

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 17 OCTOBER 1985

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 17 OCTOBER 1985

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. H. Warner, Toowoomba South) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

PETITION

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petition—

Third-party Insurance Premiums

From Mr Campbell (17 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will revoke recent increases in third-party insurance and ensure future increases are determined after public hearing.

Petition received.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed—

Report of the President of the Industrial Court of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1985.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamation under the Intellectually Handicapped Citizens Act 1985

Orders in Council under—

Forestry Act 1959-1984

Ambulance Services Act 1967-1983

Regulations under—

Food Act 1981-1984

Industry and Commerce Training Act 1979-1983

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1984.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Ayers Rock; Land Rights**

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.3 a.m.), by leave: On 26 October 1985, our nation will lose a part of itself. On that day, it is proposed to hand over ownership of Ayers Rock—

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Chatsworth.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: As I was saying, on that day, it is proposed to hand over ownership of Ayers Rock and a tract of surrounding land to a small group of Aboriginal Australians.

I rose to condemn that action. It is the view of my Government that this priceless piece of our heritage belongs to all Australians. It is not something to be sold off by a socialist Government to buy the support of another small group of Australians—the left-wing faction of the Federal ALP.

We are all Australians. We are one nation—not a nation divided by race. Any move towards the granting of Aboriginal land rights to one section of the community and the resultant creation of a nation within a nation should be opposed. The Queensland Government believes in equal rights—not land rights.

It has always been clear to me that the vast majority of Australian people support that view. Yet the Hawke Labor Government in Canberra is determined to proceed with a land rights policy that is against the wishes of the majority and gives to one section of the community rights and privileges that are not available to other Australians.

My purpose in rising to speak today is to draw the attention of the House and the nation to the full ramifications of a detailed survey, conducted by Australian National Opinion Polls, into land rights. The House should note that the survey was commissioned by the Federal Australian Labor Party Government. I now have a copy of the full survey document, which I table.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

That alarming and devastating document is the clearest indictment of the Hawke Government and its land-rights policies that anyone could ask for. It shows that the ALP, to implement its unwanted and unwarranted policies, is prepared to ride roughshod over the wishes of the vast majority of the Australian people.

I quote from the survey table on page 58 of the document. It shows that, in Australia as a whole, at the most only 24 per cent of people support the concept of land rights. On a State-by-State break-down, the maximum support for the policy among Western Australians is only 9 per cent; among Queenslanders, 16 per cent; South Australians, 21 per cent; Tasmanians, 26 per cent; New South Welshmen, 27 per cent; and Victorians, 28 per cent; yet, despite such overwhelming opposition, Mr Hawke is proceeding to give away Ayers Rock—the first step in what will be the progressive hand-over of other areas of this nation. So much for consensus! Worse than that, the document shows that the Federal Government is considering massive expenditure in an effort to buy public support for its rejected land-rights policies.

Mr Scott: You would be the most anti-black person in the Chamber.

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members that, under Standing Order No. 108A, ministerial statements must be heard in silence.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Unlike the honourable member for Cook, who is violently opposed to white rights, I believe in equal rights. He is arrogantly opposed to whites having the same deal.

Page 5 of the document states that, unless a massive public relations campaign is undertaken urgently—at public expense, of course—support for the ALP's position on land rights will be "irretrievable". It describes the land-rights issue as the most divisive and potentially explosive issue that any Government has faced in the post-war period. How interesting. That is in the ALP's own document.

Mr Scott: That's all humbug.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Federal Labor Government, which is of the same party as the member for Cook, commissioned the report. Is he saying that his Government is humbug?

Mr Scott: You're the humbug.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: They are all humbugs. I am glad to hear the member for Cook say that they are all humbugs.

Fancy the Federal Government spending \$100,000 of tax-payers' money on a survey to discover that! I have been pointing that out for years. I have been giving it that advice for years—free of charge.

Another interesting aspect in the report appears at page 34. It says that the policy of the Queensland Government in enacting deeds of grant in trust was supported by those surveyed. Surely that is a slap in the face for the ALP.

The document reads—

“The action is seen to have given acceptable security of tenure to those reserve lands where Aborigines have a legitimate claim to ownership.

. . .

Even supporters of land rights feel that the Queensland Government has taken real steps in the right direction.”

I suppose I should thank the Federal Government for financing a document that supports our policies and rejects theirs in relation to the correct method of approach in these matters. However, the most serious aspect of the existence of the survey and its findings is that it has not yet been the subject of public debate. It has been stowed away. It has been hidden. It is being revealed publicly now, no doubt for the first time.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Scott interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The member for Cook ought to read that document—if he is able to read.

I refer now to an important aspect of the matter, and I will have much more to say about it at a later time. I should like to record that I will have more to say about this later than what I have to say now.

In this respect, I refer to the role of His Excellency the Governor-General, who has been called upon to preside at the Ayers Rock hand-over ceremony. It is my belief that His Excellency is being compromised. He is being called upon to do something against the wishes of the Australian people. He is being used by the Hawke Government to lend credibility to this whole sad tragic event.

Mr Casey interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: As I said before, I will have more to say about that at a more appropriate time.

My concern is that the information contained in the survey should have been made available to Government House in Canberra before His Excellency considered the invitation to attend the ceremony. The Hawke Government had not given that document to His Excellency when he was asked to attend the ceremony. If it was not made available, it should have been. It has not been released to the public by the Federal Government, although some sections were leaked to the media. It has been hidden in the hope that the Australian Labor Party will get away with this scurrilous sell-out of our national heritage.

In conclusion, I want to say that no-one should have the right to give away such a significant part of this nation without prior reference to the people through referendums. I want to assure this House and the nation that I will play a prominent role in making sure that, if Ayers Rock is given away by the ALP, it will be given straight back to the nation by the coalition Government when it comes to power at the next Federal election. The whole ALP policy of land rights will be stopped.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Cook under Standing Order No. 123A.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: For goodness' sake, Mr Speaker, throw him out.

At that time, this whole business of land rights will stop so that we can proceed forward to the future as one people and one nation.

Portion 79, Parish of Barrow, County of Ward, Shire of Albert; Speech of Member for Salisbury

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (11.14 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday, in this House, an honourable member made a speech which contained some extremely serious allegations. That honourable member alleged that a senior Minister had been guilty of abusing his office as a Minister to achieve massive personal gain. That honourable member made some truly breathtaking accusations which, when examined, amount to a deliberate and wilful attempt to mislead this Parliament for personal political capital. That honourable member is guilty of a systematic campaign of persecution based on nothing more than innuendoes, distortions, fabrications and misinterpretations of selectively leaked documents twisted out of context.

I wish, at this stage, to make some comment on a speech in this House yesterday by the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss). Before I make specific references to his charges, I wish to place on record my concern at one statement that that honourable member made during his speech. During the course of that speech, the honourable member tabled a letter from the acting secretary of the Land Administration Commission, dated 11 September 1984. The honourable member, in tabling that letter, said that it, "told the Minister's engineers". *Hansard* records, and honourable members will recall, that I rose to a point of order and said—

"I rise to a point of order. Did I understand the honourable member to refer a couple of minutes ago to a Minister?"

The honourable member for Salisbury replied—

"I made reference to the Minister for Lands."

Thereupon I resumed my seat and said that I was sorry. The honourable member then said—

"I certainly intended no reference to the Minister for Local Government in what I just said."

Copies of the speech of the honourable member for Salisbury were distributed to the press gallery. Those copies clearly show that, in many instances, changes were made to substitute the word "man" for some other word. It is my belief that the honourable member slipped badly when he went through his speech changing certain other words to "man" or "man's", because he failed to notice the term "Minister's engineers". It should have been "The man's engineers". When I rose to a point of order, the honourable member said he had been referring to the Minister for Lands and intended no reference to me.

It is my contention that his reference to the "Minister's engineers" did not refer to the Minister for Lands but did refer to me. The letter tabled was to my family company's engineers.

I call upon the honourable member for Salisbury to apologise to me and to this House for his deliberate attempt to mislead this House in this instance.

I now wish to reply to the substance of the honourable member's allegations. In doing so, I thank him for tabling the documents that he tabled yesterday, because they provide the evidence for rebuttal of his charges.

By way of introduction, I make the observation that the honourable member, who likes to portray himself as a brilliant lawyer, needs to do some basic research.

He tabled a document that he claimed was a lease. He made a large point in his allegations of saying that Maralinga had breached that lease. If the honourable member had given that document more than a cursory look, he would have seen that it was clearly headed as a proposed special lease—not a lease, but a "proposed special lease".

The honourable member puts great store in being precise, so I inform him that Maralinga has not been granted a lease by the Land Administration Commission but

has been furnished with the document that the honourable member tabled, which spelt out the conditions of a proposed special lease.

The honourable member, although clearly confused by the difference between a lease and a proposed lease, went on to quote from that document, and claimed that Maralinga was in breach of the conditions by cutting down trees and quarrying the island. That allegation is a complete and utter fabrication. There has been no quarrying on the island, and there never will be any quarrying on the island.

No trees have been cut down by Maralinga, despite the claim by the honourable member, who could do no better than quote unnamed "people who have inspected the island". That sort of evidence is, to say the least, a very strange basis for an allegation brought by a lawyer. If the honourable member had further read the conditions of the proposed special lease that he tabled, he would have read that one of the conditions was that, "The lessee shall maintain the leased land free of noxious plants".

If the honourable member had read the memo from the Forestry Department dated 20 July 1982, which he tabled, he would have read—

"This portion is a low Island covered with grass, lantana and other weed growth, timbered with odd river oaks, with the exception of the western tip which carries a moderate stand of forest red gum."

There has been some clearing of the island by Maralinga. The clearing has been of the lantana and other weed growth mentioned by that Forestry Department memo and was done as part of the conditions of the proposed special lease. In fact, had any such clearing of noxious weeds not been undertaken, it could have been argued that Maralinga was in breach of the conditions imposed.

I refer to the allegation by the honourable member that a harbour was to be created. That is one of his most fanciful allegations. If he had done his homework, he would have discovered that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority has a particular engineering terminology that uses the term "to cut the harbour" as the way of describing a connection between a non-tidal lake and a tidal waterway. The honourable member's ignorance of this terminology had him jumping at shadows, and suddenly a simple proposal became, in his mind, a giant inland harbour complete with marinas.

A number of other allegations were made by the honourable member. His own documents prove one thing: the island was and is to be retained. He has chosen to ignore his own evidence.

I had intended to produce and table an extract from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* wherein it was clearly stated by the company—probably years ago—that this island would never be removed. That extract has not yet arrived, but I will table it when it does arrive. I noticed that last night, when the honourable member for Salisbury was speaking on a Channel 2 program, he again referred to the removal of the island and said, "It must have been an afterthought of the company or the Minister or the family or whatever."

I repeat emphatically that it was not intended that that island be mined, removed or tampered with to the extent that the honourable member so blatantly referred to yesterday.

I table a letter that I received today from Oceanics Australia, the firm that undertook studies of the river.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

I seek leave to have that letter incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

OCEANICS AUSTRALIA

DIRECTORS:
W. R. B. Morrison, B.E., M.ENG.SC., PH.D., M.I.E.AUST., A.M.A.S.M.E.
M. F. Winders, B.E., M.I.E.AUST., A.M.I.M.A.R.E.
W. W. Barlow, B.E., M.I.E.AUST., M.R.I.N.A., A.M.S.N.A.M.E.

99 Leichhardt St., Brisbane
P.O. Box 203, Spring Hill 4000
Telephone: 831 6744
Telex: 42766

17th October, 1985

Hon. R. J. Hinze,
Minister for Local Government, Main Roads
and Racing,
Parliament House,
Brisbane 4000

Dear Sir,

Re: Coomera River Extractive Operations Environmental Impact Studies

I believe the following information is relevant to assessing the claims made by Mr W. K. Goss, M.L.A., in Parliament yesterday, October 16, regarding alleged impropriety in dealings with government concerning an island in the Coomera River, viz. Portion 79, Parish of Barrow.

In July 1982 we prepared a report "Coomera River Extractive Operations Environmental Impact Studies" for submission to the Albert Shire Council in accordance with instructions from Burchill & Partners Pty. Ltd. The report was prepared to satisfy guidelines issued by the Council. They addressed the potential environmental impacts which might arise from extending the existing Farley & Lewers and Nucrush operations near Upper Coomera and commencement of extraction from another deposit immediately upstream of the highway bridges. The report was prepared for and paid for by the owners of the various parcels of land involved i.e. Maralinga Pty. Ltd., Nucrush Pty. Ltd. and Gambamora Pty. Ltd.

Discussions were held with the Council at the time of establishing the study guidelines and the Council's concepts of environmental constraints were made known to us. The development proposals offered by the owners of the properties concerned embodied these constraints and the recommendations of a 1979 report to the Albert Shire Council by its consultants, Cameron McNamara, entitled "Coomera River Extraction Study". The development proposal was similar to a preferred option of that study, namely that the pits should be extended to the river itself and create tidal water areas of recreational and aesthetic value rather than freshwater off-stream lakes which have been found elsewhere to be an unsatisfactory end use.

In both studies the island in question and others just downstream were planned to be excavated for recovery of their sand and gravel and to maximise the recreational value of the waterway.

Each of the proposals investigated by our company provided for rural residential development of the land left after extraction of the resource. In the case of Maralinga Pty. Ltd., overburden above the deposit was proposed to be placed upon the balance land, across portion of the island in question and into a section of a shallow channel between the island and the shore to create a more useful shoreline for residential development. Approval for this was sought from the Forestry Department in April 1982.

Our environmental study identified two problems upon which the presence of the island had a bearing. Firstly, the length of waterway created by the Maralinga and Nucrush excavations would approach 1600 metres, leading to the generation of sufficiently high waves along the western bank to cause bank erosion and the study recommended the placement of rock protection along that section of the shoreline to offset this. Our subsequent advice to Burchills to retain the island would result in the "fetch" being reduced to such an extent that protection against wave attack would no longer be required. Secondly the enlarged waterway would reduce flood levels downstream to such an extent that a high head loss would need to be incorporated between the freshwater and tidal sections of the river and means of achieving this were recommended. Retention of the island as a block in the river would reduce the amount of loss required and the duty thus required of any structure or transition zone.

Upon receipt of this advice, Burchill & Partners Pty. Ltd. advised the L.A.C. in November 1983 that their client did not wish to excavate the island but still wished to

reclaim part of it and part of the shallow channel separating it from the southern bank. I understand the ramifications of leaving the island were discussed at length by the Council with several government departments and in April 1984 we reported upon our detailed examination of its effects upon tidal and flood flows. This examination was requested by the Council's consultants, Cameron & McNamara (see their letter to Albert Shire Council, 13.1.84). Normal procedures were then followed to allow the reclamation to happen and for the Maralinga proposal to proceed.

In summary, a preferred option of the 1979 Cameron McNamara report to Council provided for removal of the island. The proposal submitted by Maralinga Pty. Ltd. (along with those of Nucrush Pty. Ltd. and Gambamora Pty. Ltd.) and analysed by Oceanics in 1982, provided for extraction of the bulk of the island and other nearby islands. It also provided for reclamation of the balance, together with a section of the shallow channel, for incorporation in a shoreline residential development. An application was made to Forestry to enable this to happen. Our report identified two problems which could be avoided if the projecting part of the island was not excavated. The L.A.C. was then advised that this section would not be excavated or developed, that reclamation of portion of it and the channel would still be required and that the projecting section of the island would be preserved as Public Open Space. I understand the L.A.C. proposed that this could be carried out as a Special Lease, not unusual for this form of development.

The planning of this development has been under the strictest surveillance of the Albert Shire Council and a number of Queensland government agencies, including Lands Administration Commission, Forestry Department, Department of Harbours & Marine, Department of Primary Industries and the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, to whom we reported on numerous aspects. I am sure there has been no impropriety demonstrated by persons associated with Maralinga Pty. Ltd. in the progress of this development from the planning stage to the present and this is evidenced in correspondence and reports.

Yours faithfully

Oceanics Australia

M. F. WINDERS

Winders, Barlow & Morrison Pty. Ltd Trading as Oceanics Australia

Mr HINZE: Mr Speaker, the honourable member, in his speech yesterday, quoted from a report of that company, so it is appropriate that its entire case be presented in the proper context.

I will quote from one section of that letter which follows on from an outline of Oceanics's advice to Maralinga's consultants, Burchill and Partners. It says—

“Upon receipt of that advice, Burchill and Partners Pty. Ltd. advised the L.A.C. in November, 1983, that their client did not wish to excavate the Island but still wished to reclaim part of it and part of the shallow channel separating it from the southern bank.”

I also draw attention to the part of that letter which noted that a preferred option of the 1979 report from Cameron McNamara and Partners, consultants to the Albert Shire Council, provided for removal of the island. That report was adopted by the Albert Shire Council, and had Maralinga wished to follow that independent report of the council's, it, too, would have sought removal of the island.

The simple facts are that Maralinga did not, in the final analysis, seek removal. In fact, it sought quite the reverse.

The honourable member's charges do not have the slightest relation to the truth. Again I reject them categorically.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Referral of Matters Raised by Member for Salisbury in Matters of Public Interest Debate on Wednesday, 16 October 1985

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That the matters raised by the honourable member for Salisbury during his speech on matters of public interest on Wednesday, 16 October, be referred to the Select Committee of Privileges for consideration.”

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Portion 79, Parish of Barrow, County of Ward, Shire of Albert; Speech of Member for Salisbury

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (11.24 a.m.): Continuing my ministerial statement, Mr Speaker, I have to advise you now that the issue of the *Gold Coast Bulletin* to which I referred a few minutes ago has now come into my possession. It says, in part, "Eagle's home on the river is safe". It states emphatically and clearly that the island is not to be removed. It is dated 2 September 1982. I now table it.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Well, it proves that he was dishonest in what he said.

Mr Burns: The only people who are dishonest are on that side.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns: You are an old crook.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Lytton under Standing Order No. 123A.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Lytton got so heated by the argument, he called me an "old crook".

Mr Burns: Of course you are.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I object to that remark and ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Lytton to withdraw that remark.

Mr BURNS: In accordance with the forms of the House, I withdraw the term "crook", but the Premier is certainly old.

PRIVILEGE

Interpretation of Standing Order No. 120

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (11.25 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. I refer to Standing Order No. 120 and its application in this Parliament. In the way in which that Standing Order was applied in the House yesterday, it mounts a protective shield around Ministers against legitimate scrutiny and questioning of their conduct and activities.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: The honourable member for Mulgrave should be as interested in this as any other honourable member.

Yesterday, the honourable member for Hinchinbrook (Mr Row), in his capacity as Deputy Speaker, ruled that the comments made in the Matters of Public Interest debate by the honourable member for Salisbury contained imputations of improper motives against the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing. The member for Salisbury was ordered by Mr Deputy Speaker to withdraw those comments.

It seems to me that if Standing Order No. 120 is to be interpreted and applied in that way, this Parliament might just as well shut up shop. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that it was never intended that the office of Speaker be used to afford Ministers absolute protection. For this reason, as a matter of urgency, I request your ruling, Mr Speaker, on how Standing Order No. 120 is to be interpreted and applied on future occasions.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I undertake to look into the matter as soon as possible.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah): Under the provisions of Standing Orders Nos 49 and 52, I seek leave to move a motion without notice to suspend so much of Standing Orders as would enable a debate on the contents of the Commonwealth Government publication entitled *Reform of the Australian Taxation System*, on the grounds that the proposal will—

- (1) increase substantially the cost of Government;
- (2) destroy incentive, thrift and prudence by the implementation of a savage capital gains tax;
- (3) cause widespread unemployment in the hospitality, tourism and automobile industries;
- (4) create confusion and uncertainty in the community regarding Government taxation policies;
- (5) destroy normal business planning for the future;
- (6) establish a new and anti-social tax on employing people;
- (7) not reduce the level of taxation;
- (8) substantially increase administrative costs of private enterprise; and
- (9) appear to breach section 114 of the Constitution.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 6		NOES, 32
Gygar		Braddy
Knox		Miller
Lee		Burns
Lickiss		Milliner
		Campbell
		Palaszcuk
		Casey
		Price
		Comben
		Scott
		D'Arcy
		Shaw
		De Lacy
		Smith
		Eaton
		Underwood
		Fouras
		Vaughan
		Gibbs, R. J.
		Veivers
		Goss
		Warburton
		Hamill
		Warner, A. M.
		Hartwig
		Wilson
		Kruger
		Mackenroth
<i>Tellers:</i>		<i>Tellers:</i>
Innes		Davis
White		Prest
		McLean
		Menzel

Resolved in the negative.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.35 a.m.): Mr Speaker, in view of the absence of the Government—I do this with the greatest of reluctance—I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is not in his correct seat.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot move his motion while I am on my feet.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. The Minister was not speaking from his usual seat.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! While I am on my feet, a motion cannot be moved. The motion can now be moved.

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to resume their seats.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I point out to the leader of the Liberal Party that today is an allotted day. Time is moving on. Government members wish to debate the Education Estimates, which is a very important part of government.

Mr WARBURTON: I rise to a point of order.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Speaker, I sought leave to make a ministerial statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Did the Premier and Treasurer seek leave to make a ministerial statement?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Yes.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Taxation Policy of Federal Leader of Liberal Party

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.37 a.m.), by leave: To satisfy the leader of the Liberal Party, I now challenge and ask his Federal colleague Mr Howard to come clean and to let this nation know exactly where he stands on the issues that the leader of the Liberal Party wants debated. Not only do I ask him but also I challenge him to come clean. Which system of taxation will he support—the fringe benefit tax or a capital gains tax? Will he allow claims for legitimate business expenses, or will he not? Let him come clean. Let us have a real tax statement for the nation. If the Leader of the Opposition would direct his questions in the right direction, instead of engaging in a lot of cheap talk, we would have a better realisation of where he stands.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (11.39 a.m.), by leave: This morning, the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze), in referring to statements made yesterday, made much about the difference between a lease and a proposed lease. For the record, I wish simply to clear up that misrepresentation by referring to what I said.

When I spoke, I quoted the letter that stated that approval had been given to seek authority to grant the lease. Further in my speech I made a point of stressing and asking, "When did the recommendation for the grant for the special lease go before Executive Council?" Because there was some uncertainty, I added, "and if it did, did the Minister concerned declare his interest?" I was given to understand that a lease had been granted. However, the document that I tabled, and copies of which I circulated to members of the press, has printed on it in large letters that it is a proposed lease. I do not believe that any suggestion of my misleading the House could arise from that.

The second reference that appears to suggest that I misled the House is the——

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Salisbury, when he appears before the Privileges Committee, will have plenty of time to explain why he said those things.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury is allowed to explain how he feels personally misrepresented.

Mr GOSS: The second matter that the Minister referred to is the reference to "the Minister".

Mr Hinze: You deliberately told lies. You know that.

Mr GOSS: If that is a parliamentary term, I will let it go. It is a matter for your impartiality, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not want the proceedings to turn into a debate. I will not allow them to turn into a debate. I think that the honourable member for Salisbury has made his point, and he should desist as soon as possible.

Mr GOSS: I will be brief. The reference is to "Minister". I stress that what I said yesterday was accurate. I said that I certainly intended no reference to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing in what I said, and I intended no reference. I thought that I made reference to the man. If the words that I used were in fact "the Minister", it was unintentional.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member for Salisbury has made his point.

Mr GOSS: No, I have not made my point.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury cannot argue with the Chair. I think that he has made his point.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Wolston under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr GOSS: I rise to a point of order. It has been suggested that I deliberately misled the House. I am seeking to make a personal explanation in order to answer that allegation. I will not take long. I believe that I am entitled to do so.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is entitled to do so, and he has been given that opportunity. However, I said before that I will not allow the proceedings to be turned into a debate. I also pointed out to the honourable member that he is holding up question-time.

Mr GOSS: I seek your ruling, Mr Speaker. Am I permitted to proceed with my personal explanation?

Mr JENNINGS: I rise to a point of order. Yesterday, in this House, honourable members witnessed something that I, as a member of Parliament, have never witnessed before. The honourable member for Salisbury spent nine minutes making serious allegations against another member, who was in the Chamber at the time. However, the honourable member for Salisbury did not have the intestinal fortitude to name that other member, thereby giving him the legitimate right to dispute those allegations or take points of order. It was a cunning exposé of a half-truth in an attempt to completely deny a member of this House the rights that he has.

At present, the honourable member for Salisbury is attempting to make a personal explanation and say that he did not mislead the House. Yesterday, he misled this House for a full nine minutes, with the sole purpose of impugning a Minister of the Crown.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Once again, I ask honourable members not to turn the proceedings into a debate. As all honourable members are aware, I am bound by Standing Orders to listen to a point of order. However, there comes a time when, because of the length of time involved, honourable members will have to pull their heads in. I include the member for Salisbury. A personal explanation should relate to a matter that affects

a member personally. It should also be concise. I ask the honourable member to finish within a minute.

Mr GOSS: Certainly, Mr Speaker.

The next misrepresentation was not by the Minister but by certain media reports, including an article in the *Daily Sun* that stated that I said that trees had been cut down. I did not say that; I said that the trees had been cut above the ground. What I was saying was that the extraction that has occurred has cut the roots of the trees, which will cause them to die. The final matter——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! As I said before, I think that the honourable member for Salisbury has made his point.

Mr GOSS: No, I am not finished. I have one more point to raise.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! No more!

Mr GOSS: I rise to a point of order. I seek leave to make a personal explanation in relation to one further matter in respect of which I have been misrepresented.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has risen on a point of order. I will listen to it first.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. I do not have to appeal to you, Mr Speaker, to realise that the honourable member for Salisbury made a very clear-cut statement in the Chamber yesterday with the intention of making all of the statements that he wanted to make—statements that are not correct, as he very well knew. The appropriate time and place for the honourable member to explain is when he appears before the Select Committee of Privileges.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have taken that into consideration and have asked the honourable member for Salisbury to cease making his personal explanation. He has now risen to a point of order, and he will proceed with it.

Mr GOSS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My point of order is that I seek leave to make a short personal explanation on one further matter in respect of which the Minister misrepresented me this morning.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (11.46 a.m.), by leave: The Minister said that, in relation to activities of his company, I had claimed on a television interview last night that that was merely an afterthought. My use of the term “afterthought” was a reference to the Minister’s claim that he was proposing to hand the property over as a park. The House should realise that what he should have said was “marine park”, because that is what it will be when he is finished with it.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. State Budgets

Mr HENDERSON asked the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer—

(1) Has he had the opportunity to read the Budget papers for 1985-86 from New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia?

(2) Is he aware of the following facts, namely: (a) South Australia now has a State debt of \$3.337 billion, (b) the Auditor-General of South Australia, Mr Tom Sheridan, has directed the attention of the South Australian Parliament to the dangers of the State’s high level of public debt, (c) the State debt in South Australia has risen by 30 per cent since the election of the South Australian socialist Bannon Government in 1983, (d) the

cost of servicing the South Australian debt has now risen to \$373m per annum, (e) the New South Wales Treasurer, Mr Booth, has pointed out that his State's liabilities, at the end of June 1985, stood at \$18 billion, (f) in order to meet the difference between income and expenditure in New South Wales, the Wran Government is selling off State assets, such as dams, power stations, buses and trains, in a desperate gamble to get its avaricious, socialist hands on enough cash to keep the State afloat, and leasing the assets back, and (g) in Victoria, the Cain socialists are involved in a mass orgy of similar financial irresponsibility?

(3) How do such Budget strategies compare with strategies adopted by the Queensland Government?

(4) Do the New South Wales, Victorian and South Australian socialist Government approaches indicate that future generations of Australians will be saddled with this debt?

(5) Is the much-mooted economic soundness of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, as argued by the Opposition in Queensland, nothing more than an illusion?

Answer—

(1 to 5) Firstly, I thank the honourable member for Mount Gravatt for bringing these matters to the attention of the House. He is clearly an astute student of Government financial management issues and is to be commended on his research. The members opposite will, of course, close their eyes to the realities of what is happening in the Labor States and attempt to put their own construction on the figures that the honourable member has provided; but the figures are undeniable.

Any thinking person with a genuine interest in these matters should be very concerned about the growth in public debt throughout Australia, particularly in the Federal sphere, and the growing cost to tax-payers of meeting that debt. The Federal trading deficit increased by a further \$122m in September, so that Government now has to service a debt of approximately \$12 billion, which will lead to higher inflation, higher interest and higher unemployment. The present socialist Federal Government could not even manage a pie stall.

The increasing debt-servicing requirements elsewhere contrasts with those in Queensland. The proportion of our Budget required for debt-servicing has fallen from 5.7 per cent in 1983-84 to 5.4 per cent in 1984-85 and to an estimated 5.1 per cent in 1985-86. The majority of Queensland's borrowings are in respect of productive assets, such as power stations, ports, rail electrification and so on, which, by their very nature, are self-funding and impose no burdens on the tax-payers of Queensland.

The Queensland Government does not and will not borrow to meet its recurrent needs. It will not sell its assets, as other States have been doing. Last year, the New South Wales Government sold assets worth \$34m and is now leasing them back. With a strong commitment to a balanced Budget policy, the Queensland Government does not need to borrow for such purposes and does not have large unfunded deficits on recurrent Budgets, as does the Labor Government of South Australia. Indeed, the 1985-86 Queensland Budget provides for an accumulated surplus of \$489,000 at 30 June 1986. No other State can match that. The Queensland Government is to be commended on its record of financial and budgetary management, which has taken Queensland to the wonderful position that it presently enjoys.

I fear, as does the honourable member for Mount Gravatt, that the policies of Labor Governments in other States will lead those States down the path to bankruptcy—they are very close to it now—unless corrective action is taken. Those Governments could well learn from the budgetary management and expertise of the Queensland Government, which has continued, and will continue, to bring great benefits and long-term prosperity to the State of Queensland.

2. Police Complaints Tribunal Report on Child Pornography

Mr **WARBURTON** asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police—

With reference to the 1985 annual report of the Queensland Police Department, and in particular to the section relating to the activities of the Police Complaints Tribunal, in which it states: "During the year the Tribunal exercised its discretion to act upon its own initiative to investigate allegations of police involvement in a child pornography ring. The Tribunal called witnesses before it and, for the first time, the Tribunal issued subpoenas compelling attendance of witnesses.", and to his commitment given to the Parliament late in 1984 when the Opposition brought this serious matter to his attention—

Has he received a report from the Police Complaints Tribunal in respect of the investigation referred to in the annual report and, if so, will he either table that report or make a full statement to the House outlining the results of the investigation?

Answer—

In answer to the question by the Leader of the Opposition, I refer to this part of the question—

"During the year the Tribunal exercised its discretion to act upon its own initiative to investigate allegations of police involvement in a child pornography ring. The Tribunal called witnesses before it and, for the first time, the Tribunal issued subpoenas compelling attendance of witnesses.', and to his commitment given to the Parliament late in 1984 . . ."

I ask the Leader of the Opposition to clarify what was meant by that. What was the commitment referred to? I want to clear the matter up, because the only commitment that I gave in relation to the reports has been fulfilled.

Mr Warburton: The commitment was that you would be open and frank about the whole thing.

Mr GLASSON: That is all right, then.

Answer (continued)—

The investigation cannot be completed until certain criminal trials take place.

The tribunal, however, has seen a great many witnesses and intends to see a great many more before its report can be written.

3. Leichhardt Highway/Tara-Surat Developmental Road Intersection

Mr **NEAL** asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

With reference to the number of fatalities that have occurred at the intersection of the Leichhardt Highway and the Tara-Surat Developmental Road—

What measures are currently occurring to upgrade this intersection?

Answer—

Action has been taken to improve safety at the intersection by refurbishing signs and, where necessary, relocating them for greater effectiveness. Rumble strips on all approaches have been resealed and 80 km/h signs have been placed on all four legs. These measures appear to have been effective, as no major accidents have been reported since January this year. However, the situation is being closely watched by Main Roads Department officers.

4. Capital Expenditure on Education

Mr **BURNS** asked the Minister for Education—

(1) What was the total amount of capital expenditure in all categories on education in Queensland schools each of the last five years for (a) primary schools, (b) secondary schools and (c) technical and further education colleges?

(2) What total amount of capital expenditure in each of those categories was expended from (a) Commonwealth funds and (b) State funds?

Answer—

(1 & 2) The total capital expenditure on primary and secondary schools and technical and further education colleges for the last five years was \$413,567,175. This is made up of \$263,911,496 from State funds and \$149,655,679 from Commonwealth sources.

A more detailed break-down, as requested by the honourable member, is given in information which I table and seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following document—

TABLE

Table: Capital Expenditure 1980/81 to 1984/85
for Primary, Secondary and TAFE

Year	Source	Primary	Secondary	TAFE	Total
1980/81	State	22,775,644	12,815,948	3,956,794	39,548,386
	C'wealth . .	8,170,910	6,467,630	12,916,621	27,555,161
	Total	30,946,554	19,283,578	16,873,415	67,103,547
1981/82	State	22,221,730	13,758,843	5,257,931	41,238,504
	C'wealth . .	9,838,100	7,873,300	13,410,601	31,122,001
	Total	32,059,830	21,632,143	18,668,532	72,360,505
1982/83	State	32,285,142	16,242,416	3,698,249	52,225,807
	C'wealth . .	12,112,105	8,760,732	9,833,071	30,705,908
	Total	44,397,247	25,003,148	13,531,320	82,931,715
1983/84	State	28,645,126	18,521,630	6,517,582	53,684,338
	C'wealth . .	19,406,666	10,274,213	15,069,269	44,750,146
	Total	48,051,792	28,795,843	21,586,851	98,434,486
1984/85	State	27,322,000	25,635,000	8,735,000	61,692,000
	SMCWP . .	2,853,795	12,668,666	0	15,522,461
	C'wealth . .	13,196,310	12,741,919	17,571,796	43,510,025
	Total	43,372,105	51,045,585	26,306,796	120,724,486
Total 1980/81- 84/85 Expend- iture	State	136,103,437	99,642,503	28,165,556	263,911,496
	C'wealth . .	52,381,576	46,044,541	51,229,562	149,655,679
	Total	188,485,013	145,687,044	79,395,118	413,567,175

Notes

- (a) Expenditure in 1982/83 and 1983/84 include special fund amounts in addition to loan funds.
- (b) Expenditure under the Special Major Capital Works Program is shown separately for 1984/85.
- (c) Some Commonwealth funds for TAFE are provided to this Department for the purchase of equipment in new and existing buildings. These funds have not been counted as capital expenditure for the purposes of this Table. They are identified in the Budget papers under Education Department Special Standing Fund.

Answer (continued)—

I wish to point out that in the table there is reference to "SMCWP". That stands for State Major Capital Works Program, and relates to State funds.

5. Bridge to Stradbroke Island

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—
With reference to the Government's decision to build a bridge to Stradbroke Island—

- (1) How many companies expressed an interest in constructing the bridge?
- (2) Who are the companies on the short list and how were they selected?
- (3) Is the bridge to be a toll bridge and, if so, what is the expected toll?
- (4) If not, how will the companies be recompensed for their outlays, etc.?
- (5) Has the Government made firm decisions on the route to Stradbroke Island?
- (6) If so, will he give details of the mainland and Stradbroke Island routes as well as the islands affected?
- (7) Did an interdepartmental committee, chaired by the Co-ordinator-General on 8 September, state that it would cost \$100m more to build via Russell Island compared with the cost via Peel Island?
- (8) If a bridge is built via Russell Island, who will be responsible to develop water, sewerage and roads to service the 14 000 allotments on the island?
- (9) Will any land have to be resumed for the project?
- (10) Will the bridge and roadworks have two lanes or more?
- (11) Will it be a bridge or a causeway?
- (12) What will be the length of the bridge-works or construction over waterways?
- (13) What clearance above high water will be provided for small craft using the waterways?
- (14) Are there any proposals that would tie the construction of a bridge in with the development of residential, high-rise, canal/waterfront land development on North Stradbroke Island?
- (15) What funds or land, etc., will the State Government and the Redland Shire Council be expected to contribute to the bridge and roadworks scheme?
- (16) When will a final decision be announced on the timetable for construction of the bridge?

Answer—

(1 to 16) I am very pleased that the honourable member is expressing a keen interest in this most worthwhile proposal, which will prove to be an immense booster for the continued rapid development of the south-east corner of this great State. As not all of the matters raised by the honourable member fall within the scope of my various departments, and as gathering this information will take some little time, I propose to forward the honourable member full details in writing as soon as practicable.

Mr Burns: The Minister is an artful dodger.

Mr HINZE: Mr Speaker, I think he called me an artful dodger.

Mr SPEAKER: Does the Minister object?

Mr HINZE: No, I do not think I will take objection.

6. Local Government Superannuation Scheme

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

- (1) During 1984-85, were tenders invited for management of the Local Government Superannuation Scheme?
- (2) How many tenders were received and what were the names of the tenderers?
- (3) Who was the successful tenderer?

(4) What were the reasons why the successful tender was accepted?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) Five tenders were received from the following tenderers for the management of the proposed new Local Government Superannuation Scheme—

State Government Insurance Office (Qld)
Mutual Life and Citizens Assurance Co Ltd
National Mutual/T and G
AMP Society
City Mutual Life Assurance Ltd.

In addition, submissions were received from the following companies on the manner in which they would handle part of the fund for investment purposes—

AUC Holdings Ltd
Hill Samuel Australia Ltd
Sun Alliance Life Assurance Ltd
Zurich Australia Life Insurance Ltd
Invia Investment Management Ltd.

(3 & 4) It has been approved that the Local Government Superannuation Board negotiate with the State Government Insurance Office (Qld) for the management of the proposed new superannuation scheme on the basis that the tender submitted by that office was considered to be the most advantageous for local government employees.

7. Court Actions Against Unions Involved in Electricity Strike

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs—

With reference to the electricity strike in February, during which time the Government stated that it was possible that businesses which suffered financial loss or ruin could sue the unions responsible, and as he took an active role in this matter and had meetings with aggrieved business proprietors—

- (1) How many businesses have taken action against the unions?
- (2) What are the names of the unions?
- (3) What is the nature of the action taken against them?

Answer—

(1 to 3) There is no doubt that the ill-fated electricity dispute has caused considerable financial damage and inconvenience to business and the community generally in Queensland. I am sure that, as a result of the firm action taken by the Government to restore power and end this dispute, those misguided trade union leaders responsible for the strike now deeply regret their unwise action.

To assist business and organisations wishing to protect themselves against the sort of ruinous industrial conduct that took place during the electricity dispute, the Industrial (Commercial Practices) Act 1984 was further amended in March this year. Advice was tendered to several business people to ensure that they were properly informed of the extent of the legislation and the other avenues available to them to seek damages against trade unions.

I have no knowledge of any actions which subsequently might have been instituted by individual businesses. However, the Government, for its part, has taken every legal action to ensure that the Queensland community is protected from irresponsible union campaigns. For example, during the so-called blockades of Queensland by the ACTU—that really was a farce—the Government successfully sought an injunction against Telecom for failing to maintain services in Queensland. Action was also instituted against the

Transport Workers Union under the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act, with very effective results. As that type of action could in many ways be considered to be a crime, one has to ask what the Commonwealth Government did during that period. The Queensland Government actually had to use some Commonwealth legislation in the interests not only of the people of Queensland but of the people of Australia as a whole.

I might also mention here the proceedings in the Queensland Industrial Court for the deregistration of the Electrical Trades Union, as an outcome of the electricity strike. That hearing has now concluded and the decision has been reserved.

Honourable members will, of course, be aware of the recent Supreme Court injunction secured by the Government under the Industrial (Commercial Practices) Act, which prevented Queensland meat-workers from joining their southern counterparts in a stoppage over the disgraceful Mudginberri issue, when the union put forward proposals that were contrary to agreements reached by the courts and everybody else.

The Government stands ready at all times to take similar action in the interests of the public generally in this State.

8. Marketing Budget for Expo 88

Mr UNDERWOOD asked the Premier and Treasurer—

With reference to media statements during the week ended 12 October by the former marketing director of Expo 88 (Mr Mark Cassidy), in which he claimed that it was his company that took action to terminate the marketing contract with the Expo authority because it appeared that the marketing budget would not be met and that, therefore, little or no commission would be paid from the contract provisions—

(1) What is the marketing budget of Expo 88?

(2) Is the marketing budget unlikely to be met and, if so, what are the current expectations regarding the marketing budget?

(3) Is the marketing budget likely to be revised downwards and, if so, what is the new budget likely to be?

(4) When will the new marketing director be appointed and on what basis is he likely to be employed?

Mr SPEAKER: I call the honourable the Premier and Treasurer.

Mr Scott interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It has been such an interesting morning.

Mr Scott: Where you got beaten.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member got well and truly trounced and done over this morning, so he should hope that I do not start on him. Having answered that interjection, I will now answer the question.

Answer—

(1) The marketing budget of Expo 88 consists of all operating revenues expected for the Expo under the broad headings of attendances, pavilion rentals and sponsorships.

(2) No.

(3) No.

(4) It is expected that a new marketing director will be appointed before the end of this month. He will be an employee of the Brisbane Exposition and South Bank Redevelopment Authority. This answer is based on information which has been provided to me by the executive officer of the Brisbane Exposition and South Bank Redevelopment Authority.

9. Queensland Day Committee

Mr UNDERWOOD asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts—

With reference to an amount of \$10,000 that was transferred from the Queensland Film Corporation to the Queensland Day Committee for 1984-85—

- (1) Who authorised the transfer?
- (2) For what purposes was the transfer made?
- (3) Were the funds spent on the purposes for which they were approved and, if not, how were they spent?
- (4) From what other sources does the Queensland Day Committee draw its funds and in what amounts?

Answer—

- (1) The Queensland Film Corporation.
- (2) To assist with a national tour of the Haig collection of historic photographs.
- (3 & 4) The Queensland Day Committee does not fall within the ambit of my ministerial responsibilities.

