practising School, which is in my electorate, and I was chairman of the school committee. He taught two of my seven daughters, and they reported to me that they thought he was a very good schoolteacher. While I was chairman of the committee, no complaint was made of his work as a teacher.

Mr. Murray: Was that the baccarat school committee?

Mr. MANN: The Central Practising School, Leichhardt Street, Spring Hill. It seems strange that the modern method of teaching is altogether different from the method used a few years ago. It ignores spelling and handwriting. Children at State schools used to be taught to spell and write, but I have been told about children who have left school at 15 and 16 and whose spelling is atrocious and handwriting even worse. This new method has operated in the time of this Government.

However, it is not my intention to attack the department or the Minister, because I have always found him fairly decent and have always had the highest respect for him as a man. I want to say a few words about the Police Department. I do not want to attack the Commissioner of Police. I feel that he has done a fairly good job as Commissioner. I look back to the days of Commissioner Carroll and Commissioner Glynn and others and I feel that Bischof, if not better, is as good as any of those gentlemen. I feel that he has established good public relations for the police. I have never been one to toady to the police. As a matter of

fact, I have always had some sort of obsession against them, because I feel that I have run into policemen who have been a bit over-zealous, and if there is one thing I hate it is someone who is over-zealous.

As I say, I think Commissioner Bischof has measured up to police commissioners of the past and has established good public relations. As a matter of fact, in recent times public co-operation with the police has been outstanding, only because of the attitude of the present Commissioner in calling on the public through the Press to co-operate wholeheartedly with the police in detecting and reporting crime. I have no fault with the Commissioner or members of the C. I. Branch; my complaint is with the licensing section. An inspector named McNeil, I feel, should not be there.

I have read what the Commissioner for Police has said about the incidence of crime during the year, and the various new sections that have been attached to the Criminal Investigation Branch. He goes on to tell how he has gone to no end of trouble to post a detective at every local police station in the suburbs, as part of a plan to reduce Brisbane's growing crime rate. There is no doubt that the incidence of crime amongst young people in Brisbane has increased. The Commissioner says also that he is sending Inspector Raetz to New South Wales and other States to investigate their police methods so that he can come back here and establish in the Police Force the most up-to-date methods of detecting crime.

But I feel that if Inspector McNeil was transferred from the Licensing Branch to the C. I. Branch he would go a long way towards stopping the criminal element, because if he adopted the same attitude in dealing with them as he adopts in dealing with the public in my area it would have a big effect. I am not saying that the man is dishonest or that there is anything wrong in his attitude. I feel he is a very honest and capable man, but he is over-zealous. There are 50 hotel-keepers in my area and he and his men, almost every night, rush into various hotels right on 10 o'clock. He embarrasses not only the hotel-keeper but also the patrons. Hotel-keepers are allowed to sell liquor up to 10 o'clock at night. Very often when a person is in a hotel purchasing a jug of beer at one minute to 10 p.m. officers of the Licensing Branch will say, "Get rid of that beer or else!" It is wrong. I am glad that the Minister for Justice is here because he enforces the liquor laws. If what these police officers insist upon was intended the Government would stop hotels selling liquor prior to 10 p.m. The hotels are entitled to sell up until 10 p.m. Even if the hotel has a floor show, immediately at 10 p.m. patrons are told to get rid of their liquor or else. I have had several complaints from hotel-keepers in my area about this.

Mr. Hughes: It would be fair and reasonable to extend the liquor laws to allow time for consumption.

Mr. MANN: I reckon that the liquor laws should be altered so that the hotels could be kept open until midnight. I know that you, Mr. Campbell, will not allow me to elaborate on that.

Mr. Chinchin: Is that your policy on liquor?

Mr. MANN: That is my idea; I am not expounding my party's policy.

Mr. Hughes: What you have been saying does not help us as a tourist city.

