

Donations

Please.

16th October 1982
Vol II No 12



"Righteousness exalteth a nation ..."

SOCIETY
O
UTLAW
CRNOGRAPHY

[OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF 'STOP & CARE']

(Registered by Australia Post - Publication No. QBH2921)

Editor/Director: Mrs. H.S. Joyner PO. Box 162, Margate, 4019. Phones (07) 284.1211 & 284.3575

"Seek that you may excel ..."

COMMITTEE
AGAINST
REGRESSIVE
EDUCATION

State v. Church

[Contributed by Robert Csmak, Teacher]

The Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill seeks new powers over the Catholic Education system by making provision for Ministerial power to close Catholic Schools and prohibit Catholic teachers from teaching in Catholic schools.

We as supporters of the Catholic system of education cannot be satisfied with the assurances of the Education Minister, Mr. Gunn, that the Bill is not designed to curtail the independence of the Catholic education or eliminate it altogether.

The Minister has made vague verbal promises that the long working relationships between the State and Catholic Education would be preserved. Why then Section 63 (1) that states that any non-state school can be de-registered (closed) if it is not satisfactory "in the opinion of the Minister". On what basis or standards would a Catholic school be judged, except his "opinion"? It is not stated in the Bill. The Minister has told us that he would be reasonable in this matter. But why should he then seek such vast extra powers of closure over the Catholic Schools.

In practice, of course, the Minister would rely on the advice of his inspectors as to whether a Catholic school should be closed. How do we know the inspectors will not be hostile to Catholic Education? The inspectors, of course, are drawn from the Department of Education whose schools are presently losing students in great numbers to the private schools. It is not likely that these inspectors would look upon this development with favour, nor on the Catholic system which is one of the causes of it.

Also, teachers could not teach in a Catholic school (or any school) "unless authorized so to do by the Board" (Section 51J). We, the Catholics, would no longer choose our teachers but could have teachers hostile to our faith imposed on us and our children. The Board members can be expected to be largely hostile to the Catholic system.

There are many many other parts of the Education Act Amendment Bill that are hostile to Catholic Education or the parents. The intent of this reprehensible Bill is very clear -- to control or stifle the Catholic Education system and other Christian schools. Verbal assurances of the Minister to the contrary are worthless. He must agree to withdraw this Bill ENTIRELY.

A new Bill should be drawn up in consultation with the Catholic system of education (as SHOULD have been done with this Bill). The new Bill must specifically guarantee the independence of the Catholic system of education (and that of other interested Christians), and the freedom of Catholic teachers to teach in Catholic schools.

"NOTHING LIES BEYOND THE REACH OF PRAYER ---

EXCEPT THAT WHICH LIES BEYOND THE WILL OF GOD."

SUGGESTED AIMS OF EDUCATION

In the last issue of STOP PRESS, we published a contributed article entitled, "RIGHTS OF PARENTS IGNORED IN AIMS OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT". In error, we omitted to acknowledge that the article was produced by the FESTIVAL OF LIGHT & COMMUNITY STANDARDS ORGANISATION (Q'ld.), P.O. Box 392, Alderley, 4051. You may recall that their comments included the following:

"The rights of parents in the education of their own children are ignored in the Statement of Aims prepared by the Queensland Department of Education. Our opinion is that the principal aim should be amended to read:-

'The principal aim...(of State Schools) is to help PARENTS guide THEIR children to progress towards the full attainment of their potentialities as individuals, AS MEMBERS OF THEIR OWN FAMILIES, and as adult members of our society.'"

"Most parents know, to their sorrow, that the ability to question and to argue is already well-developed in their children, and does not need help from our State school teachers and educational administrators as their first and foremost particular aim."

The first aim reads:-

1. *'...to help children develop lively, inquiring minds, giving them the ability to question and to argue rationally, and to apply themselves to tasks.'*

"Particular aim No. 5, if allowed to be adopted, will authorise teachers and educational administrators to change the moral values of children from a firm adherence to the Christian moral values of their parents, and instill in children the belief that they are entitled to pick and choose whatever moral values they like out of the MULTICULTURAL education they will receive."