10. Early Release of Prisoners

Mr FITZGERALD asked the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs—

With reference to an article in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 10 August, which states that the New South Wales Government is to prepare legislation to tighten up the parole system so that sentences imposed by the courts are more reflected in the sentences served by convicted persons, and to a similar article that appeared in *The Age* (Melbourne) on 5 August, which indicated that the Victorian Government was taking similar action—

What is the position in Queensland regarding early release?

Answer—

It is my understanding that owing to substantial overcrowding in the prisons systems of both New South Wales and Victoria, the early release of prisoners has been seen as a means of reducing gaol numbers. That is not the situation in Queensland.

For instance, in Victoria, remission rates have been increased to something like 50 per cent or more. The Victorian Government has now obviously realised the error of its ways, as it so often does, and is endeavouring to rectify the problem.

In cases of fixed-term sentences, the release of prisoners on parole is made by the Parole Board, which is a totally independent statutory body under the chairmanship of a Supreme Court judge. Life prisoners are released by Executive Council on the recommendation of the Parole Board.

Generally speaking, a prisoner is not eligible for release on parole until he has served one half of his sentence of imprisonment. On occasions, however, the sentencing judge may make a recommendation for earlier consideration of release. Prisoners serving terms that do not exceed six months are not eligible for parole.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Parole Board may release a prisoner on parole at any time when the board is satisfied that special circumstances exist. However, when the sentence is less than six months, the approval of Executive Council is required. It is my understanding that only on very rare occasions does the board make an order under those circumstances. Indeed, I am advised that only three prisoners have been released under special circumstances since 1983.

Having regard to the foregoing, it is not considered that there is any need to amend the legislation in this State dealing with the early release of prisoners on parole. However, the honourable member may be assured that the position will be closely monitored.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The time allotted for questions has now expired.

VOTE ON ACCOUNT, 1986-87

Mr SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that the following provision be made on account of the services of the year ending 30 June 1987—

From the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the sum of \$900,000,000;

From the Trust and Special Funds, the sum of \$1,300,000,000;

From the Loan Fund, the sum of \$90,000,000.

Message referred to Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

Resumption of Committee—Estimates—Ninth and Tenth Allotted Days

Estimates-in-Chief, 1985-86

Education

Chief Office

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (12.1 p.m.): I move—

“That \$17,663,300 be granted for ‘Department of Education—Chief Office’.”

The consolidated revenue allocation to Education of \$1,174,784,700 for the 1985-86 financial year exceeds the 1984-85 allocation by \$102,223,600.

The Estimates of the Department of Education were last debated in this Chamber in December 1983 in respect of the 1983-84 financial year. There were, of course, significant developments in educational expenditure in the 1984-85 financial year. I believe it important that I make reference to some of those developments in this speech in addition to drawing attention to the initiatives and enhancements that will be a feature of the department’s operation in 1985-86.

Education is concerned with meeting challenges. I propose to address some of the challenges that my department is presently meeting or is preparing to meet. Education is often seen as a preparation for the future, and our education authorities must be continually preparing to meet the challenges of the future.

Preparing For the Challenges of the Future

Education 2000

Members will be aware of the discussion paper *Education 2000* that I tabled in this House on 5 March 1985 with a view to seeking widespread public comment from parents and students, employers, professional associations and other interested parties concerning the future directions of Queensland education. It is important to understand that this paper is not a blueprint for change but rather a framework within which informed public discussion could take place. As such, *Education 2000* does not represent Government policy, it was simply provided to assist in maintaining the highest possible degree of community consultation.

This public discussion of the curriculum and function of Queensland schools and colleges is the first all-encompassing review of this kind for many decades. It is timely, given the rapid changes that are occurring within schools and, more importantly, within the society in which they exist. It is a sobering thought to consider that students entering our pre-schools now will graduate from our universities and colleges of advanced education in the twenty-first century.

Of more immediate concern are the various changes occurring within our education system. The rapidly increasing number of students undertaking studies at the Year 11

and Year 12 levels in our high schools has changed the nature and expectations of the student population at this level. Approximately 65 per cent of Year 10 students are returning to undertake Year 11 studies in Queensland State high schools.

The continuing growth of the Queensland student population and the rapid expansion of State pre-school facilities are examples of rapid change within the Queensland school system. Almost 73 per cent of eligible 4-year-olds and 5-year-olds attend a State pre-school centre for a non-compulsory program.

In essence, *Education 2000* is concerned with the relevance of the curriculum experienced by students in our schools and colleges and the continuity of the curriculum as students progress from stage to stage through the education system. These stages include both formal and non-formal education, and range from pre-school to high school, technical and further education, and tertiary education respectively. In particular, *Education 2000* raised the question whether the curriculum in our schools and colleges is relevant to the needs of our students as they live and work in this rapidly changing world.

Education 2000 sought public comment on ways to ensure that Queensland students experience a smooth flow of learning experiences as they move from one stage to the next in the State's education system.

Education 2000 should be considered not as a revolutionary proposal but rather as an attempt to bring together, for community consideration, a number of very promising initiatives under limited use in Queensland schools. These initiatives include—

A curriculum that spans pre-school to Year 10: the P-10 maths curriculum has been under limited trial in Queensland schools. This curriculum provides a sequence of content and skills from pre-school through primary school to Year 10.

Initiatives to reduce the problems experienced by some students in the transition from primary school to Year 8 high schools: the provision of first-year centres and other curriculum and organisation initiatives in many high schools has assisted students in making the transition from primary school to high school.

Increased co-operation between secondary schools and TAFE colleges: in response to the changing needs, abilities and career expectations of the rapidly increasing numbers of students in Years 11 and 12, a number of high schools and adjacent TAFE colleges have co-operatively developed programs of study that offer a broad range of subjects from academic to vocational that cater for the individual needs and abilities of students.

I repeat: the prime purpose of the publication of *Education 2000* was to stimulate public interest in, and discussion of, the future development of education in this State. I believe that, to that end, it has been extremely successful, both through the attendance at a large number of public meetings throughout the State, and through the eliciting of over 1 000 written submissions from interested organisations and individuals.

Following the completion of the *Education 2000* discussion process, I record my appreciation, and that of my department, of the efforts and interests of all those organisations and individuals who prepared submissions. The views expressed in those submissions will now be considered by a committee of review to be chaired by Emeritus Professor G. W. Bassett. The committee reflects a range of educational, professional and community interests. It will consider the views expressed in the submissions, and provide advice on the levels of support for, or opposition to, the proposals advanced in *Education 2000*, and comment on the merit of any alternative proposals.

The large number of submissions received will mean that the committee of review will have a lengthy and onerous task. However, prior to the receipt of the final report of the committee of review, a number of trials of alternative educational structures will be commenced, and will continue over the next three years. These trials will be carefully monitored and evaluated, and the results used to guide further developmental work on curriculums and structure. They include two pre-school to Year 7 schools at Northview, which is near Mackay, and Kurwongbah, which is just north of Brisbane, which will open in 1986; an intermediate school (Years 4 to 10) at Roma, to open in 1987; and

two colleges for the immediate post-compulsory years, one at Hervey Bay, to open in January 1986, and the other at Alexandra Hills, to open in January 1987.

The trials of those alternative educational structures will enable my department to explore ways in which the richness and breadth of educational offerings in State schools and colleges might be improved and extended. While the present offerings in our schools and colleges are already both rich and comprehensive, there is always scope for improvement, and it is important that current offerings be continually adapted to ensure that they really do meet the needs of our students and our society, and are responsive to the demands of society, which itself is rapidly changing.

Project 21: Teachers for the 21st Century

In addition to the department's *Education 2000* initiative, during 1985 and 1986, the Board of Teacher Education will be undertaking a review of teacher education and registration in the State, under the title *Project 21: Teachers for the 21st Century*.

Over half of the teachers currently teaching in Queensland schools will not reach the present retiring age until ten or more years beyond the year 2000. Teacher education courses designed now will be producing graduates who will serve the greater part of their teaching career in the twenty-first century. It is timely, therefore, to look towards the needs of the schools and of the teaching profession, and to consider how teacher education and the teacher registration system may best meet those needs.

The review is being assisted by a special project grant of \$30,000. The Government is confident that this Project 21 initiative will further improve the quality of teaching and learning in Queensland schools over the next 25 years.

Review of School-based Assessment (ROSBA)

The third and final phase of the introduction of school-based assessment following the ROSBA recommendations is taking place over 1985-86. Thus, for the first time, all secondary schools in Queensland will be included in the scheme.

Following recommendations resulting from an evaluation carried out in 1984 by Professor Campbell of the University of Queensland into the implementation of ROSBA, the 1984-85 Budget provided funds for additional support services for the Board of Secondary School Studies. These additional support services comprised an assessment unit responsible for refining the concept of achievement-based testing; the secondment of State review panel representatives to co-ordinate review procedures and assist teachers; and an increase in the number of research staff working within the board. A further enhancement of \$150,000 has been allocated in this financial year to continue those support services.

While our education authorities must prepare to meet the challenges of the future, they must also, at the same time, meet the needs of the present. Meeting present needs is often less exciting and less spectacular than preparing to meet the challenges of the future, but it is no less crucial. The 1985-86 Budget provides for a substantial allocation of resources to meet present needs, one of the most significant being an adequate number of teaching staff for schools and colleges.

Meeting the Need for Teaching Staff

A total of 1 259 teaching positions have been added to my department's establishment for 1986 as a result of the 1985-86 Budget. Of these, 135 are to provide for the assumption of responsibility for the schools previously operated by the Endeavour Foundation, and 16 are to cater for the transfer of responsibility for schools in the outer Torres Strait from the Department of Community Services to my department. This means that, in 1986, my department will have a net gain of 1 108 teachers, a figure far greater than any additional teacher provision announced in other Australian State Budgets for the current financial year. Of the 1 259 positions, 35 will be allocated to pre-schools, 396 to primary schools, 422 to secondary schools, 234 to special education, 37 to the Hervey Bay college, and 135 to technical and further education.

Meeting the Challenge of Reducing Class Sizes

Clearly, a major feature of the additional teaching staff for State schools is a continuation of the class size reduction program. Members will recall that this program was announced in the 1982-83 Budget, as a four-year undertaking to achieve the class size targets recommended by the parliamentary Select Committee on Education. The achievement of those targets would result in maximum class sizes of 25 in Years 1 to 3, 30 in Years 4 to 10, and 25 in Years 11 and 12. Since the inception of the program, considerable progress has been made towards achieving these targets. The progress which has been achieved in the primary area is shown in Table 1, which is one of four which I now table for the information of members, and seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following documents—

TABLE 1. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SINGLE-TEACHER PRIMARY CLASSES EXCEEDING PARLIAMENTARY SELECT COMMITTEE TARGETS

Year	Number	Percentage
1982	4 283	57.0
1983	3 257	41.9
1984	2 454	32.1
1985	1 758	22.6

Mr POWELL: The table shows that the percentage of single-teacher primary classes exceeding select committee recommendations has decreased each year since 1982, the year immediately prior to the implementation of the program, until, in 1985, only about 22.6 per cent of primary classes exceed select committee targets. Furthermore, most of the classes now exceeding targets are only marginally in excess of the parliamentary select committee's recommendations, a situation which certainly did not exist in 1982.

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE-TEACHER PRIMARY CLASSES EXCEEDING PARLIAMENTARY SELECT COMMITTEE TARGETS, 1985

Number of students by which class exceeds Select Committee targets	Number of classes	Percentage of all classes in the State
1	659	8.5
2	485	6.2
3	272	3.5
4	165	2.1
5	94	1.2
greater than 5	83	1.1
Total	1 758	22.6

Mr POWELL: Table 2 shows how close the 1 758 primary classes exceeding targets in 1985 are to complying with select committee recommendations.

TABLE 3. MEAN SIZE OF SINGLE-TEACHER PRIMARY CLASSES

	Single Year Level Classes		Composite classes	All single-teacher primary classes
	Year levels 1-3	Year levels 4-7		
1982	28.0	30.1	23.1	28.1
1983	26.0	29.2	22.3	26.9
1984	25.0	28.4	21.6	25.9
1985	23.8	27.4	21.1	24.8

Mr POWELL: Table 3 demonstrates the remarkable reduction in the mean size of single-teacher primary classes that has occurred since 1982.

Next year represents the final stage of the primary class size reduction program, and it is expected that, through careful planning, full compliance with parliamentary select committee recommendations will be achieved in State primary schools.

In State secondary schools it has not been possible to effect reductions in class size of the order planned, because of the unprecedented increases in enrolments that have occurred, particularly at the Years 11 and 12 levels. Between July 1982 and July 1985, there has been a 52 per cent increase in Years 11 and 12 enrolments in secondary schools. Whereas only 49 per cent of the 1981 Year 10 students progressed to Year 11 in 1982, by 1985 the progression to Year 11 had jumped to 65 per cent of the Year 10 enrolment. Progression from Year 11 to Year 12 has remained very high (currently, 84 per cent) and, as a result, Queensland now ranks second only to the Australian Capital Territory in retention of students to Year 12 in State secondary schools.

Despite the dramatic increases in secondary enrolments, in 1985 only a very small percentage of secondary classes exceed the targeted levels. Less than 9 per cent of English classes exceed targets, and across all subjects the percentage is considerably lower.

Although progress in class size reduction in secondary schools has not paralleled that achieved in the primary area, the performance has nevertheless been creditable, particularly at the Years 8 to 10 level. This is demonstrated in Table 4.

TABLE 4. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SECONDARY ENGLISH CLASSES EXCEEDING PARLIAMENTARY SELECT COMMITTEE TARGETS

	Years 8-10		Years 11-12		Years 8-12	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1982	462	14.1	169	16.5	631	14.7
1983	236	6.7	205	17.1	441	9.3
1984	276	7.3	206	14.7	482	9.3
1985	245	6.2	241	15.0	486	8.8

Mr POWELL: I hope that honourable members look closely at those tables.

The large increase in enrolments at the Years 11 and 12 level is reflected in only a very small reduction between 1982 and 1985 in the percentage of Years 11 and 12 classes exceeding select committee recommendations. In years 8 to 10, however, the percentage of classes exceeding select committee recommendations has decreased from 14.1 per cent in 1982 to 6.2 per cent in 1985. This is particularly impressive in view of the fact that there has, of necessity, been a diversion of teachers from Years 8 to 10 levels to the Years 11 and 12 levels to cater for the growth in student numbers in the senior years.

The class size reduction program will continue in State secondary schools in 1986. Although every effort will be made to achieve the class size targets in all year levels in secondary schools, this may not be possible, owing to increases in enrolments and the difficulty in recruiting suitable teachers. That last statement is most important.

Difficulties have been encountered in recruiting secondary teachers who are willing to serve wherever required in the State, especially in fields such as mathematics, science, manual arts and commercial subjects. The demand for secondary teachers has increased greatly, in response to the large influx of migrants from interstate, particularly from 1980 to 1982, the unprecedented increase in the number of students who are remaining at school until Year 12, and the class size reduction program.

Since the early 1970s, Queensland has strenuously sought to balance teacher demand and supply, and this has been largely successful. The orderly preparation of secondary teachers in Queensland was upset, however, in the late 1970s by the repeated media reports about an impending Australia-wide teacher surplus and the attention paid to statements of the then Federal Minister for Education with respect to lack of job opportunities for teachers. Untold damage was done when quotas of intakes into courses preparing secondary teachers were not filled from 1979 to 1981. It took time and a great deal of effort to overcome the impact of such publicity and to convince Canberra that the national embargo on the funding of additional enrolments in teacher education was totally inappropriate in Queensland.

The supply and recruitment of teachers has been managed extremely well in this State, given the great increases in demand for teachers. Indeed, the situation has been managed in as orderly a fashion as interference from Canberra allowed.

Meeting the Need for Technical and Further Education

TAFE enrolments are expected to maintain a trend of high growth during the 1985 and 1986 academic years, with expected annual increases of 10 per cent. In 1985-86, major advances will be made in the provision of new facilities and the development of new courses to keep pace with the needs of Queensland communities. TAFE will continue its commitment towards established programs such as adult education, apprenticeship services and para-professional courses.

The most recently completed colleges—the Central Highlands college at Emerald and the South Burnett college at Kingaroy—will have their first intake of students in the 1986 academic year, whilst growth will continue at the newly established colleges at Grovely and the College of Tourism and Hospitality. Other major capital projects currently under construction at Rockhampton, Townsville, Ipswich, Mackay and South Brisbane are expected to become operational during the 1985-86 financial year.

It is envisaged that, in 1986, a pilot project of traineeship in selected industries will be introduced in Queensland TAFE colleges, along the lines suggested in the Kirby Report. The number of colleges offering the tertiary and vocational preparation programs will also be expanded.

As mentioned previously, it has been necessary to increase the full-time teaching numbers within the division to meet the demands for tuition and, during the coming year, an additional 135 teachers will be engaged.

I think that it is important to note the very significant role that technical and further education is playing in preparing young people for employment and, consequently, increasing their prospects of employment. This role is constantly expanding, as the introduction of new and extended courses in such diverse areas as horticulture, tourism and marine studies testifies. TAFE's contribution is not only a contribution to education but also a contribution to the State's economy and to the State as a whole.

Meeting the Challenge of Technological Development

We live in an increasingly technological world. Our schools and colleges must, therefore, produce students who fully understand the impact of technology on society and have the necessary skills and confidence to function effectively in a society which is making greater and greater use of increasingly sophisticated and powerful technology.

Probably the most obvious and pervasive impact of technological progress on our society comes from computers, and the 1985-86 Budget makes further provision for Computer Education Programs, which were also given a high priority in the 1984-85 Budget.

Computer Education Program

In 1985-86, the department will continue the provision of class-room sets of microcomputers to high schools and secondary departments. In 1985-86, the allocation for this, the second year of a three-year program, will be \$2,941,000. By the end of this financial year, it is expected that the majority of secondary schools will have received some allocation of microcomputers.

Other activities to be supported within the Computer Education Program will include—

- continuation of assistance to enable primary and special schools to purchase computer equipment;

- the development of curriculum materials to support the introduction of computers into secondary schools;

- studies and inquiries to support curriculum revision, development and implementation in computer education; and

- the development and support of regional computer centres and advisory services.

In all, a total of \$4,988,000 will be spent on the Computer Education Program in 1985-86, of which the State Government will contribute \$4,232,000. The balance will be provided by the Commonwealth Government. Contrary to popular belief, this means that the State Government is providing 85 per cent of the funding for the Computer Education Program, while the Commonwealth is providing only 15 per cent.

Utilisation of the Domestic Satellite

Queensland schools, colleges and universities are implementing Australia's first trials of educational applications of satellite technology. Australia's domestic communications satellite, Aussat, has the potential to provide those living in remote areas with an outstanding array of high-quality educational services. Because the Queensland Government is the only State Government to lease a transponder, the educational institutions of this State have the opportunity, once again, to lead Australia into a new era.

The best known of these trials is the Mount Isa School of the Air distance education trial for 1986. A Year 6 class of eight students will be linked with their teacher in Mount Isa and will also view a regular television program transmitted from the Brisbane studios of the Department of Education. In addition, the satellite network will carry computer data between the students and their teacher.

Other trials planned involve almost every level of the educational spectrum. The department's Technical and Further Education Division plans to use the satellite to encourage further study and to present structured TAFE programs leading to some form of certification. In addition, the Darling Downs and Capricornia Colleges of Advanced Education intend transferring existing land-based communications systems, such as telephone tutorials for their off-campus students, to the satellite for trial.

Electronic Learning Centres

Another major initiative relevant to technological development in this financial year will be the establishment, throughout the State, of the first of a network of electronic learning centres, which will offer learning programs that are studied primarily through information technology. The centres will employ systems and devices, such as computer-aided learning courseware, authoring systems, computer-managed learning, interactive video discs and automated office equipment.

An allocation of \$220,000 has been made to establish the first centre at the Ithaca College of TAFE during 1985. Initial programs to be offered at the centre will include literacy and numeracy for adults and microcomputer applications software training. The network of electronic learning centres will be established progressively throughout the State, with the size and services of each being determined by community needs. It is expected that the resources and expertise associated with those facilities will be made more widely available in order that Government and business organisations may conduct their own training and staff development programs at the centres.

Application of Technology to TAFE Courses

In 1985-86, there will be further applications of technology to TAFE courses. The development of resources-based materials will enable self-paced learning programs to be implemented at selected colleges of technical and further education throughout the State. Initially, metal-fabrication programs will be trialled at Ipswich, and trials will later be extended to catering and hospitality programs.

Technology Services Unit

Meeting the challenges of technological development is clearly an onerous task for a department whose chief function is to educate children for life in the world both of today and of tomorrow. In recognition of this, a Technology Services Unit has been established within my department to strengthen and streamline the mechanisms by which technology could be introduced most effectively into the operations and responsibilities of the department. In its initial months of operation, the unit has focused on issues related to the applications of satellite and computer technology to the education

process. However, it is also vitally concerned with the development of technological policy in education and of productive relationships between industry and education, including the tertiary sector.

Meeting the Challenge of Pupils with Special Needs

Within the total school population, many students have special needs, and meeting the needs of those children has again been accorded a priority in the 1985-86 Budget.

Special Education

In the area of special education itself, two significant developments have given impetus to the need to extend and enhance services. Firstly, the Education Act Amendment Act of 1984 extended ministerial responsibility to two new client groups: children from 0 to 5 years and handicapped students of 15 to 18 years of age. Secondly, from the beginning of 1986, my department will accept responsibility for the schools previously operated by the Endeavour Foundation. An additional 135 teaching positions have been added to the establishment of my department to enable the teachers presently employed by the Endeavour Foundation to be transferred to my department.

My department now also undertakes to provide educational services to more severely handicapped children. Following the extension of both age range and degree of handicap in special schools, and a policy of integration of the less-handicapped children, increased special education support to both primary and secondary schools will be required.

Evidence of that increased support can be seen in the increase in the number of special needs units in secondary schools. Those units cater for the requirements of students who experience significant difficulty in coping in the conventional class-room. Thirteen additional units will be established in 1985-86, and will be staffed by 52 teachers, comprising 13 special education remedial teachers and 39 secondary teachers. A further 45 teachers have been provided for specialist services in the areas of remedial resource support, guidance, communication, and special education, visiting and advisory services.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education

Transfer of Schools on Outer Torres Strait Islands

In May 1984, the Government determined that responsibility for education in Aboriginal and Torres Strait island communities would be transferred to my department, with full control being assumed by 1 January 1987. My department assumed control for the recruitment, placement and management of teachers for all Government schools and pre-schools on Torres Strait and on Aboriginal communities from January 1985. Thirteen schools were transferred from the control of the Department of Community Services, as well as one former Anglican mission school, St Paul's School on Moa Island.

My department, in conjunction with the Department of Works, has developed a program to upgrade facilities at those schools. The total value of the works involved is estimated at \$15.5m. The program is to be undertaken in stages, for completion in 1989, and it is proposed that it will be jointly funded by the Commonwealth and the State, with the State bearing approximately two-thirds of the costs.

My department's main concern is for the quality of education that the schools and pre-schools provide and, with this in mind, it has started a program to staff the schools with appropriate numbers of qualified teachers. This approach has been sought by all the local communities.

It is planned to have at least a qualified principal at every school by 1987. At present, there are only six such principals. A total of fourteen is planned. In addition, the number of qualified class-room teachers will be increased from the current two teachers to a total of 20.

Already, \$3.1m has been committed to provide a replacement school at Mabuiag Island and 11 houses for qualified teachers on 10 other islands. Construction of additional houses is planned in 1985-86, and this will enable the posting of appropriate numbers of qualified teachers to all schools in 1987. In addition, work on five more replacement schools is proposed for 1986.

Co-operation between the divisions of pre-school and technical and further education will lead to the commencement of an early childhood community teacher education program in Cairns during 1986. This course is being designed to prepare indigenous staff to work in pre-school facilities on Torres Strait islands and in mainland Aboriginal communities.

Far Northern Schools Development Unit

To support and develop the provision of educational services in schools on the Torres Strait islands and in the Cape York area, a Far Northern Schools Development Unit is being established on Thursday Island. The unit will be responsible for the development and dissemination of a range of curriculum materials for use in schools on the outer Torres Strait islands. It will include curriculum officers and an additional advisory teacher, be managed by a supervisor and a deputy supervisor, and come under the control of an inspector of schools located in the Peninsula regional office in Cairns.

An amount of \$300,000 has been allocated in the 1985-86 Budget towards establishing the Far Northern Schools Development Unit.

Allowances to Assist Isolated Children

At the beginning of 1985, a new scheme of living away from home allowances was introduced to rationalise assistance available for isolated students who must live away from home in order to attend school. A remote area tuition allowance, a remote area hostel allowance, and an extension of the remote area travel allowance scheme were implemented. In 1986, the rationalised scheme will continue.

Remote area tuition allowances are available to assist parents whose eligible children incur tuition costs in boarding schools. The assistance is designed to complement State and Commonwealth per capita grants and also to relate to the level of fees paid.

The 1986 tuition allowances will be—

\$945 (primary) and \$1,261 (secondary) for students at schools with the highest fees;

\$473 to \$944 (primary) and \$632 to \$1,260 (secondary) for students at schools with modest fees;

\$472 (primary) maximum and \$631 (secondary) maximum for students in schools with low fees (based on actual tuition fees payable).

Remote area hostel allowances of \$369 for each eligible student will be available in 1986 on behalf of students boarding at student hostels. Remote area travel allowances apply to all eligible isolated students, and the amount of the assistance varies according to the location of the home and the distance travelled to the boarding facility. Assistance to students will range from \$53 to \$475 in 1986.

Meeting the need for university and higher education

The recurrent and capital funds to be appropriated for Queensland's three universities and six colleges of advanced education represent funding for the second year of the 1985-87 triennium. This triennium has seen a modest return to growth in higher education but, unfortunately, this has been accompanied by increased demands for specificity by the Commonwealth Government in relation to where and how the additional funds provided are expended. Queensland's share of Australia's higher education funding is still less than 15 per cent, although its share of the population is in excess of 16 per cent.

Mr Simpson: Shame! They are short-changing Queensland.

Mr POWELL: As always.

There has, however, been a gradual improvement in our relative share of the funding in recent years and we might, one day, achieve our due entitlement.

In recent years, this State has been continually pressing the Commonwealth for additional student places and funding to allow our young school-leavers the opportunity

to undertake higher education. Against this unmet need, it is disappointing to note the emphasis being given to attempts by the Commonwealth Departments of Education and Trade to market our education overseas. Presumably, the possibility of attracting foreign dollars to Australia means more to the Commonwealth than the education of our young people. The Federal Government must accept that its primary responsibility is to provide adequate places for suitably qualified Australian students.

Let me stress that I am not opposed to the overseas marketing of our educational expertise. On the contrary, I support fully such initiatives, and Queensland's tertiary institutions are currently involved in a number of developments in this area. The Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education, for example, is currently offering a degree course via external studies to full fee-paying students in Hong Kong. I believe, however, that while the Federal Government should be encouraging marketing initiatives, it should also be taking positive steps to increase the number of tertiary places available to Australian students.

I assure honourable members that I will continue to make forceful representations to the Commonwealth authorities to ensure that Queensland secures its rightful share of Commonwealth funds for tertiary education and that the need for additional tertiary places for Queensland students is met as soon as possible.

Meeting the Needs in Special Subject Areas

I spoke earlier of the richness and breadth of our present educational offerings in schools and of the desirability of increasing those qualities even further. Much of that richness and breadth is provided through special subject areas. But, all too often, those special subject areas are overlooked in our consideration of the level and quality of our educational services. I take this opportunity to redress such oversights and to draw the attention of members to some of the specialist subject services provided through my department.

Health and Physical Education

School Camping

In the course of the financial year, school camps will be conducted for approximately 25 000 children at various venues throughout the State. They will range from camps conducted in residential sites to camps in wilderness conditions. All regions participate in these programs and, in the 1985-86 financial year, to remove disadvantages produced by distance the Government will provide an additional \$20,000 towards the cost of transporting children from outlying areas to camps on the coast.

Learn-to-swim Classes

About 83 000 children attending State and non-State schools are provided with free transport and free admission to school, public and private swimming-pools throughout the State at a cost of \$581,000. A further \$280,500 will be provided to operate 138 State school swimming-pools for the 1985-86 swimming season. Cleaning and maintenance costs will also be provided. The essential aim of these learn-to-swim classes is to provide an opportunity for all children in the State to attend swimming lessons in class groups until each can swim a distance of at least 25 metres and become familiar with water safety procedures.

Art Education

Artists in Schools

During 1985-86, \$15,000 has been allocated to extend the Artists in Schools Program to all educational regions of the State. Under this scheme, practising artists are commissioned to work in schools to provide to students living exemplars of artists at work. Projects will include writing, ceramics, crafts and music.

Australia-Japan Exchange

Under the terms of agreement on the sister relationship between the State of Queensland and the Prefecture of Saitama, Japan, of 1984, an exchange exhibition of children's art works has been arranged. The Queensland work will be shown in various locations in Japan and the Japanese work in the education regions throughout Queensland during 1986.

Music Education

Secondary Music

Music teachers were employed in 129 State secondary schools in 1985.

The Queensland Symphony Orchestra continued its program of concerts for secondary students.

An achievement in 1985 was the introduction of an exciting new course, musician practice, which opened up the study of music to a broader base of students who are interested in the more practical aspects of music.

Primary Music

The major challenge of 1985 was the need for the expansion of music classes into more State primary schools. This challenge was partially met by several regions through the implementation of the interim staffing policy of sharing music resource teachers between several schools. A continuing in-service program was assured by the training of selected music resource teachers to become leaders in their prospective areas.

Along with the annual Queensland Symphony Orchestra concerts, other performances for schools were arranged by the Queensland Arts Council in liaison with my department.

Plans for a primary music block have been completed and construction on the first building is proceeding.

Instrumental Music

The instrumental program has grown from one instructor in 1972 to 161 instructors serving 111 secondary schools and 344 primary schools throughout the State. Approximately 16 000 students are involved in the program. The number of requests for inclusion in the program necessitates a substantial expansion for 1986.

In 1985, a number of eminent music educators provided clinics and master classes for instrumental music instructors.

Schools have been very active in providing performances for audiences throughout the community. Two Brisbane secondary schools undertook interstate visits, on which performances by their music groups were met with critical acclaim.

Special Events

Funding of \$30,000 has been allocated towards the residential program for musically outstanding students (MOST), to be conducted at Griffith University. Seventy young musicians selected from throughout the State will participate in this intensive musical development program.

The festival of bands and orchestras, Fanfare '85, was successfully launched in May this year at regional festivals throughout the State. Groups competed for selection to represent their region at the State festival in Brisbane in October 1985. The State festival will culminate in a performance at the Queensland Performing Arts Centre tomorrow evening. An allocation of \$70,000 has been made to support this program. If honourable members are able to attend that function tomorrow night, I am sure that they will enjoy a feast of really good music.

Agricultural Project Clubs and Associated Activities

Demand from both primary and secondary schools for the services of organisers from the Agricultural Project Club Branch continued at high levels during 1985. Organisers made more than 1 150 visits to primary schools, and 35 000 students again visited field-study centres. Interest in agricultural studies remains high, with increased numbers of secondary schools wishing to introduce agricultural subjects.

Project Clubs

More than 530 schools were involved in project club activities. The Edwin Butt Award for environmental education projects in Queensland schools was again strongly supported. Most popular activities included environmental studies, native trees, bee-keeping, gardening, poultry, citrus-growing, nature trails and practical scientific studies.

Selected club members participated in the 1985 RNA farm camp and the 39th Annual Summer Agricultural School at the Queensland Agricultural College.

Agricultural Sections—State High Schools

A new agricultural centre was established at Gordonvale State High School, and construction and preliminary work is nearing completion on the new Wilsonton Agricultural Centre, which will open in January 1986 and service the three State high schools in the Toowoomba area.

Agricultural subjects, including animal husbandry, agricultural mechanics, animal and crop production, agriculture, and agricultural science, were offered to Years 8 to 12 students in 44 State high schools, 31 of which have field laboratories for teaching and practical experience. Those laboratories, which are funded by the department, usually include sections housing poultry, bees, cattle, goats, sheep, nurseries, orchards and agricultural crops.

Field-study Centres

Centres continued to be fully booked with long waiting-lists. The upgrading of facilities has proceeded with completion of eating areas at Amarook, Paluma and Numinbah Valley. Accommodation units have been relocated at Jacobs Well and Stanley River. The Jacobs Well marine studies trawler was launched recently, and will begin full-scale operation in early 1986. A highly successful co-operative venture by Gold Coast TAFE, secondary education and the field-study centre has resulted in the construction of three accommodation huts at Numinbah Valley. Further units are under construction.

Concluding Comments

In conclusion, I acknowledge the contributions of the officers of my department and of the various statutory authorities within the portfolio to education services in this State. I believe that the people and students of Queensland are well served by those officers, and I thank them for their efforts.

Too often, contributions and achievements pass unnoticed, and I have been concerned that this has been so in my department. I have decided, therefore, that, in future, meritorious service with the department will be acknowledged in two ways. Firstly, teachers, public servants and other Crown employees who complete 25 years' service with the department will be presented with an appropriate certificate of commendation. Secondly, after 35 years' service, a commemorative medallion and certificate will be presented. Normally, this presentation would occur on retirement.

I have also decided that, from next year, schools celebrating the 50th, 75th or 100th anniversaries of their establishment will be presented with an appropriate wall plaque to commemorate the event. I hope that, in these ways, pride in achievement and a sense of historical worth can be fostered.

I spoke just now of the retirement of officers, and I acknowledge the forthcoming retirement of one of the senior officers of my department, Mr E. R. (Ted) Duke, regional director of the Brisbane South Region. After many years of outstanding service as a teacher, principal, inspector of schools, and regional director with the department, Ted Duke will be retiring in February next year. That service has taken Ted throughout the State, and I know that his contributions to education have been highly valued wherever he has been. Without doubt, Ted has been one of my department's most successful and capable regional directors, and I thank him for his long and loyal service, and wish him well in his retirement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I desire to inform honourable members that, on the Vote proposed, I will allow a full discussion on all of the Minister's departmental Estimates (Consolidated Revenue and Trust and Special Funds).

For the information of honourable 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 UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (12.47 p.m.): Firstly, I endorse the Minister's remarks about Ted Duke, and wish him well in his retirement.

The quality and the cost of education are the two prime concerns of parents in the education of their children. Ten years ago the State Government introduced a policy of nil growth in the public service. That policy is now having a serious effect on the education of children and on the administration of schools and of the Education Department itself. The extent of that effect can be demonstrated by the fact that, at the beginning of this year, several new schools were opened without clerical support staff, and it was five months before the staff became available. In the meantime, the principals and teachers of those schools were required to perform the tasks of clerks and typists. They were probably the most highly paid clerical staff in Queensland schools. This inefficiency is a matter of grave concern to parents and educators alike.

According to the Budget figures, in 1977-78, the teacher staffing level was 20 592. In 1984-85, it rose to 25 246. In the same period, the public service component of the work-force in our schools did not increase or remain static—it actually decreased. Given that, in that period, school curriculums and administration systems have become more sophisticated, resulting in additional duties, it is disappointing that clerical and administrative staff levels have dropped, not only in the schools, but in the regional offices and other administrative sections of the Education Department as well. Clearly, additional administrative staff are needed to back up the clerical and typing staff so that the maximum benefit is gained from the education dollar expended in this State.

This Budget has made provision for 1 000 additional teachers, which means that there will be more pays to sort out, more transfers and transfer appeals to be decided, more telephone calls to be handled and more records to be kept. It all adds up to more paperwork. Who will do this extra work? For the first five months of this year, the teachers and principals in the new schools were performing those functions.

In education, it is time for the Government to modify the nil growth policy in the public service, so that teachers and principals can go back into the class-rooms to do the job they are paid for and trained for.

As I mentioned earlier in this session, this year's Budget reveals that the Government's promise on class sizes is phoney and broken. It is broken this year, because 1985 is the year in which the class size promise was to be honoured in full, that is, that Years 1 to 3 and Years 11 and 12 were to have a maximum class number of 25 and classes in Years 4 to 10 were to have a maximum number of 30 students. Today the Minister made not one mention of the Government's promise on class sizes. He has not even bothered to answer the points raised in my earlier speech. He knows quite clearly that he and his Government have broken their commitment given to the parents, teachers and students of this State in the class-size promise made four Budgets ago.

Mr Powell: Didn't you listen to what I was saying?

Mr UNDERWOOD: I have been listening.

It is not only Labor electorates that are affected by the broken promises on class sizes—it affects all electorates. As proof of that, one has only to look at the Redlands area, where up to 15 per cent of primary school classes bear testimony to the Government's broken promise on class sizes. In some schools, that figure is down to 5 per cent or 10 per cent; in others, the staff have agreed to compromise to have one bigger class in return for composite classes. The clear-cut fact, however, is that the Government has not provided the staff even where those arrangements do not apply.

I move on to the cost to parents of education. This Government has made no real changes to the financial support for p. and c. associations within the State school system. In the middle of last year, the p. and c. associations waged a great campaign that brought pressure to bear on the Government to do something about providing financial relief

for the parents who raise money for the State's schools. Nothing has been done in that area. On 16 May 1984, the editorial of *The Courier-Mail* stated—

“The Government has been loafing at the expense of parents. It has been prepared to sit back, let others raise essential funds—between \$22 million and \$25 million every year—and spend the money elsewhere. Against the splendour of members' facilities at Parliament House, most state schools are shabby indeed. Against the collected wisdom in the members' library, most school collections are paltry and inadequate. Education is the poor relation in Queensland, and it shows.”

That is an editorial from the conservative friends of the Government down at Queensland Newspapers. Not one thing that the Minister has said today or is contained in the Budget papers has changed that. Of course, Mrs Galtos is no friend of the Labor Party; in fact, she tends to support the conservative side of politics in this State. The Minister cannot say that that was a campaign by Labor supporters.

The *Education 2000* documents are most worrying for parents, educationally and particularly financially. In 1982, research carried out for some newspapers revealed that it cost \$600 to send a child to school. Extrapolating the figure by using the rate of inflation, one finds that these days the figure would be of the order of \$800. That is a significant cost to parents. Admittedly, they get some financial relief, but it is not enough.

In relation to costing and funding, the four major areas that are untouched by the Minister in *Education 2000* are staffing, capital works, equipment and cash grants and allowances. The documents made public by the Minister do not touch upon those matters. The documents do not explain how the Government intends to fund *Education 2000*; however, in a moment I will refer to other material that has been widely circulated throughout Queensland.

The *Education 2000* documents as produced for public scrutiny and discussion are gobbledegook to most people. Even educationists, who are used to the style of language used in the education field, have had difficulty understanding them.

Mr Stephan: You must admit that it did create subjective discussion.

Mr UNDERWOOD: “Subjective” is the right word. Objectivity is what we are really after.

The *Education 2000* documents were described, in a submission by the Association of Independent Schools in Queensland, to the committee set up by the Minister as *Alice in Wonderland*. That is what the Association of Independent Schools—not the Queensland Teachers Union, but the schools themselves—thought about it. The association was critical of the *Education 2000* documents. It goes without saying that honourable members have read the material produced by the two major teaching associations or unions in the State and the material produced by the parents and citizens associations, which were also critical, in part, of the *Education 2000* documents.

It is interesting to note that the Minister has not yet released the report of the Working Party Appointed to Examine Implications of the Proposed Re-arrangements in Schooling, dated November 1984, which is commonly known as the Matheson report and is stamped “Confidential”. Had the Minister presented that report to the Parliament, he would have found himself not making that slip-stream tour round Queensland propagandising his incomplete documents that are full of gobbledegook and incomplete statements. Had that document been presented to the people of Queensland for discussion, the people would have found that, contrary to what the Minister said in the presentation of his Estimates, in which he said that *Education 2000* was not a blueprint for change, the document was not Government policy but a document produced for public consultation.

The Matheson report states on page vii—

“The Working Party considers that the recommendations provide a blueprint for action.”

That contradicts what the Minister said today. Perhaps the Minister has thrown that document out. I will be interested to learn whether he has. What has been put in its place? The Minister is laughing. I take it that he has not put anything in its place.

Mr Powell: You are so stupid with the things that you bring up.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I think that I will buy the Minister a copy of *Roget's Thesaurus* so that he can find another word for "stupid". Every time someone introduces an issue into a debate, the Minister calls him stupid. Although he is the Minister for Education, he is fairly illiterate.

Opposition members sat in silence and listened to the Minister's lengthy presentation. He did not provide very much, other than self-praise for himself. He is now interjecting. That is fine by me.

The Minister has not refuted any of the public criticisms made by me and others in the press about the contents of the Matheson report. The Matheson report outlines clearly that the Government will be using that report as a blueprint for action to renege once again on its promise to decrease class sizes. The report states clearly that the question of increasing class sizes is up for grabs. It states clearly that the awards for teachers working in the schools will be renegotiated. Hours, conditions and pay rates are all up for grabs and renegotiation.

The industrial record of the Queensland Government to date means simply one thing—worse pay and conditions for people working for the Education Department. If it is contrary to that, it is a mark on the wall for the Government. Mr Powell will be the first Minister to reverse totally the Government's policy on pay and conditions for teachers in this State.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr UNDERWOOD: One of the most serious, and miserable, actions taken this year by the Education Department is in regard to teacher aides in Endeavour Foundation schools. At the beginning of this financial year, it was originally intended that the salaries of those teacher aides would be changed from a full-time basis to a casual basis. However, that has been postponed until the beginning of the next school year. As honourable members are aware, the Education Department has taken over the Endeavour Foundation schools.