Mr. MANN: It certainly does not. In the hotels in the city on week-days very little business is conducted before mid-day; on Saturday no business is done at all before 7 p.m. I know this man McNeil. I have been interviewed by him. I feel that he is too zealous. My quarrel is not with the Commissioner of Police.

I want the Premier to tell the Government parties that the liquor laws should be altered. I was glad that the hon. member for Murrumbidgee made a statement on the subject recently when he was opening a motel. Hotels in the city area should be allowed to remain open until midnight. I hope that the Premier will do something as a result of the statement of the hon. member for Murrumbidgee. I do not want to digress. I am trying to tie my remarks up with the attitude of the police towards hotels in my area. In the city the hotels are getting a raw deal. Their rates have been increased. The Brisbane City Council has put metered areas outside their hotels, which restricts parking. I wonder if the Government has considered what was said by the hon. member for Murrumbidgee. When I get the opportunity I will have more to say about the matter to the Minister for Justice.

There is an entirely different attitude on the South Coast. They have an open go down there. Teenagers and young people can flock into the hotels at any hour of the day. You see them down there getting drunk and causing brawls. This is no laughing matter. There is one law for the South Coast and one for the city in the view of the police.

An Honourable Member: Whose fault is that?

Mr. MANN: I do not know. I believe it is the fault of the Licensing Branch. There is an open go on the South Coast all day. Try to get a drink up here one minute after 10 p.m. and you will find McNeil or one of his men on top of you. The whole thing is wrong. I am protesting against this man McNeil, and I could not care less what the Commissioner of Police thinks about it. I have no brief for any member of the Police Force. I do not want to beef about anybody or knock anybody, but the man in charge is the wrong man in the wrong place. The Minister should shift him and put in his place

a more capable officer who can understand the requirements of the hotel people and the people who want to drink in hotels. If the Minister went into a hotel and bought a jug of beer at a minute to 10 and was told, "Get it into you or throw it out", what would he do? Would he throw it out?

Government Members interjected.

Mr. MANN: I am not concerned about what the hon. members for Maryborough or Sandgate might say. I am stating my case for the people in my electorate. I am not elected by the Police Force, the Commissioner, or the Minister; I am elected by my electors and I am speaking on their behalf—the 50 hotelkeepers, the people who patronise their hotels and the workers who go there on Friday night, Saturday night and other nights for a drink. Tourists should also be considered and this facility should be provided for them. I could make further reference to travellers who visit the city but I know that you, Mr. Campbell, will not let me do that because they come under the Minister for Labour and Tourism. I am advocating this for the public in my area. It is wrong that hotels should have to close at a minute after 10. The law should be altered to give some elasticity. I suggest to the Minister for Education, as he is in charge of the Police Department, and to the Premier, who is in the Chamber, that consideration should be given to amending the law.

Mr. BEARDMORE (Balonne) (8.57 p.m.): As hon. members on this side have dealt with various aspects of the Minister's Estimates in a very favourable way, and as the electorate of Balonne and the young people who live there are very important to me, I propose to be more or less parochial.

I preface my remarks by paying tribute to the Minister for the wonderful job he has accomplished for the young people of Queensland, particularly those in country districts where before 1957 education appeared to hold no interest for Labour Governments and where very few facilities were available for secondary education. If other electorates have benefited to the same extent as Balonne since this Government came to office—and I have no doubt they have—the story is a very happy one. It is such a happy story in Balonne that it can be told over and over again. Prior to 1957 only a few fortunate country children had any hope of continuing beyond primary school because, as the Minister said previously, many parents could not afford to send their children to boarding school. Much talent was lost, as girls took any job that was offering, and boys drifted into shearing sheds or other pastoral callings, or menial and other dead-end jobs.

In 1957 when I became the member for Balonne there was not one secondary department in the electorate. Today there are four

secondary departments in the electorate, at Dirranbandi, St. George, Surat and Tara, and two others, Goondiwindi and Mitchell, also serve the Balonne electorate. These thriving secondary schools provide opportunities for students to fit themselves for their chosen careers. The picture has changed completely from that which existed prior to 1957.