The fifth aim reads:-

5. *'...to instil respect for moral values, for other people and for oneself, and tolerance of other races, religions and ways of life.'*

"Adoption of this policy will preclude teachers from affirming, in subjects such as history, geography and social studies, that having one wife only, and regarding all mankind as our neighbour (Christian culture) is superior to the moral values of other cultures."

"The basic error in this STATEMENT OF AIMS prepared by the Department of Education is the bland assumption that teachers and educational administrators are entitled to take over the child wholly and mould the child even contrary to the parents' wishes and beliefs, instead of limiting themselves to that portion of the child's schooling delegated to them by the parents, and which can be effectively taught in the 25 hours each week the child is in school."

Parents are urged to complete the response section of the Aims of Education Form, and return these to the Department of Education. In addition, make an appointment to see your local Member of Parliament, and give him a copy of your comments. If you have not received an "AIMS OF EDUCATION" form from your child's school, or if you want further copies, they are available from:

Education Department, (Supply & Stores Section),
270 Lutwyche Road,
WINDSOR. 4030. Ph: 57 4171

The Statement by Festival of Light/CSO also suggested that the Education Department adopt the Principles prepared by the Australian Council for Educational Standards.

A separate sheet is included with this 'STOP PRESS' detailing matters relating to Aims of Education, including the 'STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES' drawn up by the Australian Council for Educational Standards. We encourage their adoption by the Queensland Education Department, and urge readers to send a copy of the enclosed sheet to your local member of Parliament, suggesting that he or she press for their adoption at Parliamentary level.

"Then I proclaimed a fast ... to seek of Him a right way for us, AND FOR OUR LITTLE ONES, and for all our substance.... Then ...the hand of our God was upon us, and delivered us from the hand of the enemy, and of such as lay in wait by the way." [Ezra 8.21,31]

CALL TO PRAYER (WITH FASTING)

Over the years 'STOP & CARE' members have pointed out to both church and government leaders that, because of society's dire need of God's help, we as a Nation should admit this and call a National Day of Prayer - if not the Federal Government, then at least the State Government, or the Churches. A RUN OF FAITH was held recently. Now let's have a DAY OF PRAYER FOR THE NATION.

MAY WE PLEASE HAVE YOUR SUPPORT
AND INVOLVEMENT?

HUMANISTS believe and religiously practice their doctrine that there is NO GOD and that we must SAVE OURSELVES.

"Cursed be the man THAT TRUSTS IN MAN, and maketh FLESH his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. ... Blessed is the man that TRUSTS IN THE LORD.." [Jer.17.5&7]

There is an overwhelming need for CHRISTIANS to practice just as religiously THEIR doctrine that it is GOD WHO SAVES US AND NOT WE OURSELVES!

In the last few weeks I have had a number of members asking me to call for our own DAY OF PRAYER (WITH FASTING), to seek an end to the Education Act Amendment Bill, and absolute deliverance from any possibility of oppression by any power-seeking EDUCATION MONOPOLY, now or in the future.

Therefore to this end, and on behalf of the executive of 'STOP & CARE', I am suggesting SUNDAY, 31ST OCTOBER, as our DAY OF PRAYER AND FASTING - showing to God and to others that OUR HOPE IS IN THE LORD.

- (a) to rid us of the Education Bill,
- (b) to save us from STATE EDUCATION MONOPOLY,
- (c) to preserve our rights as parents

POLITICAL CONCERN IS NOT NEW

From time to time over the last twelve years, issues of STOP PRESS have expressed some concern over the aims and activities of the various major political parties. In recent issues, our interest has centred mainly around the National Party and its support for the publicly discredited Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill. As a result, we have received a concerned response from a few of our members that we are 'branching out into the area of politics' when we ought to remain non-political.

In actual fact, neither "STOP" nor "CARE" have ever been 'non-political' (although we have always been, and still are, non-party political). The formation of both these organisations grew from a dismay over the anti-God drift that was evident in the government of the time, specifically in the areas of education and pornography. At our inception, we were authorised by the Justice Department to exist and act as a semi-religious and semi-political body, and for this reason, we were exempted from the provisions of the Charitable Organisations Act.