That action is a very retrograde step in the education of the students attending Endeavour Foundation schools. The teacher aides in those schools are not really teacher aides; they are virtually teachers by virtue of the work that they do. The students who attend those schools require a great deal of supervision and attention, which is provided by the teacher aides. The teacher aides in Endeavour Foundation schools are faced with health hazards over and above those faced by other teacher aides in ordinary State schools because of the particular physical problems of the students who attend Endeavour Foundation schools. Those teacher aides are more prone to illness, and they require more sick leave and time off than other teacher aides in order to overcome the illnesses that they contract as a result of following their occupation.

I cannot understand why the Government is changing the rate of pay of those teacher aides from a full-time basis to a casual basis. It is not as though it will save the Government a great deal of money. The teacher aides willingly met with an officer of the department in the belief that they would receive a reasonable reception. In fact, they were spoken down to and sent packing.

The teacher aides in Endeavour Foundation schools do a magnificent job. The Minister and his Government are kicking them in the head, so to speak. I call on the Minister to revise the Government's decision and ensure that the teacher aides who are currently working in Endeavour Foundation schools continue on at full-time rates of pay. A casual rate of pay for some teacher aides will mean a loss of up to \$2,000 in annual income. That is a very serious prospect for people on set incomes who have a

set family budget. The loss of that amount of money will cause severe economic hardship for such families.

If the Government wants to press on and introduce casual rates for teacher aides in other schools, let it do so. However, let the Government do it to the teacher aides who are appointed after the introduction of casual rates, so that when people take on the job, they know exactly what they are facing. The teacher aides who are already employed should be allowed to continue on at their current rate of pay until they retire or resign from the service of the department.

This penny-pinching by the Government is in contrast to what has happened at the Hervey Bay senior school, particularly in regard to the appointment and enlistment of staff and negotiations with the Queensland Teachers Union in relation to wages. In fact, the department has given an open cheque to the Queensland Teachers Union. It has made the offer so good that the Queensland Teachers Union cannot refuse it on behalf of its members. As all honourable members are aware, Queensland Teachers Union policy is against the senior school concept. However, the financial offer is so good that it cannot be refused.

The teacher aides in Endeavour Foundation schools, who are very small in number, cannot fight for themselves, industrially. They do not have the political clout of the Queensland Teachers Union. Because of its political clout, the Queensland Teachers Union has been given an open cheque by the Minister so that his senior school—his show-piece, for which \$9m has already been allocated—will go ahead without any ripples.

What sort of a Government is it that will kick the teacher aides of Endeavour Foundation schools and, at the same time, pork-barrel the Hervey Bay senior college?

Mr Scott: You see the similarity with their treatment of the workers in the electricity supply industry.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That is right. The little people get kicked and the people with the political muscle get all the bikkies from this Government.

I will examine in detail the expenditure on that Hervey Bay school. I have mentioned the figure of \$9m, and \$1.1m has been allocated in the Budget for the running expenses of the school. By July 1986, \$666,000 will be expended on salaries alone. That means that the figure will have to be topped up in the next Budget. That sort of expense is totally unjustifiable pork-barrelling by the Minister in his own electorate, particularly when one considers that the Budget has allocated approximately \$6m for three new high schools. In other words, if the Hervey Bay senior school—that show-piece in the Minister's own electorate—had not been built, an additional three State high schools could have been built in other parts of Queensland.

Redlands is calling out for a high school. Ipswich, Townsville, the developing areas on the north and south sides of Brisbane and other areas in south-east Queensland are calling out for high schools. High schools in those areas are all seriously over-populated; but, no, the Minister pressed on with grandiose pork-barrelling in his own electorate. That is totally unjustifiable. He may laugh, but the facts are available for all to see. He needs to answer to the people in the remainder of the State.

The Hervey Bay school was claimed to be the initial project of Education 2000. What does the Minister intend? Are we to have \$9m educational edifices all over the State? Of course not. The education budget could not sustain it. The Government cannot afford to build \$3m high schools, let alone \$9m senior schools.

The academic aspect of Education 2000 is very serious indeed, particularly for those in the schools who have a working-class background. By being streamed into either academic or industrial courses, students will have their future employment and social options limited. In other words, some of them will be shunted off into dead-end sidings.

It was naive of the Minister to say that Education 2000 is all about updating the curriculum. Honourable members may not realise it, but for some time the department has been engaged in updating all facets of the curriculum. Already, science is in place.

A review of the music curriculum is under way. Mathematics is already streamed from Years 1 to 10. A review of language and arts is also under way. Those new curriculums that are not already in place will be in place over the next couple of years. It is obvious, therefore, that it is not necessary to have Education 2000 to update curriculums.

The Minister made much play of his committee of review. It was the Opposition that made the announcement. Mr Matheson had the temerity to comment on it. He let the cat out of the bag and was hauled up to the Minister's office and scolded. Much later, the Minister made a statement to the Parliament about the review. Because the news had already been made known to the public, his statement was not reported. He may hiss and boo now, but the facts are reported in *The Courier-Mail*.

The cost of implementing Education 2000 will be immense to the private schools, which will have to raise their fees. That will impose an even greater hardship on parents who send their children to private schools. For the same reason, it will impose hardships on those who send their children to State schools.

Time expired.

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (2.23 p.m.): It gives me much pleasure to join the debate and to congratulate the Minister on the handling of his portfolio.

Mr Scott: You never forget congratulations.

Mr STEPHAN: No; but does the member for Cook not agree that the Minister's efforts are worthy of congratulations? If one believes they are, it does not hurt to say, "Well done." If one feels otherwise, it does not hurt to express those feelings, either. I do not hear many members opposite extend congratulations.

Mr Scott: He is a keen Minister; I will say that about him.

Mr STEPHAN: He is a keen Minister and he handles his portfolio very well. I congratulate him on that.

Because the Minister is a former teacher, he had to overcome the hurdle of jealousy of him that existed in the department. However, he has proven by his ability that he is worthy of his ministerial position.

I extend my thanks to his personal staff, also—Ron and the two Craigs. Their help and assistance are always very much appreciated.

Education has the largest allocation of funds from the Budget. That alone imposes a responsibility on the Minister. Often it is felt that education covers only those between the ages of four and 18 or 19. The report presented by the Minister shows that education covers a wider field than the provision of instruction in schools. For instance, special education is designed to meet the very real needs of an increasing number of students. The department administers programs that enable projects to be undertaken in the field of agriculture, and the music and art sections cater for cultural needs.

The provision of transport can sometimes be a problem and is often the source of criticism by members of the public. Most of the criticism relating to education centre on transport. Some of the complaints are that school bus routes are not far-reaching enough, that school buses do not pick the children up at the correct place and that school buses are either leaving the bus stop too early or delivering the children home too late.

I would like to spend time commenting on the response of the Department of Education to the needs of rural areas by the provision of training and the construction of colleges and, in particular, the special schemes that are provided for rural youth. The department's responsibility in rural areas is very important. I begin by turning my attention to the location of kindergartens. I note that the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) is in the Chamber, and I remind him of comments that he made a couple of weeks ago when he attempted to justify the cut-back in financial assistance provided by the Federal Government for kindergartens and creches in the community. I inform

him and other honourable members that the State Government has maintained its grants to kindergartens, despite the withdrawal of financial support to Queensland by the Commonwealth Government to the tune of approximately \$6m. The responsibility accepted by the State Government is very important not only for the people who make use of the kindergartens but also for everyone in the wider community.

Members of the Creche and Kindergarten Association of Queensland appreciate the assistance offered by the State Government and realise that the Government has taken up the leeway, and has made it so much easier for families to have their children looked after. Mr Keith Hayes has written a letter, and I wish to read a small segment of it.

Mr Hamill: Do you know that Mr Hayes was a candidate for the National Party at the last State election?

Mr STEPHAN: I am not sure whether he was or not.

I point out that he is the president of the Creche and Kindergarten Association of Queensland and that he has written to me expressing views on the aspect I have just mentioned. I have no doubt, however, that any person who is given responsibility in the field of education would be a supporter of the National Party. I also believe that that could be said of 70 or 80 per cent of the people of Queensland.

The letter states—

“We have just received details of the 1985/86 State Budget presented by the Premier, and we were very pleased to learn that the State Government has, in fact, provided the necessary additional funding to maintain the existing levels of financial assistance for kindergartens.

I can assure you that the Association and the Community Kindergarten Movement sincerely appreciate the special consideration which we have received on this particular occasion, and for the continued support which we have enjoyed from the State Government over so many years.

The maintenance of the grant levels should enable committees to confidently plan for the future, and to maintain fees at levels which will be affordable by a majority of families.”

Mr Davis: In my room, I was listening to the proceedings in the Chamber, and I heard you mention something about hurdles.

Mr STEPHAN: I did not say I had any hurdles at all. The honourable member for Brisbane Central has come in a little late. He should not sleep so long after lunch. It would be of great assistance if he was in attendance in the Parliament.

I conclude the point that I was making by giving the assurance that the State Government will maintain the present level of kindergarten and pre-school services by increasing its own contribution to approved staff cost by 59 per cent to 80 per cent. That will ensure the continuing viability of those services in the community.

I now deal with the increases in the number of children who attend schools at the various levels provided for under the State's education system. For example, the number of children who attend State schools has increased by 441 and now totals 29 977. Enrolments in special schools and units showed a rise of 110 and have now reached 5 482. Enrolments in State primary schools continue to show the effects of a decline in births in the 1970s and a slowing of migration to Queensland and have dropped by 5 427. The number of students enrolled is now 232 313. The number of State secondary school students increased by 4.7 per cent in 1984, and that followed a rise of 6.4 per cent for the period 1983-84. Although at a reduced rate, the number of secondary school enrolments was expected to continue to rise until 1987.

It is impossible for the State Government to carry the burden of significant numbers of additional students without the receipt of matching financial assistance from the Federal Government. Senator Susan Ryan has endeavoured to impress upon the Federal Government that Queensland lags behind the other States in the field of education. She

has pointed out that the determining factor is not merely the amount of money provided and that the standard of education is determined more by the way in which a particular amount is spent. For a long time now, the Minister has been saying that it is not the amount that is spent but the way in which it is spent and the way in which teachers, students and parents actually react to the money that is spent. Even the Federal Minister is beginning to realise that.

Mr Hamill: Are you reporting what the Federal Minister is saying?

Mr STEPHAN: I am saying that at last she is realising that it is not only money that is influential in education, although that was what was said a few years ago.

I now refer to the enrolments in Years 11 and 12. There has been a large increase in the numbers of students going on to Years 11 and 12. The increase has been of the order of 11.7 per cent, and that reflects a State-wide trend which has become evident over the past few years. That is obviously a response to the generally higher standard of qualifications being demanded in the work-place and the greater overall competition for jobs.

There has been a broadening of the curriculums in secondary schools and the introduction of link courses involving TAFE. Plans have also been set in motion to build new style junior colleges, to which the Opposition spokesman referred. For example, Pialba was specifically designed to cater for Year 11 and Year 12 students. It has to be recognised that there are changing needs in the educational program, and no longer can it be expected that students wishing to go on to tertiary education will be able to find a place in a tertiary college. A great many students who are very well educated will in fact not be able to find a place in a tertiary college and, for that reason if for no other, there is a need to look at other more practical methods of education.

Mr Hamill: What is the shortfall that you see?

Mr STEPHAN: I cannot give the honourable member the exact number, but there is a shortfall, and it has grown in the past couple of years.

It is for that reason that the increased availability of TAFE courses is very important. Emphasis should also be placed on developing new courses that keep pace with the needs of the Queensland community. There has been a wide variety of TAFE courses available in the past, but that does not mean to say that they will be sufficiently varied for future requirements.

TAFE enrolments are expected to maintain a trend of high growth, with anticipated annual increases of about 10 per cent. Further activities leading to the construction of additional TAFE facilities will continue for projects currently at an advanced stage of planning.

To be a little parochial, as I am from time to time, I point out that, although a number of TAFE colleges have been built in centres adjacent to Gympie, there is a very real need for the construction of a TAFE college in Gympie itself. The rapid growth of the Gympie area has meant that the number of students, including adults, wishing to undertake TAFE courses has reached the point at which the construction of a TAFE college has become necessary. It should be borne in mind that, because Gympie is the centre of a very large horticultural and agricultural area, courses in land use and rural management should be made available. For example, at present no college offers a course in farriery, although I understand that such a course will begin in Brisbane next year. Because of the number of horses in Queensland, such a course is necessary for persons living in rural communities. Other courses are available in mechanics, leatherwork, wood-working and leadlighting. If ever an area deserved a TAFE college, it is Gympie. I understand that such a college is in the planning stage at present, and I thank the Minister very much for his support. I understand that the college will begin offering courses in 1989-90.

The value of training for the older members of the community should not be underestimated. Training for rural youth and junior farmers is also very important to

the rural community. The rural youth organisation played a big part in International Youth Year. It takes part in overseas and interstate youth exchange visits. The benefit of those visits should not be underestimated. Last year, I was fortunate to be closely involved in the selection of youth exchange students. The quality of youth taking part in these schemes is extraordinarily high.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: I am sure that the honourable member would also learn a lot.

The participants certainly gain a great deal from overseas exchange trips. When they return to Australia, they have a completely different outlook on life. I was privileged to be an American International Farm Youth exchange participant in 1959. I certainly learnt a great deal from that. If the honourable member for Windsor had grasped the opportunity to travel in parts of Australia and the world, he, too, would have his feet on the ground and know a little more about what goes on in the world, and he would know what goes on beyond the last street light.

Mr McPhie: He did not get very far.

Mr STEPHAN: No, he did not. I believe that a couple of years ago he took part in a horse ride. I think it was in the Ride for Democracy. When he got two miles past the last street light, in amongst a few gum trees, he lost his way.

Mr Powell: He got lost on the Bruce Highway in my electorate.

Mr STEPHAN: He was about 100 yards from the railway and 200 yards from the road.

Mr McPhie interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: He has not absorbed very much. He has not learned much about catching eels, either. However, if we give him time, another 15 or 20 years, he will be able to get past the first gum tree.

The rural training schools are very important and highly appreciated by the students who attend them. The school at Emerald was one of the first. The students who pass through those schools come out far better equipped to take their places in the rural community.

Plans are on the drawing-board for a horticultural college close to the north coast area. For many years, growers in the Gympie area have been producing horticultural crops and sugar-cane. It is very important to have such a college to help the horticultural industry.

I referred earlier to the instrumental instruction given in schools, its importance to the schools and its effect on the community. This instruction is greatly appreciated by the students and the community generally. The Minister told us that schools have been very active in providing performances for audiences. In this context, he referred to two Brisbane secondary schools from which students went on interstate visits. Many schools organise community concerts both in and out of school hours. The school bands and community organisations virtually depend on the instrumental instructors. My only criticism relates to the inability of the smaller and more remote schools to take part in the instrumental program. That is much to their disadvantage. People in the areas in which the program operates really appreciate it.

One of my greatest criticisms concerns school bus transport. Hardly a week goes by without parents somewhere across the State having difficulty transporting their children to school. Another aspect of the same problem concerns the bus-operators themselves. I note that the rates payable to bus-operators for their school services will be increased by 6.3 per cent. Despite the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) said eighteen months or so ago that there would be no increases in the price of fuel, it has increased from 30c a litre to over 50c a litre. That increase in cost must be borne by the operators,

as must the cost of tyres and wages, and the 6.3 per cent increase does not cover those increased costs.

In addition, buses do not last for ever and eventually need to be replaced, which is not a cheap operation; it is a big investment. I feel sorry for the bus-operators, and I hope that the Government can help them to overcome their problems, because it would be a sad state of affairs if many bus-operators were not able to continue and decided to close down their operations.

On a concluding note, I mention student allowances. Until the early part of this year, a grant was made available to some students based on very strict means test guidelines. Many people really appreciated that grant of about \$50—I am not sure what the actual figure was. These people, who have fairly tight financial constraints placed upon them, have found it very difficult without the student allowance, which is now not payable. I suggest that, if it is at all possible to restore the grant, it should be restored, because it does help to alleviate the problems. The allowance does not involve the Government in a large sum of money but, at the beginning of the school year when a lot of money has to be found by parents to get children settled into school, the grant was appreciated.

All in all, I congratulate the Minister on his handling of his portfolio. I wish him the very best for his future and I know that, if the performance of the Education Department over the last three years is maintained, the community can rest assured that the education of our children is in good hands.

Mr Davis: He has to be an improvement on the last Minister.

Mr STEPHAN: I did not say that things need to be improved; I said that they need only to continue along the same lines.

Time expired.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (2.43 p.m.): It is pleasing to be able to debate the Education Estimates. One of the criticisms levelled at the Queensland Parliament, not only in recent times but in the past, is the fact that the Estimates of every department are not debated each year. That is a major failing, because large sums of public money are expended through a variety of departments. If the expenditure that the Committee debates in any one year was tallied up, it would represent only a very small portion of total Budget outlays.

This year, it was not expected that the Committee would debate the Estimates of the Minister for Education. According to the draft issued by the Leader of the House (Mr Wharton), the Estimates for Transport; Water Resources and Maritime Services; and Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs were to be debated. I thought that the Estimates for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs would make a very interesting debate, particularly as it is International Youth Year. Certainly, education has some input from youth. However, although the ill health of one Minister, and the untimely death of another presented some difficulty in debating their Estimates, there seems to be no good reason why the Estimates for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs cannot be debated this year. Maybe the program has been changed because the Government feels that the Minister for Education is more competent in this Chamber than his colleague the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs. It is a question of relativities, and I will leave that subject on that note.

Mr Davis: He shakes head and smiles inwardly.

Mr HAMILL: I know that the Minister is a modest man, and I am sure that he will take my comments to heart.

Certainly this Estimates debate is a good opportunity to discuss what I might describe as one of the burning issues in education in this State.

Mr Comben: Arson!

Mr HAMILL: From time to time, schools do go up in flames, and not much has been done about providing adequate safeguards.

I was not about to mention arson; I wished to speak about *Education 2000*.

Mr Cahill interjected.

Mr HAMILL: Mr Booth, I should draw your attention to the fact that there is a fugitive in the Chamber. I know that the Americans are looking for a terrorist in Yugoslavia; I think that he has turned up here—I am sorry, it is the member for Aspley, who is hiding behind dark glasses. It is a case of mistaken identity.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! I remind the member for Ipswich that he is debating the Education Estimates. Initially, he claimed that he wanted the opportunity to do so. I would like him to do so.

Mr HAMILL: Thank you, Mr Booth. The terrorist over there distracted me somewhat from my notes.

I want very much to discuss *Education 2000*.

Mr FitzGerald: Handwritten notes, again?

Mr HAMILL: The honourable member can have a look at them.

That document contains a number of very important points. As the Minister has already said in the debate, there has been widespread public comment on it. I point out that much of that comment was not widespread support; in fact, the document stirred up much animosity in the community.

I submit that the document was not found by many in the community to be easy to comprehend, couched, as it was, in convoluted terminology, often using the sort of jargon that one expects to find in documents on education and sociology. It should have been in terms that would be readily comprehended by the majority of the community. After all, it is a very important document.

The document contains a number of points that are worth while considering. One of those is the P-10 continuous curriculum. The honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood) said that in a number of areas the Department of Education has actually been developing continuous curriculums, so it is not necessarily a new concept.

However, one of the points made in *Education 2000* is that a problem of transition between primary and secondary schools exists in the education system. Much was made of that in the context of endeavouring to restructure the school system into three segments. To substitute one transition for two transitions seems to me to be somewhat lacking in logic. Presumably, if the argument is that there is discontinuity between Years 7 and 8 and if the department is developing a continuous curriculum, surely that is meant to overcome that sort of problem. However, what *Education 2000* is heralding is two periods of discontinuity—between Years 3 and 4, and between Years 10 and 11.

Education 2000 is also lacking in its proposal to set up a committee for curriculum management and accreditation. The brief of that committee was to determine the philosophy of P-10 education. Again, that is a classic case of putting the cart before the horse. The department is saying that it will have P-10 education and then it will determine a philosophy to justify that position. The usual way of going about these things is to discuss a variety of alternatives, have some philosophical underpinnings and then give effect to that philosophy by determining a course of action.

Another point that obviously has alarmed many people in the community is the provision in that document for the preparation of syllabuses and curriculum guide-lines by, in the terms used in the report, “appropriately constituted groups”. Like so many other aspects of *Education 2000*, the whole message has not been spelt out. What is meant by the word “appropriately” is not known. The report uses the term “appropriate” frequently, as it does the term “relevant”. However, there is no real definition of what is deemed by the authors of the report—and presumably by the Education Department—to be meant by “appropriately constituted groups”. I believe a number of groups in the

community would see themselves as having a very important input into curriculums, but whether they would be appropriate groups to be doing so is quite another question.

Another issue that is of some concern is TAFE vis-a-vis Years 11 and 12. One of the great flaws in the document that was distributed to the public is the failure not only to determine the philosophy in P-10 education but also to determine exactly what the roles are for schools and technical and further education. Lack of definition is a problem. A blurring has been allowed, and it is perpetrated further by the report in arguing strongly for integration between TAFE and Years 11 and 12. If the report is an indication of some of the thinking within the Government, it would appear that, in education, two institutions have quite separate roles to play and ought not to be run together in the fashion that is suggested.

What I consider to be a retrograde step in education is an over-emphasis in the report in favour of specific vocational training instead of general education. A fallacy that is perpetrated by many of the conservatives in this country, and others, is that schools should churn out square pegs to put into square holes in the labour force. That has never worked; it will never work, and it is not the role of schools to do that. I am not saying that students ought not to enter the labour force, or whatever they want to do after they leave school, without basic skills that are applicable to their later life. If it is a case of slotting people into vocations, that is not the role of a general education. If people are going to be placed into vocational training very early in their education or very early in their life career, there will be not a skilling of the labour force but rather a de-skilling, in which people do not have the general skills that give them mobility in the labour force in later life.

I would suggest that every member of this Assembly had another occupation or another vocation before he entered Parliament. That is commonplace. A person will change his vocation many times during his working career. That is why the acquisition of general educational skills is most important.

Mr Stephan: Did you put in a submission along these lines?

Mr HAMILL: I had a number of things to say when the report was issued. They are on the public record and they are there for all the world to see. This afternoon, I am taking the opportunity to make a number of other submissions. I do not know whether every other submission that will be received in relation to this matter will be made fully public.

This afternoon, the honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood) referred to the working party, which made a number of interesting points about the role of the teaching profession. One statement related to the caring function of teachers. That also has generated some alarm in the community. If teachers are to become just generalist teachers, as a large section of the *Education 2000* report would seem to indicate, teachers will become glorified child-care officers rather than educationists.

That leads me to a very important and related point, which is staff mobility and specialisation. One very strong point made in the *Education 2000* report is that greater mobility among primary and secondary staff is needed. That is based on an assumption that there ought to be general teaching skills. That assumption seems to lose sight of the fact that there are very specialist areas of study, particularly in the maths and science arena, which, because of their specialist nature, are not within the capacity of every teacher to teach. As Queensland's education system is demanding greater efficiency in maths and science from students at an early age, particularly those with a view to further tertiary studies, it is unreasonable and impractical to expect every teacher who is presently teaching in the upper classes of a primary school to be competent and confident to teach the specialist areas of maths/science, which are creeping down further and further from matriculation age.

That problem has been addressed by the academic board of the University of Queensland. It expressed a concern that delayed specialisation, particularly in those areas, will perhaps be detrimental to tertiary studies. The threat is being held out that

if the standard of matriculators falls back, the universities may well have to institute or reinstitute their own entrance examinations. That also would be a retrograde step.

Community relevance has also been raised. I liken it to what was said earlier about appropriate people being part of the curriculum bodies. The terms of the report are vague. The report holds out a threat of undue influence from extremists and vocal, well-organised minorities who, in the past, in this State have had the ear of the Minister for Education or, if not his ear, the ear of the Premier. One does not have to go too far back to find organisations such as STOP and CARE, the associates of Mrs Joyner, and so on—

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr HAMILL: I do not know. I dare say that she is still round the place.

Those organisations are endeavouring to turn education in this State back to the Dark Ages, governed by a sort of code based upon the dogmatic excesses of their religious fundamentalism. A similar threat would seem to loom in relation to any move to restrict teacher-training, say, to one type of institution. I hope that the situation will continue in which teachers can be readily recruited through the universities and other tertiary institutions as well as institutions that specialise in teacher-training.

Country areas have also expressed concern about the feasibility and practicality of having senior colleges drawing students from a very large area. Of course, other schools are very concerned that, if the restructuring proposal goes ahead, the lack of funding would put the availability of resources, particularly in laboratories and libraries, out of the reach of the department and indeed the education system in this State.

Honourable members have already heard that Queensland schools, particularly in the secondary school sector, are notoriously underresourced. The education budget constitutes about 23 per cent of consolidated revenue outlays and has in fact had a real increase over the last year. The Opposition welcomes that. Nevertheless, compared to funding levels prevailing in other parts of the nation and, indeed, compared to funding levels which prevailed in education even 10 years ago, an enormous backlog of funding has been necessary to catch up. The backlog occurred as education outlays in this State contracted very much in the latter 1970s. Of course, this present outlay today does not redress that very large backlog.

As I have said, a number of matters are of concern in relation to the concept of Education 2000. I will make a couple of concluding remarks on this particular aspect before moving on. The working party report from which the honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood) quoted was stated to be a blueprint for action. This, of course, has been disavowed by the Minister. I wonder whether, when the report came forward, there was something of a bandwagon effect in the Government with some enthusiasm for it until such time as the full depth of community reaction was ascertained. Maybe the Minister took the tiger by the tail and is now a little chastened by the fact that the tiger is rearing up at him.

I will deal with another aspect of education, that is, advanced education. I notice that, in his introduction of his Estimates today, the Minister was less than totally candid about tertiary places in this State. The Minister has been consistently playing politics in this regard, and today was no exception.

I was very interested to read the report of the Board of Advanced Education. The following is a passage from that report—

“There is in Queensland a determination to improve participation rates in tertiary education, a determination which is being frustrated by Commonwealth funding policies which perpetuate past inequities, whereby Queensland continues to receive a proportion of the total available funding much lower than its proportion of the Australian population.”

That statement gives an indication of the reality. Certainly, Queensland needs additional tertiary places. In fact, the same report indicated that, had places been available in 1984,

about 1 800 qualified students may have found places in the tertiary institutions of this State. It is a tragedy that that shortfall exists.

The report itself gave an indication of the reason for this. The reason is quite clear. It is that there were approximately seven or eight years of non-growth in tertiary education in Australia. In support of this contention, I read from a very learned document which was presented to the annual conference of the Australasian Political Studies Association in Adelaide this year by Smart and Scott et al—

“Fraser kept Commonwealth education spending in real dollars stationary for seven years—”

that is the Government that the Queensland Government supported—

“However, whilst the total educational cake remained static, the sectoral shares of the cake did not. There was a very significant redistribution of shares away from the universities and colleges towards the TAFE sector and away from the government schools sector towards the non-government sector.”

What has been the record of the Federal Labor Government in the short period that it has been in office? For the first time in almost a decade, the tertiary education sector has experienced real growth. The number of places available for students desirous of tertiary education in Queensland has been increased. Those figures ought to be on the record. Again I read from the report of the Board of Advanced Education—

“To be fair, it must be acknowledged that the need has been recognized by Commonwealth authorities in a practical way by the allocation of a large share of the additional available places to this State . . .”

In real terms, in 1984, Commonwealth outlays for tertiary education increased by 4.6 per cent and, in 1985, by 4.7 per cent. What has that meant for Queensland? In 1984, of the 3 000 new places funded for tertiary education in Australia, 700 were provided for Queensland. In 1985, of the 1 300 additional places funded by the Commonwealth Government for tertiary education in Australia, Queensland received 400. It is quite clear, therefore, that Queensland has received the lion's share of new places. That is the initiative of a Labor Government, after seven or eight years of total neglect by the Liberal and National Parties that resulted in no growth in the tertiary education sector.

Of course, we must all strive to achieve additional tertiary places; but, in doing so, we must not be misled by the cheap political point-scoring indulged in by the Minister for Education. That is not only my contention; it is embodied in the 1984 annual report of the Board of Advanced Education, which was tabled in the Chamber this year.

One other aspect of the report that is instructive relates to restructuring of education. The possible blurring of the roles between the universities and the colleges of technical and further education is a matter of concern in the advanced education sector. That is similar to the comments I made in relation to schools vis-a-vis TAFE—a matter at issue in Education 2000. I stated that that represented a fundamental flaw in Education 2000. Quite frankly, if those who argue that there ought to be role definition in the advanced education sector are the mandarins in the bureaucracy who are advocating the blurring of roles in the secondary and immediately post-secondary area, they ought to take note of that report.

I conclude with a remark about Education 2000. The universal value of the good foundation created by a general education ought to be recognised. Schools provide that foundation. I refer to a comment on Education 2000 that is apposite. It comes from the Association of Independent Schools of Queensland—

“In summary, the document Education 2000 lacks any basic philosophy and thus is intellectually bankrupt.”

It holds out the threat that mediocrity will prevail under the Education 2000 proposal. Once the department addresses the important matter of role definition, Queensland should have a far better education system.

Time expired.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (3.4 p.m.): I support the Minister's presentation of the Estimates. I support also the activity in the department since he has been responsible for it. He has achieved a progressive lowering of class sizes, which must be applauded. I thank him particularly for what he has achieved in my electorate.

As one who has, for the first time, a child in the education system, although only at the pre-school level, I am beginning to understand that system better and taking a greater interest in it. The standard of teachers in my electorate is very high. I refer particularly to the standard of the person teaching my child. Unfortunately, she is to be married and will be moving over the border to Moree. I make a personal plea from my wife and me that the Minister find an equally astute teacher next year.

All jokes aside—the standard of teachers in the country is excellent. Rarely is there a dud. In view of today's state of technology and community standards and life-style, education is all-important. If the Government is not able to provide a system of education that outfits children so that they may cope with society as it is today, it will create real problems.

I thank the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) for the building programs that are carried out by his department in conjunction with the Department of Education in my electorate. In the main, the people of my electorate are well served. I look forward to the provision of additional facilities that are needed, and I have already mentioned some of them in my speech on the Estimates presented by the Minister for Works and Housing.

However, the Oakey High School has developed problems associated with an expanding enrolment. The Minister for Works and Housing has previously supported me by the provision of land in areas where present facilities have outgrown demand. The administration block at the Oakey High School is the recycled Dalby Court House. The former member for Condamine bequeathed us that second-hand court house from Dalby, for which I was very grateful at the time. At this stage of the game, however, I feel that, to meet the increased need, it may not be unreasonable for the people in that district to be provided with a new administration block. I should like the Minister for Education and the officers of the Department of Works to look very closely at that matter.

There is also a need for a science-room. As well, library facilities could be provided by utilising a veranda at the school. By having the veranda enclosed by glass, a library could be provided quite cheaply. I ask the Minister to give some consideration to those two matters also.

Associated with the provision of an administration block is the necessity of a sick bay. An unsatisfactory situation exists. It must be remembered that the area would be used by children and, at present, they are left in a room on their own when they are ill. I do not think that that is satisfactory, and facilities should be provided so that someone can attend to them when they are distressed. I look forward to the Minister taking steps to redress that problem.

The tuck-shop facilities at Millmerran have been condemned by the health inspector of the local council. Apparently, the tuck-shop is not up to scratch. That problem needs to be redressed and, with a bit of luck, the provision of a new tuck-shop may soon be under way.

Having asked the Minister for extra facilities, I should now like to thank him for what has been provided in my electorate by the department. Over the past 12 months, a building program has been in operation in the Jondaryan district. Since the establishment of the Jondaryan Woolshed as a tourist attraction, many people have moved to the area. The population has expanded. A reticulated water supply system has been introduced by the town council, and a new pre-school has also been constructed.

As all honourable members would know, Jondaryan is an old, settled area. In years gone by, as many as five hotels were located in the district. Many more people lived there in the past than live there now, and among those who settled the area must have

been some very good drinkers. Much of the former productive areas have been subdivided and, with the ready availability of a water supply, people have moved in and resettled the area. In addition to that, employment has been provided at the Woolshed, and I have discovered that people commute from Toowoomba to Jondaryan on a daily basis.

Mr Davis: That is not a great distance.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is true. Army personnel who live in Oakey commute to Toowoomba, and that is only 12 miles away.

I thank the Minister and the officers of his department for the new pre-school at Jondaryan. I understand that a new Early Special Education Unit will also be provided, and that will be of great benefit to the young children.

Mr Davis: You have not got it yet.

Mr ELLIOTT: The Department of Education is in the process of providing it.

Mr Davis: But you have not got it yet.

Mr ELLIOTT: The concrete has been poured, and that is not a bad start.

Mr Powell: I know where concrete should be poured.

Mr ELLIOTT: I could think of a good spot to drop a blob of concrete—on the honourable member for Brisbane Central. That may quieten him. People tell me that some people can talk under water with a fish in their mouth; the honourable member could talk under wet concrete with a fish in his mouth.

Mr Davis: How is it that you are speaking on an educational matter?

Mr ELLIOTT: Because I am slightly better educated than the honourable member is—but not much.

Mr Henderson: You went further than Grade 3.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, I went just a little further than that.

I was about to refer to Education 2000. It is important that the Minister continue to get the message through to the community that educational planning is an ongoing process that requires input and discussion, so that a decision can be reached relative to how education will be handled in the coming years.

I thank the Minister for his offer to come to my area and discuss the matter with the public, teachers and members of p. and c. organisations. I look forward to his coming to Kingsthorpe so that people can discuss with him all the other problems facing the area. A great deal of development has been occurring in the area——

Mr Davis: Kingsthorpe has about four people and a cow.

Mr ELLIOTT: That shows just how out of touch ALP members are. That remark is typical of their attitude towards and understanding of country areas. The member for Brisbane Central has an understanding of the country that extends back to Steele Rudd's days. His best contacts with the country are through his ancestry.

Mr Turner: He has not been off the concrete footpath.

Mr ELLIOTT: He has not been off the footpath lately, unfortunately, and so has missed the amazing development that has occurred in the Kingsthorpe area. Kingsthorpe is about 25 miles from my home, and at night it looks like a major city. From my home, one can see the lights of Toowoomba glowing over the top of the mountains, but one can see the lights of Kingsthorpe before Toowoomba. They glow at about the same intensity as those at the Army Aviation Centre at Oakey, where about 1 000 people live. An incredible number of people have moved into the area.

The growth of Kingsthorpe has created a great need for further education facilities. The Minister has promised to come to the area to discuss the problems, particularly

those relating to bussing. At present, some children travel to Toowoomba to go to school; others travel to Oakey. It seems that the consensus is that the children should go to school in Oakey. Only recently, I again checked that claim, and I understand that that is still the position. I look forward to the Minister's visiting Kingsthorpe to sort out that problem.

Other members wish to speak in this debate, so I will not take up very much time. However, I do want to refer to training colleges for tourism. I was delighted to hear an announcement by the Minister for Education after the presentation of the Budget that training colleges would be established all along the coast. The college at Gatton—

Mr Littleproud: The Federal Government has put the hospitality service in jeopardy.

Mr ELLIOTT: My colleague from Condamine is correct. I was about to move on to that point. It is something about which I feel very strongly, because over the past five years, I and a number of other members have put a tremendous amount of effort into trying to get the Government to realise the great potential of the tourist industry, and to legislate for and work towards getting facilities of that sort on stream. The recent announcement by the Federal Government of taxation measures related to the hospitality industry really upset us.

To give credit where it is due, at times the Federal Minister for Tourism (John Brown) has done some very useful work in relation to overseas promotion. It ill behoves the rest of the Federal Government not to support John Brown.

Mr Davis: John Brown—

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member hates him because he is a businessman, and probably even makes a profit. That would really upset Opposition members. John Brown even gets up early. He runs a meat-packing business, and I have seen him get up at 4 o'clock in the morning—

Mr Henderson: That is obscene!

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, Opposition members would consider that to be almost obscene. As I said, John Brown has done some good promotion work.

The State Government has run with the ball and provided facilities at Gatton, South Brisbane and TAFE colleges. The Government has received much community support. In Cairns, the business people did something for themselves. They bought the Adobe Motel and educated people there under practical, day-to-day conditions. No better training could be provided. I compliment the people of Cairns on what has been done.

It is incredible that Labor, having seen the results of the work done by so many people, because of its ideology and hatred of people making money or getting anything—John Brown is always being accused of having free lunches—should introduce legislation under which people will be unable to get a job.

Mr Davis: What has this got to do with education?

Mr ELLIOTT: It has a great deal to do with tourism and the young people whom we have been training throughout the State. The State is committed to providing facilities to train 5 000 people for the tourist industry.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member for Brisbane Central is always talking about pollution and the environment. I put to him that the restaurant trade is probably the least-pollutant of businesses. It employs many young people and, more importantly, it employs young people close to where they live.

Mr Scott: What has this to do with education?

Mr ELLIOTT: It has everything to do with education. The Minister has had the foresight to work in with the tourist industry and provide colleges to train people. Next

year, the State will be able to train 5 000 people, but there will be no jobs for them. That is an absolute shame—an utter disgrace! Opposition members should hang their heads in shame for being associated politically with the Federal Government's move.

The restaurant trade in Toowoomba is already down 30 per cent and it is down about 50 per cent in Brisbane. That will knock out——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: Opposition members will be laughing on the other side of their faces. I predict that this move will bring down the Federal Government. All of the young people to whom I referred, together with many people in the motor-car industry, will be without jobs.

The Government must now consider whether the Minister for Education is doing the right thing. The Minister will have to look closely at his budget and ask whether he should have so many facilities for training young people for the tourist industry when they could well be trained and then have to go on the dole. It is absolutely incredible. Opposition members are terribly negative. They cannot bear to think that people might make a profit or have some enjoyment.

I have a few comments to make about taxes on road transport. Recently, in the Adjournment debate, I spoke about a road tax to be levied by way of a metering device. I forecast that it will not be long before those devices are fitted to school buses. The ordinary trucks will be the first to be taxed; the tourist buses will be the second; and I predict that school buses will probably be in third position.

I commend the Minister's Estimates. I am delighted to have taken part in the debate.

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (3.20 p.m.): If one were to accept blindly the pronouncements of the member for Cunningham (Mr Elliott) and the Government's propaganda about the State's educational status, which appears to be so sound, debate would be superfluous. Regrettably, that utopian situation does not exist and, although considerable achievements have taken place, for which I give the Government credit, there is no cause for complacency and, in many areas, disquiet is justified.

The document *Education 2000* has attracted its supporters and its detractors, which is to be expected with any proposal that signals yet another change in education. Although Opposition members have outlined their concern about it, my brief contribution will be mainly in respect of the post-compulsory area. The concept of a P-10 curriculum is highly desirable. The principle of delayed specialisation is educationally sound and it is something that the public has wanted for some time.

The present situation, in which Year 8 students have to make decisions that will determine or cut off their employment paths for life, is unsound and inappropriate for the latter half of this decade. Because it is the first year of high school and means a change of environment, Year 8 is a traumatic year. The Minister made mention of that in his speech, and I have mentioned it over the last couple of years in this place, but there has been very little improvement. Regardless of the fate of *Education 2000*, that situation will continue for some time, and I again remind the Minister of the need for more resource teachers, particularly for Year 8 students, so that the present wastage brought about by poor transition from primary to secondary school and the inadequate development of some students, resulting in their inability to pursue the higher streams of study in Years 9 and 10, can be averted.

Justifiable concern has been expressed that some breadth of education will be lost in Years 11 and 12 under the *Education 2000* proposal, and to some extent I share those concerns. However, I agree that some of the streams of study proposed will undoubtedly find favour with conscientious students who lack top academic ability but seek meaningful career paths. I note that a number of the proposed streams of study closely mirror those in place or proposed in Victoria. With more detailed planning and

some modification, they will adapt well for integration into the Australian Government Priority 1 Program, which has been mentioned today.

Because of the way in which the *Education 2000* proposal came into being, and regardless of its virtues, an odium is attached to it. In all other States in which a review of the education system has been undertaken—and there have been quite a number—input has been received from a wider catchment of opinion and experience, including contributions from across State borders, than was the case in Queensland. My criticism is not of the talented people—I stress that—who served on the committee of review, but rather of the Minister who effectively excluded people who could also have made a valuable contribution. Therefore the suspicion remains that the basic form of the recommendations was decided before the review was officially launched, and it was only the details of the options and not the fundamentals that were open to comment by contributors.

Today, I repeat my greatest concern: unless the overall level of commitment to education by this Government takes a jump in quantum, any action by the Minister and his department will have only inconsequential effects on education in this State. In my view, the Minister has behaved in a cavalier fashion in response to frequently expressed concerns about the restructuring of the school organisation. For example, he has repeatedly denied that the P-10 curriculum will mean changes—to use his words—to the bricks and mortar. The Hervey Bay senior college contradicts that statement, because its establishment was a clear and fundamental departure from existing practice.

There is no doubt that a junior college was to be built at Alexandra Hills. After the Minister held a public meeting down there, the late John Goleby sensed the community resentment and the project was quickly upgraded, firstly, to a high school and, more recently, to a senior college.

The Minister is certainly adept at using semantics to overcome some of the serious questions put to him. In one example, he was at pains to refute that a number of projects that could be seen as evidence of physical reorganisation within the school and TAFE systems were not in fact pilot projects but were trial projects. With the hard evidence of the closed-shop attitude on the preparation of *Education 2000*, most people find that explanation unsatisfactory.