Two weeks ago the Minister for Works and Housing accompanied me to the Surat speech night. I attended a speech night at Dirranbandi last Monday and on Tuesday attended the St. George speech night. In each case the hall was packed to the doors by parents and, indeed, by many who were present only because of the interest they take in education and the young people living in the district.

Is it any wonder that members of the Opposition are anxious to decry the splendid record of the present Government? Nothing could underline more effectively the apathy shown by the Labour Government towards the education of our young people when it had the opportunity to do something for them, particularly those who live in the country areas.

The parents of those children know full well the splendid opportunities available today to give them the chance of a higher education. Labour's disregard for this facility over the 40 years it was in power is to its eternal shame. The change-over from Labour's handling of education involved this Government in the building and equipping of suitable classrooms and other facilities, and the provision of a teaching staff presented major problems. The position is now perhaps only beginning to sort itself out.

As an instance, St. George State School in August, 1957, had a teaching staff of seven; today there is a staff of 18, excluding the head teacher. I have no doubt that is the picture in many other country centres. In addition, eight new schools have been established in remote areas of the Balonne electorate, at Moonie, Kindon, Westmar, Lundavra, Teelba, Dunkeld, Weengallon and Beardmore, and just recently a new school was granted for Yuleba Creek.

This of course is only part of the success story. Playing fields and equipment, school libraries, lunch rooms, water supply schemes, and improvement and beautification of grounds have been provided. We established school bus services of which I shall give particulars later.

Here are some interesting figures for the record. The total expenditure on school buildings and grounds in the Balonne electorate from 1 July, 1957, to 20 January, 1966, was \$680,054. Some of the major

projects included in that expenditure were the undermentioned—

	\$
Bollon State School ..	13,420
Bungunya State School ..	22,524
Dirranbandi State School	138,870
Glenmorgan State School	22,908
Meandarra State School	23,262
St. George State School	131,972
Surat State School ..	100,168
Tara State School ..	147,016
Thallon State School ..	26,686

The total expenditure incurred by the Department of Works on other Government buildings in the Balonne electorate from 1 July, 1957, to 20 January, 1966, was \$481,802. This money was expended on police stations, court-houses, hospitals, maternal and child welfare centres, C.P.S. residences, etc.

Free school road-transport services at present operating in the Balonne electorate are costing the Government \$71,800 a year to convey a daily total of 610 secondary-school and primary-school pupils. The undermentioned school road-transport services have been instituted since 1 August, 1957—

Yamburgan and Noondoo	Donga
Myall Park	South Glen
Glenearn Road	Humbug Road
Grasstrees Corner	Marmadua Forest
West St. George	Kogan Road
Minimi Station	Blenheim
Burgorah	Nindi Gully
Whyenbah Station	Weengallon
East Surat	Westmar South
South Surat	Westmar East

That is a total of 20 transport services.

May I say here that in 1957 there were no transport services available in Balonne, as it was then constituted, and there are only three left of the four that were serving the eastern end of what is now the Balonne electorate. To those services must be added a bus that conveys secondary-school pupils from The Gums to Tara. Approximately 180 students are conveyed by bus each day to the school at Tara.

Since 1 August, 1957, a total subsidy of \$5,345 has been paid by the Department of Education to parents and citizens' associations or similar bodies in the Balonne electorate under the conditions of the School Ground Improvement Subsidy Scheme. Projects undertaken by the various school committees under this scheme have included such items as—

Construction of tennis courts, basketball courts, and cricket pitches;

Provision of items of playground equipment;

Provision of lunch rooms;

Provision of water supply schemes;

General improvement and beautification of grounds;

Purchase of motor-mowers, etc.

In the implementation of its policy to bring secondary-education facilities within the reach of as many students as practicable, the Government instituted the secondary-school transport services to which I have already referred, and established new secondary departments in the Balonne electorate at Dirranbandi, St. George, Surat, and Tara.