We believe that God's Truth is applicable to every area of our life - including the method of our secular government. When we highlight the blatant disregard of God that is displayed at times by our governments and by political parties, we are not branching out into any new areas of concern - we are simply being true to our foundation principles.

Thank you to those people who wrote with the well-being of our organisations at heart. We appreciate your interest and value your prayers.

Editor

"If God be for us, who can be against us?" [Romans 8.31]

"Ye have overcome them: because greater is He that is in you, than he that is in the world." [1 John 4.4]

"Jesus said, 'I am the vine, ye are the branches without Me ye can do nothing.'"

[John 15.5]

A Comparative Critical Analysis of the Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill

EDUCATION ACT 1964-1970

Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill

67. Maltreatment of children. (1) A teacher in a State or registered school who forms the opinion on reasonable grounds that a child who is a pupil at that school is being maltreated or neglected in such a manner as to subject or be likely to subject the child to unnecessary injury, suffering or danger shall, within 24 hours after forming that opinion, notify by the most expeditious means available to him a person authorized to be notified for the purposes of section 76K (1) of the *Health Act 1937-1981*.

(2) Where notification is given to an authorized person pursuant to subsection (1), the teacher (if he is a teacher in a State school) so notifying shall, within 7 days after doing so, forward to the Director-General notification in such form as is specified for the purpose by the Director-General.

(3) An authorized person who receives a notification from a teacher under this section shall act in such manner as will best ensure the safety and well being of the child in question and, in so doing, may communicate the notification to other persons for the purpose of having investigations or inquiries made or other things done to enable full effect to be given to the provisions of this section.

(4) A notification given pursuant to subsection (1) or (2) shall state the observations and opinions upon which the teacher's suspicion is based.

(5) In addition to receiving the notification pursuant to subsection (2), the Director-General may require the teacher or any other teacher or officer of the Department associated with the child in question to forward to him any statement or further information that the Director-General considers he should have concerning the child.

The teacher or officer concerned shall comply with such requirement.

(6) Where in compliance or purported compliance with this section a notification is given or a statement or further information is furnished in good faith by a teacher or other officer—

(a) no liability at law is incurred in respect of the giving or furnishing thereof by him;

(b) the giving or furnishing thereof shall not in any proceedings before any court or tribunal or in any other respect be held to constitute a breach of professional etiquette or ethics or a departure from accepted standards of professional conduct.

(7) A person does not incur any liability as for defamation by the publication of any defamatory matter contained in a notification or statement or further information as aforesaid where such publication is made in good faith and pursuant to any provision of or otherwise in the execution of this section.

(8) In this section, the term—

“child” means a person under or apparently under the age of 17 years;

REGULATIONS

RECORDS AND RETURNS

33. A principal shall be responsible for the proper keeping of the school records and the punctual preparation and despatch to the Director-General of the returns prescribed by this Regulation.

A principal of a State school shall keep readily available the following documents and such other documents as may from time to time be prescribed:—Admission Register, Class Roll Book, Daily Report, Register of Time Lost, Current Work Programs, Accident Register, Punishment Register, Certificate of Transfer Book, Stock Book/s, Account Books, *Education Office Gazette*, Religious Instruction Register, Register of Duty Performed (Supply and Part-time Teachers), Log Book of Fire Drills, official letters, memoranda, reports and necessary duplicates of returns and reports of inspection.

68. School records. (1) The principal of a State school shall keep such records as are prescribed by the regulations.

(2) A person engaged in carrying this Act into effect shall preserve and aid in preserving secrecy with regard to all confidential matters concerning any pupil contained in school records and in the records of the Department and shall not communicate any such matter to any person except—

(a) to a person authorized by the Director-General to receive such information;

(b) to a lawfully constituted court or tribunal.

(3) A person engaged in carrying this Act into effect who inserts or publishes in the records of a State school or the Department or who makes any allegation or comment or gives any opinion in respect of any matter touching on or concerned with a pupil of a State or registered school shall not thereby incur any liability if he has acted in good faith and without malice and with reasonable care.