Another concern about the Hervey Bay senior college is that it is located within the electorate of the Minister, and although people expect it to enjoy educational success—I make no secret of that; I believe it will have community approval—one cannot be left with other than a real concern that the inevitable inadequacies—I say that quite deliberately; there will be some—and any unsatisfactory concepts may not be revealed to the same extent as they would be if the college was located elsewhere. I also express my concern that, because the Minister's reputation hangs on the performance of this college, it may be selectively and very favourably resourced—that is to say, the staff appointed may be hand-picked. For instance, I know that the principal who has been appointed is an excellent choice—I know the man; he is a top educator. However, that indicates to me that the staff selected may not be a fair average of the staff that will be available if similar colleges are to be established elsewhere.

The same thing could arise with respect to the level of material resources. In all, the results of this college should come under exceptionally close scrutiny, because they may not be representative of what may be achieved in other colleges that are otherwise identical.

Having regard to Queensland's relatively poor position in relation to education expenditure, the Opposition is entitled to put the proposition: How can large expenditure outlays be justified on multi-sector institutions as a means of broadening the curriculum base for post-compulsory education? I would be surprised if some of the Government members who represent country electorates are not concerned about the Hervey Bay model, because, if it is adopted as a standard model for the future of State education institutions, country areas will be clearly disadvantaged. Frankly, such facilities will not be feasible in areas with small populations.

I am rather interested in the future of the Maryborough college, because, even though it is very close to the Minister's territory, it is a college in relation to which people have been screaming for improvements. I would be very interested to learn whether, in the very near future, an attempt is to be made to spend a great deal of money on that college.

The Australian Government has shown its concern about, and awareness of, the educational needs of the young people of this country, and it has previously attempted to bridge the gap between what was needed and what has been provided within the State system. One example is the Participation and Equity Program (PEP). I will be very frank about that program. When it was announced, it was applauded by everyone except the Queensland Government. This Government followed up its initial criticism and lack of support by not properly controlling the program and by further criticising it. It wanted the Federal Government to hand over the money with no strings attached and, of course, with no accountability. I notice that, last week, in answer to a question by a Government member, the Minister stated as the reason for the cut-backs in a particular program—I cannot remember what it was—that in 1986 the funds available under PEP would be substantially reduced. In effect, the Australian Government was criticised for supplying funds; now it is criticised for reducing them. In his answer, the Minister also neglected to mention that the reason for the cut-back in PEP was the commitment to the new traineeship program.

As I said, the Government has agreed to the traineeship program. In my view, in some ways the PEP program was valuable. In many instances, though, it was inappropriately applied and poorly administered. The Federal Minister for Education would have been well advised to have restricted funding under the program earlier, until there was evidence of a more co-operative attitude from this Government. To put it quite bluntly, instead of being given the full credit for the PEP initiative, the Australian Government has to withstand criticism, which I think is justifiable, from the schools and general community as end-users in the program.

As early as 3 April this year, as reported on page 4843 of *Hansard*, in referring to the report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission released earlier that week, I drew the attention of honourable members to the fact that, although the six-State average per capita spending on education was \$484.91, Queensland's expenditure was the lowest of all the States at only \$422.74 or 87 per cent of the all-State average. As to technical and further education—expenditure per capita in Queensland was \$36.92, compared with the Australian average of \$55.46. In other words, Queensland spent only 65 per cent of the all-States average.

I believe that the Federal Governments of Australia, both present and past, have every justification to take the Queensland Government to task for its present and past misrepresentations about the level of Federal support. Only a week ago, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Tom Burns) asked for a break-down of Commonwealth and State contributions to the Queensland education system. By way of answer, all that he received were the details of the recurrent funding, highlighting the fact that the TAFE sector had only a 20 per cent Federal contribution. What the Minister did not say was that, in the 1981-82 financial year, before the Hawke Government came into office, the TAFE contribution by the Federal Government was in fact 16 per cent.

Mr Powell: I gave an answer to the question I was asked.

Mr SMITH: The Minister could have broadened his answer. I am coming to the reason for that. I think that the Minister well knows what is coming. Because I interjected and asked about the capital contribution, the Minister was fairly hostile.

In overall capital terms, from 1980-81 to 1984-85, for all primary, secondary and TAFE areas, the Federal contribution was in fact 56.7 per cent of the State contribution. When one examines the figures for TAFE—this is where the Minister claimed a contribution of only 20 per cent by the Commonwealth—one finds that the State

contributed about \$28m, compared with the Federal Government's contribution of \$51m. In percentage terms, the State contributed only 35.5 per cent of total expenditure.

Before anyone runs for a calculator, I point out that, during the luncheon recess, I made some calculations using the Minister's figures. In the last financial year, the highest percentage of State funds went to the Kingaroy college, whereas most of the other TAFE colleges were starved for funds. Those funds were directed to that college simply because the Commonwealth would not agree to fund it.

I turn to the record of the Hawke Government in the area of capital expenditure. For 1983-84, the State contributed \$6.5m and the Commonwealth contributed \$15m. The State's contribution was therefore only 30.2 per cent of the total expenditure. In 1984-85, the State contribution was \$8,735,000, while the Commonwealth's contribution was more than \$17.5m. The State's contribution was only 30 per cent.

There is no doubt that figures and statistics can be misused. I have taken the precaution of using the figures quoted by the Minister before the luncheon recess. I am so sure that what I am saying is correct that, if the Minister can show in any way that I am incorrect, I would be willing to apologise.

I do not claim that the Federal Government is always correct. More honesty by the Queensland Government, particularly in respect to funding, would certainly be helpful for serious discussion about education in this State. As I have travelled round the State, it has become evident to me that a very regrettable reduction has occurred in the level of commitment to the formal vocational training in TAFE. I sincerely hope that the new training program will remedy that.

I will make a few comments about my own electorate, and I will mention a couple of matters in relation to the TAFE sector. I will have to skip a couple because I do not have sufficient time to deal with them all. I am concerned that there does not appear to be any country representation on the Board of Adult Education. I will not go into that in detail; I simply ask the Minister to consider it.

I am still concerned about the decentralisation of management. Year after year, long delays occur in the payment of wages to part-time teachers, particularly in TAFE. I have raised that problem previously in this Chamber. It has been remedied once. However, I understand that the same old problem has recurred. It causes those teachers difficulties.

From the time a TAFE teacher with a technical background takes up a position, his or her skills tend to wane. The situation is similar to that of an engineer coming out of a practical position and entering an administrative position. In three years' time, the engineer finds that he or she is well and truly behind the eight ball. The same thing is happening to TAFE teachers, so more attention should be paid to in-service training.

I turn to my own electorate. Naturally, I am delighted with the new college opened recently by the Minister. It is great to see that the institute of technology will open probably next year. However, a major problem has arisen in that the adjacent Pimlico school, which previously used the facilities of the TAFE—I am speaking now of the refectory—has now been denied access to them. It is not really a matter of asking for something new; I am asking that that facility be restored. I believe that the Education Department has asked the Works Department to include it in the program; however, at this stage it has not been done.

The Pimlico school certainly has many students. It is a top school in Townsville, regardless of whether it is a private or public school. More children desire to attend Pimlico than it has places for; but the department's zonal requirement forbids them from doing so. The Government has agreed to build a new school at Condon. I do not oppose that. The locals thought that the school should have been sited in Murray, but I accept the findings of the demographers who studied the region. Tremendous growth is also taking place on the southern outskirts of Townsville, and that will have to be considered seriously in the future if the Government does not want to run into grave educational difficulties.

The Minister mentioned the computer program. Undoubtedly, the State Government has spent a great deal of money in capital terms, as has the Federal Government—although the Minister tries to play that down. I have been informed from a variety of sources that, because of the shortage of money for purchasing software and for the training program generally, the computers are not being utilised to anywhere near the fullest extent. The hardware facilities are very impressive, but their operation presents a pretty poor picture.

I remind the Minister that, last year, I asked that TE scores be released much earlier so that Queensland students would have as good an opportunity as interstate students, whose scores are released earlier, to enter tertiary education or the work-force. I would welcome a commitment from the Minister that a much-improved effort will be made this year to get the TE scores out to give the kids a better opportunity than they have at present.

Last year, a Government member spoke with pride about the centres of continuing education round Brisbane. He spoke about the facilities available. I have had the opportunity of visiting a couple of them, as the Minister is well aware, because I sought his permission to do so. Quite frankly, I was appalled that the facilities are so poor in those centres. I hope that the Minister pays personal attention to that matter.

Time expired.

Mr CAHILL (Aspley) (3.40 p.m.): As anyone reasonably conversant with education knows, the stronger a State Government education system is, the stronger a non-Government system has to become. The Queensland Government recognises that.

It is my pleasant duty to support the Minister's presentation of the Education Estimates from the point of view of the Government's backing of what are generally termed "non-Government"—that is, non-State—schools. Perhaps "non-Government" is the more accurate, because all the schools in this State are supported by this Government, whether they be controlled by the Education Department or not. The Bjelke-Petersen Government—and specifically the Education Department under the direction of the Minister (Mr Powell)—has been, as always, generous in its support of education as supplied by systems other than that of the State.

Queensland has about 400 non-Government schools, with an enrolment of over 100 000 and a teaching strength of almost 7 000. The Government regards it as its duty to support those schools and the parents of the children who attend them.

The State Budget contains an increase of \$2,691,000 in per capita grants for students in non-Government primary and secondary schools. That follows real increases of approximately 6 per cent in the 1984-85 State Budget. Per capita grants for primary and secondary students in non-Government schools have increased as follows—

	\$ p.a.
Primary (existing)	384
(new)	411
Secondary (existing)	621
(new)	666

Increases will be effective from the third term of 1985, which is now.

In the last six years, per capita grants have risen from \$22.5m for the financial year 1979-80 to almost \$59m for the financial year 1985-86. As the Minister has said, this reflects the high priority given to education by the Government and its recognition of the right of parents to educate their children in a school of their choice.

On the subject of increases—the State Budget has provided an additional \$530,000 for increases in the textbook allowance rate for students in Years 8, 9 and 11. Naturally, it is an across-the-board increase, so students in non-Government schools are catered for as well as those in State schools. The Minister has announced that the new rates of allowance are as follows—

Year	Allowance \$
8	48
9	58
10	35
11	98
12	40

That increase follows an average increase of 12 per cent in last year's Budget. The total cost of the textbook allowance for 1985-86 is estimated to be more than \$10.5m.

It can be claimed accurately, therefore, that the level of support by this State Government to non-Government schools is generous. I support the Minister thoroughly when he says that the non-Government school sector plays a very important role within the general school community, which explains the very supportive attitude of the Government to the independent school system and its contribution to education.

The Government believes that each non-Government school is entitled to an equal amount of money per student, irrespective of where the school is situated and regardless of who operates it. However, I, with the Minister, am disturbed with the so-called "needs base" for funding that the Federal Government seems intent on pursuing. The Minister has said also that the 12-point scale on the needs base is open to too much manipulation and patronage.

The Queensland Government's policy of funding independent schools based on an equal amount per student is the fairest way. That, surely, is unarguable. Also, the State Government assists independent schools to the extent of many millions of dollars, by subsidising interest payments on capital costs. If the Federal Government were to be fair to the non-Government sector, it would pay a straight-out per capita grant so that, together with the State Government per capita grant, the schools would receive at least 50 per cent of the current costs of a Government school.

On the other hand, the Federal Government has taken the first step towards gaining control of all non-Government schools, the 12-category system for funding being the thin edge of the wedge.

There is no doubt that many honourable members opposite are privately supportive of the non-Government school sector. Indeed, some of them—perhaps many of them—at some time attended a non-Government school. But there can be no argument that the Australian Labor Party is opposed philosophically to non-Government schools. Philosophically, it follows slavishly the policies of the Australian Teachers Union, which is so strongly opposed to the existence of such schools that it would abolish them. However, even Senator Ryan, the Federal Minister for Education, knows that all have been told by the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) that the taking over of the administration of those schools would be politically disastrous. But there is no doubt that this is the ultimate goal of the Labor Government.

When I say "abolish", I do not mean knock down the buildings; in fact, there was, some years ago a suggestion—a very sneaky suggestion—that the Federal Government take over the payment of salaries of teachers in non-Government schools. That is a very tempting suggestion for a headmaster who is faced with the payment of, perhaps, \$1m in salaries. That is obtaining control through the back door, in my view, because he who controls the purse-strings ultimately can control the curriculum; and when he controls the curriculum, he controls what the teachers may or may not teach and what the students may or may not learn. Private schools will not fall for those tactics.

The Federal Government is using the age-old tactic—in fact it is as old as Julius Caesar—of divide and conquer by giving the so-called needy schools more assistance than those that are deemed to be rich. Categorising of schools on financial grounds achieves nothing but the penalising of those which attempt to raise their own funds. Whilst I am on the subject of divide and conquer—it could appear to be working, from the recent reports in the newspapers.

The Anglican Church has protested strongly to the Federal Government about its funding, but it seems that, in that protest, it is making a veiled attack on the schools owned or operated by the Catholic Church.

As many people would know, Anglican schools are, to a great extent, independent of themselves, whereas other systems, such as the Catholic Education Office, are systemic. But there are more Catholic schools outside that systemic system than there are schools controlled by any other religious persuasion: For example, within the Brisbane Catholic Archdiocese, there are at least 20 schools outside the direct control of the Catholic Education Office,—that is, non-systemic. Of course, they all follow the same theology, but they are independent of themselves, and so fall into the same category as any Anglican, Presbyterian or Methodist school.

I am not saying this to cause further friction. Indeed, my wishes are exactly the opposite. I really mean to point out to those honourable members of the Anglican persuasion, who are criticising the Federal Government, that they are criticising it for the wrong reason. They are being seen as being part of a squabble between controllers of schools in the non-Government sector. Those people, such as the Australian Teachers Union, who would destroy this system—this freedom of choice—will win, while this squabble keeps up.

The Queensland Government will not be changing its policy of equal assistance to all non-Government schools irrespective of their location or of their governing authority. It is absolute nonsense to say that families sending their children to private schools are among society's so-called "elite". Approximately 1 in 4 Queensland children are in non-Government schools. That means that almost a quarter of Queensland families, who are already paying through their taxes to maintain the governmental education system, place high priority on education to the extent that they are willing to pay twice in exercising their right of free choice.

Socialist politicians throughout Australia make no secret of their desire to abolish private or non-Government schools in the interests of socialist conformity and in furtherance of their unremitting war on freedom of choice.

What would be the cost to the tax-payers of Queensland if the socialist side of the ALP was successful, or if every parent with a child in a private school decided to enrol that child in a Government school? That would mean an increase of approximately 30 per cent in the number of students enrolled at Government schools, and there is every reason to expect that the Education Vote would have to be increased commensurately. It is already over 25 per cent of the State Budget.

I have mentioned the attempts by the socialists to divide and conquer by categorising some schools as "wealthy". In the creation of so-called "wealthy schools", there is one very important factor that I ask honourable members to note quite carefully. That factor is the high level of bequests and donations made by past ladies and old boys—persons who remember with gratitude the benefits they received from their school.

Instead of exhibiting jealousy and resentment, persons who are opposed to non-State education would be better advised to inculcate a similar feeling of loyalty and appreciation in the graduates from State schools, most of whom are top people. As I said at the beginning of my speech, parents who exercise their right of choice in a different way, and choose the State-school system, actually receive a major benefit from the existence of non-Government schools.

This Government believes that all parents have a right to expect Federal Government support for their children's education in return for what is paid to Canberra in taxes. In other words, this Government is living up to its promise; its continued promise of supporting a freedom-of-choice society.

I congratulate the Minister and the Government on their support of the non-Government sector, and I have much pleasure in supporting this area of the Education Estimates.

Ms WARNER (Kurilpa) (3.52 p.m.): I also wish to talk about the matter of choice within education, and how, even given budgetary constraints, this Government has not seen fit to implement that idea in as good a manner as it could have done. I want to talk about the Government's preference for listening to what could be described as fundamentalist groups and being very sympathetic to their points of view and dictates. Of course, I am talking about those notorious organisations STOP and CARE, which have had such an influential role to play in Queensland's education policy over the past few years. Unfortunately, in my opinion, they seem to be having an increasing influence. I will explain why later.

One of the problems that emerge when groups such as those are allowed to influence education is that the variety and range of educational ideas and programs in schools are restricted. Of course, the community has seen the notorious banning of material for many years—starting off with SEMP and MACOS—the less obvious but nevertheless influential tinkering with curriculum development, and the outright banning of material from the Human Rights Commission, the Red Cross Society and peace studies and suchlike.

There has already been much debate in this Chamber on those matters, and even on the work done by the department's own religious studies curriculum development section. They have been sifted and sorted out to promote the idea of that fundamentalist sect which has the ear of the Cabinet—to the detriment, I believe, of the education of children in Queensland and of the progress that could be made in that area.

Let me look at this insidious and creeping fundamentalism that is taking over Queensland education. Because of the attitude of the Minister, it is seemingly unable to be prevented. I do not believe that he is as blinkered as the groups to which he listens. Nevertheless, he must agree with me that the aim of fundamentalists such as Mrs Rona Joyner is not to educate in a critical manner, where all ideas have equal tenancy within the market-place of the school and where children can make up their own minds about what are correct and what are incorrect attitudes.

They do not seek to encourage in young children a critical appraisal of knowledge, and only by the critical appraisal of knowledge do we learn anything. Only in that way has humanity advanced since the beginning of time. If that critical element in education is denied, progress is also denied.

I suggest that that is what fundamentalist groups wish to do. They wish to deny progress and change for the people of Queensland. They wish to maintain the inequalities that exist in our society. All the matters that Governments are supposed to address—the social problems, the difficulties that individuals experience in their daily lives—in an open and frank way to better organise society so that more people may feel more secure and live happier lives will not come about when progress and change are denied. When beneficial change is denied, that can never happen.

It is unfortunate that the influence of this ideology is present in the Education Department. I do not say that it is present throughout the whole system but, unfortunately, it is cropping up more and more as these groups gain more and more credibility with the Queensland Government.

Fundamentalist thought emerged with the label "fundamentalism" out of depressed and beleaguered communities in rural America in the last century. Those communities believed that living in society was so bad for them that they could maintain their optimism only in the belief that the second coming of Christ was just round the corner. They adjusted their thinking to purify themselves in such a way that they would be ready for the second coming. The many false predictions of a second coming caused these people to revise their thinking. Nevertheless, they persisted, and one of their tenets was that the literal interpretation of the Bible was the correct one and that any kind of educated analyses of contradictions in the Bible were to be eschewed because they did not lead to a feeling of security.

These people used the Bible as a blinker or security apron. Their thinking was not accepted by the whole of society. Honourable members should realise that the whole of society, since the time of capitalism—which I am sure this Government strongly supports—has changed radically and quickly. Technological changes have produced enormous social changes and will continue to do so irrespective of the efforts of the fundamentalist groups. However, by actually preventing new ideas from coming forward, they tend to make the changes less beneficial rather than more beneficial in terms of sorting out social problems in society.

We have witnessed a rather ridiculous situation in Queensland in which, in the name of pluralism, the Minister has ordered that creation science be taught. Creation science is such a hidebound, dogmatic version of the beginning of humanity that it leaves no room for pluralism. People who accept that God made the world like this in seven days—although that defies the credulity of the average child—actually prevent further thought on the subject. Yet the Minister is introducing fundamentalism into our schools under the guise of pluralism. Therein lies the incredible hypocrisy at the heart of what he is doing. In the name of introducing more and more ideas, he is preventing ideas from gaining currency in schools. He is introducing creationism and, at the same time, is banning materials developed by humane societies who look at social development and life as they really are, or as they see they really are. I would like to hear the Minister's arguments as to why materials are banned from schools if creationism is to be accepted in the spirit of pluralism, as he has suggested it should be.

The ideological roots of fundamentalism must be looked at very carefully, because it has attracted a group of people who are very inward-looking and who see that change is necessarily bad, even if it is motivated by a desire to create a better world for the people who live in it. The ideology is that, theologically speaking, it is best to hang on to some outdated notion of what was considered by the previous generation to be right rather than to critically evaluate theology, which, of course, takes place in many religions that have survived and are good for society.

Among all the religious sects that exist today, fundamentalism is morally bankrupt. That is because it does not see that it is important to make our society a better society. It takes no responsibility for the human condition, and it would rather shape its concerns round the salvation of the individual soul than the betterment of society. As I said, that is predicated on the notion that the second coming is just round the corner.

This particular theology attracts an essentially authoritarian personality, and it permits the injustices and inequalities that exist today, which are perpetrated by the powerful and by those who have a vested interest in their maintenance and who exacerbate them, to continue unabated. It allows people to be exploited; it reinforces the attitude that the powerful are always right; and it has little concern for what more enlightened Christians would call God's children—the poor, the lonely, the widowed, the children, the lame, the blind and the imprisoned. That is a biblical quotation. Of course, all honourable members are aware of the attitude of this Government towards those who are imprisoned—it cares not one jot!

On the basis of that theology, throughout the Department of Education, fear and intimidation are developing among the professionals who have been educated and who know what the notion of critical inquiry is. They have taken time out to do some independent research and they know what they are talking about; yet their advice and professional opinion is trampled on by directives from the department. That occurs in a very covert way. One of the problems faced by the Opposition, not only at this level but at other levels, is that the people who implement Government policy are so frightened and intimidated about their jobs that they are not prepared to give a frank, open and professional opinion about what the department does.

One of the subjects that I wish to address today—I have raised it in this Chamber time and time again—is the very important question of the development of programs for equality. The Federal Government has addressed the question, and I will quote from *Government in Focus*.

Mr McPhie: Queensland is the only State in which there is no discrimination.

Ms WARNER: The honourable member should take another look at that statement, because it can be demonstrated clearly that this Government does not believe that discrimination exists. On several occasions in this place, the Minister for Education has stated that girls are not discriminated against in education and that there is no sexism in education. Last week, in answer to a question from me, the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) said that there was no discrimination against women in employment in Queensland. That statement is not borne out by the fact that women in Queensland are an exceedingly disadvantaged group, even though we make up 51 per cent of the population. Instead, women are treated as a disadvantaged minority, and that is a gross injustice.

I will quote from the *Government In Focus* Commonwealth introduction to the Participation and Equity Program (PEP) from Senator Susan Ryan who said—

“We live in a society which is both diverse and unequal. It is no longer sufficient to argue that equal opportunity comes from giving all students access to the same kind of curriculum in the same kind of school.”

What she is saying is that if disadvantaged people are treated on an equal footing with others, and if they have the same skills and ability, they are being done a disservice, and that the disadvantage they already suffer is being compounded.

There needs to be an equalisation of levels. If that position is taken, the assumption is that all people start from the same point. What I am suggesting to the Committee is that society is so fundamentally unequal that children entering schools do not begin from the same point; they begin from different points. Those differences have to be accommodated within the system, otherwise the system itself perpetuates that disadvantage and that disservice to those children. That is where inequity exists, and that is how inequality is perpetuated.

I have mentioned on numerous occasions that the Australian society has an innate sense of fair play, an innate sense that life should not be different for different people when that is beyond their control—whether because of their parents or because of where they live; whether they are born girls or whether they are disabled. People themselves are not to blame for those disadvantages. It is our responsibility—and it is the Government's responsibility—to take notice of those disadvantages so that they may be corrected. I do not say that all people should be the same; I say that they should be given an equal chance. To do that, existing disadvantages must be taken into account.

One of the things that the Participation and Equity Program in secondary schools, as outlined by the Federal Government, is committed to is the removal of the barriers to full and equal participation by young girls, people from lower socio-economic groups, Aborigines, students from non-English speaking backgrounds, the disabled and others for whom there has not been a fair go and who have been excluded from many areas of Australian life. This Government is more interested in the dictates of the fundamentalists, to whom I have previously referred, and prefers to ignore the Federal Government's attempts to address the inequalities that exist within the system.

I will give one brief example from many examples that I have of the way in which that federally funded program has been subverted by the State Government. Seventy-five per cent of the funds that the Commonwealth Government has made available should be spent on the ground in schools. One of the problems is that although many people within the education system know what is going on, they are incapable, unwilling or frightened to give actual times and dates, but they will say—given the circumstances and the record of the Government, I believe them, because it is quite plausible—that some of those funds that should have been spent on the ground in schools have been spent in other ways, one of which was to fund the International Youth Year discussion on *Education 2000*. That is not spending money on disadvantaged children in disadvantaged areas. It is also reliably rumoured that that money has been used to fund the secondary operations unit, which is a curriculum-based unit. Because it is in the schools that the

disadvantage exists and it is in the schools and on the ground that the money should be used, that is a scandal. I have not very much time left, so I will simply point out to the Committee that PEP will need considerable monitoring by the Federal Government.

One entertaining, if rather bizarre, incident occurred recently. It was decided within the Education Department that the issue of *Quest*, which is sent out by the department to schools, would deal with the subject of education of girls. When the copy went to the departmental officials, it was savagely censored. All reference to the Commonwealth's funding initiatives was deleted, as well as reference to the teachers' unions and the equal opportunity resource units. Quite laughably and ludicrously, the department was so petty that the photograph on the front of that magazine, which was of a girl student apparently in class, with her hand raised to answer a question, was changed, on the ground that it was too militant to depict a girl with her hand raised, to a photograph of a girl sitting passively looking over her shoulder. They are the lengths to which the department has to stoop—

Mr Powell: What are you talking about?

Ms WARNER: I am talking about *Quest*, the magazine that is sent to schools by the Education Department. That is what actually happened. Censored and uncensored versions of that magazine are available. The lengths to which the Minister allows that type of thinking in Queensland today are ludicrous.

Time expired.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (4.12 p.m.): I rise to speak in support of the Estimates for Education. Some of the comments by the previous speaker left me dumfounded. I could not give any credence to them.

It is my intention to outline in some detail the role of primary education, its achievements and its likely development in the future. Primary school education represents the first seven years of compulsory education. It can be said that primary school lays the foundation upon which individuals develop their specific talents for later life. Primary schools develop the basic skills of communication and computation and begin the spiralling process of learning about our society, science and other skills. The Queensland Education Department has served the State extremely well for many years. Its worth can be judged by comparing the attainment levels of our children with those of children in other States. It can be said that, in all standardised attainment tests used, the children in Queensland perform as well as or better than their counterparts in other States.

The amount of money spent per capita in education is often used to gauge the worth of a State's education system. It is true there is some relevance between money and quality, but I insist that such a relationship is only a guide. Such a system does not take into account the efficiency with which the money is expended. It does not take into account the difference in costs of buildings, heating and cooling of buildings and many other factors. In fact, a great number of factors must be considered when drawing comparisons and these same factors prove completely the inaccuracy of the comparison between education quality and per capita expenditure.

It is my own personal opinion that the theory that the more one spends on education, the better the education, results in ill-advised expenditure. In the private sector, the method of ensuring economic profit or even survival is to attain quality at the lowest possible price. If that maxim is true in the private sector, surely it must also apply in education. Bearing that in mind, if our schoolchildren are shown, by way of standardised tests, to have attainment levels equal to any in Australia, yet our level of per capita expenditure is lower than that in most States, it clearly indicates that the Queensland Government is able to produce the same level of education more efficiently.

I would offer the same advice to school principals and parents and citizens associations. A tremendous number of teaching aids are available on the market. Some are most effective; some I regard as pure gimmickry.

In my experience as a primary school teacher, I visited a number of schools, and I could say in all sincerity that, in every school, I saw expensive teaching aids lying idle in cupboards, in stock-rooms or on class-room shelves. It is very easy for a teacher to substitute expensive gimmickry in the form of teaching aids for well-prepared and well-presented lessons using a minimum of aids but depending upon sound teaching techniques and the persuasive powers of a strong personality. The substitution may not be deliberate; nevertheless, it occurs. That being the case, I am of the opinion that parents and citizens associations and principals should examine seriously their expenditures on equipment and expendables to determine whether cost savings could be made. The cost of duplicating paper in schools is astronomical, yet I can state confidently that, in many cases, whereas a duplicated sheet is handed to a child, a simple piece of work on a blackboard or the use of an overhead projector could be substituted at much lower cost.

As a parent of school-age children, I am very much aware of the costs involved in education. Parents are constantly asked to pay for art equipment, work pads, school uniforms, bus fares, new shoes and so on. Add to that the urging of the p. and c. association to generously support school functions, and one soon realises the concern of the average parent about the cost of education today.

It is a fact that parents do not want to deny their children the best education that they can afford. However, the average parent also wants money to be spent wisely and efficiently.

I firmly believe that the Education Department is using its funds efficiently. I have previously demonstrated that the attainment levels of Queensland children compare most favourably with those of children in other States, yet this State's per capita expenditure is lower. That proves my point.

I believe that in the area of intraschool expenditure by principals, staff and p. and c. associations, further trimmings may be possible without necessarily jeopardising educational standards.

I turn now to teacher-training. I am of the opinion that teacher-training colleges should place greater emphasis on teaching techniques. As teacher-training is now in the hands of autonomous colleges, the department can no longer direct. However, I hope that the colleges are willing to listen. Complementing this is the absolute necessity on the part of principals to ensure that young teachers are given explicit assistance and direction to enable them to become part of a co-ordinated staff that provides a continuous learning experience for children from Year 1 to Year 7.

In recent years, the tendency has been for schools to closely co-ordinate once again the efforts of all year levels. That is to be commended. Prior to that, in an era when individual professionalism was the in thing, I saw evidence of teachers going off in all directions. Those teachers were probably teaching a very worthwhile subject-matter, but, unfortunately, it was perceived by the parents as not bearing much relationship to what was being taught in the previous year or what would be taught the following year.

I note that the present policy of the department is to have considerable in-service training aimed at the principals of schools. They have the very important role of being the agents of change within schools. I fully support such a policy, because it creates a situation in which the principal introduces overall changes in a subject and ensures that innovations are carefully co-ordinated throughout the school.

I spoke earlier about the danger of teachers using gimmicky teaching aids at the expense of sound teaching techniques. In defence of the teaching profession, I must state that I firmly believe that, if this has happened, it is largely because such a practice has been forced upon teachers.

Education theory says that each child is a unique individual with quite distinct abilities and needs. That being the case, he or she must receive special attention. That sounds quite logical, but it was my experience as a teacher that to put such a theory into practice perfectly was impossible.

Bearing in mind that lessons in primary schools usually last 30 minutes, I found it impossible to set a number of different individual lessons in progress, to give individual instruction to each child and then to adequately correct all the individual work in that short time.

Mr Comben: You were a bit slow.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I could handle fellows like the honourable member for Windsor pretty well.

Teaching is a very difficult profession. It drains a person mentally and emotionally. The pressure of providing individual care for each child places tremendous pressure on the teacher—too much pressure, I believe—and can lead to the inevitable burn-out syndrome that is spoken about in teaching circles today.

Smaller classes will reduce the pressure on teachers, and the Education Department has reduced class sizes considerably. I admit that as yet it has not achieved its aim of having all classes at the level it deems ideal. However, great progress towards that end has been made.

It is my opinion that, although reducing class sizes is admirable, it is only one area that needs to be addressed to ensure that our education standards remain high and that the teachers of the department are not overtaxed.

I believe that the volume of content in the curriculum should also be carefully examined. It appears to me that the department is pressed to include new subject-matter into the curriculum, but finds it difficult to exclude matter, because it is difficult to say that something is irrelevant. The times allotted to various subjects are also worthy of close scrutiny. I believe that some subjects are given time far in excess of their true worth. However, that is a personal opinion.

No doubt the Minister's officers continually address such matters, but I mention them today because I feel that they are worthy of further consideration.

Mr Comben: Which subjects are you talking about?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I would rather not mention them here; I can discuss them with the Minister privately.

The 1985 school year saw the beginning of a new educational region—the Peninsula Region—which is functioning well. It has some unique challenges, namely, distance education and providing education to the Torres Strait Islanders. Previously, those children were under the control of the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs.

I note that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander consultative committee has been set up to advise the department on the needs of the indigenous people. I understand that, as a result of consultation with that committee, special curriculums are being developed to suit the needs of the Islander population. In particular, bilingual programs and mathematics suited to the local community are innovations. Without doubt, as the region has been under the department's control for less than 12 months, much still remains to be achieved in the Torres Strait area; but I have confidence that, given time, the educational services provided to the children in that area will be equal to those elsewhere in the State.

Curriculum developments continued during 1985. At the beginning of 1985, a new handwriting program was introduced in Year 1. The new method, more efficient in hand movement and claimed to improve legibility and style, was carefully researched. It was obvious that such an innovation had to be introduced in Year 1. Given time, it will become the norm at all levels. I have every confidence that, in the meantime, the teachers of Queensland will gradually develop the skill throughout their schools as the present Year 1 students progress through their schooling.

It is the intention of the Education Department to have syllabuses in language, arts and maths that will provide a continuum of learning from Years 1 to 10. Those syllabuses

have been further planned and assessed during the last 12 months. I noted wherever Education 2000 meetings were held that that concept was readily accepted by the public.

In social studies, new resource materials are being developed. In this subject area lies a great opportunity to develop an awareness of our Australian life-style and an understanding of our social controls. There also exists the opportunity to develop positive attitudes about such matters. If our young people up to Year 10 are able to learn how our society works and to appreciate our heritage, as adults they will be able to exercise their democratic rights without the danger of being influenced and manipulated through ignorance.

During the last 12 months, 10 new primary schools have been built. It is noteworthy that a sports oval is now a standard facility at all new schools. I commend the Minister for that initiative. It has been proved that a child's scholastic achievements improve if his physical fitness is improved. Therefore, facilities for sport and physical education are essential. I was pleased to learn also that a principal is appointed to a new school well in advance of its opening, allowing him to organise before the arrival of students. That is a commonsense move.

I commend the practice of forming p. and c. associations prior to a school's opening. The role of a p. and c. association is invaluable. It is no mean task to create that body for a new school. Any steps that the Education Department is able to take for its formation are to be encouraged.

Mr Comben: Unpaid tax-gatherers; that's all they are.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The member for Windsor has no regard for his children, evidently, and does not want to be part of their education system. He is not prepared to make any contribution. He expects the State to do it all.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. As the honourable member ought to know, I have no children—that I know of.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I accept the first part of the honourable member's statement. I am not quite sure about the second part.

I note in reports emanating from the department that library resources continue to be expanded. The grants provided by the Government to help stock libraries with such aids as video tapes, blank audio tapes and audio-visual hardware highlight the fact that the very nature of school libraries has broadened considerably. All schools receive a library resource grant, the size of which is calculated on a per capita basis. All schools with an enrolment in excess of 300 have a library staffed by a trained teacher/librarian.

I am pleased to note the emphasis placed on teaching library skills in all their forms. Without doubt, the need to continually educate ourselves beyond formal schooling will increase. It is vital that children are taught the skills of research, recording and reporting, so that, in future, they are able to gain access to various sources of information to educate themselves in whichever field they choose.

The department has continued to expand the number of teachers, though not at a rate some would desire. Those detractors must realise that the department is limited by budgetary constraints, which are set by the Government in answer to a call from the electorate at large for reduced Government spending. Members of the Opposition are in the fortunate position of being able to highlight areas needing more funding and of being free of the realities of Government. It could be said that members of the Opposition are often hypocritical in their approach, because, on the one hand, they charge the Queensland Government with being excessive in its imposition of governmental charges and, on the other, they allege that the Queensland Government does not spend enough. If the Queensland Government is to keep governmental charges at a minimum, as it has done, logically it must limit its expenditure.

At present, the allocation for education is the largest of those in the State Budget for all areas of government. The amount set aside for education has been increased

continually over the years, and I feel sure that the Government will continue to increase the allocation within its budgetary constraints, ever mindful of the need to give quality in education on a cost-efficient basis.

I notice in the data supplied by the department on staffing that of more than 11 000 primary school teachers employed by the department, 2 390 are now four-year trained. The percentage of teachers who have obtained a degree is also rising, and that is to be commended. However, I am keen to see occur a growth in the level of inspectorial involvement of the department that will ensure that people who are most effective in the class-room are recognised and receive due consideration when promotions are being offered. I mention that, particularly in respect of those whose formal qualifications might not be as high as the qualifications deemed necessary.

I have no argument to offer against the consideration of education qualifications when appointments are made, but I believe that people who do not hold high academic qualifications often possess outstanding abilities in teaching techniques, and have a good influence on the formation of character in children. Such people sometimes go unrewarded because the inspectorial staff do not see enough of the abilities they possess, and tend to rely instead on the listing of a teacher's tertiary qualifications when they make decisions about promotion. An increased inspectorial staff would also assist greatly the administration of schools by disseminating new techniques and subject-matter throughout the schools system.

In conclusion, I again highlight certain initiatives announced in the 1985-86 State Budget that add weight to the Government's contention that the Queensland Department of Education caters for present educational needs and is already planning for the future. The education Vote in the State Budget is \$1,174,784,700, which represents an increase of approximately \$102,200,000, or 9.5 per cent, on the Vote in the 1984-85 Budget. The primary education sector will gain a further 396 teachers of the 1 087 new teachers who will be employed. In addition, eight new primary schools will be established. In a separate area of primary education, \$120,000 has been allocated to upgrade School of the Air facilities. There will be a continuation of the Computer Education Program in the amount of \$5m. Further development in this field includes development of curriculum material, regional support centres and assistance to primary schools in the purchase of computer equipment.

Non-Government schools in the State received an increase of \$2,691,000 in per capita grants. The previous grant for primary schools was \$383 per annum for each student. This year, the rate has increased to \$411 per annum for each student, and that increase is effective from third term in 1985.

Remote area allowances have also been increased. The remote area tuition allowance will range from \$472 to \$945, and the hostel allowance will be \$369 per head for students who live in remote areas. The rate for a travel allowance depends on location, and it ranges from \$53 to \$475. The travel allowance will be payable at the beginning of 1986.

The achievements and initiatives I have listed, which pertain to primary education, provide evidence to substantiate the claim that the Queensland Department of Education is doing a splendid job. I pay tribute to the Minister. As a member of his parliamentary committee, I have been made acutely aware of his capability and his positive practical approach.

I also congratulate the Director-General of Education, Mr George Berkeley, and his departmental officers on the role they have played. During my speech, I have offered specific comments, and I wish to point out that they were offered in a constructive sense so that they may be considered by the Minister.

In conclusion, I declare my strong support for the Education Estimates for 1985-86.

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (4.29 p.m.): I have pleasure in joining in the debate on the Estimates of the Department of Education. Because education is being discussed in the Chamber today, I have to say that, insofar as election campaigns are concerned,

members of the National Party are among the best educated people I know or have come across for some time. Their high standard of education can be seen in an instruction that was issued by senior police officers to police officers in the Wynnum district very recently. That instruction suggested that they should make a thousand arrests before Christmas in that district, but they should not arrest anyone from Redlands electorate before the by-election. That shows what an educated group members of the National Party are, and it shows that, when talking about education, the cunning and smartness of people such as the Government members should not be underestimated. It is pretty clever not to arrest people prior to a by-election campaign if one wants their votes.

Mr Powell: I think you might be joking.

Mr FOURAS: I am not. What I have said is absolutely true. I can inform the Minister that a direction has been issued by senior police officers at police headquarters outlining what the quota is for the next three months, but specifying that no-one from the Redlands electorate should be arrested before the by-election. My credibility is on the line, and I state quite clearly that what I have said is true.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Menzel): Order! The honourable member for South Brisbane must return to the subject-matter of the debate.

Mr FOURAS: I certainly will, Mr Menzel. I assure you that, from now on, my comments will be strictly related to the Education Vote.

When one talks about the role of the Government in education, one has to look at two aspects. Firstly, the Government has to fund and resource educational units. It has to fund and resource pre-schools, primary schools, secondary schools and TAFE colleges. Secondly, it has to have regard to factors relating to the curriculum and the aims of education at all levels. That raises a question that I want to develop today about who controls curriculums—whether it is the professionals in the Education Department or the politicians. Considering what has been happening in Queensland for some time, that question has to be asked.

There is no doubt that all the schools I mentioned come under the control of the State. Tertiary institutions are not controlled by the State because they are totally funded by the Federal Government. That has given tertiary institutions some sort of safety valve by way of autonomy, so at least academic freedom exists within them. It ought to continue to exist, because surely the State ought not have any control over a system in which the people being taught are adults. Surely adults in the tertiary system should be able to think for themselves. I am concerned about some other aspects of tertiary education to which I will refer later.

A problem exists at the Griffith University with regard to a bachelor of arts course, the proposals for which outline some optional parts of the course which could make up a maximum of one quarter of the undergraduate degree. Much heat is being generated at the university by this National Party Government's trying to interfere in the system.

To return briefly to funding—it has been well catalogued in this Chamber that the funding of schools in Queensland has continued to be parsimonious. Queensland has the lowest funding on education per capita. I will not cite statistics because they bore people, but it is a fact—

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr FOURAS: They are, because every day people are told how little the Government spends on education.

I refer to one area of funding that has really upset me, and it relates to this Government's stopping the student allowance at the beginning of this year. There had been no previous announcement of that change. Poor families, including single mothers, were told by the schools before the school year started of the abolition of the miserable, paltry \$54 student allowance that they had been receiving so that they could send their children to secondary school with the proper books, uniforms and other basic essentials.

It covered only a very small fraction of the cost, but at least it was something. At that time, the Minister said quite clearly that he saw the allowance as a welfare measure. I say quite sincerely that the decision was not in the interests of children, who should have equality of opportunity. How can they achieve equality of opportunity if they turn up at school without the proper books and uniforms and are penalised from day one? They have no chance of achieving equality of opportunity in the education process. The Minister and the Government should be ashamed.

The Government is sick and twisted if it cannot find at least as much money as is found in other States to help children from poor families. For example, the New South Wales and Victorian Governments find in excess of \$200 a year for children in Years 8, 9 and 10 if their parents receive maximum social security benefits. That is done so that children can be given what we on this side of the Committee believe is an equal opportunity. If children from poor families go on to Years 11 and 12, the Federal Government gives them quite a good deal of money. They receive a tangible amount to enable them to stay at school. But what is the point of the Federal Government's making thousands of dollars available to children from poor families if they are to drop out before they reach Year 11?