So that satisfactory accommodation will be available for teachers at a reasonable rental, the following accommodation has been provided by the Government—

Tara—Two twin-unit dwellings and one house for a married teacher;

Dirranbandi—One twin-unit dwelling and one house for a married teacher;

St. George—One twin-unit dwelling;

Thallon—One house for single teachers.

In July, 1963, approval was given for the payment to a local authority of an education subsidy to a maximum of £5,000 in any one case on the basis of 25 per cent. of the cost of construction of a swimming pool in a town with a population of under 5,000. That is a wonderful thing for country towns. This subsidy is in addition to the normal Treasury subsidy. Under this scheme an amount of \$10,000 subsidy was paid on the cost of construction of the pool at St. George.

Is it any wonder that the Honourable Jack Pizzey will go down in history as the greatest Minister for Education that the Parliament of Queensland has ever known?

Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (9.9 p.m.): Although many words have been spoken in this debate, many of them have been virtually useless. In most instances members on the Government side of the Chamber have supported the Minister and have merely added the local scene to the over-all picture that he painted.

Nobody can deny that what the Minister said is substantially correct. There has been a great upsurge in education in this State, and he has some claim to political credit (I do not know how much that is worth) for being Minister for Education at the time that it has taken place.

So far as my electorate is concerned, I can say that I have done pretty well. But if we are to give credit to the Minister, let us also give credit to the people who actually planned the work over the years and submitted ideas to the Minister and who, by their hard work, have made it possible for the department to attain what it has achieved.

Mr. Campbell: He has been very receptive to sound suggestions, hasn't he?

Mr. O'DONNELL: As I have said before, I believe that there has never been a better administrative team in the department. I do not say there will never be a better administrative team—after all, if there is

satisfaction with the present standard, education will stagnate, and we must have progress—but it cannot be denied that Queensland is being served by an excellent team, from the Director-General down.

The men who are administering the department today all served as teachers—as assistant teachers, as head teachers—and they served not only in the more congenial parts of the State but also in what are regarded by many people as the less congenial parts. They have brought to their job a dedication and an industry and ability that have placed them at the head of the Department of Education, and I congratulate them on what they have achieved.

I congratulate also the teachers of today—the younger teachers. They have the advantage of entering the Teachers' Training College at Senior level and having two years at the college, so that they have a higher level of education than formerly and a more mature approach when they actually begin teaching. They are going out and tackling the difficult tasks in high schools in country areas and are achieving remarkably good results.

All this boils down to the fact that, in the main, people who have elected to join the Department of Education have given excellent service. I do not think that can be denied. Although there may be armchair educationalists in the Chamber who believe that they can tell all and sundry what should be done in the field of education, it is the administrative officers of the department—the men in the inspectorate, the people who are serving in the schools—who actually know the full score. From the young people who are serving today will emerge the team of the future, just as in my day there emerged the team of Mr. Murphy, Mr. Black, Mr. Guymer, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Wood, and others. It is important that we should realise that. Those men are working hard and endeavouring to obtain the best possible results for Queensland.

As I have said before, I do not think that in 1957 the late Sir Herbert Watkin, who gave wonderful service to the State, took his feet off his desk and began working just because Mr. Pizzey became Minister for Education. It would be an indictment of those people to say that only in the last nine or so years has the Department of Education given service. One could go as far back as one likes and find that the prevailing conditions at the time dictated the work the department could do.

Mr. Hanlon: In the previous nine years they were bringing smoothly through the primary stages the large increase in students now reflected in secondary schools.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That is true, but every difficulty was faced up to. Some people talk today about teachers going on strike and pass critical comments about them. Back in the 1940's Sir Arthur Fadden accused the

teachers of Townsville of being Communists, so there is nothing new in what is taking place today. It is not only teachers of today who express their views, although teachers in the education service are the type of people who have never gone in for militant action. When we look at the word "strike" relative to teachers it has many side issues that could become quite laughable, and possibly an extensive strike by teachers would have more repercussions on the teachers themselves than on the department. Perhaps down through the years that idea has been uppermost in their minds, and even if they were ever disposed to take such action they have never done so.