(4) In any proceedings taken against a person referred to in subsection (3) on account of an insertion or publication the burden of proof that such person has acted otherwise than in good faith or has acted with malice or without reasonable care shall be upon the plaintiff.”

Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill

Criticism No. 7

The Bill is Anti-Family - Teachers to Inform Against Parents

It attempts to force teachers to inform against parents, by making it compulsory for them to pass on any SUSPICIONS of child abuse, while protecting them from any liability for the publication of DEFAMATORY MATERIAL.

CLAUSE 54 - inserting Sec.67 (Maltreatment of Children):

While we deplore genuine maltreatment of children, we condemn this section for its ANTI-FAMILY THRUST, and its DICTATORIAL INTERFERENCE in what should be for teachers (as for all other members of the community) MATTERS OF CONSCIENCE only, tempered by the realization of their legal liability in the rare event of their becoming in any way involved as 'accessories after the fact'.

This is another instance of the unnecessary and risky inclusion in the Education Act of a law that would be wide open to abuse - and of which the subject-matter is more efficiently dealt with where it belongs - under the Criminal Code.

A next-door neighbour might also form an OPINION that a child is being abused, but he is not (yet!) compelled by special enactment of law to communicate immediately the observations and opinions upon which his/her suspicions are based. Neither is he (yet!) provided with absolute privilege and protection to allow him to publish defamatory material, such as teachers are, under this section of the Bill. This privilege to teachers even goes beyond the privilege enjoyed by Parliamentarians themselves.

CLAUSE 54 - inserting Sec.68 (School Records):

By the addition of this Section teachers are given privileges even greater than Parliamentary privilege. Thus this provides an avenue for abuse of the system which could easily be detrimental to the well-being of the family, or an individual parent or child especially as the section allows no access to the records by either parent or child. No real opportunity for redress is provided to any injured member of the family.

My husband and myself, even though we went to the school principal, the Education Minister and the Director-General, were still refused access to or information from our child's RECORD CARD. This happened a few years ago, and refusal then was on the grounds that any information on the cards was SECRET AND CONFIDENTIAL THEN. Now it is obvious such was not the legal position at that stage, for it is only NOW being put into the Act by this Bill. Therefore, all information on Record Cards would appear to be currently available to parents as their RIGHT. We would certainly appreciate from the Premier or the Education Minister written clarification of this point.

* * *

Clause 54 is not the only part of the Bill that displays the Education bureaucrats' anti-family bias.

- CLAUSE 20 imposes a \$500 fine for any parent or child who "wilfully disturbs" a school or class (the offence is not defined!); and a \$500 fine also for a parent or child who "upbraids, insults or abuses a teacher or teacher in training" (no matter what offensive language or act the teacher or trainee teacher may have used in regard to the child or his parent!).
- CLAUSE 21 also imposes a \$500 fine on parents or children who are on school premises without lawful authority or excuse, or who fail to leave promptly when ordered to do so by any teacher, for the time being, in charge. The decision of the teacher (no matter how biased or incompetent such person may be) appears to be infallible!

In my published COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE BILL, Clause 20 ("Wilful Disturbance") and Clause 21 ("Trespass on School Premises") are dealt with under CRITICISM NO.2, where the emphasis is on "TOO MUCH POWER TO BUREAUCRATS". This issue of 'STOP PRESS' is reprinting only CRITICISM NO.7. Clauses 20 and 21 will be treated more fully in a later 'STOP PRESS' in which I plan to reprint CRITICISM NO.2.

THE FAULT WITH THE BILL: The primary fault of the Bill is its false basis -

- (a) the Department has NO RIGHT to assume that CHILDREN are the PROPERTY OF THE STATE, nor
- (b) can the Department assume that the STATE SYSTEM of education is ADEQUATE AND PERFECT and that there must be NO DEPARTURE FROM ITS CURRICULUM nor QUESTIONING OF ITS METHODS OR CONTENT - (this it does despite the Government ban on the highly controversial innovative social studies packages - MACOS AND SEMP that the bureaucrats so avidly supported and defended.