At a school in my area, a child used to turn up with a piece of wood wrapped in brown paper because he did not want the other children to know that he had a single mother who could not give him enough money to buy lunch. He did not want to be embarrassed; he did not want to be different. He did not want to be the scapegoat; he did not want to be different. At the beginning of every school year, a dozen or so distraught people come to my electoral office. They are worried because they cannot find the \$200 needed to send their children to high school. If they were in southern States, they would get that money. Their position would be assessed prior to their children's attending high school and they would get the money.

I am advised by the Auditor-General that the Government has \$58.8m in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The Government is crying poor, and it really does not care about the plight of these people. If it was fair dinkum, if it was committed, the welfare programs would be better funded.

I am concerned about other areas of funding that affect the constituency that I represent in this Parliament. I might add that it is very well represented. Queensland suffers from a lack of State funds for multicultural education. The Queensland Government is the only State Government that does not believe in having community languages taught in school. Queensland is the last bastion of monolingualism. For some reason, the Government is frightened about people learning their own languages. In interstate schools, community languages are taught. Surely in my electorate, Greek, Vietnamese and Italian could be taught. At the New Farm School, surely Italian and Vietnamese could be taught to all the children. If that were done, prejudice and discrimination would be eliminated. The children would learn to value their language and their culture.

The money for disadvantaged schools comes from the Federal Government, just as multicultural legislation comes from the Federal Government. It is very unfortunate that the Queensland Government under-resources Queensland schools, and it performs shockingly in the special areas.

I return to the discussion on curriculum control. In recent years, the Government has tried to exert reactionary ideology on the curriculums for both primary and secondary schools. The attempt began in earnest with the banning of MACOS in primary schools from 1978. That was followed by the banning of SEMP from secondary schools in 1979. Since then, honourable members have witnessed a litany of Government interference in school curriculums. There was the banning from Queensland secondary schools of the Curriculum Development Centre's human rights materials; the banning of references in the multicultural kit; the banning of the Curriculum Development Centre's antisexism materials; the banning of peace education; the refusal to allow children to participate in the flag competition; the banning of popular theatre troupes from performing in Queensland secondary schools.

The Government's attempted control is operating in many diverse ways. For example, sex education in school hours is denied to all Queensland secondary students. Certain science is being imposed in all Queensland science courses. Pressure is sought to be placed on teachers relative to the use of certain books in literature courses. A climate of fear has been set up amongst many teachers. That has become part and parcel of what schools are about—a climate of fear and a climate of intimidation among teachers.

Since the banning of MACOS and SEMP, anything progressive in Queensland schools with regard to curriculums and practice is under suspicion or is banned. The Premier's famous comments were quoted in *The Courier-Mail* of 23 February 1978, following the banning of MACOS and SEMP, in this way—

“There is someone over there (he meant the Education Department) who does not seem to know what the Government wants taught in schools. The trend in recent years seems to have changed in certain areas to what it was. We expect the department to be alert to what the Government wants.”

That is what the Premier said, and that is what the Minister supports. Since then, department officials have ensured that school curriculums contain what the Government wants, and that has much to do with standards, ideology and interference.

Anything progressive in education comes from Canberra, either from the Hawke Labor Government or from previous Governments. It is then rejected out of hand or watered down in Queensland. Queensland children are denied many of the opportunities available to children in less authoritarian States. They are denied opportunities to become active and critical social participants in grossly under-resourced schools.

I turn now to discuss the interference by the State Government in tertiary education, and I will refer specifically to the current debate that has become a cause celebre at Griffith University.

Tertiary education is fully funded by the Federal Government, and there has been an increase in real terms in that funding. That contrasts with the State Government's funding for education, which has decreased in real terms.

Courses at colleges of advanced education are controlled to some extent by a statutory authority, that is, the Board of Advanced Education. In the last few years, the State Government has sought to interfere in the curriculums and operations of CAEs, and it has denied any notion of academic freedom. It must be emphasised that a democratic society requires the existence of groups of people who have the opportunity to think deeply, and often critically, about society as well as to develop and exchange ideas. The State Government has attempted to restrict such freedom in the CAEs, and I will give the Committee a number of examples.

In late 1983, the Queensland Government, through the Board of Advanced Education, attempted to impose a set of uniform and very restrictive by-laws upon all the CAEs in Queensland.

Mr Powell: What by-laws?

Mr FOURAS: I am referring to sections 3 and 4 of the draft by-laws as outlined in a letter in my possession, which I will not read because it will take too much of my time.

Mr Powell: Do you mean the Financial Administration and Audit Act?

Mr FOURAS: No. That draft by-law dealt with how people could be sacked or removed from teaching in schools for statements that they made or for activities in which they were involved outside of the system. That was the draft by-law that the Minister refused to accept.

Following the amalgamation of James Cook University and Townsville College of Advanced Education, the State Government attempted to impose restrictive, anti-academic-freedom by-laws on the amalgamated institution. At various times, pressure

has been brought to bear on college-directors, particularly at the Brisbane CAE, regarding the political involvement of academic staff in anti-Queensland-Government activity.

As has already been said, people with ideologies that are very similar to those of this Government have attempted to interfere in the curriculums and in the direction of universities in this State. With the banning of the MACOS concept, STOP and CARE appeared. Then there was Rona Joyner, who is a member of the National Party, and now we have Women Who Want to be Women, led by Jackie Butler, who is also a member of the National Party. That group is circulating a petition at Griffith University. I think that those women should have called their group "Women Who Want to be Doormats". My wife, who is far from being a feminist, on hearing the title of the group, said to me, "Surely I wouldn't want to be a woman; I know I am one."

A petition has been circulated at Griffith University by those who spell out the new Right ideology. They believe in flat-rate taxes and deregulation and do not want a just and equal society. They want the State Government to investigate all courses that consider women, the family or sexuality; they want control over such courses.

The petition, of which I have a copy, gives two telephone numbers for those who want further information. I rang one of the numbers—I did not say who I was—and asked what the group was about and whether there was any political ideology behind it. I was told that the Premier and the Minister for Education support the group, and that all they want is for me to sign the petition so that the group can influence the structure of the courses at Griffith University. These people are supporting Professor Caton, who addressed a branch meeting of the National Party about a course at Griffith University. I have read that speech, and I found it to be absolutely astonishing.

The report of Professor Caton's address reads—

"I reluctantly concluded that the course vetting mechanisms were unlikely to sustain the objections of a single individual. . .

The pertinent question for us is how Parliament should respond to petitions for an inquiry into teaching on the family in Queensland tertiary institutions. The petitions express the apprehension that the tertiary classroom is used to undermine family values.

. . .

Politically they are a plea that the government honour the National Party's commitment to uphold the family."

He expressed some phenomenal ideas. He spoke about the conservative position.

The report of his address continues—

"It then began to dawn on some that the changes wrought by a half century of the welfare state had so altered the metabolism of the body social and political that its continuance in equilibrium appeared to be in doubt."

He went on to speak about what I call the new Right ideology.

The report continues—

"They are proposing innovating measures such as industrial deregulation and the flat tax. They will need to be equally bold in the field of social policy."

He speaks about some fascinating aspects, which are the views that he wants imposed on our tertiary institutions.

The report of his address continues—

"The second cause of distress is the sharp increase of marital breakdown accompanying the permissiveness unleashed by the Pill. It is important to understand that the Pill Era, now about a quarter of a century old, confronted human populations with the unprecedented situation in which a simple, painless choice could sunder the sexual act from reproduction. The introduction of the Pill has been in effect a massive experiment with human sexual behaviour. I propose to read the results of

that experiment, and I say that it worked seriously to the disadvantage of women while creating optimum conditions for the roving Jake.”

If this were not so serious, I would laugh.

As part of his solutions, the report states—

“The long-term goals are obvious: repudiation of family planning and rehabilitation of the male to parental responsibility.”

He wants to do away with family-planning and he wants to do away with the pill.

The Minister for Education and the Premier and Treasurer support these views—

“By repudiation of family planning I mean a future when the Pill, abortion, and other reproduction interventions will be shunned by the great majority of Australians.

. . .

Perhaps the most telling sign is the emergence of a new puritanism in the midst of the trendy camp. The feminist campaign against sexism is an assertion that women are no longer available for casual use and enjoyment.

. . .

Although family planning is claimed to be an entirely benign and enlightened reproductive strategy, that is far from so. Prolonged induced infertility leads in some cases to post-pill infertility and its attendant regrets. Pregnancy by choice is supposed to enhance marital harmony, but choice opens new reasons for disagreement about the number and spacing of children.”

He is saying that the choice for the control of the number of children in a family leads to bickering. People such as Professor Caton simply want their own way. They want the Government to investigate all courses that consider women, the family or sexuality.

Here is another statement of his—

“Consequently conservative parties may attack the destructive consequences of permissiveness at its morbid fountainhead, family planning. They can bring the medical profession before the bar of public opinion and demand to know why they should not be impeached for dereliction of duty.”

By family-planning, he does not mean only abortion; he means the pill. He means absolute family-planning. When I rang up, I was told that Professor Caton was the champion of these people. I was told that I should circulate the petition because the Premier and the Minister for Education were just waiting for the petitions to come in so that they could act to save women, the family and all of us from sexuality.

Time expired.

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (4.49 p.m.): Today’s detailed presentation by the Minister for Education of his 1985-86 Estimates reflects the excellent developments that have recently occurred in education in this State. I also believe that they reflect the dedication of the Minister, the director-general and all sections of the Education Department in their determination to give students of all ages every opportunity to develop to their highest potential. The aim of the education system should be to allow every student to develop to his highest potential.

During the Budget debate, I spoke extensively on the effects of the recent Budget on the education system in this State. Therefore, today, I do not wish to retrace that information. However, I wish to refer to the comments of the member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras), who spoke about the teaching of languages in schools. The largest high school in his electorate offers at least six languages to Year 8 students. Maybe he does not realise that. Although I have been to the last five p. and c. meetings, the honourable member was not present.

Mr FOURAS: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is misrepresenting what I said. When I was talking about community languages, I was talking about

languages in primary schools. Although languages are taught in secondary schools, they are not taught in primary schools.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Menzel): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr LINGARD: Today I wish to refer to politics and its influence on education, because the honourable member for South Brisbane has spoken about that. I will refer mainly to secondary education.

At the recent Australian High School Principals Association conference in Melbourne, a paper was presented by Dr Phillip Hughes on this topic. This conference of AHSPA, as it is referred to, has met annually for many years and presents a forum at which representatives from principals associations from each State can exchange ideas as well as present formal presentations to the Federal Minister for Education. In itself, it receives presentations from prominent personnel outside the education system.

At this stage, I pay tribute to Mr Bill Callinan, who is the first president of that body. I pay this tribute because Mr Callinan retires at the end of this year. He is, at present, principal of Miami State High School. He has been a prominent sportsman and very influential in the principals association. Next year, the annual Australian conference will be held in Brisbane and hosted by Queensland. I trust that it will give visiting personnel a preliminary view of what will happen in Expo 88.

In referring to the effects of politics and education, I refer not to the role that politics might play in the school curriculum but to the role that politics should play in decision-making within the Education Department. Clearly, many people will immediately say that politics should be kept out of the decision-making process in education. As a previous president of the Principals Association, I respect and understand that view. However, as a member of Parliament, I am concerned that politics is not involved enough in the education of our children and therefore does not understand the needs of the system, nor does it exercise enough control over how the money is spent in the system. What other system employs inexperienced young people and says, "If you are satisfactory in your second year of service, you will never be checked up on again; that is, unless you are deemed to be completely incompetent."?

How can a political party grant millions of dollars for the employment of its teachers, yet abrogate responsibility for inspecting the work of its employees? How can a political party accept a mandate from the public to govern a country, yet hesitate to approve what can and cannot be taught in the system?

I refer to comments by Phillip Hughes at the principals conference this year. He said—

"There was no golden age when politics and education were separate."

It is ridiculous to think that this should be so. It is wrong for the Education Department to believe that politicians should stay out of education, and it is irresponsible for politicians to think that they should. Clearly, though, that will be the call of the Opposition.

Professor Bill Walker said—

"Principals and teachers alike continue to be puzzled and angered by the recent declining political sympathy for schools, and especially government schools. In their naivete they blame politicians rather than the public for this. In this they are simply wrong. The fact is that the politicians' lifeblood depends upon votes: if they felt for one moment that public sympathy was clearly with the schools, that public feeling was strongly against present funding levels or that the public placed a higher priority on the needs of schools than on other social institutions, they would act accordingly."

Unless the Government is implicated in the decision-making within the Education Department, there is little likelihood of a positive public approach to the education program. Obviously, we need to state the intentions of the education system clearly, implement them and report publicly and positively about them. That cannot be achieved without the support of the Government, and the Government cannot act positively unless it believes that the system is supportive of it.

In his assessment of the education system, Freeman Butts said—

“A democratic education in a democratic society will therefore try to achieve a balance between three legitimate participants: government, profession, and public. If any one of the three gains too much exclusive power, dangers are in the offing. If government dominates too exclusively, you have the danger of arbitrary and autocratic control of education for partisan purposes. If the profession becomes too domineering, you run the danger of bending the educational system to the vested interests of a small group that may be too exclusively concerned with its own privileges and status. If voluntary agencies are given full sway, they may consider the schools to be the football of whatever powerful minority may be able to gain ascendancy for its own interests. Free and open discussion, communication of ideas, and balance of interests among these three elements will, I believe, best serve the cause of democratic education.”

I accept the difficulty that the Director-General of Education, in his role, might be placed in. I would not suggest that a Government should implement a policy that is not supported by the director-general. However, neither should a director-general implement a policy or retain a policy that is not accepted by the Government. Fortunately, in Queensland, a very positive co-operation is evident, and this should continue.

It is unfortunate that the Queensland Teachers Union does not adopt a similar attitude. I believe that the QTU has become extremely unprofessional in its approach. It has adopted an antagonistic approach in presenting its demands. I cite the example of the recent presentation of its statement on education-funding in Queensland. The first sentence in its beautiful glossy presentation mentions the amount of money that is spent on horse-racing and aircraft. In an effort to create sensationalism, the QTU has adopted sarcasm and moved away from the professionalism that education deserves.

I cite also other presentations by the Queensland Teachers Union on budget demands and teaching incentive payments. These presentations are simply a statement of every possible demand and request that the QTU can think of. They cover every rational and irrational request that can be thought of by both conservative and radical elements in that organisation.

Mr De Lacy: They adopted Bjelke-Petersen's tactics.

Mr LINGARD: The honourable member for Cairns thinks that co-education is only for boys, not for girls.

The Queensland Teachers Union makes no attempt at compromise. That can be seen in the recent class size strike action. Many in the teaching profession have sympathy with the demands for classes of 25 pupils for Years 1, 2, 11 and 12, and of 30 for other years. However, although the union fought the issue, several nights before the strike the executive refused to compromise and relate the strike to those specific issues. The QTU demanded that the Government grant its entire class size policy, that is, classes of six for remedial work and drastically reduces classes in science, art and practical subjects.

Clearly, the issue then became one of additional accommodation that would be necessary. It was an impossible immediate demand on the Government. However, teachers were still forced to lose a day's pay and risk suspension because of this unprofessional, uncompromising and, I believe, antagonistic political approach towards the Government. I call on the Queensland Teachers Union to change its attitude so that changes can be made to policies that will benefit the students of this State.

I believe that close liaison between the Government and the Education Department is necessary to ensure that education is not used as both a political and a social scapegoat. I refer to the growing practice of placing all the blame on the education system. In 1979, I was part of a principals' delegation that argued very strongly against the introduction by the conservative Federal Government of transition education schemes. Without going into all of the details, I state that the principals believed that the education system was being blamed for the growing unemployment problem. It was implied that children were at risk because they did not have the basic skills and expertise for the jobs. There was

a great move for programs that assisted students in the transition from school to the work-force.

In order to get out of the unemployment dilemma, the Federal Government adopted the attitude of placing money into the transition education program to overcome the problem. However, all honourable members are aware that no jobs were available. If students who participated in the program were able to develop any expertise to find a job, it was done at the expense of someone else. The program did not increase the number of jobs. Subsequently it failed and has been replaced.

I criticise also the present Federal Government's Australian Traineeship Scheme, which was announced recently by the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke). The first lines of the brochure state—

“It is very difficult for young people to move directly from school into a worthwhile job.

They need training in the kind of skills necessary to carry out that job, and in the skills needed in the workforce generally.

The idea of Traineeship is to provide this bridge between school and work.”

Like the transition education program, it will be used by the Federal Government in its statements on what it is doing about the unemployment problem. Once again, schools will get the blame.

I believe that the Government can enforce two concepts on society. The first is the family concept; the second is the concept that everybody should earn money by being employed. Therefore it is the responsibility of any Government to actively support the retention of the family concept and to ensure that enough jobs are available for people. In implementing policies, however, the Government and the department must ensure the autonomy of the school principal. In Queensland, school principals enjoy great autonomy. In fact, the principal of a school probably has the greatest chance of any officer to exercise his autonomy and to implement his own ideas.

However, several aspects must be improved. The first is the way in which schools are forced to retain students with problems of discipline. As more and more students face the pressures of unemployment, many of low academic achievement are remaining at school, because it is the better alternative. That group has many problems of discipline.

The second is that schools are being forced to accept students with learning difficulties and those who are handicapped. The educational advantage to the latter group is not challenged. I support the concept of main-streaming. However, that places strains on teaching personnel. Disciplinary problems place added demands on teachers and other students. The end result must be a less effective learning process in comparison with that in the days of highly motivated and intellectually capable students. Parents with the financial ability to select private schools, where, they believe, those aspects will not enter into the education of their children, are clearly choosing that avenue. The Government must note the move towards the private school system.

I refer to a special committee's report on problems of discipline in Queensland schools. I suggest that it is an urgent matter to be faced by the Government and the department. School principals ought to be encouraged to adopt a positive attitude to what I refer to as care, control and discipline in schools. Unfortunately, that role is being delegated to senior masters and other personnel. Far too often the attitude is, “Johnny is playing truant. Poor Johnny. I wonder what is wrong with the curriculum. I wonder why Johnny doesn't like school.” Then far too often follows the thought, “Johnny needs to speak to a social worker. Let's have more social workers.” I know what Johnny needs—and Johnny should receive it. “Discipline” is not a dirty word. Clearly, corporal punishment must be used if Johnny does not accept the rules and regulations. Creeping into our system is the thought that punishment should not be part of the educative process. We are all aware of the effects of that in America. The effects of it are creeping into some southern States as well. Administered correctly and used as

a final resort, corporal punishment is still necessary in our schools if we are to maintain order and allow every child to achieve to his absolute potential.

Having taught in both private and public schools, I am concerned about another aspect, which I believe requires the co-operation of the Government and the department to overcome. It was once considered a necessary part of teaching to participate in extra-curricular activities. It was always accepted that a teacher should coach football, cricket, netball or a cultural activity, such as drama. Several factors have caused the participation of teachers in extra-curricular activities to decrease. The first is the end of the inspectorial system, under which teachers continually faced an inspection of their work. Their activities in both the class-room and outside were reported on. I remind the Committee that, under the present system, a teacher faces an inspection in his second year and, if he is then regarded as satisfactory, he is not forced to face another official inspection. The second factor is, clearly, the employment, as teachers, of parents who have parental responsibilities both before and after school. The third is the employment of specialist teachers in drama, physical education and theatre, and the expectation that those teachers will accept a role in extra-curricular activities.

At present, it is accepted that the principal should monitor the involvement of a teacher's extra-curricular activities. However, that is idealistic. Far too many teachers are doing nothing. There need to be clearly defined regulations about the minimum hours that a principal can expect teachers to attend school other than in class-room teaching. It should be obligatory for teachers to participate in at least a minimum amount of extra-curricular activities and playground supervision. The present school time is 24 hours 10 minutes a week. When preparation time and correction periods are deducted, many teachers do not spend 20 hours in the class-room. Of course, the Queensland Teachers Union would object, but at present there is a stand-off. It is the students who are affected. They are not all receiving extra-curricular sport or cultural activity. That has to be remedied.

The Government and the department have bowed to the pressure of the unions in the matter of the inspectorial system. Suddenly, the attitude has been adopted that it is a sin for an inspector to see a teacher who is not doing a good job. That contact has been replaced in secondary schools by placing responsibility on the principal and the subject-master. A competent principal or subject-master would perform such a function well, but not enough influence is being exerted on the staff teacher, who does not perform to the best of his ability.

In the light of that, the Government and the Department of Education must closely monitor demands made by the Queensland Teachers Union that apply to preparation and correction periods. Such periods are referred to by teachers as "spares" and, quite often, that is the way in which they are treated. Over the years, the responsibility of teacher supervision, curriculum preparation, moderation of exams, assessment procedures and student counselling has passed from the department to the school. The teaching profession has accepted that but, in return, has demanded time to do that work.

In addition, a demand has been made for the provision of more subject-masters. At the last school at which I was principal, more than 25 people were employed in the role of subject-master. The public would be shocked if it realised that these people are in contact with students for only a very short period. Many teach only three or four classes. That factor has placed increased demand on the number of teachers required, and the Government must take a much more rational approach if it wishes to improve the student-contact time with those experienced teachers.

I must say that it is pleasing that Queensland has led the way in the decentralisation of the education system on a State basis. The recent formation of a tenth region in Cairns has completed the structure, and it will bring more services to areas of north Queensland, which is especially important now that the Government has accepted responsibility for the Torres Strait islands. It is interesting that, at the last Australian High School Principals Association meeting, the processes of decentralisation and devolution were the main issues. Clearly, the other States wish to move from the

problems brought about by decentralisation. In Queensland, education regions have had responsibilities for staffing delegated to them. All regional and service activities are dealt with by them. More and more, financial matters are being handled on a regional basis, and regional control in public relations, community interaction and the development of education programs is being exercised effectively.

I make special mention of sport, which is also co-ordinated on a regional basis whereas, previously, each sporting organisation throughout Queensland arranged sporting activities, such as cricket. A difficulty that arose with this procedure was that the sporting activity tended to be well organised in a particular area whilst other areas were neglected. Success of the sporting activity depended very much on the personnel involved. Under the present structure, a regional sporting officer is appointed for each of the 10 regions throughout the State. It is the responsibility of that officer to ensure that each of the 17 or 18 sports is organised efficiently.

At a local level, several schools have bound together to form the basis of local competitions. At that level, selected students participate in a regional competition and, beyond that, State-wide interregional competitions are held to select State teams. From State teams, participants are selected to make up teams that will compete at an international level. Some of the teams have participated in world tournaments. I have been involved in the organisation of sport, and I feel that a tremendous improvement has been brought about in the structural organisation of school sport, and that has meant increased opportunities for students.

However, one difficulty that has arisen indirectly is the need for students and staff to be absent during school-time. Because the examination system is now based on cumulative testing rather than the end-of-year examinations on a large scale, a conflict of interest can arise. That difficulty must be monitored very closely.

In conclusion, may I say that, in the 1990s, education will have to cater for the unemployment explosion. Year 10 students—who have no other reason except that they are waiting for a job or they feel that being a school student is better than being unemployed—will place greater pressure on accommodation and increase the social problems that already exist in the school system. Those who criticise *Education 2000* are short-sighted. The Government needs to plan now for future educational needs. *Education 2000* is not intended to be an outline of present needs; it is an outline of the future demands that may be placed on the education system by society.

I congratulate the Minister and the officers of his department on having the courage to initiate the survey and on facing criticism from those who relate the proposals to present needs.

Time expired.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (5.9 p.m.): At approximately 4 o'clock this afternoon, I spoke with a teacher at a non-Government school about the selection of subjects for one of my children next year. Had I telephoned the Graceville State School, which my daughter attends, at 4 o'clock, I guarantee that I would have been able to speak to the principal, Mr Capra. Many dedicated teachers are employed in the system of education in State and private schools, and it is to them that all honourable members owe gratitude for what is, generally speaking, a system that arms most children with the necessities with which to face a modern life, despite the increasing complexity of society and the increase in the size of the information bank now available in any education system.

It is at the edges that things start to go wrong. I understand that the honourable member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) had a reputation as a tough, efficient and effective school principal, but I do not agree with everything that he said. He referred to the document *Education 2000* and to the drift towards private schools. I suggest that if he looks at *Education 2000* he will see one of the reasons why there is a drift towards private schools.

An Education Department as large as Queensland's will contain a variety of personalities, no doubt a variety of political attitudes and a variety of educational

attitudes. It will contain people who started life as teachers and who have ended up as educational administrators, theorists, curriculum-developers and any number of other positions for which, frankly, their earlier training and tertiary or comparative qualifications did not necessarily equip them.

Why do I say that one can find in *Education 2000* one of the reasons for a drift towards the private school system? I invite people to contrast the phraseology and the use of intellect and logic that produced that document with the document from the Association of Independent Schools titled *Education 2000: A Response*.

Mr Littleproud: One was intended for discussion and comment, and the other one was a comment.

Mr INNES: I will deal with this matter. I am quite capable of constructing my own speech and pursuing my own lines of thought.

Mr Littleproud: You asked for a comment.

Mr INNES: I did not ask for the honourable member's comment.

I will use what are clearly a couple of key paragraphs in *Education 2000*. My discipline is basically one that is concerned with the language, and I have no embarrassment in saying that I find *Education 2000* a difficult, tortuous document full of convoluted jargon-ridden statements in which simple thoughts, I perceived, were converted into almost mystical statements. I will give members an illustration, as follows—

“Within an educational system as large and as complex as that presently operated by the Queensland Department of Education, the issue of program *continuity* becomes particularly important. Continuity within an institution requires much co-ordination. To achieve continuity of program offerings across institutions and, indeed, throughout the entire system of education in Queensland, is a major organizational task. The task is made even more complex by the need for *continuity* and contiguity of higher level programs with requirements of commerce and industry and with prerequisites for advanced studies in institutes of higher education. This indicates quite clearly that, not only are the two identified major issues interrelated, but under certain circumstances they work in opposition. Inevitably this means that tensions will occur between system-level co-ordination and the efforts of particular institutions to respond in a flexible manner to local needs.

An educational system which over-emphasizes continuity of learning, may, with the best intentions in the world, produce organizational responses which stifle local initiative, dilute specialized services, and point towards, if not conformity, then mediocrity. On the other hand, if an educational system disregards the issues of continuity and becomes preoccupied with institutional responsiveness and flexibility, even with the laudable intention of achieving curricular relevance, then a possible outcome is fragmentation of effort and discontinuities for learners as they progress through the system from institution to institution.”

Does that not simply suggest, if one can penetrate the barrier of convoluted statements, that a problem for education is developing a continuous program and allowing some local flexibility? Is that not what it says?

Let us get away from the simple lawyer's response to this document and look at the educationist's response. Let us see what the Association of Independent Schools had to say. It refers to other examinations of education systems. Its comments read—

“The decision to examine ‘the issues and options for the future of Education in Queensland’ was a commendable one and the intention may be seen to be in keeping with other reviews such as the Beazley Report in Western Australia, the Blackburn Report in Victoria, the Karmel Quality of Education Review, ‘Nation at Risk’ and ‘The Paldeal Proposal’ in the United States.

It soon becomes clear, after reading *Education 2000* however, that the sort of philosophical argument about the future of education in the next twenty years which

forms the basis for the reviews mentioned, is sadly lacking in the Queensland Department of Education document.

It advocates change, but the reasons for change are never identified and the hoped for results of change are totally ignored."

As a simple lawyer, I understand those words. They seem to be fairly clear. The association's comments continue in this way—

"It should, however, be clear to anyone who reads the document that if the single 'option' is agreed upon (and there are no others), the entire curriculum and hence the entire education system will change to a greater extent than has happened before in the history of this State."

It concludes the preamble by saying—

"In summary, the document *Education 2000* lacks any basic philosophy and thus is intellectually bankrupt."

I turn from the response of the Association of Independent Schools—I understand that the comments of some of the other schools were even harsher—and look to the response of the Queensland Catholic Education Commission. Although it is perhaps less robust in its response and more diplomatic, precisely the same types of sentiments are echoed. In its introduction, it refers to the lack of educational vision. I will not read the three paragraphs, but I will read this part, which follows the section headed "Lack of Educational Vision"—

"*Education 2000* is silent on this topic. The changes proposed appear as a set of possible solutions to as yet an unidentified problem."

The response has another section headed "Lack of Educational Philosophy", and another headed "Terminology", from which I now quote—

"Much of *Education 2000* focuses on four terms of education principles: continuity, relevance, responsiveness and flexibility. Suffice it to say that the first two of these terms present most readers with difficulties. Superficially the terms evoke acceptance from the reader. However, it is not clear for example what relevance refers to; relevance of the curriculum to the learner's needs? to the needs of society? to the teacher's needs? to something else? The document seems to decide in favour of education relevant to vocational needs of students or to the needs of society to sort students into categories."

Under the section headed "Implications for the Catholic Schools" the following appears—

"*Education 2000* was obviously written with the institutions administered by the Education Department in mind. It is ambiguous therefore when responses are sought, to know whether the responses should concern only the Department's institutions. However, major changes to the State sector of education will have obvious implications for Catholic schools.

. . .

The role of Catholic schools and of the private sector in general is totally neglected in the discussion paper."

What else is totally neglected? It seems that the document concerns itself particularly with the streaming of students into the three new categories. In its major specific proposal, it appears to advocate a major change at the Year 7, Year 8 age, in proposing to lump together the Years that presently provide the majority of students at both the secondary schools and the primary schools. Throughout the world, education systems appear to reflect the change that is obvious to any parent and obvious to any ordinary member of the community, namely, the significant change in personality, outlook and physiology of children about the age of 10, 11 and 12 years. That age group has tended to change with the increasing maturity of children in the better-fed parts of the world. The rest of the world appears to reflect such a change. The document *Education 2000* proposes quite clearly a dramatic change at that level.

In attending, as I have, department-sponsored meetings to explain the implications of these proposed changes, I have been told specifically by some of the people who were chosen to advocate the department's view that *Education 2000* should be viewed less as a proposal to change institutions and more as predominantly concerned with curriculum development to overcome the jump, or the hurdle, of discontinuity between Years 7 and 8. In other words, the community should continue to think of the State's primary schools and secondary schools as they presently exist. If that is so, I would have thought that it is an extraordinary reflection on the Education Department, as it has been organised for a long time.

If there is so little communication that a major problem has developed concerning children who leave primary school in Year 7 and go into secondary school in Year 8, I would have thought that a simple internal rearrangement of the department rather than an external rearrangement of the schools or the development of a single curriculum development body that goes through the entire school system would have been an inexpensive, logical and non-dramatic response to the problem.

By questioning, it is very difficult to find out whether the document *Education 2000* really is a proposal simply to change the basis on which curriculum is developed, so that it is developed for all the years by one body, or whether the semblance of primary and secondary education is to be retained. Many people have suggested that, because *Education 2000* is so pretentious in what it sets out to do and what it advocates, that is, that it is a blueprint for the future, and provides so few specific proposals as to what hard education issues will be involved, it reflects a manpower problem in the Department of Education. That is manifest in a lack of science and mathematics teachers in secondary schools and a difficulty in responding to the bulge of students who move from primary to secondary schooling. If the primary/secondary system is broken down, teachers can be transferred internally. By that I mean that they can be used, if necessary, to teach Years 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, without major dislocations. At present, the work-force is organised and accredited for the two different levels.

Those who perceive that the document *Education 2000* might reflect that type of activity would suggest that it runs completely contrary to the way of the world. Any parent who has attempted to do his child's homework knows that it is still fairly easy in Years 5, 6 and 7 to cope with the maths, social studies or science; but the moment the child goes to secondary school and comes under the guidance of specialist teachers—that is the way of the world; advancing knowledge leads to increasing specialisation—the parent has great difficulty in keeping up with the assistance given to the child. One would think that specialisation is essential, particularly for maths and science.

It is very difficult to understand what the proposal is. Are teachers to float between the two levels? Are they to float from the general to the specific? How will they be organised? How will they be trained? Apart from proposing those broad bands, the document really proposes a variety of mechanical situations. It concentrates on curriculum; indeed, it constantly refers to curriculum. However, I am not sure that it addresses the sorts of problems that have been addressed by other reports or the sorts of things that are talked about by both parents and educators. In other words, it does not address the question about what the secondary school or the Year 8 to Year 12 curriculum should involve. Should it involve compulsory maths, science, English and a language to a higher level than at present?

Students at Japanese schools are required to take the hard subjects. The options are reduced right into the 16-year-old and 17-year-old level. One of the complaints in America and in Australia has been that the soft options are allowed too early in the school career. I have just heard the member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) refer to language teaching; but there is no encouragement for children to take languages. If Australia is to take its place as a modern, well-educated community, some knowledge of languages should be mandatory for all our students. There is no encouragement in the present curriculum in the State school system to take languages; in fact, there is every encouragement

against it. As a rule, children do not like languages; but there is no incentive or persuasion to take those options.

Education 2000 does not address the hard issues. What it proposes is the setting up of a committee to develop appropriate curriculums. Why does *Education 2000* not address the sorts of things that the Government or the department believe should be obligatory as part of the curriculum in a modern and enlightened society moving towards the twenty-first century?

The interesting political fact is that *Education 2000* does not mention the weighty document and study performed by politicians—the honourable member for Fassifern referred to the involvement of politics—in this Assembly some years ago. The Ahern report was a weighty document. It dealt with specifics; it dealt with hard issues. Why has no mention been made of the Ahern report?

Mr Littleproud: That was a report; this is a discussion document.

Mr INNES: One would have hoped that it would be a more purposeful discussion document. It has provoked the concern of a whole variety of people.

Mr Littleproud: The other one was a report.

Mr INNES: I had thought that the member for Condamine was a competent teacher, but his comments do not reflect well upon the intellectual equipment of a modern educator.

One would expect that something that set out to put before the community issues and options for the future of education in Queensland would have included those sorts of matters that excite debate and that have been the focal point of direct debate in educational circles throughout the world.

I am concerned about the operation of politics in Queensland education. It is a matter of some regret that of the first 125 capital projects announced after last year's Budget in terms of the hardware of schools—that is, school buildings—85 per cent went to National Party electorates.

Mr FitzGerald: They are all the fast-growing electorates.

Mr Gygar: Hooked again!

Mr INNES: Yes, I have got a bite again.

If the Government wants to take the Rocketts out of the education system—I will avoid Lyle Schuntner, who is basically a decent fellow—it should look to others in the Queensland Teachers Union whose politically motivated, destructive views on education I never want inflicted on my kids in a class-room. I am also fearful that politics on the other side of the fence has an insidious effect on the sort of generalised, bipartisan discussion that should take place in the interests of education and the future of Queensland.

I am very concerned that minorities, such as the religious groups that advocate creation-science views of the world, can impose their views through the vehicle of the Education Department of this State. That view is not broadly accepted by the scientific community or by the educational community; but through the vehicle of minority influence, their views are being given greater weight than they should. In the United States of America, those views have been held—properly, in my view—to be an attempt to introduce religious partisanship and religious education into the school system.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (5.29 p.m.): I shall use this Estimates debate to speak principally on the need for a tertiary education institution in Cairns. I will not be saying any unkind things about the education system, about schools in Cairns or about *Education 2000*, because I shall endeavour to solicit, on behalf of the Cairns region, the assistance of the Minister to establish a tertiary institution there.

The honourable member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) would not take my interjection. He never takes my interjections because, if he did, it would interfere with his very carefully prepared scripts. He made a low-key comment on co-education. By way of interjection, when he was lambasting the Queensland Teachers Union for its so-called confrontationist attitude, I was simply endeavouring to say that they learnt that from the Queensland Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen). The honourable member was adopting a tactic, which is becoming all too familiar in this Chamber, of accusing other people of doing something when he has done exactly the same thing. It is a political tactic called "sophistry". The honourable member for Fassifern has developed that into a very fine art.

The tertiary education institution in Cairns has been thrown round for some considerable time. At a Far North Queensland Regional Unity and Co-operation conference earlier this year, it was suggested that something concrete should be done to move in that direction. As a consequence, the Mulgrave Shire Council picked up the gauntlet and commissioned an economic research consultant by the name of Bill Cummings, who is well known in Cairns, to prepare a submission. I understand that the submission has been forwarded to the Minister. From a subsequent report, I understand that the Cummings report was forwarded to the Board of Advanced Education and subsequently to the James Cook University, which, I understand has statutory responsibility for advanced education in north Queensland.

As a result of that submission, a public meeting was convened in Cairns on 30 July. It was attended by a large number of concerned people in the area. It was also attended by two invited guests. They were Mr Ross MacKee from the Board of Advanced Education in Brisbane and Mr John Williams, who is chairman of the North Queensland Advisory Board on Advanced Education. From that meeting, a committee called the Far North Queensland Tertiary Education Committee was formed. It comprises approximately 20 members, of which I am one. The committee is well represented by a broad spectrum of business, commercial, Government, educational and local government interests, as well as the professional and general community in Cairns. A couple of subsequent meetings have been held. A number of task forces have been appointed to research certain aspects. We are hoping to prepare a submission for presentation to the Board of Advanced Education by March of next year so that it can include something in its State submission, which, if there is to be any possibility of funding in the next triennium, which is 1988-90, must be lodged with the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission by September 1986.

North Queenslanders see themselves as a pioneering group of people who are fairly independent of the need for Government assistance. Apart from some resentment when our children have had to travel long distances to attend tertiary colleges, we have accepted that we did not have one. However, in recent years, times have changed. The area is expanding rapidly. The population has grown enormously and more people are aware of the need for tertiary education.

For generations, the lack of tertiary education facilities in the region has impoverished the social fabric of the region as families were forced to separate and children to go away, more often than not, never to return—not by choice but by circumstance and necessity.

I have one daughter who went to university in Brisbane. She has now moved to Canberra. It is clear that, if the region is to continue to progress in an increasingly competitive and technologically oriented world, more and more tertiary education skills will be needed in the work-force, and its industries will need to have ready access to the knowledge and skills available from tertiary education institutions.

More importantly, however, for the wider national interest, Cairns is a city that is doing well. It is a city that is set in a special, natural, social and economic environment. It is rapidly building up a special role in the wider northern Australian/south-west Pacific islands area. It is a city that is building a special place in national and international tourism. It is a city that is set in a tropical environment similar to that in many

developing countries. I believe that a tertiary education institution can be established in such a city in the expectation that it will succeed, play a progressively special role in tertiary education and research in Australia, and be of great importance to this country's international relations.

I know that the Minister is aware of the promotion of a tertiary education institution that is taking place in the Cairns region. I am aware that funding for tertiary institutions comes from the Commonwealth. However, I am also aware that the State Government has a constitutional responsibility for all education and, therefore, the recommendations of the Queensland Board of Advanced Education will go to the Commonwealth if, at any stage, a tertiary education facility is established in the north.

The Minister is on record as saying—and he repeated today in his speech on his department's Estimates—that he believes that Queensland is being short-changed by the Commonwealth in regard to funds for tertiary education. Far-north Queensland is being disadvantaged vis-a-vis the rest of Queensland, as is Queensland in relation to the rest of Australia.

A couple of weeks ago, in this Chamber, mention was made of a college of advanced education at the Gold Coast. I understand that planning has been approved and preliminary funding been granted for that college. The Gold Coast does have a much larger population than the Cairns and far-north region. However, when other criteria are taken into consideration, such as the distance from existing institutions and other special needs and unique circumstances, a case can be made out for a tertiary institution in far-north Queensland over and above that of the Gold Coast. I am not knocking the need for a college of advanced education at the Gold Coast.

I am a great believer in tertiary education. Before entering Parliament, I spent a good deal of time overseas examining the education systems in developing countries. I was shocked that many of the so-called developing countries of South East Asia have a higher retention rate than Australia in secondary and tertiary education. That can be expected in countries such as Japan. However, in places such as the Philippines, which most Australians regard as a third-world country faced with many problems, a bigger percentage of students are undertaking tertiary education than the percentage in Australia. That did a good deal of damage to my perception of Australia as an educated, enlightened and privileged country.

As I think all honourable members are aware, the Commonwealth Government has released a plan to tackle youth problems in Australia, in particular youth unemployment. That plan is called Priority 1.

Mr Alison: Particularly in restaurants.

Mr De LACY: I do not know why the honourable member for Maryborough interjects with totally irrelevant comments. If the honourable member wants to talk about education, I will debate it with him. However, ever since I began my speech, he has been interjecting about restaurants, which are totally irrelevant. Restaurants have nothing to do with the Estimates being debated.

Mr Palaszczuk: He must eat out a lot.

Mr De LACY: As the honourable member for Archerfield says, the honourable member for Maryborough must eat out a good deal.

The essential components of the Priority 1 plan of the Federal Government are a traineeship scheme for school-leavers, a system of allowances to assist young people to remain at school, and additional places in tertiary education. I hope that the campaign for a tertiary institution in north Queensland will tie in with the Federal Government's objective of providing more places for tertiary education in Australia.

A number of phases have occurred in the development of tertiary education in Australia. In the early 1970s, there was an explosion in the number of colleges of

advanced education. In the late 1970s, the number of TAFE colleges increased dramatically. The 1980s have been characterised by amalgamation or rationalisation of tertiary colleges. At present, a hiatus stage has been reached, hopefully only until the next stage. I am hoping that the next stage could signal an explosion in tertiary education facilities in a high technology world, in which youth unemployment is a real problem. The people of Cairns want to be in on the ground floor when that happens.

First, I establish the need in north Queensland—and Cairns in particular—for a tertiary education institution. In 1983, the population in the statistical district of Cairns was 63 000 and, for the far-north Queensland region, 152 000. The Cairns region is growing faster than all other Queensland provincial regions. Over the period from 1947 to 1981, it experienced a growth rate of 4 per cent, compared with 3 per cent in Townsville, 3.2 per cent in Mackay, 1.3 per cent in Rockhampton and 1.9 per cent in Toowoomba. In the seven years from 1976 to 1983—the latest period for which I have figures—the population of Cairns increased by 26.4 per cent, compared with 10 per cent in Townsville, 18.1 per cent in Mackay, 5.2 per cent in Rockhampton and 7.3 per cent in Toowoomba.