Our problem is not the personnel of the Department of Education, it is the Government. We criticise them here—it is directed personally at the Minister because he is the agent for the Government's policy—because we feel, as an Opposition, that if we do not make some protest about education as it is today we are certainly not doing the right thing as an Opposition. Reverse our positions; put us over there with the same performance over the last nine years, and put the Government over here, and I am prepared to say that every word of criticism that has come from this side of the Chamber today and tonight would be repeated by those on the other side. It is a good thing in many ways, because the important point is that we must have a deep and abiding interest in education.

The hon. member for Clayfield is often laughed at because he over-uses the word "exciting". We are inclined to forget that education is exciting. I do not like to use the word that he has worn out in this Chamber, but it is exciting, and until we can transmit that thought to the people outside we will not awaken keen public interest in education, or incline them to accept increased taxation so that we may have better schools, more teachers and more equipment, all of which we are crying out for today. I feel that that is the key to the situation.

People are interested in their children until they obtain the best out of the education system; they then put them into positions and, so they hope, everything is right for life. After that, their interest in education drops and any suggestion from, say, a parents and citizens' association, that they should give support to education is met with the answer, "We have done our bit. It is finished so far as we are concerned". If the people are genuinely concerned about progress they will be always interested in education. I think it is a most important part of Government activity to impress this aspect upon the general public in order to obtain the maximum support.

I feel, as others have said during this debate, that the commercialisation of education—if it can be put that way—is the force that impels people to seek higher education. This applies particularly to

parents who seek higher education for their children. This is not good enough. We dictate to our children what school they will go to and, in some cases, what courses they will take. We are completely wrapped up in the all-important question of what is going to happen to our children in the future. We are concerned about whether they will obtain good jobs, and that sort of thing. To talk about education for leisure is sheer hypocrisy for most people. The education for leisure that they talk about is the leisure that is available when they are at the top of the tree, when they can enjoy themselves and spread their wings.

We must get down to the basic facts of education. Today education has become as essential as is the driver's licence to the motorist. It is very good to see new methods being used in the schools. New methods, such as the Cuisenaire system, make education more interesting and more exciting for the pupils. However, the same problem remains for the teachers: the individual differences in their students; some are smart, some are average, and some are below average. Despite new systems, that fact has to be faced up to.

As new methods are introduced they will stimulate the students and make them more interested in their schooling, but there will still be the different types of students. Sometimes we are satisfied because we see good results coming from some children. More than 20 years ago I studied a book "Learning and Teaching" by Hughes and Hughes that we used in those days as part of our Education course. Many of the so-called advanced ideas of today were included in that book. Also, we can go back to other books written before that time which indicate that many of the ideas being put before us now are not new at all.

Some of the suggestions that are laughed at today may be common education practice in 40 years time. The people entrusted with the responsibility of education in this State are always on the watch for new ideas and methods. We know from past performance that they have given faithful service. We have no fears for the present because we know we have a good team. They also face the responsibility of selecting and training the members of the future administration.

I do not know how we are going to get around the difficulty of bringing in many of the ideas proposed in this debate. If the State education system is so strait-laced, let me pose a question to those educated outside the State system in this or any other State. Were they educated in a way that was any different from that which teachers were using in Queensland then? Is there a different modus operandi in the schools that are not "strait-laced" and have no restrictions? I do not think so. I spent exactly 12 months of my life as a pupil in a State school, and I taught for 30 years in a State School, but

I did not detect any shadow of difference at any time. I have seen quite a few changes, some of them beneficial, some not so beneficial. The whole idea permeating education today concerns differences in individuals. It can be implemented only by reducing class-numbers, particularly for those who have no great academic ability.