The bureaucrats responsible for this Bill are denuding parents' rights according to these false assumptions, resulting in -

- (a) SECRET DOSSIERS being kept on our children,
- (b) all avenues for exercising PARENTS' RIGHTS or obtaining REDRESS in relation to our children are being closed by this ANTI-FAMILY bureaucracy.

Reiterating...

The Education Bill MUST GO!

Admittedly, this Bill can only stay 'alive' until Parliament is prorogued prior to the next election - but until then, so long as it remains, there is that ever-present possibility of its being rushed through Parliament on the pretext that it has finally been "amended as negotiated with the church leaders". Even if this were so, and with due respect to church 'leaders', education of children is primarily the right and responsibility of PARENTS. THE God-given role of Christian parents MUST NOT BE USURPED BY ANYONE - not by the church and certainly NOT by the State. We have a FREE-ENTERPRISE GOVERNMENT, and yet, even in Queensland, we are still having to combat aspects of SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NEO-NAZISM - all monopolist philosophies that will lead to THE CORPORATE STATE, i.e. -

rule by: (1) BIG GOVERNMENT, (2) BIG UNIONS, (3) BIG BUSINESS
and the individual 'be damned'!

This Education Amendment Bill is a classic example of a "BIG GOVERNMENT power-grab" and MUST BE RESISTED TO THE UTTERMOST!

In urging the passage of this Education Bill, is the NATIONAL PARTY administration ignoring NPA policies such as -

(1) INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS:

The National Party believes that a choice of school is to be encouraged in keeping with this philosophy of freedom of choice, ... the Party believes independent schools should be encouraged, and they should be enabled to operate without loss of their independence.

(2) PRIVATE ENTERPRISE:

The wage earner should be free to choose his type of employment and should have the opportunity to take his own initiative to fill any position .. in business, and the consumer should be free to allocate his income as he or she wishes. Difficulties within the Australian private enterprise system have arisen from the tendency in recent decades to transfer an ever increasing amount of responsibility to the Government.

As the Government becomes more involved in regulatory action, in providing more services etc, it has demanded a greater share of the country's financial resources, and this inevitably leads to higher taxation.

(3) EDUCATION:

The National Party believes in ... Independent Schools.

(4) OBJECTS:

The objects of the Party shall be: To fear God ...

(5) MEMBERSHIP:

(a) Residents of Queensland who subscribe to the Policy and Platform of the Party ...

Fortunately responsible members of Cabinet have to date successfully resisted this grab for unbridled bureaucratic power, but the National Party organization, on the other hand, has much for which to answer.

While others are being expelled, will those shadowy elements also be 'carpeted' who have ignored National Party policy and advanced SOCIALISM under the name of the Party??

PARENTS' RIGHTS ARE ERODED BY EDUCATION BILL

IN SPITE OF all the assurances given to us by the Minister for Education and his departmental officials, it is difficult to contain grave fears that the Education Bill of 1981/82 is dangerous and divisive.

CLAUSE 20: WILFUL DISTURBANCE OF SCHOOL -

Through this clause any person who "wilfully disturbs or interferes with any group of pupils engaged in school activities, whether on school premises or not, commits an offence against this Act." The penalty is a fine of \$500. Rebuking school-aged louts on our buses or trains, admonishing unruly hoons attending skating rinks or other arenas on sports days, or even refusing to serve ill-mannered oafs clamouring for instant attention at the daily tuck shop, technically constitute an offence against the Act.

Moreover the Act declares flatly that any person who "upbraids, insults or abuses a teacher or teacher in training in the presence or hearing of a pupil whether on school premises or not commits an offence against this Act." INCREDIBLE! Note that there is no mention of misdemeanour by the teacher exciting such action by an irate parent.

Even student teachers are protected against the felonies likely to be perpetrated by parents. Not long back, a student teacher swore foully at a class of five-year-olds during practice teaching. When upbraided and rebuked by the Principal, in the presence of the class, the student repeated the offence during the lunch-time, having tracked down the pupils in the playground.

While the Principal was incensed by the student's inexcusable behaviour and his lack of contrition, and the class teacher quite tearful about the trauma experienced by her young charges, the student teacher was completely exonerated by the Teachers' College which had spawned him, on the ground that any rebuke or reprimand would be an affront to his civil liberties.