Although the far-northern/Cairns region is the largest geographically—it is fair to say that it has the greatest number of resources, particularly when tourism resources are taken into consideration—historically, it has been the least and the last developed. That is probably because it is the farthest north. When its resource potential is considered, it is still the least-developed part of the State.

Recent projections by the Co-ordinator-General's Department illustrate that, in the 15 years to the turn of the century, the far-northern statistical division is expected to emerge as the largest in population outside the Brisbane/Moreton region, overtaking in the process the divisions of Townsville, Rockhampton, Wide Bay/Burnett and Darling Downs. It is estimated that, by the year 2001, 222 000 people will be living in the far north.

The next point I make is that the far north receives less than its share of the Government dollar. The growth in Government services has been disproportionately centred on Rockhampton, Townsville and Darwin, which I have used also in my comparison of northern Australian regions. The proportion of the work-force in Government employment, based on the 1981 census, is 24.3 per cent in Cairns, 38.4 per cent in Townsville, 40.9 per cent in Darwin and 30.8 per cent in Rockhampton. To put it all in perspective, I mention that the figure for Canberra is 57 per cent. Another statistic that proves the same point is that, for the period 1976 to 1981, the non-Government sector accounted for 54 per cent of total employment growth in Cairns, but only 12 per cent in Townsville and 11 per cent in Rockhampton.

Compared with the equivalent regional cities of Darwin, Townsville and Rockhampton, the city of Cairns and the region associated with it are grossly underprivileged in the provision of Government services, including tertiary education institutions. Cairns, the north's second-largest city, has no tertiary education facility at all. Both of the smaller cities of Darwin and Rockhampton have colleges of advanced education. It appears that Darwin is soon to have a university campus also. Townsville, with an immediate regional population only marginally greater than that of Cairns, and a smaller regional private enterprise sector, has both university and CAE facilities.

Having established the relativity of Cairns and the far north in terms of size, growth potential and the provision of Government services, in which it is underprivileged, I now place in perspective the absence of a tertiary institution in Cairns relative to the rest of Australia. Eleven smaller provincial cities in Australia have substantial tertiary education institutions. Cairns is the only provincial city in its size range without a tertiary education facility. The only larger non-metropolitan urban centres without tertiary education institutions are the Queensland metropolitan fringe cities of the Gold Coast and the Sunshine Coast and a string of towns identified as the Burnie development statistical district in Tasmania. However, if the size of cities without tertiary institutions is plotted against their distance from tertiary institution facilities, Cairns stands out.

How has the absence of tertiary facilities affected the young people of far-north Queensland? Have the people who live in that area been given an equal educational opportunity? The Minister has acknowledged that the participation in tertiary education is lower in Queensland than in the rest of Australia. I am concerned that the lack of tertiary education facilities has led to a lower-than-average tertiary education participation rate, which puts people who live in far-north Queensland a long way behind those in the rest of Australia.

I have obtained statistics and tables that show that at tertiary level, the participation rate in the far-northern region is much lower than it is in regional centres such as Townsville, Rockhampton and the Darling Downs. I do not have time to read all the tables; suffice to say that the regional tertiary education institutions in Queensland primarily serve the cities in the immediate location and the surrounding region, and the role that they play in servicing nearby regions drops away very sharply. It is difficult not to arrive at the conclusion that, if the participation rate in tertiary education in Queensland is to be lifted, a high priority must be given to the establishment of a tertiary education facility in the Cairns area.

When the provision of a tertiary education institution was examined with a view to the type of institution that would be suitable for the far-northern region, at no stage did the Far North Queensland Tertiary Education Committee decide to burn any bridges or to close off any options. The committee would be prepared to accept a proposition that involves becoming part of the campus at either the James Cook University of North Queensland or the University of Queensland, or an expansion of the facilities at the tertiary and further education colleges. The in thing these days is for cross-sectoral institutions to incorporate technical, professional and high-level university education in one campus. The committee would be prepared to start with one of any of those three, and move in whatever direction was deemed to be the most suitable.

It is fair to say, however, that the more vocationally oriented, post-tertiary professional level of education is usually encompassed in colleges of advanced education, which would fit in with the predominantly private sector activity that is to be found in north Queensland. A college of advanced education would provide more flexibility in the type of training offered, and would allow a wider range of entry standards, as well as providing increased opportunities for people who cannot study full-time.

In the short time that remains, I wish to mention the need for a tertiary institution in north Queensland to provide courses in nursing studies. As all honourable members know, the Federal Government has agreed in principle to change nursing training from hospital-based to college-based training. If that was to occur—and I hope that it will, eventually—the young people in north Queensland who wish to take up nursing would be seriously disadvantaged if such a tertiary education facility in which to train was not provided in their part of the State.

A task force of the commission has examined the possibility of an open-style, high-technology concept in tertiary education or university education. A subcommittee has been formed. Two members of that subcommittee have had experience of an open-campus program at the Deakin University in Victoria. In the area of high technology, that is an exciting concept; and the commission believes that Cairns is strategically placed in the north and in the South Pacific region to offer that kind of facility in Australia.

A number of special fields of study are peculiar to north Queensland. The very distinctive characteristics of the region will almost inevitably lead it to play a very special role in tertiary education and associated research that must be carried out. I quickly mention the specialised areas that are important in northern Queensland: tourism and hospitality, rain forest research, multi-cultural education, Aboriginal culture and anthropology, fish-farming and aquaculture. It must be remembered that Cairns is the largest fishing port in northern Australia.

Time expired.

Mrs HARVEY (Greenslopes) (5.50 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I join in this debate on the Education Estimates. As I was, until recently, a high school teacher, I have some very strong views on the needs of children in education, particularly in high schools.

One of the areas of concern that I came across in my teaching career was special education and its application to high schools. I am delighted to be able to commend the Minister at this stage on the concept of a Special Needs Support Group in State high schools. Because I feel that it is such a worthwhile innovation, I will concentrate on that area.

I propose to go onto the subject in some depth for the information of members and for the information of their constituents who, I am sure, would want to be acquainted with this type of innovation. It caters not only for the 3 per cent of students in high schools who are intellectually, hearing, visually or mildly or heavily physically handicapped but also for that part of the student population about which I was particularly worried. I refer to those students who could be defined as the academically or emotionally at-risk students. They were students whom one could not pin-point simply by looking at them. One could not tell that they were at risk simply because they were in a wheelchair or had an obvious disability. They were students who had a very subtle but also very serious disability that affected not only their learning ability but also their entire future. I repeat that I am delighted that this Special Needs Support Group is being made available to State high schools.

For the information of members I will outline the staffing establishments for 1985-86. The group is currently operating at Capalaba, Dakabin and Glenmore, and is shortly to go into Centenary Heights, Heatley, Mabel Park, Moranbah and Toowoomba. Those schools are very privileged to have the services of that type of unit.

I will explain what the unit really is. It is a grouping, ideally of five, although, in some cases with smaller numbers in schools, it could be only three. Perhaps those numbers will be changed from time to time. It is a grouping of specialist teachers, including remedial resource teachers; what is called an adaptive teacher, who has the ability to adapt courses for special needs; a community co-ordinator, who is able to organise community contact for students who need more hands-on type of learning; a drama specialist, who can provide role-playing situations for those students who learn better from a role-playing situation as opposed to a textbook situation; and a migrant English as a second language teacher for those schools with a considerable migrant population. Those teachers will work in the class-rooms and will also advise teachers about special programs. They will also be able to work in with the entire school in devising those types of programs that can be seen to be of benefit in integrating, into the wider student population, the student with problems. It is a very worthwhile project.

As I have pointed out, these units have been established in secondary schools throughout Queensland. They are not closely linked, and I suppose that there will be quite a difference in terms of what is relevant for each school. So it will be interesting to see how the projects develop in the different schools because of the differences in population and environment. These groups should not be seen merely as an extension of the special education services that are common in primary schools, or simply as an extension of established secondary resource teacher services. Special Needs Support Groups will provide secondary schools with an opportunity for extending recent initiatives in school organisation and administration, curriculum development, teacher development, student welfare provisions, and community participation in schools.

The one thing that used to break my heart as a high school teacher was the type of child who, when I asked, "What are you good at?", would answer, "I'm good at nothing." When the mother said, "You are good at skating; you are good at stamp-collecting," the child would say, "Yes, but I'm not good at maths." It was tragic. I could see that the students, because of the terrible subject orientation in the class-room through their primary school life, had gained the impression that, because they were not good

at a certain subject, they were not good at anything. It was sad to see that attitude snowball into a complete loss of self respect and——

Mr Palaszczuk: Self-esteem.

Mrs HARVEY: Yes, self-esteem. I thank the honourable member.

I guess that former teachers in this Chamber know what I am speaking about. I am sure that they have all experienced it. It is a sad, sorry sight. When a teacher says to a student, "You are good at skating. All that matters is the fact that you are good at something," it is terrible to hear the child say, "No, I have to be good at maths. Everyone says that if I cannot do maths I will not get a job."

We are all well aware of the lack of employment opportunities and the problems confronting youth. However, the emphasis has become so heavy on the very young that it overrides their enjoyment of their talents and their ability to recognise their talents.

Mr Lee: Would that come from within the home itself or perhaps a little from the parents?

Mrs HARVEY: It is a combination of events. Society is leaning towards saying to the very young, "You must be good at all of these things to succeed. You must get your homework right." Teachers, parents and everyone else are stressing that. That puts a lot of pressure on little people. Perhaps those who are more sensitive and do not have as much ability to cope are the ones who suffer most. They back away and withdraw. They will withdraw from the single problem with maths, and often withdraw from everything. The child then loses self-esteem and, later on, creates discipline problems in the classroom.

After having seen so much of it, I was at a loss to understand how to deal with it. I guess that is why the Special Needs Support Group should be praised from the high heavens because it deals with it. It will investigate those students. Probably it will do exactly what I used to do at Springwood, that is, look at the academic scores and try to see where the problem lies—where the block to learning lies. Sometimes it goes back to a problem triggered in the early days of schooling. This group may stop the snowballing effect that creates failures.

I am very sorry to say that, sometimes, we create failures in our schools. A teacher may say to a little child, "If you cannot do maths, you are not doing very well." The effect of that builds up and the child becomes no good at other things. He may be good at only one thing, but he is never praised for it. It may be that no-one knows that, at home, the child is very good at cooking. The opportunity to show it does not come out for years. Maybe a child may be destined to become the world's greatest chef but does not know it because he is no good at maths. It is tragic that, because of our emphasis on subjects, we sometimes create failures. The snowballing effect has to be eliminated. Someone has to say, "It does not really matter that you are not good at this, as long as you are good at something." It does not matter what the "something" is. Maybe a child is destined to be another Dick Smith or another Dick Johnson. Maybe a child is destined to be good at driving cars round a track, and mathematics does not matter. Sometimes we have to bring a little compromise into education.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mrs HARVEY: I am pleased that the Minister for Education has recognised the problem that I have outlined and has come up with the answer in the form of the Special Needs Support Groups.

It is recognised that each student's total school experience will be effective and appropriate only if it contains a coherent, consistent and continuous educational program. Comprehensive educational programs address more than the academic dimensions of education. They must also provide opportunities for students to develop a sense of individuality and of belonging.

The development by a student of a sense of individuality in a school setting involves an expression of ideas, interests and values so that temperament and personality, the qualities that distinguish one person from another, can develop. A student's growing sense of identity includes striving for individual competence as well as personal choice in areas as diverse as a selection of school subjects and making friends. It involves differentiation from other people, from institutions and from authority. It also involves integration with others, with ideas and with social institutions.

For students to develop a sense of belonging, schools need to provide opportunities for affiliation with others and for identifying with groups, organisations and causes. Through common experiences, students form attachments with one another and establish a sense of belonging to one or more groups. Therefore, support group programs will reflect this preoccupation with student individuality and a sense of belonging. This is the theme that I picked up from *Education 2000* when I spoke extensively about the document in my electorate. Because the concept of *Education 2000* allows a greater scope for individuality and for flexibility in the system, it should be considered seriously. It represents tremendous progress for the education system. Parents agreed without exception that that flexibility is very important.

Many good educational initiatives have been introduced, often by necessity, in a piecemeal fashion or on a program-by-program basis and incorporated into existing school programs. These piecemeal measures that are eventually incorporated are very difficult to keep going. At Springwood State High School, the principal was promoted, as was the deputy principal, and Ian Henderson and I both ended up in Parliament. We were basically the core of the school and understood what was going on. These sorts of programs are limited to the people who can support them. Therefore, it is a good idea to place in a school a permanent group who can support a program and, in that way, the regular teaching population does not need to be depended on to keep the program going.

When all the pieces were considered together, a comprehensive united school program did not necessarily result. However, when a principal, as a leader of a school community, is given control over circumstances and appropriate support, the result is a program that is planned as a coherent whole to meet the individual needs of students. The greatest barrier to such a comprehensive program design has been the lack of support from people whose time and expertise are available to class-room teachers.

Special Needs Support Groups will provide schools with teachers who have appropriate skills so that schools can develop alternative programs that will contribute to their total provision for individual student needs. The best types of alternative programs build on the qualities, by using teaching and management processes based on differences, rather than deficits, that students bring to school.

That was the point that I was making much earlier. For too long, the worry has been deficits. Differences can now be considered and, hopefully, the positive side of a student's education can be given more consideration than has previously been the case. Talents have always been recognised, but perhaps only in the form of talents that can be developed within the school syllabus. Sometimes the talents do not quite fit the packaged programs.

Programs based on a different model accept and appreciate each child as an individual. At the same time, tensions can be created when a school attempts to balance individual needs with social and organisational needs. This should not prevent a school using such balanced mechanisms as moving away from curriculum and towards students; adopting learning processes that can be seen as journeys of discovery; encouraging human values rather than academic performances; modifying its preoccupation with norms and academic standards by setting student-oriented priorities; and creating and maintaining close relationships with its wider communities. The roles of people within special needs support groups will accommodate program continuity and consistency and acknowledge the importance of developing student individuality and belonging. I look forward to

visiting some of those schools. Because this is quite an exciting field, I would be happy to report back to the members of Parliament who are interested.

I take this opportunity to speak about some other initiatives. The 1984 Education Act Amendment Act gave ministerial responsibility for two new client groups, that is, children from zero to five years and handicapped students from 15 to 18 years of age. The Endeavour Foundation at Coorparoo does quite a deal of good work. The young people there put tablets in bottles, little screws on the ends of gadgets, pump up plastic balls and so on. A great deal of work is done there, and it will be a great benefit to have the assistance and full support of the State and to have as many resources as possible provided by the State. I congratulate the Minister on that step and for incorporating within the teaching population of the State the teachers at Endeavor Foundation schools.

I feel very strongly about the provision of breakfast for schoolchildren. I do not know that that comes specifically under special education, but it is a subject that is near and dear to my heart. This morning, I had 95 children from the Coorparoo State School visit Parliament House. I mentioned to the teachers that the school would get a new tuck-shop. Because the school is 108 years old, that is a cause for great rejoicing.

I also told the teachers that I had mentioned to the p. and c. association that perhaps it should conduct a survey of the children at the school, because I know from my days of teaching at Springwood that children are arriving at school without having any breakfast. Some of them may have had a \$20-note in their hand to buy breakfast. Children who are hungry cannot be taught. Most children were eating lunch at morning tea time—usually only doughnuts. Because the ladies in the tuck-shop had not had time, lunch had not been prepared by that hour of the morning. As a result, some of the children would come into class in a quite hyperactive state from eating the gooey stuff at morning tea, and they would be impossible for the remainder of the day.

As the teachers were leaving today, they said to me that, as a matter of fact, a number of the children were eating breakfast as they were getting into the bus to come here this morning. That was breakfast! I am sure that the Minister would appreciate that a much larger proportion of children than is presently thought is coming to school without having eaten breakfast. It is impossible to put information into a head that controls a hungry stomach. Perhaps the department should conduct a survey on that matter. I do not know whether the answer is to urge parents to take the matter more seriously or to have tuck-shops supply suitable food, such as an apple or flavoured milk, so that at least the children will have something in their stomachs before they go into class.

This is an ever-increasing problem. It does not necessarily arise from parental neglect. These days, with so many more mums in the work-force, parents are in a rush to get to work. Perhaps when they put breakfast on the table the children are not ready to eat, so they finally go to school without having breakfast. The parents put a few dollars in their hands and tell them to buy something later on if they are hungry. After the war, children in Australia were supplied with free milk. The assumption was that not everybody could afford food; many people were still very poor. Because these days people are considered to be not so needy, free milk is no longer provided.

What is happening now is not a matter of money; it is a matter of time. People are very busy. Most of the time they do not recognise that breakfast is not consumed and that it is left on the table. I ask the Minister to give a little more thought to the matters that I have mentioned.

Mr PALASZCZUK (Archerfield) (7.25 p.m.): Mr De Lacy, it is always nice to see a friendly face in the chair.

Before I begin my remarks on the Estimates of the Minister for Education, I take the opportunity to thank him and the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) for their co-operation with their Federal counterpart, Senator Susan Ryan, in announcing the upgrading of the administration of teaching facilities at the Inala State High School.

I express my appreciation to Senator Susan Ryan for taking the time to inspect the school. Her visit resulted in a joint Federal/State announcement on the immediate commencement of the project.

I thank also the students at the Inala High School who supported me in my representations on their behalf. They worked tirelessly by putting pen to paper and by producing a constant flow of letters to the editor and by contributing to lively discussions on the school campus, gathering support for the campaign to improve their school facilities. Their efforts have been well rewarded.

Finally, I thank the principal of the Inala High School, Frank Peach, and congratulate him on his appointment as an inspector.

Mr Scott: A top man.

Mr PALASZCZUK: As the honourable member said, he is a top man. He will be a great loss to the Inala High School and to the total school community in my electorate, especially the Inala school cluster that he pioneered.

I concur with a few of the comments made by the honourable member for Condamine (Mr Littleproud) in relation to the important role played by 16 per cent of teachers in our State who are still unqualified—I refer to those teachers who do not have the upgrading or the degrees—and also the role that school sport plays in the school curriculum. Over the last five or six years, the role of interschool sport has been diminished by principals and staff who have been worried about time spent by teachers with students who play interschool sport. Throughout my teaching life I always maintained that interschool sport played a very important part in the schooling system.

Mr Henderson: Hear, hear!

Mr PALASZCZUK: I thank the honourable member for Mount Gravatt for his support.

The role played by that 16 per cent of schoolteachers who have not upgraded or obtained degrees should be recognised. As a schoolteacher, I can recall a number of teachers who forwent gaining their academic qualifications mainly because they were interested in their students. They were the ones who went to school at 7.30 in the morning and who left school at 4.30 in the afternoon. Before school, they took on board the responsibility of looking after children. After school, they coached children for interschool sport.

Mr Henderson: They were the respected teachers, too.

Mr PALASZCZUK: The honourable member is correct. They always maintained respect in the school communities.

I hope that the Minister takes my statements on board. If there is a plan to upgrade those teachers, it should be done in school-time on full pay.

It is about time that somebody mentioned the Participation and Equity Program. The Hawke Federal Government has decided that the grants to the States under the Participation and Equity Program planned for 1986 will now be spread over the 1986-87 years. Both schools and TAFE colleges will be affected. 1986 was to have been the last year of the program, which began in 1984. However, PEP will now extend over four years instead of three years. PEP has targeted 714 schools in 1985. It aims to stimulate an increase in participation by young people by reducing significantly the number of students who leave full-time education prematurely.

It also seeks to foster improved outcomes in education. These are the long-term aims, the achievement of which is being stimulated by PEP.

No-one can deny that the Participation and Equity Program has made a promising start in its first 16 months. In Government and non-Government schools, a number of PEP projects, which address the need for teacher development and curriculum change

to encourage participation in education, especially by those groups that have been underrepresented, are being conducted.

In the TAFE sector, new initiatives for disadvantaged groups have included courses designed specifically for certain migrant groups, Aboriginals, isolated rural youth, women and girls. Provision has also been made for the socially disadvantaged and the physically or intellectually disadvantaged.

The extension of PEP to four years, at a reduced rate of expenditure, will allow time for greater attention to be devoted to the development of the program, particularly in areas such as curriculum change and targeting of schools. The Federal Labor Government's decision to spread, over 1986 and 1987, the amount presently provided for 1986 will result in the provision of \$41,079,000 in each of those years. The amount presently legislated for 1986 is \$82,157,000.

I have spoken previously about the need for a TAFE college in Inala. At the outset, I congratulate Kingaroy—and particularly its member of Parliament for his wonderful representations in Cabinet—and now Warwick and Kingston for getting this facility. As I have pointed out on previous occasions, the suburb of Inala is the same size as the city of Maryborough. I have previously suggested to the Minister for Education that the former St Mark's Leagues Club in Lilac Street, Inala, could be a starting point. However, that suggestion seems to have been lost in the system.

At present, the TAFE college nearest to Inala is at Bundamba, and the pupils have quite a journey given the transport system in Inala. Inala has an indifferent bus service to Oxley or Darra, then an unco-ordinated train service to Bundamba. It is reasonably tolerable during the day-time. However, it precludes adults, who wish to take night courses, from attending. At present, adults living in Inala, who are taking night courses travel to Corinda, which is not too far away. That is fine if one has a car. However, if one does not have a car—

Mr Davis: You're a prisoner in the suburb.

Mr PALASZCZUK: As the honourable member for Brisbane Central says, the people are prisoners in their own suburb.

Without a car, it is virtually impossible to get out of Inala because there is no night transport. This is one of the reasons why it was so vital that the Brisbane City Council Cityxpress bus service be extended from Acacia Ridge to Inala. Even though this service is hourly after 6 p.m., it is better than nothing. If the service were extended, Inala night students would have reasonable access to any educational institution. However, in his wisdom, the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) decided that the extension was not to be.

Mr Davis: In his bitterness.

Mr PALASZCZUK: As the honourable member for Brisbane Central says, in his bitterness.

I am sure that the boffins, who advise the Minister and work from 9 a.m. till 5 p.m. and are supplied with Government cars, did not even consider the plight of the night students when knocking the Cityxpress bus service to Inala on the head.

Perhaps if people, particularly house-bound housewives who are stuck at home every day, had better access to evening classes, the community would not have half the social problems.

Whilst I am on the subject of TAFE colleges, I intend once again to bring to the attention of the Committee the advantages to the State Government of purchasing the St Mark's Leagues Club. Recently, officers of the Catholic Archdiocese of Brisbane have told me that the building and land are for sale. After an inspection of the facility and discussions with the members of the Inala schools cluster and community representatives, I am convinced that the Department of Education should recognise the potential of the site for use as a Brisbane-West Region applied-study centre.

The facility could be identified as an extension of the campuses of Richlands State High School, Inala State High School and, with a cross-suburb road link to Acacia Ridge, the Acacia Ridge State High School. It could be made available to all educational institutions in the region, in the same way as the Brisbane-South Region commercial resource centre is used. The centre would ultimately require a full-time co-ordinator—I realise that—but staff at both the Inala high and Richlands high have the potential to use the facility as an extension of their campuses. Already a significant quantity of equipment and number of personnel, provided by grants from the special programs project, are located at those two high schools. Incidentally, the ceiling on funding for the project currently is determined by space limitations at both schools.

A large number of submissions under the special programs scheme has been forwarded by both high schools. The funding received runs into six-digit figures. With the assurance of the future development of the Participation and Equity Program, which I outlined earlier, the potential for the facility, if acquired, is unlimited. The outcome of the acquisition is not only the product obtained but also the process that would result in developing the facility over a number of years.

The facility lends itself to a wide range of uses. In the immediate future, it could be used for—

music, for skills developed in learning to play instruments and for instrumental music lessons by visiting specialists;

radio, sound, lighting, audio-visual techniques, film and television, drama, human movements, dance and orienteering; and

TAFE stream 6 adult education, the need for the development of which is obvious, as no adult education course is offered in that area, which has a population of 30 000.

In the short term, the facility could be utilised for catering and hospitality, driver education and road safety. In the long term—and I stress that—it would be used as a commercial resource centre, similar to the Brisbane-South Region commercial resource centre, for senior manual arts, landscaping and environmental studies and for professional development and in-service training of staff from all educational institutions. The facility could virtually become the community centre for Inala, Acacia Ridge, Richlands, Darra, Carole Park and Durack.

I hope that the Minister examines and considers my suggestion and divorces himself from his bricks-and-mortar Government, the sole aim of which is to open buildings in an endeavour to attract publicity and votes. I urge the Minister to bite the bullet and negotiate the purchase of the existing facility at the St Mark's Leagues Club.

It would be remiss of me not to draw attention to the state of education in the Redlands electorate. A survey recently revealed that most classes in Redlands exceed the recommendations made by the Ahern committee. The position has deteriorated rapidly.

Mr Scott: And the National Party will rue the day on 2 November.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Yes. The Labor Party is eagerly awaiting the election of Con Sciacca as its new member of Parliament.

On the basis of the facilities provided in Redlands, Queensland is the most underserved State in Australia. This Government—the Bjelke-Petersen scandal-ridden Government—has no adequate answer to the needs of people in growing areas. I refer to the Capalaba State High School as an example. It has 1 900 pupils. The electorate of Gregory has a total of 8 000 people spread over thousands of square kilometres. The principal town, Longreach, has a population of about 1 900. Imagine the result if the population of a town the size of Longreach were squeezed into a couple of buildings for over six hours a day. Thinking people would be appalled. It is deplorable that student members at Capalaba High School have been allowed to grow till they are the equivalent

of the population of Longreach. I have no doubt that members of the National Party will run down to Redlands and promise all kinds of schools; but the main question that must be answered by the Government is not where its financial resources will come from, but where the teachers will come from.

As was said previously by the Opposition spokesman the honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood), an additional 1 087 teaching positions have been created. However, all honourable members would know that funds for 135 of those positions were provided by the Endeavour Foundation and that 35 positions were assigned to pre-school teaching, 15 were primary advisory positions and 19 were secondary consultant teaching positions. The actual number of teaching positions provided by the Government is therefore reduced to 883. That represents an addition of approximately 10 teachers for each electorate. In the electorate of Redlands, the addition of ten teachers will not do anything to alleviate the problem that exists, let alone solve a future problem.

The National Party has said that since it won Redlands, 19 schools have been opened in that area. It should be pointed out, however, that some of the schools in the area are over 100 years old, which is just a shade older than the Premier and Treasurer. One wonders how accurate claims made by the National Party are. The people of Redlands must be made to realise that the cynicism of the National Party knows no bounds when it comes to buying votes.

While I am speaking about deficiencies in staffing levels and accommodation in the schools of the Redlands electorate, I point out the inequity that exists in the Government subsidy system. That system works against people who live in areas of rapid growth, such as the electorate of Redlands. Through no fault of their own, parents who send their children to school in the Redlands electorate are unable to contribute as much as they would like to p. and c. association fund-raising ventures. The reasons are quite obvious: for instance, parents have to furnish new homes; they have to landscape their gardens; they have to purchase the necessary white goods for their homes; and, of course, they are paying off mortgages on their homes. As a result, the funds of the p. and c. associations in the Redlands electorate are much lower than the funds held by associations in the well-heeled areas.

I feel that that inequity requires close scrutiny. I cite an example: if one were to compare the fund-raising activities of schools in areas such as Capalaba or Birkdale with, say, schools at Graceville or Indooroopilly, one would not have to be a Rhodes scholar, as the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) once was, to work out that the constituents of Redlands subsidise grandiose schemes of members of p. and c. associations at Graceville or Indooroopilly. Let me take the example one step further. On a dollar-for-dollar basis, if \$15,000 was raised by holding a fete at the Graceville school—and that would be a very conservative estimate—the Government's subsidy would bring that amount up to \$30,000. If a fete was held in the Redlands area—an area in which there is not much money—and \$6,000 was raised, the subsidy would bring that amount up to \$12,000. The figures speak for themselves.

The Government subsidy scheme needs to be overhauled in an effort to overcome injustices of that type. I am quite sure that, my colleague and friend Con Sciacca, the Australian Labor Party candidate and next member for Redlands, because of his knowledge of the electorate, will form part of a future Labor Government that will eliminate such injustices.

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (7.43 p.m.): I begin my speech this evening by congratulating the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) and officers of his department on the operations carried out within the education system in this State not only during the past year but also over several years. I believe that the Education Department is continuing at a steady pace along a well-designed course in the provision of educational instruction and facilities in Queensland.

I want to acknowledge especially the understanding and the firm grasp of the workings of the department displayed by the Minister. That is not only because he was

a teacher—being a teacher does not necessarily equip one to be a good Minister for Education, although I am sure that the Minister's training has provided him with a good basis—but also because he has a genuine and particular interest in the role played by the education system in society and because he has a gift for educational administration from which everyone benefits. I take the opportunity to wish the Minister continuing good health and happiness, and I extend my best wishes to him and his wife on the occasion of their recent marriage.

My comments about the Education Estimates will take two main directions. I wish to comment on distance education and, to a lesser extent, tertiary education. First of all, I wish to acknowledge the new work and improvements, and the continuing work, being carried out in my electorate.

My electorate is fortunate in having probably the widest range of educational facilities of any electorate in this State or Australia. They range from the pre-school and special school right up to a tertiary institution, including the rural training school. I instance the new Burdekin College of Technical and Further Education at Home Hill, which the Minister opened not long ago, although it commenced operation at the beginning of this year. The new school that has been built at Jarvisfield virtually completes the range of new facilities in the Burdekin. Another facility that is almost completed is the new administration block at the Home Hill High School. It is a magnificent facility. Various other improvements include new toilets at the Home Hill State School.

I congratulate the Minister and his department on giving approval for a major amenities block at the Burdekin Rural Education Centre at Clare, which will mean a significant improvement in the life-style of the students. At Burdekin Falls a pre-school to high-school standard school was recently opened under the principal, Geoff St Clair. I understand that this magnificent facility will ultimately be shifted, but I visit it regularly. The facility that has been provided by the department is making a wonderful environment in which the children can learn. The students come from all over Australia. Children from South Australia, Western Australia, New South Wales and all over this State work and learn together in a wonderful environment.

I would be remiss if I did not mention a very special school in my electorate. I like to think that all schools are special, but the Ravenswood State School, strangely enough, recently held what is understood to be the first fete in its 112-year history. The school was opened on 27 October 1873, and since that date about 4 000 children have attended the school. In years gone by, Ravenswood was the centre of a huge gold-mining operation. In fact, it is now coming back into prominence as a gold-mining area.

The principal's residence in Ravenswood is of particular interest. I understand that it is the oldest in the State still in use, and it has been continually used since 1873. I was very fortunate in being able to attend the fete. I commend the way in which the people involved with the school, under the young, very excited and enthusiastic principal, Mr Ian Mackay, got together to organise the fete. People such as Mrs Lorraine Italiano, who is the president of the p. and c. association, Mrs Jennifer Carter, the treasurer, and Mrs Judy Lambert, the secretary, did a wonderful job. I was very happy on that occasion to be able to present a book about Queensland to Roslyn Easton to commemorate that first fete. Roslyn will place it in the school library.

A number of residences have been constructed in the electorate to accommodate teachers who have recently been appointed to cope with the increasing number of children in the community. In every instance there is a major and continuing need for maintenance, and this is being very adequately dealt with by the department.

A fire recently occurred at the Ayr State School. The principal, Mr Ian Fisher, was able, with the help of the community and the fire brigade, to bring it under control. The fire was maliciously lit. I want to make particular reference to the efforts of two young gentlemen, Jeremy Ivory and Peter Dennis, who live in Graham Street, Ayr. They spied the fire and raised the alarm. However, not being content with raising the alarm, they went over to the school and took on the fire on their own. They went to great

lengths to try to bring the fire under control. Their efforts resulted in minimal damage to the school. In fact, with Mr Fisher's aid, they were able to save a major portion of the school facility, the loss of which would have created tremendous problems for the staff, parents and, more particularly, the students. I draw the attention of honourable members to the need to place greater emphasis on watching out for vandalism, because school facilities are constantly at the mercy of people who, for some reason or other, want to create devastation.

I commend the single-minded community attitude of those two young fellows, who could have ignored the fire on the basis that it was someone else's business. If there were more people like those two lads in the community, there would be fewer traumas.

I mention the recently celebrated 75 years of operation of the Maidavale school. It should be of particular interest to honourable members, because that school was the school at which the late Arthur Coburn, the former member for Burdekin, taught for 20-odd years before becoming a member of this Assembly for 19 years. The celebrations were guided by Julie Urry, the school principal. I congratulate all who were involved.

I move now to an area of education in which I have been interested for years, namely, distance education. The Government has been highlighting its continuing interest in distance education in several tangible ways, not the least of which was the announcement some time ago of the building of two new schools of distance education in Longreach and Charters Towers, to be commenced in 1987. I have a certain affinity with both communities. My eldest daughter commenced her School of the Air education some time ago through Charters Towers. The support services provided by the Department of Education were of tremendous benefit to my wife in the 11 quite difficult years she spent in educating our children, without any prior knowledge of teaching. Mothers in the same situation have to prepare their children for a secondary education and lay the foundation for successful careers. Much of the support received by my wife was given by the dedicated officers of the Department of Education under the various Ministers for Education.

With reference to the distance education and some of the operations of the Isolated Children's Parents Association, in May 1983, the Queensland Council of the ICPA presented a submission to the Minister for Education suggesting that a ministerial committee be established to define distance education and propose ways in which that definition might best benefit isolated students within the State. As a result of negotiations with the Minister, the association raised several points that needed to be addressed. They were, firstly, the forthcoming launching of the Australian-owned satellite, which has now been accomplished; secondly, the improvements constantly being made in the process of extending education to isolated students; and, thirdly, the need to provide the best possible service to isolated students because of the ever-growing importance of education in modern society.

In November 1983, Cabinet approved the establishment of a ministerial advisory committee on distance education. It had certain terms of reference. It is very important that they be recorded in *Hansard*. They were—

- “(i) a clear definition of the meaning of distance education as it applies to the needs of geographically isolated students and others in Queensland;
- (ii) the development and implementation of changes arising from that definition, and strategies for their integration into the existing education system;
- (iii) ways in which distance education might be most effectively co-ordinated;
- (iv) the relationship of the above to the relevant sections of the Fifth Interim Report of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland; and
- (v) any other matters that might arise pertaining to distance education and the educational welfare of those who learn at a distance.”

The approval of Cabinet was gained on 28 November 1983.

The membership, as originally approved, comprised Mr Bill Hamilton; Mr Phil Cullen; Mrs J. H. Dill; Mr Ken Imison; Mr Ian Matheson; Mrs Patricia Mitchell, who is currently president of the State and Federal council of the Isolated Children's Parents Association; Mr Bunny Powne, who is well known to all honourable members and to people throughout the State; Mr John Tainton; and Mr Dick Warry, who, I am delighted to say, is assisting the Minister tonight. The executive officer to the committee was Mr John Kitt. When the original chairman, Mr Bill Hamilton, moved to another section of the department, Mr Matheson became chairman and, subsequently, Mr Dixon was appointed to succeed him.

The committee has met formally on 18 occasions, and is now considering its final report to be delivered to the Minister. The committee did not just meet in Brisbane. It travelled all over the State, including the remote areas, and invited submissions from everyone.

The committee also met with people from overseas, and I was delighted to meet and talk with Mr Ernie Tolly and Dr Bill Bramble from the Alaskan Department of Education. I was interested to hear of their experiences and attitudes. They have very positive attitudes to the satellite communications network and are of the belief that Queensland needs that type of facility.

Tomorrow, the Isolated Children's Parents Association is meeting in St George. In my capacity as immediate past president, I am flying out to St George with the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mike Ahern) to open the conference. The work of ICPA touches upon the lives of virtually every rural family—indeed, every family—in this State.

I make particular reference to two people who have been involved with distance education. Frank and Colleen Sims operate as itinerant teachers out of Cairns. I am sure that the honourable member for Cook (Mr Scott) will acknowledge the wonderful work that they do. In the Queen's Birthday honours list they were awarded the Order of Australia. I think that that would be the first time that a husband and wife have been awarded such an honour. It would certainly be the first time that it has happened in education. After 8½ years as itinerant teachers, they are still enthusiastic and dedicated in their work in the Gulf and Peninsula areas.

I will read briefly from a booklet titled *State Education in Queensland: A Brief History* to emphasise just how far the wheel has turned. It contains this passage—

“Attempts to solve the problem of distance constituted another important trend in the new century. Distance had always been a major factor inhibiting the spread of schooling. To help overcome this problem, the Department implemented an itinerant teacher scheme between 1901 and 1932. Itinerant teachers travelled over the lonely outback to bring books and a few hours of schooling to the children of isolated settlers and pastoral workers, but few of these teachers were able to visit families more than three times a year. With the improvement of postal facilities, the Department gradually replaced the work of the itinerant teacher by the more efficient services of the Primary Correspondence School, founded in 1922.”

The department has seen fit to reconstitute the operations of itinerant teachers as a very necessary component in bringing professional services to students and families in very isolated areas.

Finally, I touch on some areas of tertiary education. As all honourable member are aware, the Education Department has an interest in various facets of tertiary education—universities, CAEs and TAFE colleges. Because two of my daughters are involved with the tertiary level of education, I have a particular interest in it. Most parents would acknowledge that they do not really come to understand the benefits, the deficiencies or the problems within the various facets of education until they themselves are touched by them. I must confess to a singular disinterest in tertiary education when my children were at primary school. Now, because of my daughters and because I am a member of the Minister's education committee, I must confess that I take a far greater personal

interest in tertiary education. As one of my daughters is studying for a teaching diploma and the other for a commerce degree, every day I see the practical aspects of tertiary education.

The three areas of tertiary education in this State gain a disproportionately low share of Commonwealth funding. In fact, between 1971 and 1983, Queensland's population increased from 14.2 per cent to 16.1 per cent of the national population, but the proportion of funding did not increase during that time. Although Queensland has that percentage of the population of Australia, it receives much less than 16 per cent of Commonwealth funding for tertiary education. If Queensland had received an annual grant in proportion to its population, its universities would have received an additional \$20.9m. On the same basis, Commonwealth grants to advanced education in Queensland would have increased by \$7.5m and, for TAFE, by \$6.5m.

In its report for the 1985-87 triennium, the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission acknowledged Queensland's relatively low participation in tertiary education, particularly in technical and further education. As other honourable members have said, one of the reasons is that Queensland is deprived of funding. If the allocation of funding over those years had been based on the proportion of under-25-year-old students, the funding would have been even higher.

I acknowledge the work that has been done in my electorate at the Burdekin College of Technical and Further Education and congratulate the college on the way in which the people involved are integrating the courses into the community. At the moment, it is running pre-vocational courses—one in engineering construction, which takes six months off an apprenticeship course; another in business studies relating to retailing, wholesaling and so on; and one in hairdressing. Even from my small community, approximately 900 students have undertaken part-time courses at the college. One of the problems faced by students at TAFE colleges—I am sure that it applies to other tertiary institutions—is in finding accommodation and gaining access to courses. I am sure that, in many areas of the State, that is a major problem.

Time expired.

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (8.3 p.m.): I am pleased to have the opportunity to take part in the debate. Largely, I shall refer to educational matters in my electorate. The Education Department is most important to the Cook electorate and is a very important department in the State.

Firstly, I shall comment on the Minister's role. I am curious to know whether, after the coming ministerial reshuffle that the Premier and Treasurer has in mind, the Minister will remain in his current position. I know that he is a very ambitious man and has his sights set on the premiership.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SCOTT: He should not hold his breath. By the time he gets even close to the top, the National Party will be voted out of office.

Mr Borbidge: Do you think you will be the member for Cook for that long?

Mr SCOTT: I am certain I will still be the member for Cook.

The Minister is dedicated to his job. He has the experience. Government members have praised the Minister and I certainly will not damn him.

Mr Burns: They have to do that or they will get into trouble tomorrow at the party meeting.

Mr SCOTT: Of course. If they do not, they will be lined up and caned by the Premier.

I will not damn the Minister with faint praise. He has the potential to be a good National Party Minister for Education. He went through a period when he had a swelled

head. He lost touch with the ordinary people. It is a shame that that happens to Ministers, because basically they are decent people. If the Minister forgets to talk to the ordinary person, he will lose touch with reality. It is a shame for that to happen to any Minister. Collectively, the Government is out of touch with the people of Queensland. The event on 2 November will prove my point. I make a confident prediction now that the Government will be beaten roundly in the Redlands by-election on 2 November. On that day, the Opposition will be taking the smiles off the faces of Government members. There are many good Ministers. Because of the course that the Government has taken, it has collectively lost touch with the people. The Minister is tending to do that, too. The Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson) prides himself on being in close touch with the people of this State and certainly with members of this Assembly. It is good to deal with such a Minister. I should like the same reaction from the Minister for Education.

I must comment generally on the poor tone of the speeches made by Government members. I invite honourable members to read them tomorrow. Those members made concocted speeches that were read out in this Chamber. The grammar and syntax from some of the former principals were shocking. It is no wonder that English has a low level in educational priorities. Do I see a smile on the face of the honourable member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard)? His speech was a classic example—sentences ending with prepositions and that sort of thing. His syntax was dreadful. Relatively speaking, I am an uneducated person, but I am certainly better than some Government members. The only thing that troubles me is that they are so high and mighty. Their noses are so high in the air. I would not mind if they had made their speeches off the cuff. If they did we would expect to hear sonorous, rolling phrases from them. But they went to the trouble of laboriously writing their speeches in longhand and having them typed by their secretaries. I would say that the secretaries are probably responsible for the punctuation. What those members did is a scandalous state of affairs. They should be sent back to school and re-educated. Of course, after the next election they will have a chance to get back to the old chalk and blackboard. On the way through, they should be given a lesson in basic English, because it is urgently needed.