We know that in most instances there is a great body of average pupils and then there is perhaps the most important section containing those who are below average. They can only be coped with successfully by the application of individual teaching methods. I want this recorded and kept firmly in hon. members' minds.

It is true that we have a teacher shortage, and we shall probably have shortages from time to time in the future. We have had shortages in the past, but we have also had an excess of teachers, too. The Minister, who is not in the Chamber at present, will recall that in 1929, 1930, 1931 and 1932 teachers-in-training were drafted or transferred to the Public Service. They are now in their fifties; there has been a loss of some top-class teachers as some of those men have risen to high positions in the Public Service.

We have more to think about than our home State if we are to be pioneers in advancing the cause of the under-privileged in Asiatic countries and if we are to further such schemes as the Colombo Plan. We in Australia have a bounden duty to train personnel for overseas service to help these people. This problem, in itself, concerns Queensland as a State, and Australia as a nation.

Mr. Murray: Fortunately we are training many of their people, but you suggest that is not enough?

Mr. O'DONNELL: That is right; it is not enough.

To further our relationship with these people we have to enter many fields where development is urgent, notably those of teaching, engineering and food production, in order to give them the assistance they need.

A wrong construction may perhaps be placed on the idea that the Department of Education has not undertaken public relations. I refer to the days of A.L.P. Government. No-one can deny that with decentralisation in this State, by which regional offices were established not only along the coast but also in the western areas, much was done to promote good public relations between the Department of Education and parents and citizens. Not only are the people in the countryside familiar with their local head teacher and his staff; they are just as familiar with the regional director and the district inspector. That is important. It was brought about, not by this Government, but by the Australian Labour Party. The

regional directors and some of the inspectors act on a personal basis, and Christian names are exchanged with local people.

The changed attitude under Labour Government to inspection of schools was an improvement. The Director-General of Education will agree that in the old days there were some tartars—and real tartars they were. But nowadays very little criticism is levelled at the inspectors. Because of decentralisation and closer liaison brought about by this important innovation, inspectors are advising teachers today more than they ever did before.

Mr. Ramsden: What did the hon. member for Toowoomba East mean when he said the teachers felt they were not trusted?

Mr. O'DONNELL: He could be dealing with an aspect with which I am not familiar. This is what has happened in regional areas of the State.

I suggest that people do not give credit to the political party of the day that brought this about. They say that there should be decentralisation. But there is decentralisation, and it is effective decentralisation. Teachers today—I am talking about the central region—meet the regional director at least twice a year. He goes out to see them; they do not have to go to his office. He does not visit one teacher without saying, "Have you a problem?", and he treats all problems sympathetically. That policy was laid down by Labour in office and it is important to realise it. I should like to see the word "Inspector" disappear and suggest that "Adviser" would be a better title for these people, who do such valuable work. Only with close association between young teachers and the older men in the service can there be development to a higher degree.

There is one matter about which I am gratified. For five years I was the one lone voice in this Chamber asking for a special allowance for children who, for financial reasons, could not go to secondary school because of their remote situation. The Government responded to my call and accepted it as part of its policy this year. I am proud that I had something to do with it. I took it up with the Department of Education on a personal basis and I was told it was impossible to draw the line with respect to eligibility. I am pleased that the line has been drawn.

(Time expired.)

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD (Logan) (9.34 p.m.): I have carefully studied the Estimates and the Annual Report of the Department of Education, and I have taken a close interest in the debate today. All phases of education have been discussed. I propose to deal principally with tertiary education. But first and foremost, through you, Mr. Hooper, I say to the Minister, on behalf of the people of Logan, "Thank you for what you have done for education in my electorate". I assure all hon. members that these thanks are not given for

nothing. Within the last four years three high schools, with an enrolment of approximately 500, have been established in the area. Ten years ago it was difficult to obtain 10 children in the town of Cleveland to have a high-school top established.

Let me now deal with transport to schools. The Department of Education has made provision for children to travel across the bay from Dunwich and the four islands to attend high school. Special boat and bus services have been provided to cover approximately 17 miles by road and seven or eight by water. When I say the Minister has done well for the Logan electorate, I really mean it.

To be parochial for a moment, there are several things that I would like done throughout my electorate. The Thornlands school needs additional accommodation; the Slack's Creek school wants an area of bitumen for a parade ground; and further development is needed in the Woodridge area.

I should like to thank the Minister for his efforts in having the electorate policed. Any requests that I have made have received immediate attention, and the policing of Cleveland and Dunwich under difficulties is much appreciated.

I well realise that the expansion of primary and secondary education has had to receive first priority in the allocation of the limited funds available. This is the result of the great increase in the birth-rate in the early 1940's, which has resulted in such an effect on education in the last decade or two. However, even as a layman I can see that the position with tertiary education in Queensland has been growing more and more acute. There are 14,813 students at centres of tertiary education, and of that number 13,518 are in Brisbane. It speaks well for Queensland that this represents 16 per cent. of the total Australian enrolment, as Queensland's population is less than 16 per cent. of Australia's.

I have two reasons for raising this aspect of education. I do it in an effort, firstly, to reduce as far as possible the time and money wasted by the high rate of failure at the university, and, secondly, from a purely parochial angle, to expedite the construction of the university at Mount Gravatt. Those in the electorate of Logan, particularly the northern end—and, indeed, all districts south of the Brisbane River—are vitally interested in this project.

As a guide to my first concept, I ask the Committee to look at the number who applied for scholarships, the number who were qualified to receive them, the number who actually did receive them, and the number who carried on regardless of whether or not they received scholarships. These are the figures: 4,306 applied, 3,525 qualified, and only about one-third of those—1,170—were offered scholarships. That left 2,455 who were qualified but rejected. Of the

1,027 who carried on regardless, 618 studied full-time and 409 elected to go to work and continue their studies at night. They realised that, if they were not to become hewers of wood and drawers of water in an age in which educational qualifications will be the keynote, they had to become educated.

The Department of Education is spending about 12½ per cent. of its total allocation on tertiary education. The actual figure, which I took from the report of the Auditor-General, is \$9,309,822, and I believe it includes matching grants of under 50 per cent. from the Commonwealth. It is easily seen, therefore, that the State is doing a great deal in the field of tertiary education.

Apparently the failure rate in the various faculties at the university has not been reduced. I have studied the report of the Department of Education closely, and the Vice-Chancellor of the university seems to be rather silent on the actual figures. He refers to failure rates as being "somewhat similar to those of last year", and I have not been able to get the figures for the various faculties. I suggest that many hon. members have had the same experience as I have had and know full well that under all headings—transport, book fees, education fees, cost of living, and so on—it costs \$1,200 a year to keep a student at university. If one has some knowledge of the numbers in the various faculties each year and takes note of the examination results, it is very easy to see the economic waste to the community in tertiary education. Let me deal with the Faculty of Engineering, in which there were 180 students, one-third of whom went out in the first year. I make it clear, Mr. Hooper, that I am speaking from memory and using round figures, but that means that at least \$60,000 was lost to the community in that faculty alone. It is easy to imagine, therefore, that the total loss to the community must run into thousands of dollars; in some years it must be as high as \$1,000,000.

It seems to me that the university has an opportunity at this stage to streamline many of its procedures and to implement measures designed to promote general, all-round efficiency. We have frequently heard lengthy debates on university failure rates. I do not claim that I have any special qualifications to criticise the university; I speak purely as a layman.

To a layman there certainly seems to be something wrong when an education system that is supported by the community to the extent of millions of dollars a year persistently sustains a high failure rate in spite of the fact that entry standards are continually rising. When we stop to recall that the recurrent annual cost of a full-time university student in Australia is some \$1,200, as I have mentioned, the economic burden placed on the community by a university which features a high failure rate is, as I have said before—and repeat again—readily discernible.