Education is most important in the Torres Strait area, including Thursday Island. This evening, an honourable member said that the Minister should bite the bullet. As far as education in the Torres Strait area is concerned, he has done that. He has made a minor niche in history. He took over education in the Torres Strait area from a department that should not have been responsible for it. I am pleased that that has happened. I know that the Minister's department has problems in funding education in that area. As far as costs are concerned, he has the tiger by the tail simply because the previous department had let the education system run down to an astounding and intolerable level. That should not have happened. The constant thrust of my speeches in this Chamber has been to have that changed. I am pleased that it has happened. I do not want the credit for it. I am happy to give the credit to the Minister because he was responsible for it. He takes note of the educational situation in the Cook electorate.

Today, I listened to the Minister's presentation of his Estimates and I heard him outline his goals for the Torres Strait area. They include the appointment of qualified principals in all of the schools on the outer islands. That is most important. He realises that the people have laboured without them. At a later date, it is proposed to appoint, to each school, two qualified teachers, one of whom will be the principal. Other teachers will be educated. Basically, they will be Torres Strait Islander teachers. That is a good state of affairs, because they are very competent and capable people. They have the background of their own community. They are in touch at that good old grassroots level. The training and the appointment of those islander teachers must be speeded up. The Minister will have all sorts of problems not only with educating them but also with accommodation for them.

I wrote to the Minister about the need for teacher accommodation on the outer islands. He wrote back and told me that because they live in their own communities they do not need to be provided with accommodation. Because they are not always at

their home community, that is not the case. They cannot always rely on the community providing a house. The Minister would be aware that, up to the present, and probably well into the future, housing has been and will be controlled by the Department of Community Services. That department is capable of playing games with the accommodation for teachers. It has been and still is playing with the problem of getting goods out to the islands. The transport that has to be used is owned by the Department of Community Services. That creates enormous difficulties in that area.

I mention also the problem of teachers having to go to Cairns or Townsville to be educated. Who provides accommodation for them? Basically, this Government does not provide student accommodation at tertiary institutions. Accommodation is provided by churches or other organisations. Who will provide accommodation in Cairns for students attending the TAFE college? I have tried to get better accommodation for teachers in Cairns. A number of them are living at Alluna Hostel. It is a disgraceful state of affairs. Those students, who are undergoing important tertiary education, should not be required to live at Alluna Hostel, which has no facilities for them to enjoy their private lives, for after-hours study, research or anything. Some of the students were able to get accommodation in Department of Community Services houses. For weeks they lived in those houses without furniture. That department could not provide them with furniture. People in Cairns actually lent furniture to the Islander people living in those houses. Those students lived like flying foxes, without any of the usual facilities of a house.

That situation demonstrates this Government's lack of interest in education in the Torres Strait Islander and Aboriginal communities. The Government pays lip-service to these things, but nothing ever happens. A great need exists to start at the beginning. I know that the Minister can claim that the matter has been out of his hands up to the present time. As he said in his speech, it was only this year that he was able to take that into the Education portfolio. But that is only part of it. The Minister has to consider the whole scene, including the lives of teachers in Islander communities, their education and their re-placement back on those islands.

I will highlight more of the problems in education on the Torres Strait islands. I asked the Minister to establish a primary school on Horn Island. I know that the answer was that a decision had been made. The Minister considered it, and that is very good. It was decided that it was better to keep the larger primary school on Thursday Island and do without a school on Horn Island. Again, the Minister is not following right through. What about truancy on Horn Island? Who is responsible for preventing truancy on Horn Island?

I sent the Minister a telegram about the need to continue a boat service between Prince of Wales Island and Thursday Island. One day, when the regional director and the primary school principal happened to be on the wharf at Thursday Island, they saw one student coming over on the boat. I hope that the look on the Minister's face is not a mystified one. If it is, it means that he has not received my telegram and does not know anything about the matter. Obviously it will take as long to get a letter from this Minister as it does to receive one from the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs. That is a dreadful state of affairs.

This boat had only one student on board, so the regional director immediately cancelled the boat service. There should be seven children on that boat. The children who needed to travel to the primary school on Thursday Island were therefore forced to go back to using 12 and 14-foot dinghies over a very rough passage of water. That is quite dangerous. The Education Department did not care about that. It did not care that it was putting those children at risk. The boat service was simply cancelled to save money. I know that the Minister has now got the message and that he will consider the matter carefully. If there was only one student on that boat, it would have been a relatively rare occurrence. However, it does indicate the possibility of a degree of truancy on Prince of Wales Island and on Horn Island. Somehow or other, the police must be motivated—either by the Minister's senior departmental officers or the school principals—to check on whether or not the children on those islands are receiving an education.

Thursday Island does have a new high school. It is a shame that the Minister did not go up there to open it. However, I realise that at that time he was not in the best of health. I know that he has taken an interest and that he delegated that job. I ask him what is happening about the old site on Thursday Island. It is an ideal location for a TAFE college.

Mr Eaton: He'll open any school you ask him to. He'll help you out that way.

Mr SCOTT: Before very long, Opposition members will be opening all of the schools, so it will not matter.

Mr Eaton: You'll do a good job, too.

Mr SCOTT: I thank the honourable member for Mourilyan.

It is an ideal site for a TAFE college. That level of education is urgently needed in Torres Strait Islander and Aboriginal communities. As the Minister is probably aware, unemployment levels are extremely high. If the unemployment rate is 15 or 20 per cent in rural areas, it will be 70 or 80 per cent in the Aboriginal communities and on the Torres Strait islands. The one thing that will remedy that is the right type of education with many more practical courses for Aboriginal communities and for the Torres Strait Islanders.

I turn to the subject of health in the Torres Strait area. Immediately the cry will go up that, in a debate on education, that subject is irrelevant. The member for Greenslopes (Mrs Harvey) set the precedent. She spoke quite knowledgeably about the need for children to have the correct diet if they are to benefit from education. That is vital in the Torres Strait area. The other day, in the Chamber I asked the Minister for Health a question on this subject. The reply that I received from him was disgraceful. He skates about the high standard of health services provided in the remainder of the State, but totally ignores the Torres Strait and the Peninsula areas, where health services are provided by the Department of Community Services. It is not geared to provide health care. What it is geared to provide these days, I am not certain, but it definitely should not be responsible for health care. In Kowanyama, Edward River, Weipa South, Lockhart River, parts of Bamaga and the outer islands in the Torres Strait, health is the responsibility of the Department of Community Services. That ought to be altered.

A Cabinet minute several years ago provided that responsibility for health of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities was to be assumed by the Health Department. Earlier this year, that minute was rescinded. Is the Minister concerned about the high cost of providing education in the Torres Strait area? Have the high costs frightened the Government out of providing the health care that is so necessary in that area? I urge the Minister to implore his colleague the Minister for Health to urge the Cabinet to allow him to resume control of health in that area. That is sorely needed. A structured nurse education program is required. The Minister should not be flummoxed by it. They are the people who will guarantee that the children have an adequate diet. If the children are healthy, they are able to absorb education. That is the Minister's reason for being. He touches on part of the problem, but does not consider either end of it. I urge him to grasp the nettle and consider all aspects of education.

Mr Powell: And take over the Department of Harbours and Marine, too?

Mr SCOTT: The Minister should not be facetious. By making a joke of it, he is making a fool of himself. He is not making a fool of me. I did not ask him to take over health. I asked him to urge his colleague to have health taken over.

The state of education in Australia concerns me deeply. The Minister's only comment to me—non-constructive, though it was—was that, if I had kept my meddling fingers out of it, everything would have been all right. The Minister nods his head. That shows his lack of understanding. He has no idea of the part I played in this matter at Aurukun. The Minister might sit there pulling faces at me. That does not worry me. As I have already said, he is only making a fool of himself.

What has occurred at Aurukun is a shame. It is necessary for the department to choose teachers who have an understanding of Aboriginal communities. That was not reflected in the choice of the principal at Aurukun. I realise that the Minister probably could not have moved him—the Minister told me that he could not—but who has been charged with the responsibility of rebuilding the bridges between the town and the school at Aurukun? The principal certainly had no understanding of the way in which to treat Aboriginal children, let alone the way in which to deal with Aboriginal parents.

As a result of his poor attitude, morale both in the school and in the community broke down totally. The Minister's retort was, "If the parents won't send their children to school, we'll simply remove three teachers." What a simplistic answer to the problem. That is all he has done about it. I repeat that the Minister touches a problem in the middle but overlooks the extremities and that is where the problem lies. He might sit and giggle—he appears to be enjoying himself—but I know that he is not as foolish as he looks. I certainly hope that he is absorbing my comments.

Aurukun deserves teachers who have an understanding of Aboriginal communities. There ought to be inspectors and other senior staff with a similar knowledge. I know that such people are in the department and that, gradually, the people with that understanding and training will have a far greater say in Aboriginal communities.

A better understanding is urgently needed, and I cannot stress enough the importance of reaching that goal as soon as possible. Among Aboriginal children, there are many reasons for absenteeism which do not relate only to the problems of alcohol abuse, to the out-station program that operates at Aurukun or to hunting, as a school principal who saw fit to write to *The Cairns Post* once suggested. There is a whole host of reasons for attendance levels in Aboriginal communities not being as good as they should be, and the Minister should employ liaison officers who can work towards an improvement in attendance. The Minister should not take a simple view and say, "OK, we are providing the education and you will use it or else." The areas to which I refer are special, and special assistance is required.

Curriculum relevance, for example, is a major factor that explains the high level of absenteeism. Another factor is that very few opportunities for employment are available, and I believe that unemployment is at the level of 70 or 80 per cent. When children leave school, they have no goals, because employment opportunities are scarce, so they stay on at school for a much longer period than would otherwise be the case. Family problems also explain the reason for poor attendance levels.

I now refer to areas located in the northern section of the Peninsula region. On previous occasions, I have stressed the importance of the provision of a full high school at Weipa. I asked the Minister to inform me of the criteria that are applied in establishing high schools in an area. Weipa has a secondary department, and I am well aware of the problems associated there with having only Years 8, 9 and 10, and the limitations inherent in the reduced secondary education provided, not only for the children but also in respect of the aspirations held by the parents of schoolchildren. However, I do not think that, in this day and age, the only criterion that should be applied is the number of people who demand facilities. I can assure the Minister that, at Weipa, adequate numbers of students can be found to justify the establishment of a fully-fledged high school. The Minister played an important part in the establishment of a high school at Cooktown and he took a personal interest in that project. I am very pleased that he did.

Schools are important in the development of towns and in the retention of the population in older towns. In areas in which small country towns are located, the provision of higher educational facilities may have the effect of maintaining at a high level populations which would otherwise tend to diminish. I know that the residents of Georgetown are applying pressure for the establishment of a secondary department at the high school there. That matter is to be examined by the Georgetown p. and c. association. As soon as a consensus is reached and a decision is made, I will be writing

to the Minister about the need for a secondary department, and urging him to make a favourable decision.

Speaking of small country towns reminds me of the pleasure I felt in showing round Parliament House schoolchildren from the town of Forsayth. Those children were able to visit Parliament House because of the assistance provided by students at the Eagle Junction State School, which is a Brisbane school that has taken up an adopted school program. An exchange of students takes place. Children from Forsayth attend the Eagle Junction State School, and vice versa. It is quite often the case that that is the only way in which country schoolchildren can visit Brisbane and be given the opportunity to come to Parliament House. Every day that the House sits, honourable members see large numbers of schoolchildren in the gallery.

Before I conclude my remarks, I commend the staff of the Peninsula Regional Directorate, who are very good people to deal with. It is of great assistance to have, located in Cairns, a regional directorate office for the Peninsula area. In addition, the area has been fortunate in being provided with the flying regional director. Although this is the first region over which he has been given control, it is certainly to his credit that he has been given the responsibility for opening and establishing a regional office. I congratulate the regional director and the people who assist him on the job they are doing. I have a good relationship with the staff of that office—and with all departmental officers—and I intend to keep it that way.

I mention briefly the Participation and Equity Program that was referred to earlier, and I also wish to refer to the Priority Country Area Program. I ask the Minister how the funding priorities for PCAP are determined, and whether it is true that the same amount has to be applied to a larger area of the State. Both programs have great relevance and have the potential to provide great benefit to country areas, and I would like to see them continue and be upgraded.

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (8.24 p.m.): It gives me a great deal of pleasure indeed to participate in this debate this evening. I commence by congratulating the Minister, the ministerial officers, administrators of the Department of Education and all teachers in Queensland for the excellent contribution they have made to the development of the children and youth of Queensland.

I direct the attention of all honourable members to an unusual phenomenon. I point out that virtually all of the former teachers who are now members of this Parliament are in total agreement on one issue, and that is the importance of sport in schools. All of the honourable members to whom I have referred have expressed profound regret and deep concern for the demise of school sport. I hope that the Minister has not missed the significance of that point. Something must be done about school sport in particular and extra-curricular activities in general in Queensland schools.

I now wish to make a few comments on the article that appeared in *The Australian* dated 16 October 1985 referring to the proposed women, gender and society course at Griffith University. I feel that a number of issues need to be clarified in view of the comments by the honourable member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras).

First of all, it is important that this Committee and the community—the community includes the university community—understand that the Queensland Government has no power whatever to intrude into the internal operations of any university or college of advanced education in Queensland unless those operations are considered to be illegal. In fact, that principle applies to every facet of life in Queensland, whether it be universities, the personal lives of citizens or whatever. Unless Griffith University is acting criminally or at variance with the statute law of Queensland, no-one in Government or, indeed, anywhere else has any power to direct the university to do anything. The malicious rumours being spread round Griffith by irresponsible and uninformed people who claim that the Queensland Government will intrude into the internal affairs of Griffith are clearly designed to create confusion and spread misinformation.

I can assure the university that the Queensland Government has no authority whatever to involve itself in the current internal controversy at Griffith University—none whatever. There is nothing happening at Griffith that is either criminal or a breach of any Queensland law; hence the Queensland Government has no authority to get involved and no intention of being dragged into an internal dispute over which it has no control. It is recognised that some of the pressure is coming from outside sources, and especially from the surrounding community.

I would have thought that every publicly funded body, be it the university, the Parliament, the Egg Marketing Board, the Princess Alexandra Hospital or whatever, must accept the principle of community accountability; hence I would have thought that the deluge of letters and petitions that some members are receiving is a healthy sign. They suggest that members of the public are interested and want to be advised, if not consulted. I support that community expectation.

I have received a number of letters from within the university protesting at this community involvement. I want to read tonight my standard response to those letters, which is—

“Thank you for your letter. Regrettably, it seems to overlook the fact that, if you wish to totally divorce yourself from community comment, you ought not to accept community funds. Since Griffith is a publicly funded institution, it must be accountable to the public at large. It is not an isolated island unto itself, totally divorced from public scrutiny and accountability.

Regardless of how you or I may or may not see the role of internal procedures, I regret that I cannot accept your view that the public ought not to be able to express its view. The procedures seem to allow the University Community to express its views; the public who support you seem to be excluded. That is regrettable and it must not be allowed to continue, especially in an institution that prides itself on its open, democratic approach. After all, what is wrong with public comment or scrutiny? You failed to address this question.

I agree—the University has a good system of review, despite its possible imperfections. (I guess nothing is perfect.) But it could be better. Our job is to make it so.

Kindest regards,

Ian Henderson.”

I direct the attention of honourable members to a recent policy statement on education made by Senator the Honourable Susan Ryan, Minister for Education in the Hawke ALP Government in Canberra. This policy statement appeared recently in *The Courier-Mail* under the headline “Education: government wants to know ‘where billions go’”. The article states—

“The Federal Government was no longer prepared to pour buckets of money into the education system indiscriminately, Education Minister Senator Susan Ryan said yesterday.

She said concern about efficiency, economy, effectiveness and equity were in the forefront of education in the second half of the 1980s.

‘I want to make it clear that the Commonwealth is deadly serious about its increasing concentration on what comes out of the education system, not just how many billions we pour in’, Senator Ryan said. ‘It is clear that the community wants quality education and it is to this demand that the Government will respond.’

‘The Commonwealth Government wants to know where its money is going and what the money spent on education is achieving.’”

I again draw the attention of honourable members to the closing sentences in that article, which I shall repeat—

“‘It is clear that the community wants quality education, and it is to this demand that the Government will respond. The Commonwealth Government wants to know where its money is going and what the spending on education is achieving.’”

The National Party in Queensland and the Labor Party in Canberra are in total agreement on that point.

Griffith University is not above the community expectations to which Senator Susan Ryan referred. Later, I shall outline the way in which the New South Wales Wran ALP Government is responding to that community expectation. It will surprise and, I suggest, shock many honourable members and, I suspect, the Griffith University.

I am aware of documents that suggest that the 10-year experiment at Griffith University has been a failure. The university council recently considered such a document.

It is disturbing to note that Griffith University is not rated highly by the community, as is seen in the fact that it does not rate highly in the preference lists of potential students. That must surely be of enormous concern to all members of the community and to the council of the Griffith University, and that includes me.

If I owned a racehorse and for 10 years it finished last in every race, I would be concerned that something must be wrong. Anyone can see that. What do we do? Shoot the horse, sack the trainer, or what? Quite clearly something is wrong at Griffith University. What is wrong? Quite frankly, I do not know. I feel, however— and listen to the howls of self-righteous protest when I say this—that the buck stops with the council, and that includes me. Personally, I believe that the council must accept the full blame. It has failed the Griffith University.

I direct the attention of honourable members to the activities of the Wran Labor Government in New South Wales. This morning, I checked this information with a research officer at Parliament House in Sydney to ensure that my comments were accurate. The New South Wales State Labor Government recognises that university and CAE councils must accept the principle of accountability. That is why the Wran Government is currently restructuring the councils of both universities and CAEs. I believe that the New South Wales Government feels that a good shake-up is necessary to ensure that the institutions themselves become more efficient and cost effective.

I have been advised that the New South Wales Government is deeply concerned about inefficiency, waste and lack of responsibility in many tertiary institutions. The Wran Government is absolutely determined to make the institutions fully accountable, hence the shake-up of all governing bodies in all tertiary institutions in New South Wales.

The Queensland Government should look very carefully at that restructuring proposal. If it is successful, perhaps a similar overhaul of Queensland tertiary institutions could be considered.

I stress that the shake-up in New South Wales centres on the governing bodies—the university and CAE councils. Unless the council of the Griffith University—and I again stress that that includes me—can lift the university out of its 10 years of third preferences and low community perceptions, and unless the university reacts more responsibly to internal and community criticism and concern, I believe that it must be replaced by a new, restructured council that is given a mandate to fix the university up. The new council, working with the very excellent vice-chancellor, Professor Roy Webb, may be the only hope for the future of Griffith University.

I was intrigued to hear the comments made by honourable members about per capita spending in Queensland. I want someone in this Chamber to explain the dilemma; I find it impossible to explain away.

The 1985-86 Queensland Budget allocation for education amounts to \$1.174 billion. I stress that that amount does not include the contribution from the Works Department,

which, for 1985-86, will be as follows: for repairs, maintenance, contingencies and so on, \$46,494,000; for provision of new buildings and major upgradings, \$142,892,000; and, from the Special Major Capital Works Program, \$63m. The allocation from the Special Major Capital Works Program is in addition to that from the normal Capital Works Program and can be found on page 103 of the Estimates. The total contribution from the Works Department amounts to \$252,386,000. I point out once more that that is in addition to the specific allocation in the Budget to education of \$1.174 billion.

The 1985-86 New South Wales Budget allocation for education amounts to \$2.405 billion. I do not know whether Works allocations are included in that figure.

Queensland has 16.1 per cent of Australia's population, and New South Wales has 34.8 per cent of the nation's population. In other words, New South Wales has 2.1614906 times Queensland's population. If New South Wales allocates the same amount of money to education as Queensland, or more, and if the New South Wales Budget allocation is divided by the Queensland Budget allocation, a figure of 2.1614906 or greater must be arrived at. However, \$2.405 billion divided by \$1.174 billion equals 2.0485519. Goodness me! The Opposition and the media are either uninformed or deliberately misinformed. What it means is that the Queensland Budget allocation, which excludes the Works Department allocation, is greater per capita than the New South Wales allocation. It is a furphy that Queensland is the lowest-spending State on education.

I will now address myself to a number of issues that were raised by other honourable members. I will refer particularly to peace education, values clarification, human relationships and the like. If one was to look at the education scene in Queensland, one would find that many schools are currently involved in disputes with parents, with community bodies and so on over such issues as peace education, human relationships and sex education, among other things. If one were to project into the future to consider what is most likely to happen in Queensland education, one would find that, historically, it would follow exactly the same pattern as that of American education—that is, there will be continuing and ongoing disputes between the schools and the local community.

Many of those disputes have resulted in community groups withdrawing children from schools and setting up their own schools. The Christian education movement, which has mushroomed in America and is growing at a very fast rate in Australia, reflects the wish of many parents that their children be trained in a very special way.

There are two ways in which one can react to these community criticisms. Firstly, one could wait for a community problem to arise in a school and then address that problem. That means that one is endlessly putting out brush fires and bush fires and each little skirmish becomes an encounter in itself. Its contribution to education in the long term is probably negligible. Therefore, one must try to find a solution that solves the problem once and for all.

I direct the attention of the Committee to the Hatch amendments that were passed by the United States Congress and written into the education codes of all States in the United States of America. The amendments are really quite simple. They say this: any educational program that deals with any controversial issue, such as values clarification, peace education and sex education, shall be approved by the parents and the students who are to be exposed to that program should the children be under 17 years of age.

In other words, the decision is not made by the teachers or the school administration, but by the parents. Throughout my references to Griffith University, I stress that the ultimate sovereignty over everything that is done rests with the parents and the public. They are the ones who should make the decision on what is and what is not taught in subjects as controversial as peace education.

In relation to tertiary studies, if any subject comes within the categories that I have mentioned, a student should have a choice as to whether he or she participates in that course of study. If I am to be true to the principles that I have just stated, I must argue that it would be unsatisfactory if ever it was believed, for the briefest of moments, that the women, gender and society course at Griffith University would be a compulsory

course of study, albeit for only 25 per cent of the bachelor of arts course in humanities. Every student who studies women, gender and society should have had a free and open choice on whether he wanted to study it.

In a time of rapidly increasing unemployment and an explosion of technology, when Government funds are limited and national and State deficits are growing at an alarming rate, the Government must look very closely at where it spends its education dollar. It seems to me that spending money on a program such as the women, gender and society course is a complete and utter waste of time.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (8.42 p.m.): I wish to pay a compliment to both the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) and the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton). The Minister for Education would be well aware that, a few years ago, north Queensland had a very severe shortage of school buildings and other school facilities. I think the Minister passed the buck. He gave his approval and then passed the problem on to the Works Department. I had to spend a great deal of time with the Minister for Works and Housing. I refer particularly to the construction of the library at the Innisfail State High School. As that library is now in operation, I ask the Minister to visit that school to see the benefits that it has brought. For many years, the lack of a library severely disadvantaged the children at that school.

I acknowledge the fact that, on many occasions, the department has been able to accede to requests. We in north Queensland do not make requests lightly. From time to time the department forgets the climatic conditions that prevail there. Many schools in north Queensland—not only in my electorate—have a problem that is caused by the department's strict policy of not erecting covered walkways between demountable buildings. During wet weather, children have to use raincoats or umbrellas when moving from one building to another. Many children, because of their youthfulness and their spirit, simply run as fast as they can to get to the next class without getting too wet. They then spend the rest of the day sitting in damp clothes.

I compliment the Minister on the improvements that have been provided in my electorate but, to get down to the nitty-gritty, I am sure that I will have arguments with him and the department for a long time to come. I will be making many more approaches to them. One of those approaches will be about janitor/groundsmen, particularly in small country schools. I have already received a letter from the Minister on this subject. The Minister explained that, at the discretion of the principal and in accordance with the needs of the school, the school has the power to spend its administration allowance on a clerk-typist or a janitor/groundsman. If the administration allowance is fully expended, the general purpose grant can also be used to assist with mowing costs.

What the department and the Minister do not realise is that I live in the superwet belt of Australia where grass needs to be mown every day, particularly during the Christmas school holidays, which coincide with the beginning of the wet season. Because the grounds are not in use, the grass grows very quickly. Because the allowance paid to many of the schools in the north is so small, those schools require the Government to put in a little more money. With a little more financial help from the Government, the schools in my area feel that they could employ a full-time janitor who could work for one day a week at each school.

The schools are prepared to spend their percentage of the allowance on employing a full-time janitor. That would create permanent employment for the janitor/groundsman. Most people in the north own utilities and would be able to drive to the schools at their own expense. If the janitor was allowed to do one day's work at each of five schools, he could go from school to school with his rider mower in the back of his utility and do the necessary work. That would be a great boon to the schools and it would save them a great deal of money. During the harvesting season, farmers are very busy and work very hard. Each year, millions of dollars is saved as a result of the hard and dedicated work done by the parents and citizens associations throughout Queensland. If the Government had to foot a quarter of the bill for the work done by p. and c. associations, the Education Vote would need to be increased by millions of dollars. With

a little more concentration and effort, and with a small pittance of a contribution by the Government to parents and citizens associations, which are prepared to work for the schools, the problem could be overcome to everyone's satisfaction.

Members have referred to the encouragement that is given to sport. More encouragement should be given in that area. Although we work hard to provide a better education for our children, some of the highest income-earners in the world, not only in Australia, are competent sportsmen. I refer to the professional cricketers, tennis-players and footballers. They are leaving the academic businessmen for dead. Some sportsmen are commanding far more for their services than a businessman who has spent years at a university and undergone years of study. He is subject to the same accidents and risks as a sportsman.

Parents in north Queensland are placed at a disadvantage because on many occasions their children are chosen to participate in sporting events in the southern part of the State. If the parents cannot afford the costs of transporting their children long distances, their children are denied the opportunities available to city-dwellers. For the price of a bus fare, the students in north Queensland could travel to the QE II sports ground, which was used for the Commonwealth Games, and participate in sporting events on a first-class sports ground. They can condition themselves to the atmosphere and environment that they will face when they reach their peak as top sportsmen. That is something that will need to be examined by the department.

I have contacted the Minister for Education and the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) to see whether suitable arrangements could be made for the Government to foot the bill for an extra carriage or two on the Sunlander. I have been told that children cannot be absent from school for more than a couple of days. Because the schoolteachers in north Queensland are so keen, I am sure that they could arrange lessons for their students. It would not cost the Government very much to provide an extra one or two carriages on the Sunlander so that all the children could arrive at their destination at the same time.

Many members representing north Queensland electorates are approached continually by parents to see whether some form of financial aid could be provided so that their children can attend sports competitions in Brisbane. The children of north Queensland would like to represent their area in State championships. Those parents who have one or two competent all-round sportsmen in their families, who may be chosen for swimming, athletics, junior sport activities, Rugby League or soccer, must bear a heavy financial burden as well as an emotional burden. They do not want to deny their children the opportunity enjoyed by other children whose parents can afford to send them to sporting events in Brisbane.

Some parents have found it easier to send their children to a boarding college in Brisbane. By doing that, the children are given greater opportunities. The parents do not have to incur travelling expenses when their children attend sporting events, especially when they are versatile sportsmen who play sport all year round. As I have said, it is cheaper for them to place their children in a boarding college in Brisbane than to incur the cost of sending their children to Brisbane, where most sporting events are held.

It is said that it is unfair to hold the championships throughout the State to avoid the same people having to pay travelling expenses each year. In some country towns, the children run on grass tracks; in other places, they run on dirt tracks. When country children do get to Brisbane, they are disadvantaged because they have trained on country tracks. Those children are taken to a track such as the one at the QEII stadium, which is equal to any in the world. It is a new environmental experience for them, and they must try to maintain their sporting ability.

Mr Underwood interjected.

Mr EATON: That is right. They do not want to hold the championships in Cairns, Innisfail or up on the tablelands. Although north Queensland has many fields that would

be suitable, I must be honest and say that it does not have the tracks necessary for top-class performances.

The people of north Queensland do not want to deny children from southern areas the opportunity to perform on the best track. However, it is a bit upsetting that northerners are expected to pay to transport their children to Brisbane in order to give them the same opportunity that Brisbane children have for the price of a bus fare. It is as simple as that.

I turn to the document *Education 2000*. In the parliamentary recess, I invited people to make an input. I was not in any way biased. I attended meetings at which *Education 2000* received adverse comment. Despite the fact that some very sincere departmental officers attended those meetings, when they were pinned down by a direct, detailed question, they were unable to answer it. The stock answer was that the paper was put out for discussion and that the department wanted public input so that it could arrive at a decision in the best interests of the community.

To a certain extent those meetings were a waste of time, because, in most cases, the answers were not specific. I agree with the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) that the discussion paper was written in terms that were pretty hard for the layman to understand. Honourable members were given additional copies of the blue paper. I lent all of my copies to people. I asked them to give them back to me when they had finished so that I could lend them to other people.

The Government did give the public the opportunity to have an input. I emphasised to people that if they ignored that opportunity, it would be no good whinging after the decision was made. I have not heard one Government member do anything other than praise *Education 2000*. I am sure that if Government members—in particular those who were school teachers—attended public meetings, they must have received some unsavoury comments about *Education 2000*. The Minister or the Director-General should arrange public meetings so that they can face the public.

I know that in north Queensland—Cairns, Innisfail and the tablelands—whenever meetings about *Education 2000* were publicised, they were very well attended. However, the people all left those meetings in dismay because they did not receive any answers. In fact, at one public meeting the officers who were invited did not attend because it was the second meeting held in Innisfail. Many of the people who attended the first meeting felt that the officers were unable to answer the questions. Perhaps they came a bit too soon after the announcement by the Minister. As I have said, those officers were unable to answer the questions. The stock answer was that it was a discussion paper, that the Government wanted input from the public. The Government wanted the public to discuss *Education 2000* and to write to the department with their recommendations. The Opposition agrees with that.

I will read some passages from a submission in response to the discussion paper *Education 2000*. One of the comments was—

“The Task Force conducting the review has no members involved directly in the school system or having class-room contact. The majority of members of this Task Force have, in fact, administrative and financial, rather than educational, responsibilities.”

Another comment was—

“This whole ‘proposal for change’ . . . is a campaign to convince the community that the Department knows best and that therefore teachers and parents must accept whatever educational decisions they choose to make.”

Another comment was—

“*Education 2000*, the preferred option is presumably *preferable* to something. Since there is NO CHOICE offered at all in *Education 2000*, it must be seen to be preferable to the present situation.”

In common with the member for Cook (Mr Scott), I did not properly understand the document *Education 2000*. I am sure that the Minister, who has academic qualifications, is more aware than I am of all the schemes that have been introduced into the Queensland education system over the last 20 years—the Radford scheme, a Canadian system, MACOS, SEMP, ROSBA and all of the rest. In his speech today, the Minister said that he hopes to have ROSBA operating in all secondary schools in Queensland in the 1985-86 year. In other words, although the ROSBA system has not been fully implemented, the department is already considering another system.

I am not satisfied that the department has ever fully implemented a system introduced by the Queensland Government. It would appear, to all intents and purposes, that, when the Government is bogged down and cannot fulfil its obligations to the State's education system, whether in the provision of schools, teachers or finance to run the education service, it decides to change the system and opt for a different one. Whenever it introduces a system, it is not very long before it proposes another or talks about change, to take the heat off.

If the department has a surplus in its Vote for this year and does not know what to do with it, a few months before the end of the financial year it could approach me. I would be able to spend most of it in my electorate, without being too extravagant.

Mr Randell: You are always asking for change. You say, "It isn't good enough."

Mr EATON: Government members are always quoting the Bible. The Government never makes the changes that we want. Changes are forced upon us, as with *Education 2000*. It certainly appears that it will be forced upon us. People have lost faith in the Government. They are not sure that the Government will take notice of any submissions made. *Education 2000* will create two breaks, rather than one, in the education structure.

Mr Littleproud: No. That has been suggested. People have been asked to comment on it.

Mr Underwood: It is being brought in. The member for Condamine is wrong.

Mr EATON: That is what Opposition members are going crook about. Government members have had nothing but praise for *Education 2000*, as though it had been accepted by the public.

Mr Randell: It is a discussion paper. Everybody is able to have a say.

Mr EATON: Government members say that meetings have been held and everybody is in favour of it. I have not heard one National Party member refer to a submission that is not in favour of *Education 2000*. Prior to the closing date for receipt of submissions, the Minister said that he had not received any submissions. I would like the Minister to inform us of the number of submissions received and whether or not they were all in favour of the recommendations contained in the document *Education 2000*.

Government Members interjected.

Mr EATON: I handed submissions in, too, and attended meetings.

In the short time that I have left to speak in the debate, I wish to refer to the TAFE college in Innisfail. A common criticism by Government members is that the Federal Government is welshing on a deal, leaving the State Government high and dry.

Mr Gunn: Right; right every time.

Mr EATON: If it had not been for the Federal Government helping the State Government and then pulling out, there would have been no development whatever in Queensland.

Mr Scott: He wasn't interjecting. He was only snoring.

Mr EATON: Quite so. The Deputy Premier knows only too well that, with the money for pre-schools—

Mr Gunn: They have robbed us and robbed us for years.

Mr EATON: It is all very well for the Deputy Premier to say that Queensland has been robbed. The Federal Government agreed to finance pre-schools for a limited time. When the end of the time covered by the agreement was reached, National Party members bellowed round the countryside that the Federal Government had welsed on the matter of pre-schools. That is not so. If the Federal Government had not come to the party, there would be no such thing as pre-school aid in Queensland. It was only that the Federal Government entered into a partnership with the Queensland Government for a certain period that it got off the ground.

Members of this Government have no initiative or nous, and they have no intention of doing their best for Queensland. Government is all about the proper handling of problems. Problems are associated with each and every portfolio, and anyone can cope when the going is good. When pressure builds up, however, the men are sorted from the boys. I am saying to Government members that they have no initiative whatever.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would be grateful if honourable members would not talk across the Chamber. I think it is time that honourable members came to order, and I ask the honourable member for Mourilyan to turn his attention to the subject-matter of the debate.

Mr EATON: I will change the subject, Mr Row, to give you some peace.

The people of north Queensland need a tertiary education institution in Cairns. I would like to take on all the members of the National Party over the question of funding, but I will leave that until later. The only reason I put that aside is that I wish to do as much as I can at this point for the people of north Queensland. A great deal of effort has been put into trying to convince the Government of the necessity for a tertiary institution such as a college of advanced education in Cairns. That request is not pie in the sky, because a great number of people are footing the bill for sending their children to tertiary colleges in other parts of the State. Their children could live at home if the Government was to provide tertiary facilities in Cairns. That is a fact of which the Government has taken insufficient notice and failed to acknowledge in its allocation of resources.

Mr Powell: In the past, you have argued against the provision of tertiary education facilities.

Mr EATON: I am now asking for it because the people in the Cairns area and the north Queensland region need that facility.

I will provide the Minister with figures that can substantiate my claim. In the Cairns area alone, particularly in the Douglas shire, the number of people who would be affected is 5 000; in the Barron Valley, the figure is 15 000; in the Cairns area, 47 000; in Edmonton and Gordonvale, 11 000; in Innisfail, 17 000; in the Tully and Cardwell area, 7 000; in the southern Tablelands area, 16 000; and in the northern Tablelands area, 13 000. If the Minister was to add up those figures, he would see that, on a population basis, the area deserves tertiary education facilities that will provide an opportunity for young people. At present, all the young people who seek tertiary education have to leave home.

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (9.2 p.m.): I thank all honourable members for the contributions that they made to the debate today. I have enjoyed being present in the Chamber and listening to their contributions. At the outset, I make some general statements, the first of which relates to the grandstanding exercise that was undertaken this morning by members of the Liberal Party.

Mr Stoneman: Where are they now?

Mr POWELL: That is an extremely good question asked by the honourable member for Burdekin. In fact, where have they been all day—probably grandstanding.

The members of the Liberal Party know jolly well that today was an allotted day, set aside to discuss the Estimates of the Department of Education. Instead of wanting to discuss the Estimates of the most important department in the Queensland Government, all they wanted to do was grandstand on a taxation matter that their own Federal leader welshed on. It is clear that Liberal Party members are not present, and that is the way it should be all the time.

Mr Underwood: Why do you not move a motion of censure against Liberal Party members?

Mr POWELL: I think that they censure themselves by their absence from Parliament today, and particularly this evening.

As I said previously, I thank all honourable members for the contributions and comments that they made in this debate. However, I am somewhat disappointed by the statements that have been made.

Although I accept that Opposition members will not stand up in the Chamber and either congratulate or thank a Minister for what that Minister has been able to do, I believe it would have been fair for all honourable members—not only those on the Government side, but members of the Opposition as well—to congratulate officers of the Department of Education on the excellent job that they do in the provision of a very worthwhile service for the people of this State.

A good deal of criticism is levelled at senior officers of the Department of Education and senior public servants employed by the Department of Education. For example, by looking round the Chamber this evening, I can see some of those officers who have listened to the debate. The point I wish to make is that it is not uncommon to find those officers at work from 7 o'clock in the morning till late at night, for the benefit of the children of Queensland. Quite frankly, I think that a debt of gratitude is owed to them by the members of this Assembly.

I would like to deal briefly with some of the comments made by honourable members. At the beginning of his speech, the Opposition spokesman on education spent some time on class sizes. I did note that he made a speech in this Chamber some time ago on this matter. If he reads the speech that I made today, and looks at the four tables that I had incorporated in *Hansard*—he would not have had that opportunity before he spoke today—he will see clearly the tremendous advances that have been made. I am not saying that everything is perfect in education, nor do I think that any member has said that. However, the Education Department has a great story to tell. I would love members on both sides of the Committee to be honest and go into the schools in their electorates where they would hear the real story that is to be told, and then tell the community what is going on.

I direct the member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood) to the four tables that were incorporated in *Hansard*. He will see that the achievements have been substantial at the primary level. The targets should be reached in 1986. Table 4 summarises the significant progress that has been made in reducing secondary class sizes at the secondary level. Both the number and percentage of classes that exceeded the select committee targets have been reduced from 631 in 1982 to 486, or 8 per cent, in 1985. What needs to be remembered is that these reductions have been achieved at a time when secondary enrolments in State schools have soared from about 113 000 to 137 000, much of the increase, of course, being in Years 11 and 12.

Attention should also be drawn to the fact that, although the number of Year 11 and Year 12 classes exceeded select committee targets, they have actually increased from 169 to 241. The total number of Year 11 and Year 12 classes has increased from 1 022 to 1 606. Not only has the department been able to hold its own with 1 000 or so classes kept below targets, but also it has been able to add about 600 further classes in the face

of rising enrolments, which also meet or beat the class-size targets—hardly a phoney achievement.

The cost to parents was mentioned by the honourable member for Ipswich West. I point out that, in 1984-85, the money made available to schools for the cost of materials was increased by 33½ per cent, the establishment was met, and increased again.

Many members have mentioned *Education 2000*, and I must comment on it. I will make particular reference to some of the other members later in my speech, but the member for Ipswich West tried to make something of the so-called Matheson report, an internal report providing some advice on the implications of taking up the propositions of *Education 2000*, which is surely an appropriate step for a Minister to take before making public any of those same proposals. The member showed his abysmal ignorance of the portfolio for which he purports to be the Opposition spokesman. He claimed that three high schools could be constructed for \$7m. The cost of a completed high school to cater for 800 students is \$6.5m, while that of a high school for 1 200 students is \$8.5m.

Mr Underwood interjected.

Mr POWELL: All that would be gained for the \$7m mentioned by the member for Ipswich West is a single 800-student high school. Rather than interject, the honourable member for Ipswich West should listen and perhaps read his figures correctly.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I rise to a point of order. As the Minister will not take an interjection, I will do it this way. The figures outlined in my speech were taken directly from the State Government Budget. So what the Minister is saying is that the figures in the Budget are incorrect or his information tonight is incorrect. The Budget referred to \$6m for three high schools and \$9m for Hervey Bay.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow the honourable member to start a debate. The Minister is summing up. I do not think that there has been any personal reflection. There is no point of order.

Mr POWELL: Thank you, Mr Row. The honourable member for Ipswich West is speaking instead of listening. He might learn that the Lord gave him two ears and one mouth, and that is the ratio in which he should use them.

The figures that the honourable member used are for a first-year high school, which is a Year 8 centre. The figures that I am giving are the ones that he was trying to put across, that is, that a full high school for 800 students costs \$6.5m, and a high school for 1 200 students costs \$8.5m. All we would get for that \$7m is one 800-student high school, because the equipment for that high school would cost a further \$150,000. The honourable member is just as wrong on the matter of running costs at the Hervey Bay college. The running costs for a high school with a staff of 40 are of the order of \$1.3m per annum.

If accepted, the proposals in *Education 2000* will not involve non-State schools in any more expense than any other measure in catering for the different needs of the twenty-first century. That matter needs to be emphasised and re-emphasised; but still the detractors will be deaf.

The proposal to maintain the Endeavour aides on existing conditions is totally untenable. The Government could not possibly have people in a group within the education system being employed and being paid under different conditions of employment. If it did, it would have a SEQEB situation, and it does not want that in education. Everybody who is employed as a teacher aide will be employed under exactly the same conditions and at exactly the same salary. As from the beginning of 1986, if they wish, they will be employees of the Department of Education. Therefore, they must have the same conditions of work and pay as the more than 5 000 teacher aides who are already employed. I emphasise the words "if they wish".

Mr Underwood: What do they mean?

Mr POWELL: They do not have to be employed. If they do not wish to work next year, they do not have to work. The conditions under which they will work are laid down. They will be employed and paid under those conditions.

I thank, and congratulate, the honourable member for Gympie (Mr Stephan) for mentioning rural youth. In trying to cut down my introductory speech, it was impossible to cover the whole range of education. Rural youth is an important part of the Education Department. It does a great job in the community. I acknowledge the work done by the honourable member for Caboolture and other honourable members with rural youth.

The honourable member for Gympie spoke of the need for a TAFE college at Gympie. I accept his proposition; I have no argument with it. Certainly, Gympie has a need for such a facility, just as many other places in Queensland have such a need.

The honourable member for Gympie referred to the music program that is running in Queensland schools. Once again, I will put in a commercial and point out that, tomorrow night at the Queensland Cultural Centre, the grand final of the music competition is being conducted. Anybody who wishes can go there, get a ticket, and listen to the young people of Queensland playing in orchestras and concert bands. I am sure that anyone who attends will find them equal to any players in the world.

The member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) made some comments about *Education 2000*. I congratulate the honourable member on his contribution to the debate. Honourable members who heard it will understand that the honourable member was the author of it. Although I do not agree with much of what he said, at least it was presented in a logical and clear fashion, and it was his own work.

I was interested in his reactions to *Education 2000*. At least he had read the document. I was surprised that he should push for the continuing separation of secondary schools and TAFE colleges. That is really swimming against the tide in other States of Australia and in other countries of the world. It is also totally against what the honourable member for Mourilyan said just before I began speaking tonight.

On the blurring of the roles of TAFE colleges and secondary schools—that is, in Years 11 and 12—*Education 2000* explores the means of making those roles more complementary and supportive by providing a better range of courses for students in Year 10—better in the sense of being more suited to the needs of the students.

The honourable member for Ipswich agreed with delayed specialisation, and I point out that I was not prepared, for the sake of a few people and the academic board of the university, to draw away from that particular principle.

The honourable member mentioned also the Commonwealth Government's creation of additional tertiary places in 1984-85. What the Queensland Government has pointed out to the Federal Government is that far too few places are available in Queensland tertiary institutions, and a considerable backlog of tertiary places in this State has yet to be made up.

The honourable member for Cunningham (Mr Elliott) made an interesting contribution. He spoke of the tourist industry and the tourism and hospitality colleges. He spoke also of the way in which the State Government has responded to the needs of the tourist industry to begin training people. I place on record my thanks, and that of the Education Department, to the member for Cunningham because, when he was Minister for Tourism, he did a tremendous amount of work in association with the department in the establishment of those colleges.

Like the honourable member, I am very concerned that the hospitality industry will decline as a result of the foolish taxation proposals that have been introduced by the present Federal Government. Before those proposals were put forward, it was predicted confidently that 5 000 new jobs would become available in the tourist and catering industry in this State, and plans were being made to train the people needed to fill them. As a result of the new taxation imposition, it is a strong possibility that fewer than half

those places will be available. That must be a sad disappointment to the young people of Queensland.

Mr Littleproud: We are a bit disappointed that there are not a lot of Opposition members in the Chamber.

Mr POWELL: It is interesting that the honourable member for Cook is the only member of the ALP with the stoicism to stay behind and listen.

The member for Townsville West (Mr Smith) criticised Queensland's approach to the Participation and Equity Program. Other members opposite also spoke about PEP. Perhaps they are not aware that Queensland was the first of all the States to put firm proposals to the Commonwealth, despite the reservations that the State Government had about PEP. The Commonwealth's decision to cut the program by 50 per cent, with no notice, shows that Queensland's concerns were merited.

I place on record once again the attitude that I take to Commonwealth programs. As I said in my introduction, if the Commonwealth wants to spend money in specific areas, that is fine. However, I sound a note of warning and make it very clear to the people of Queensland that if the Federal Government spends money to introduce a program and then drops out of funding it, the program will stop; the responsibility will rest on the Commonwealth's head. The Queensland Government will continue its recurrent programs and produce a good education system; but if the Commonwealth wants to put in money and dictate to the State Government the way in which the money is to be spent, the program will conclude when it takes its funds away.

From his remarks, the honourable member for Townsville West clearly does not support States' rights. It is quite clear that he thinks that all education should emanate from Canberra and that we should all be dictated to by that Government. I do not care what the complexion of the Canberra Government is. As far as I am concerned, education is a State responsibility, and that is where it remains.

Many members opposite mentioned funding, and they applauded the way in which the Federal Government gives funds for education. I sound another note of warning to the people of Queensland: the State's grant from the Federal Government—the money that comes to the State for education, health and all the other fields of Government endeavour in Queensland—is Queensland's money. It is money that the Federal Government has taken from this State in income tax, petrol tax and all the other taxes. The Federal Government distributes that money back to the States in an inequitable fashion. Queensland gets a very bad deal.

The honourable member for Aspley (Mr Cahill) gave an excellent explanation of the funding position of non-Government schools. I thank him for pointing out very clearly the way in which the non-Government school sector is important to Queensland education and how the Government supports it.

The honourable member for Kurilpa (Ms Warner) was one of those members opposite who delivered a speech that was prepared by a socialist from some academic institution and that really bore no relevance to education in Queensland today.

The honourable member for Condamine (Mr Littleproud) showed his obvious interest in education. I congratulate him for his contribution. Obviously he had a very high reputation as a primary school teacher and I thank him sincerely for the way that he works in this Parliament. He made two points that require comment. He asked for more inspectors in schools. I echo that sentiment. I believe the department should have more inspectors within the school system, and it is working steadily towards increasing its public service establishment so that that need can be satisfied. In the last four years, the number of teachers has increased at a very rapid rate and the number of inspectors has remained stagnant. For the purpose of accountability, their numbers need to be increased.

He also spoke about qualifications. Again, I agree with him fully. The practical class-room teacher cannot be replaced. No matter how many letters a teacher has after

his name and, with due respect to the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson), who was an excellent teacher, it does not matter how many degrees a teacher holds, if he cannot produce the goods in front of the children in the class-room, he is no good. The honourable member for Condamine made that point very well.

The honourable member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras) is another one who obviously had a speech prepared by an academic socialist.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr POWELL: If it was not, and if it was prepared by the honourable member, I feel sorry for him. His speech was emotional nonsense. He spoke about academic freedom. If he had listened to the member for Mount Gravatt, he would have heard the matter described so clearly that it is pointless for me to comment any further. I ask him to read the speech of the honourable member for Mount Gravatt.

Mr Fouras: Taking the easy way out.

Mr POWELL: The honourable member for Mount Gravatt answered every criticism made by the member for South Brisbane. Time is getting on and I do not want to waste it on the honourable member.

The honourable member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) also is a former teacher. Perhaps it is not fair to say that because once a teacher, always a teacher. I thank the honourable member for his positive contribution to the debate. He mentioned Mr Bill Callinan, and I add my congratulations and thanks to that person, who is currently the principal of Miami State High School. Mr Callinan has had many years of meritorious service in the Education Department. He has been innovative, has shown initiative and has run a great school at Miami. He will be sorely missed by the Education Department. The honourable member for Fassifern spoke also of accountability. He supported the remarks of the honourable member for Condamine. He spoke of discipline and the principal's role, and I agree with his sentiments. His was a sensible contribution.

I now come to the contribution of the member for Sherwood (Mr Innes). Of all people in this Chamber to stand and speak about convoluted language! Have honourable members ever heard the like?

Mr Scott: He had you on the ropes.

Mr POWELL: Easy!

The member for Sherwood was critical of the language used in *Education 2000*. He compared it unfavourably with the language used in the response prepared by the Association of Independent Schools of Queensland to *Education 2000*. I must say that I had no difficulty in understanding the lengthy extract from *Education 2000* read out by the member for Sherwood. In fact, I had less difficulty with it than I do in understanding some of this speeches. However, I am less than comfortable with this extract from the response by the Association of Independent Schools of Queensland—

“The amplification of early advantage or disadvantage: In the development of many intellectual skills there is a phenomenon known as the fan spread effect.”

The people who criticised *Education 2000* and the way in which it was formulated were, generally speaking, the people from academia who believe that they are the only ones who have the right to say anything about education and the right to tell us how our children should be educated. The people who were involved in the compilation of the discussion paper that was sent out were parents and teachers. They are people who have done considerable research. They are not people from an airy-fairy ivory tower.

The honourable member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) asked me how many submissions were received. More than 1 000 submissions have been received by the department. They are being sifted through by an independent committee, which will report to me on the submissions. Various options were put forward. I cannot honestly say tonight

that the majority of them were one way or the other. The Government looked to the people of Queensland for their contributions.

The honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) made a very good speech about the need for tertiary education in Cairns and planning for higher education. I do not have any argument with what he said. In Cabinet I have a colleague, the honourable member for Barron River (Mr Tenni), who bashes my ear constantly about higher education in the far north. The honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) introduced the subject to me at the Gordonvale State High School when I opened an administration block. There is unanimity in the far north about the need for a higher-education institution. I do not dispute that.

The honourable member for Greenslopes (Mrs Harvey) made a special contribution about the special need support group. I thank her for that. I thank her also for the comments that she made about breakfast. Although it might sound like a funny subject, she was spot on in what she said. If children have a good feed before they go to school, it is more likely that they will perform better at school.

The honourable member for Archerfield (Mr Palaszczuk) for 13 minutes made a good speech. It was obviously one that he had prepared himself. I thank him for that contribution. However, he launched off into some nonsense about the Redlands electorate. He said something about the Capalaba High School having an enrolment of 1 900 students. In fact, the enrolment at the Capalaba High School is 1 287, which is slightly less than 1 900. He then made a big play about the overcrowding in schools in the Redlands electorate. He obviously does not know about the tremendous work done by the late John Goleby in that electorate and the fantastic job he did in getting more schools there. I have a list of the enrolments of the schools in the electorate of Redlands, which I table and seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following document—

Attachment 1

Enrolments in the Electorate of Redlands'

Preschool	1982	1983	1984	1985
Alexandra Hills	100	100	98	95
Birkdale South	48	49	50	100
Birkdale	93	100	99	87
Capalaba	100	100	94	92
Cleveland	44	50	41	40
Coolnwynpin	—	—	80	83
Dunwich	36	33	43	24
Ormiston	50	50	47	43
Redland Bay	—	—	—	44
Thornlands	95	90	92	81
Victoria Point	50	50	50	49
Vienna Woods	—	—	—	82
Wellington Point	50	50	49	48
TOTAL	<u>666</u>	<u>672</u>	<u>743</u>	<u>868</u>

Primary				
Alexandra Hills	902	891	872	692
Birkdale	634	650	644	609
Birkdale South	248	356	442	507
Capalaba	1 140	1 133	1 044	981
Cleveland	572	558	533	520
Coolnwynpin	—	—	102	185
Dunwich	206	200	203	213
Mount Cotton	154	169	169	140
Ormiston	356	339	348	326
Redland Bay	267	274	303	303
Russell Island	70	77	82	72
Thornlands	620	597	564	557
Victoria Point	274	313	305	301
Vienna Woods	—	—	—	294
Wellington Point	391	401	403	396
TOTAL	5 834	5 958	6 014	6 096
Secondary Schools and Departments				
Capalaba	1 025	1 112	1 258	1 300
Cleveland	1 232	1 306	1 412	1 621
Dunwich Primary	0	23	18	18
TOTAL	2 257	2 441	2 688	2 939
Special Schools and Units				
Birkdale Primary (Special Unit)	8	9	8	8
Capalaba Primary (Special Unit)	—	9	16	19
Dunwich Primary (Special Unit)	—	—	—	5
Redland Special	80	82	83	85
Thornlands Primary (Special Unit)	—	—	—	1
TOTAL	88	100	107	118

1. All enrolments are as at the relevant July Census.

Mr POWELL: The honourable member for Burdekin (Mr Stoneman) made an excellent contribution on distance education. Once again I thank him for his understanding of the matter and for his contribution. I thank him sincerely for mentioning my advisory committee on distance education. It has done a great job. He mentioned the names of members of that committee. They have been recorded in *Hansard*. I thank sincerely the members of that committee.

The honourable member for Cook (Mr Scott) made a contribution about his electorate. I suppose that is the way he should have done it. He advised members to get back to basic English. I did not go through his speech with my red pen. I am sure that the *Hansard* reporters took delight in editing it. I will refer to some of the issues that he raised. He referred to the transport of children from Prince of Wales Island to Thursday Island. He sent me a telegram dated 11 October. For his information, I point out that when I was absent, because of illness, on 15 July the acting Minister for Education approved the cancellation of that service. It took the honourable member from July till October to find out that it had been cancelled.

A number of reasons exist for the cancellation of the service. Eight children were eligible to use the service. Only one or two children were using the service over a regular period. My departmental officers recommended that the service be terminated and conveyance allowances be made available to the parents, who indicated that suitable arrangements can be made for the conveyance of the eight eligible students. The parents have indicated that they are happy with that.

I mention that Mr Mick Miller congratulated the Queensland Government—would honourable members believe?—on the excellent job that it has done in regard to Aboriginal education. Queensland leads the other States.

In regard to Aurukun—the people of Aurukun have been informed that the present school principal will be transferred at the end of this year. He was sent to Aurukun to do a job, which he did and did well, and for that he will be thanked.

The honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) correctly stated the relationship of this Government with universities and CAEs. I thank the honourable member for his remarks. He made an excellent contribution.

The honourable member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) said that the department forgets the climatic conditions in far-north Queensland. Three honourable members constantly remind me of the climatic conditions in far-north Queensland. I refer to you, Mr Row, the member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) and the member for Barron River (Mr Tenni).

I thank all honourable members for their contributions to this interesting debate.

At 9.32 p.m.,

Votes passed under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order

By agreement, under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307 and the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 25 September, the questions for the following Votes were put by the Chairman and agreed to—

	\$
Education—	
Chief Office, Education Department	17,663,300
Balance of Vote, Consolidated Revenue, and Trust and Special Funds	1,598,224,400
Executive and Legislative, Balance of Votes	13,114,600
The Premier	35,181,824
The Treasurer	537,618,516
Employment and Industrial Affairs	21,647,800
Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services	61,108,513
Health	990,231,200
Justice and Attorney-General	71,682,991
Local Government, Main Roads and Racing	11,354,077
Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs	30,864,355
Primary Industries	105,533,500
Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts	72,807,150
Transport	973,438,700
Water Resources and Maritime Services	61,626,740
Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs	95,716,800
Trust and Special Funds Estimates, Balance of Estimates	6,221,229,568
Loan Fund Estimates, Balance of Estimates	121,448,200
Supplementary Estimates (Consolidated Revenue) 1984-85	150,310,308
Supplementary Estimates (Trust and Special Funds) 1984-85	786,267,357
Supplementary Estimates (Loan Fund) 1984-85	5,324,868
Vote on Account, 1986-87	2,290,000,000

Resolutions reported, and ordered to be received on Tuesday, 5 November.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1981 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Gunn, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (9.41 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

Queensland has been at the forefront of financial administration and audit law reform.

The Financial Administration and Audit Act, which came into operation on 1 July 1978, has become the standard by which similar legislation is judged and, in many cases, formulated. The Act provides a modern and consolidated body of law with respect to—

the financial administration of the public accounts kept by the Treasurer;

the financial administration of the departmental accounts kept by accountable officers of departments; and

the audit of the public accounts and the departmental accounts by the Auditor-General.

The Act incorporated these three fundamental principles—

The executive is accountable to Parliament for its use of public moneys.

The administration reports to Parliament annually to give an accounting of public moneys.

The Auditor-General, being independent of both the executive and administration, reports to Parliament on whether or not the financial statements presented to Parliament give a true and fair view of the Government's financial affairs.

The amendments to the Act which the Government now proposes in this Bill will preserve and enhance these principles.

While the current Act deals with the accountability of the Treasurer for his stewardship of the public accounts and of accountable officers for their management of public moneys, the primary amendment to the Act provided for in the Bill will take the principles of the Act beyond Government departments to include statutory bodies within its operation.

The Bill proposes that general requirements be incorporated in the Act to ensure full and proper accountability of statutory bodies and to provide for appropriate financial administration of such bodies.

Many types of bodies are formed or operate as a result of some form of authority or sanction given in legislation. Examples include companies, co-operatives, utilities, insurance offices, banks, building societies and credit unions and marketing boards. In some cases—companies, building societies and so on—adequate control and accountability mechanisms already exist and are, therefore, not intended for coverage in this legislation.

The definition of a statutory body provided for in the Bill is based on the premise that a body or association of persons has a particular responsibility to whoever appoints or confirms its controlling members in office. This is not to deny that the body may

also be accountable to others. Where this is the case, the Act in no way diminishes that responsibility.

The definition operates to embrace all existing and future bodies unless naturally falling outside the definition or specifically exempted from it.

For the purpose of the Bill—

“ ‘statutory body’ means a body or association of persons (whether corporate or unincorporate) constituted by or under an Act being a body or association that has control of funds and any of whose members—

(a) is appointed thereto by an Act or by any Proclamation, Order in Council, regulation, rule, ordinance or by-law made under an Act;

or

(b) is appointed thereto or is confirmed in his appointment thereto by the Governor in Council or a Minister of the Crown.”

The definition does not include a department which is already covered by the Act, or a local authority which is governed by requirements set down in the Local Government Act.

Provision has been included for a body or association of persons to be prescribed not to be a statutory body. However, it is intended that all appropriate statutory bodies be covered by the legislation.

The basic accountability requirements on statutory bodies are set out below.

Each statutory body will be required to prepare and certify proper financial statements within two months of the close of each financial year to ensure that timely information is available on the year's financial operations for each body.

Provision will exist for the Treasurer to extend the two-month period, but only after consultation with the Minister and the Auditor-General.

Accounts and statements will be required to be submitted to the Auditor-General for audit, and for the audited statements to be published.

Provision will also be made for the Auditor-General to appoint an authorised person to undertake the audit on his behalf.

Statutory bodies will be required to prepare and furnish to the Minister, within four months of the close of each financial year, an annual report on operations.

The report will contain a copy of the audited and certified financial statements. These reports will then be tabled in the Legislative Assembly.

Where there are a number of similar bodies, and the tabling of individual reports is impractical, a summary report may be tabled.

At this stage, I remind honourable members that much of the law constituting statutory bodies already contains provisions relating to reporting, audit and accountability generally.

The proposed general provisions contained in the Bill will serve to strengthen and enhance existing law. However, to ensure that inconsistencies or deficiencies do not exist, the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act will prevail over other legislation.

The Government's objective is for the legislation to provide a uniform and co-ordinated code of accountability to ensure that all statutory bodies meet appropriate standards.

So far as the financial administration aspects of statutory bodies are concerned, two important matters are provided for.

To ensure that statutory bodies are fully aware of their responsibilities for proper financial administration, the functions and duties expected of each and every statutory body are clearly set out in the proposed section 46C.

Generally, these functions and duties require each statutory body—

to ensure that its operations are carried out efficiently, effectively and economically;

to keep proper accounts;

to ensure that moneys are spent lawfully and that reasonable value is obtained for all expenditure; and

to ensure that there are adequate safeguards to control the collection of revenue and to prevent fraud.

As well, just as departments are now required to prepare and maintain accounting manuals, provision has been made for each statutory body to prepare an accounting manual, setting out proper accounting and internal control procedures to be followed by staff.

The provisions I have just outlined have been operating successfully in Government departments generally since the introduction of the Financial Administration and Audit Act. It is appropriate that they also apply to statutory bodies. However, as with Government departments, the detailed procedural requirements of accounting manuals will not be prescribed in legislation but left for resolution by individual statutory bodies.

The proposed amendments to the Act relate to broad principles of accountability and financial administration only. In order to set more detailed requirements, Ministers will be empowered to issue directions to individual statutory bodies.

The Minister's directions will allow for more detailed standards of accounting and reporting to be prescribed for individual bodies. As well, they will deal with matters of financial administration generally. It can be expected that the content of the Minister's directions will vary depending on the size and complexity of the relevant statutory body. The Minister's directions will be similar in concept to the existing Treasurer's Instructions.

The two-tiered approach that has been adopted—that is, in prescribing the fundamental policy and principles in the Act, and the more detailed procedures and incidental requirements in the Minister's directions—will provide a comprehensive yet flexible framework for accountability of statutory bodies.

To enable the administration of the proposals to be properly co-ordinated, Ministers will be required to advise the Treasurer and the Auditor-General of the formation or discontinuance of statutory bodies. This provision will ensure that all bodies covered by the Act comply with its requirements.

As well as the provisions covering statutory bodies, action is being taken with respect to those bodies associated with statutory bodies. There are a number of cases where statutory bodies carry out functions through associated bodies. In many cases, there are very good reasons why this occurs. It is proposed to provide for the Auditor-General to perform the audit of these associated bodies and to report on these audits in his annual report to Parliament.

A number of amendments are proposed that will enhance the accountability of departments and give added emphasis to the independent role of the Auditor-General.

The Act currently requires accountable officers of departments to prepare financial statements showing details of expenditure compared with appropriations. For the last two years, and in consultation and co-operation with the Auditor-General, the standard of reporting has been expanded to include details of receipts and of financial assets and liabilities. The proposal is to now formally incorporate these improved standards of reporting into the Act.

Presently, many departmental statements are appended to the Auditor-General's report. It is considered more appropriate for audited and certified departmental financial statements to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly by the appropriate Minister or the Treasurer on behalf of all Ministers. In this way, there will be a clear distinction between

the accountability requirements of the Executive and the administration on the one hand, and the audit function of the Auditor-General, on the other.

With accountability by the Executive and administration being better evidenced, the independent role of the Auditor-General will be reinforced. The amendments will in no way diminish the requirement for the Auditor-General to report directly to Parliament on his audits, encompassing Government departments, local authorities, statutory bodies and bodies associated with statutory bodies.

In summary, then, the proposed amendments will ensure comprehensive accountability requirements for all public bodies in the State which have the control of funds. All such bodies will be subject to audit by the Auditor-General and will be required to report, each year, to Parliament on their financial activities.

The Bill also provides for a number of minor and technical amendments to the Act. These do not affect the principles which underlie the Act, but will allow more modern and streamlined procedures to be introduced.

The present provisions of the Act allow transfers only between items of the same subdivision of a Vote, even though Parliament, in its annual Appropriation Act, allocates moneys to each Vote rather than to each subdivisional item of the Vote. Provision has therefore been made for the Treasurer to approve transfers within individual Budget Votes.

There will be no change to the requirement that full details of all transfers authorised by the Treasurer be disclosed in the departmental financial statements furnished to Parliament.

Provision has also been included in the Bill for bulk allocations in Treasury Votes for items such as "award costs" to be allocated to the appropriate departments without need for further appropriation.

Present procedures in this regard are inefficient. For these particular items, individual departments are required to seek Governor in Council approval of unforeseen expenditure and it is known that unforeseen expenditure will be required from the commencement of the year. The expenditure is therefore not unforeseen as such. In fact, no overall increase in expenditure occurs, as the apparent additional expenditure is offset by savings in Treasury Votes.

This has the effect of distorting financial statements by disclosing large amounts of unforeseen expenditure in departments generally and an equally large saving in Treasury. The amendment will overcome this anomaly.

Full details of approved transfers will be included in relevant financial statements as for intra-Vote transfers.

It is proposed that there be a separate tabling by the Treasurer of a certified and audited "Statement of Unforeseen Expenditure to be Appropriated".

This amendment will ensure that Parliament is informed of the previous year's unforeseen expenditure when debating the current year's Estimates. At present, information in regard to previous year's unforeseen expenditure is contained in the departmental appropriation accounts. The accounts are part of the overall departmental financial statements, but may not always be completed, certified, audited, reviewed by Treasury and summarised in time for the Estimates debate.

A procedural amendment is proposed in relation to Governor's warrants. Current practice is to obtain warrants on account of appropriations at Vote level and warrants on account of unforeseen expenditure at subdivisional item level. With the computerisation of the public accounts, it is desirable to provide for both types of warrants to be obtained at Vote level.

A number of amendments are proposed which will clarify the interpretation of various provisions of the Act in relation to—

accounting for expenditure recovered;

the lapsing of a Governor's warrant where appropriation at subdivisional item level is exhausted; and

the current requirement that accountable officers of trading departments prepare financial statements in a set format even though that format may not be relevant.

The amendments will remove any doubt as to the proper procedures required. In each case, there is no essential change to the existing provision but simply a clarification.

An important function of the Treasurer under the Act is to formulate financial administration policy by issuing Treasurer's Instructions to accountable officers of departments. When the principal Act was introduced, it was considered appropriate to provide for amendment of the Treasurer's Instructions only after having regard to a recommendation from the Auditor-General.

Now that the procedures have been established for a number of years, and in view of the increased emphasis on the Auditor-General's independent role, it is proposed to moderate this requirement to one of consultation with the Auditor-General.

Similarly, the procedure for amending departmental accounting manuals will be varied to reinforce this independent role. The Auditor-General has been fully consulted in regard to the proposal and is supportive of it.

Several other amendments have been included that relate specifically to the Auditor-General. They are of a minor nature and again are fully supported by the Auditor-General.

The proposed amendments are as follows. The Auditor-General and his officers are to be granted indemnity from an action for defamation in respect of the proper performance of an audit.

The requirement on the Auditor-General to seek Governor in Council approval to take leave to which he is otherwise entitled will be deleted. This restriction was carried across from the old Audit Act, and is no longer relevant.

The duty on persons who are subject to audit and on bank officers to furnish the Auditor-General with information he requires in relation to his audits will be expanded. This amendment will ensure that stored data, such as that held in a computer, is made available in writing.

The duty of secrecy on the Auditor-General and on persons he authorises to carry out audits will be extended to include persons assisting on those audits.

The proposed amendments to the Financial Administration and Audit Act that I have just outlined have three purposes—

firstly, to provide a code of accountability for the State's statutory bodies;

secondly, to strengthen the principles upon which the Act is based—particularly in relation to the independence of the Auditor-General and also in providing for improved reporting standards by Government departments; and

thirdly, to facilitate the continued modernisation of procedures dealing with Government accounting.

Each of these objectives is worthy and will contribute to improved accountability of the Government to Parliament.

I draw the attention of honourable members to clause 2 of the Bill, which provides for the amendments to come into effect on a date to be proclaimed by the Governor in Council. It is the Government's intention that those amendments that can take effect immediately will be so proclaimed.

However, the far-reaching implications for statutory bodies of the proposals contained in the Bill require some delay while necessary prerequisite administrative matters are

attended to and put in place. I assure the House that the delay in implementing the statutory bodies provisions will be the absolute minimum necessary.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Burns, adjourned.

SANCTUARY COVE RESORT BILL

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill relating to the development of ‘Sanctuary Cove Resort’ at Hope Island in the State of Queensland; and that so much of the Standing Orders relating to private Bills be suspended so as to enable the said Bill to be presented and passed through all its stages as if it were a public Bill.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Hinze, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (10 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

This evening, I take great pride in introducing what will be regarded as landmark legislation throughout Australia for an integrated resort development. I hope that this Bill is regarded for what it is—landmark legislation to create an exciting, innovative development, which will mean massive investment and jobs.

The estimated cost of this project is about \$230m. Already about \$21.5m has been spent on site preparation works, which should prove the bona fides of the developers. It has been estimated that this project will create about 2 500 jobs on site and several hundred extra associated jobs during and after the project’s development.

This development is the Sanctuary Cove Resort in the Albert shire. The question may be raised as to why special legislation is required to facilitate a single resort development. The question is a reasonable one and so is the answer. Inasmuch as there has been no previous proposed development of this type in Queensland, not to mention Australia, special legislation is required. I intend later to outline the specific provisions of the Bill, indicating why this legislation is necessary.

The Bill, as drafted, will facilitate the development and ongoing management of the first of what I hope to be a new generation of resort communities, which are true, integrated, mixed land-use resorts, which can be, or are designed to become, complete resort destinations in the true sense of the term.

The provisions are based upon existing Canadian and American condominium resort legislation, but they have been modified to fit more readily into existing Queensland legislation which, in my view, will provide for a superior, more sensitive, approach to the operation and ongoing maintenance of developments of this type.

Of necessity, such legislation must be site specific, as objectives, purposes and general matters relating to such developments will vary significantly from resort to resort, resulting in the need for certain provisions in the legislation to be different. By “site specific”, I mean that the provisions of this Bill, while providing a general precedent for a future similar development, nevertheless refer only to this development.

The important thing to recognise at an early stage is that legislation of this type is not new in the global context. It is only new to Queensland and Australia. Many members may have visited resorts of this type in Hawaii, Palm Springs, Phoenix, and other places.

Honourable members who have made such visits could not help being impressed by the accommodation, the services provided, and the sense of community which exists in those resorts, and I have no doubt that they have often wondered why we have no similar developments in this State.

It should be noted also that, for each of these overseas resorts, separate legislation, which is binding in perpetuity upon all operations within these developments, is in place, and that inquiries made of the developers of such facilities have indicated that they must allow a minimum of a three-year lead-time for the legislation to be enacted. The primary mechanism used for controlling such developments in the American scene is by way of imposing constraints, covenants on title, and restraints on the developments. As this House will appreciate, the concept of covenants on title is unacceptable to this Government, and this legislation is designed to allow development to be proceeded with without the imposition of such encumbrances.

With regard to this particular Bill—it will enable a resort which comprises recreation facilities, a private harbour on land which is presently owned by the company in freehold title, a marina which will have certain berths available for day visitors to the resort, approximately 25 floating homes for which a design code is being prepared, commercial buildings within a village comprising approximately 100 tenancies, a hotel of international resort standard containing approximately 300 suites and for which a management agreement has been entered into with the Hyatt Regency chain, and the establishment of some 900 residential units. These residential units will be made available for sale to individual purchasers, and the title will be held by the purchaser pursuant to the provisions contained in the Buildings Units and Group Titles Act.

The site of the proposed development is located on Hope Island in the Albert Shire Council area, and its total area is approximately 232 ha, or about 590 acres. The land in question is approximately 4 km upstream from the mouth of the Coomera River, which discharges into the Broadwater at Southport, and the southern bank of the south arm of the Coomera River forms the northern boundary of the site. The plan designated as being schedule B to the Bill identifies the total area of the site, and it will be noted that full metes and bounds of the site have been defined by survey.

The Bill acknowledges the importance of having local statutory authorities involved in the decision-making processes associated with such a development. Therefore, the rights and obligations of such statutory authorities such as the Albert Shire Council and the Gold Coast Waterways Authority are preserved to the maximum extent that is practicable. For example, although the Bill supervenes over the town-planning scheme for the Albert Shire Council area insofar as this site is concerned, a separate planning scheme is introduced by way of schedules A and C to the Bill, which, before it can have force and effect, is required, pursuant to clause 8 of the Bill, to be submitted to the Albert Shire Council for proper definition of the proposed zone boundaries, and the prior approval of that council is required before other provisions contained in the Bill can be implemented.

Some considerable time ago, the development company made formal application to the Albert Shire Council to have a major portion of the present site rezoned by including the land in the special facilities zone with the designated purpose being tourist resort purposes. The Albert Shire Council decided to approve of the application, and an agreement relating to conditions that would attach to the rezoning was signed by all parties on 5 July 1985. The Bill confirms the contents of this agreement.

It was seen that the general designation of "Tourist Resort Purposes" was inadequate for a mixed-use development of this type, and that is what has raised the need to have more precise land-use controls included in the Bill.

Schedule C to the Bill divides the site into nine separate land use zones. These are Harbour Zone; Floating Dwelling House Zone; Village Zone; International Hotel Zone; Golf Course Zone; Recreation Club Zone; Harbour, River and Waterfront Residential Zone (two parts); General Residential Zone, and Primary Thoroughfare Zone.

The Bill creates three separate residential-use zones proposed for the site. These have been so designated because the housing types proposed will differ substantially in each and may require different levels of contributions to be paid to their respective bodies corporate for the ongoing maintenance and repair of the common areas and structures thereon.

The Bill also establishes that the Albert Shire Council is required to approve of all proposals that are normally its responsibility, such as the subdivision of land, the granting of building approvals, the setting of road construction standards and the like. The integrity of the decision-making process of the Albert Shire Council will not be compromised by the provisions of the Bill.

In addition, all lands comprising the site, notwithstanding that certain lands, such as the harbour area, which may be inundated by tidal waters are deemed to be land and will attract rates and charges levied by the Albert Shire Council. With regard to the proposed harbour—the Bill provides for the harbour area to be privately owned but requires that the approval of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority be obtained in respect of all matters that would normally require approval by that authority. In addition, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority is authorised to inspect and make orders relating to repairs, maintenance or other actions that may be required in respect of marine structures and navigation aids.

Provision is also made for the unrestricted free movement of vessels across certain parts of the harbour regardless of ownership, and it is required that fees normally paid in respect of berths in marinas elsewhere in the authority's area of jurisdiction be paid to the authority by the owner of any berthing facility within the site.

Mr Casey: Did you get rid of the lantana, too?

Mr HINZE: And the groundsel.

Mr Burns: The eagles won't be there.

Mr HINZE: The eagles and the eagles' nests are still there.

On the other hand, the company or any future owner of the harbour, as the case may be, will be responsible for the maintenance of the harbour and for dredging from time to time of the south arm of the Coomera River as the need arises. There is no requirement, implied or otherwise, for the Gold Coast Waterways Authority to undertake works of this nature for the benefit of the development.

The proposed development is consistent with its counterparts in other places of the world in that it comprises a mixture of true freehold title lands for the commercial and recreation components, and development established pursuant to the Building Units and Group Titles Act for the condominium residential areas. Further, the roads within the development will not be public dedicated roads, but rather private thoroughfares, permitting a higher level of security to be maintained for the community.

Notwithstanding that the internal roads will be private thoroughfares, the Bill preserves the right of access for all emergency services at any time, and establishes normal authorities for members of the police force. It also extends the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Insurance Act to apply to the thoroughfares as if they were roads declared under the Main Roads Act. General easement rights in the thoroughfares for the provision of particular services, such as water supply, sewerage, electricity and drainage are also created over the primary and secondary thoroughfares as if such facilities were dedicated roads.

As I have stated previously, all residential development to be established within the site is required to be established in a form permitted by the Building Units and Group Titles Act only. Ordinary subdivision development under the Torrens title system will not be permitted for dwellings. Further, having regard to the size of the project, it must be recognised that the residential development will have to be established in stages and under the provisions of the Building Units and Group Titles Act. Each stage will

be established on a group titles plan which, upon registration, will have its own body corporate as required by the Building Units and Group Titles Act. It is envisaged that between 16 and 25 individual bodies corporate will be established by the time full development of the site is attained.

The number of bodies corporate which will be created, and the need for each lot so created in the residential areas to have permanent access, demands that the normal provisions of the Building Units and Group Titles Act, which vest the responsibility for operation and maintenance of private roads serving a development in a particular body corporate, be modified to ensure that at no time can the practical access to any lot in the development be closed by a particular body corporate.

The Bill provides that those lands which will be used as roads be vested in a body designated as the principal body corporate. This principal body corporate has two major responsibilities. Those responsibilities are the ongoing maintenance and reconstruction of all secondary thoroughfares within the site on behalf of the individual bodies corporate and the administration of the development control by-laws. This is a matter about which I propose to speak later in my speech.

The membership of the principal body corporate is to comprise a nominee of the company until such time as the residential lot yield permitted by the Bill is realised and a representative of each of the bodies corporate created within the residential areas. The voting entitlements of the parties and their liabilities for the sharing of costs associated with the operations of the principal body corporate shall be borne by the parties in the ratio that their lot entitlement bears to the total number of lots which may be created under the Bill.

Initially, as all land will be owned by the company, membership of the principal body corporate will be limited to the company, which would also have a voting entitlement of 900 units and 100 per cent liability for maintenance of the secondary thoroughfares. As each stage of the development of residential lots is realised, the entitlement and liabilities of the company diminish in direct relationship to the number of lots contained in each stage, and the body corporate, which is established upon the registration of a group titles plan, becomes a member of the principal body corporate with a voting entitlement and cost-sharing liability, which is equal to the number of lots for which that body corporate is responsible.

The Bill provides authority for the principal body corporate to levy charges upon each of the member bodies corporate to meet the operating costs of the body corporate in proportion to the lot entitlements of each member, but the recoument of initial costs of construction of the secondary thoroughfares is not permitted. The principal body corporate may sue or be sued in respect of matters for which it is responsible and, once established, the principal body corporate shall exist in perpetuity.

Any decisions made by the principal body corporate which affect the interests of members must be carried by a special resolution, which requires at least 75 per cent support by the members based upon the voting entitlements referred to previously.

As many administrative matters will require day-to-day attention by the principal body corporate and as it is undesirable to have frequent meetings of the principal body corporate to attend to such matters, the Bill makes provision for the establishment of an executive committee for the purpose. Membership of the committee is determined by the principal body corporate in the Bill at its inaugural meeting and subsequent general meetings of that body as the need arises.

As the secondary thoroughfares are private roads, the Bill provides for the principal body corporate to prepare a by-law for the control and regulation of activities and traffic movement over such thoroughfares. Any by-law prepared for this purpose is required to be approved by the Minister charged with the responsibility for the administration of the Act, and such by-laws shall only have force and effect after approval of the by-law has been notified in the *Queensland Government Gazette*.

Further, because individual lots will be purchased on the basis of a prospectus that will, amongst other things, indicate that the overall development will have a certain type of general amenity, the Bill empowers the principal body corporate to prepare development control by-laws. The purpose of those by-laws is to control the size, shape, height, colour, texture and overall placement of buildings on the site and, once approval is given by the Minister and notification of such approval is published in the *Queensland Government Gazette*, the provisions of the by-law shall be binding upon all persons. Provision is also included for application to be made to the principal body corporate for variations to be permitted by the principal body corporate. Approval for such variations can be granted by the principal body corporate if it is satisfied that the granting of such approval will not adversely affect the amenity of the area or the rights of other owners within the residential area. Those particular provisions are required to protect the interests of all owners of land in these areas, and I must stress that the provisions of the by-laws will not be permitted to be in conflict with the Building Act or the Standard Building By-laws.

Schedule C to the Bill establishes a special zone, which is designated as being the Primary Thoroughfare Zone. The purpose of that zone is to clearly establish and commit, as part of the overall development, that part of the site as being the principal means of access to not only the residential zones but also the other zones which will be lands that are in separate freehold title and not subject to control by the principal body corporate. Those other lands are the Harbour Zone, the Village Zone, the International Hotel Zone, the Golf Course Zone and the Recreation Club Zone. The primary Thoroughfare Zone is, in fact, a privately owned road and, for the purposes of permitting the subdivision of land, and providing essential service easements, the Bill deems it to be a road. Provision is also made for the primary thoroughfare to be dedicated as a public road should the project fail.

As the primary thoroughfare is a private road which serves both the pure freehold lands and lands under the control of the principal body corporate, the Bill establishes a management body, which is identified as being the primary thoroughfare body corporate, which is solely responsible for the ongoing maintenance of such road and other matters relating thereto. Provision is made for the coming into existence of the primary thoroughfare body corporate at the time of registration by the Registrar of Titles of the initial plan of survey and, at that time, the ownership of the primary thoroughfare is vested in the primary thoroughfare body corporate.

The Bill provides for membership of the primary thoroughfare body corporate to comprise a representative of the principal body corporate and a representative of the owners of the pure freehold lots. For voting and cost-sharing purposes related to matters of general benefit to the site as a whole, the basis of apportionment of cost is as follows: the principal body corporate, 900 equivalent lots; the Harbour Zone area, 200; the Village Zone area, 1 200; the International Hotel Zone area, 500; the Golf Course Zone area, 100; and the Recreation Club Zone area, 100 equivalent lots. The total equivalent lot entitlement, or liability, is, therefore, 3 000.

Until such time as the development of the residential areas is more than 50 per cent completed, a major portion of the ongoing costs of maintenance will be borne by the development company.

The Bill makes special provision for the circumstances which could arise when alterations on works are undertaken for the benefit of certain commercial interests. When that happens, the cost of such work is to be borne solely by those parties who will benefit from the work.

As to the principal body corporate—the primary thoroughfare body corporate will exist in perpetuity and may levy charges upon the owners of land or the principal body corporate, or both, to fund its operations. Further, it may sue or be sued in respect of matters for which it is responsible. Again, for the day-to-day matters to be dealt with by the primary thoroughfare body corporate, the Bill establishes an executive committee in the same manner referred to previously in relation to the principal body corporate.

The Bill also authorises the primary thoroughfare body corporate to prepare by-laws for the control and regulation of activities on the primary thoroughfares, and this by-law would also have to be approved by the Minister, with notification of such approval being published in the *Queensland Government Gazette* before such a by-law would have force and effect.

Because the primary thoroughfares are not dedicated roads, special provisions relating to the establishment of a pedestrian mall are included in the Bill, but these provisions are unlikely to be required.

I consider that the provisions contained in the Bill are desirable and also that they adequately provide for the establishment and ongoing maintenance of the development once established.

Several honourable members from both sides of the House have been invited and have had the benefit of inspecting the site of this development, and I am sure that they have come to appreciate the scale, importance and job-generation importance of it.

By way of conclusion, I would like to thank Mr Arthur Byrne, the Registrar of Titles, Mr Bill Robinson of the Parliamentary Counsel's Office, and other officers who have been involved in the preparation of this Bill.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Shaw, adjourned.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 5 November 1985.”

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. On behalf of the Opposition and the people of Queensland, I register a protest about Parliament spending an extra week in recess when only five out of 18 Estimates have been debated. The only reason for the extra week in recess is that the National Party Government is not game to debate the Estimates with the Opposition because of the forthcoming by-election for the seat of Redlands. It is a shocking example of government by misadventure. Members of the Opposition protest vehemently against the move made by the Government.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! No point of order has been made out.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.22 p.m.