Mr. Tucker: Would this be the fault of the university?

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD: I will deal with that.

However, the main loss—and this is much more serious than money, to my way of thinking—is the waste of youthful years, which is never justified unless the course is fully completed. At this stage of a student's life a very important factor to be considered is the difficulty he finds in getting employment. He encounters difficulty in finding a niche into which he can fit.

Answering the hon. member for Townsville North, I should say that over-crowded faculties and insufficient accommodation are the main reasons for the necessity to limit numbers, and many useful lives are blighted merely because our tertiary-education system has become over-crowded. The Minister said that \$4,000,000 will be spent on the Institute of Technology over the next two years. To use his words, this will afford a link between the graduate and the technician, and the courses will be at professional level in their own right and recognised as such.

I should say that this Institute of Technology will have a considerable bearing on tertiary education, but I do not think it is the complete answer. I recently heard a very interesting address by the Director of the Institute of Technology at a speech night I attended at Beaudesert, in which he made similar claims of the equality of the diploma with the degree course. From a layman's point of view I doubt this. I have spoken to many graduates and undergraduates and they view the diploma somewhat differently from the degree.

This institute is a vital and urgently required link, but let us make very sure that we recognise it as such, with the function of providing diplomas for professional qualifications tending towards practical and immediate use, but on a much more narrow course than a degree course. Diplomas are quite different from degrees, which will unlock the top doors of all the professions and careers. From my discussions with graduates, I say that diplomas will not carry those who wish to go right to the top, so let us be very careful about whether we are satisfied with this Institute of Technology. We must provide facilities for university careers for those who are fitted for them.

I think the Government's aim should be that every student who can reasonably be expected to attain a degree should have the facilities available to attain this goal. The Government should not be satisfied with the diploma course which, at this stage, because of the over-crowded state of tertiary education is a great help. I congratulate the Minister for it.

The Minister said that the construction of the Mt. Gravatt university has been put back a year or two. In view of the matters I have just put forward, I view this decision

with great concern. I hope that undue emphasis is not given to the development of the Institute of Technology at the expense of the development of the university at St. Lucia and the development of the university at Mt. Gravatt.

There are some aspects of university development that we might wish to be improved. It is nevertheless true that the dynamic response of the University of Queensland to the challenge of providing new university courses where the need for such courses has been demonstrated gives reason to hope that a similar approach will be forthcoming in meeting the challenge posed by the present situation whereby the university has received less financial assistance than it might have expected.

The introduction and development of the speech therapy course at the university is, I feel, an illustration of the type of development of which we would wish to see more in our university. In 1962 the diploma in speech therapy course was introduced to train students for positions as speech therapists in hospitals, spastic centres, sub-normal centres, the special education branches of the Education Department, the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Centre and the Repatriation Department. Hon. members know that speech therapy is employed in treating anyone who has a speech defect. It is a modern method of control that is receiving considerable attention in Queensland. The first seven students to complete the course graduated in 1964, and in 1965 nine more students graduated. At the moment, there are 26 in the final year, and next year a Bachelor of Speech Therapy course will be introduced in place of the diploma in speech therapy course.

I notice in the Minister's report that there are 18 speech correctionists in the department, but only one speech therapist. The Department of Education should be taking advantage of this progressive move by the university.

At this stage I should point out that the Queensland University is the only university in Australia offering a course in speech therapy. This, I submit, is evidence of the responsible nature of the university to the needs of the community. I am hopeful that this responsiveness will increase and that rather than instituting a negative policy of extending the quota system and of slowing down development, the university will lead Australia.

Mr. Tucker: I hope we can keep these people in Queensland.

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD: That is the point. I am told by the people at the university that most of these people are going to New South Wales and South Australia.

At 9.55 p.m., under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 20 October, progress was reported.

The House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.