Under the new Bill, the student teacher would not only be protected but could indeed sue the Principal and the class teacher for upbraiding and admonishing him even though his own behaviour should have brought about his expulsion from the teaching profession.

CLAUSE 21: TRESPASS ON SCHOOL PREMISES -

This clause imposes a penalty of \$500 on any person who is on school premises "without lawful authority or excuse". Interpretation of "lawful authority" appears to reside in the Principal or teacher in charge. Thus an aggrieved parent, indignant at treatment meted out to his son or daughter, would appear to be committing a felony by entering the school premises to seek an explanation. Indeed, school authorities are even empowered to have him arbitrarily removed and charged.

In the words of the Act:

"Any person who fails to leave school premises promptly upon being ordered to do so by the person for the time being in charge of school premises commits an offence against this Act."

The rights of parents whose taxes fund the school are enormously eroded. Just imagine the likely reception awaiting some watchdogs of school standards when next they visit a school alleged to be using controversial, even pornographic, text books or courses. The authority of our teachers, even the hopelessly incompetent, is being entrenched as infallible, one of the last avenues of protest left to parents plugged up by the framers of this Bill.

CLAUSE 63: NON-STATE SCHOOLS TO BE REGISTERED -

Unquestionably the most controversial component in the Bill is Clause 63: non-state schools to be registered. While no person of intelligence can disregard the need for government monitoring of education, much disquiet has been aroused by this clause. Indeed, this seems to be the *raison d'être* for the Bill as a whole.

To what extent was the Bill inspired by self-preservation? Are our professional educators across the nation, as rumour suggests, desperately worried about their crumbling empire? They are certainly not unmindful of the massive loss of confidence in the product they have been marketing.

Across the nation a pervasive uneasiness over education is being manifested, with 24% of Australian pupils now attending non-state schools despite annually escalating costs and negligible taxation rebates. The schools run by the State are losing public confidence, responsible parents are compelled by the sheer urgency of the situation to seek alternative education for their children, or even establish their own schools.

Under this Bill, registration of all schools is to be placed in the hands of the very people who have placed State Schools at risk. They are empowered to close schools expressly established by parents to rectify what they perceive as serious defects in both the philosophical underpinnings and the teaching practices of State Schools.

Under this Bill, parents desperately worried about the welfare of their children are deprived of the freedom of choice of schools, and the right to take positive steps to rectify glaring shortcomings in the State School system, by a FREE-ENTERPRISE government.

The implications of the government action are eminently clear.

First, parents do NOT have the right to select an appropriate education for their children, children being the property of the state.

Secondly, the State-run system of education is perfectly adequate for all children.

Purveyors of such myths are clearly impervious to public opinion and comment, the interminable debate over educational standards during the past decade obviously passing over their heads.

Under this Bill, parents are powerless to protect their most treasured possessions -- their own children -- the incontrovertible evidence of a failed education system ignored by our politicians.

Under this Bill, every education decision will pass into the hands of the Director-General or his nominees -- in other words, the permanent bureaucracy, unaccountable regardless of changes in government, and untouchable in its monolithic arrogance.

Whatever the merits of MACOS and SEMP, it is on record that all of the most senior officers of the Queensland Department of Education, including the Director-General, gave unequivocal support to the two controversial educational packages. Many parents and citizens, on the other hand, found both utterly repugnant. Surely our politicians are not blind to the extraordinary significance of their decision to place in the hands of the permanent bureaucrats, exclusive authority over education when recent events have demonstrated the existence of irreconcilable differences in educational philosophy in the community.

WHY should the philosophy of the bureaucrats prevail, even over parents prepared to meet the total cost of their children's education if they have to?

CLAUSE 68: RECORD CARDS -

The new Bill also deprives parents of a basic right provided by the Principal Act: the right to access to school records concerning their children. It is one of the most disturbing elements in the whole Bill. Section 68 refuses parents the right to consult or even check for accuracy record cards compiled on their children, regardless of the quality or competence of the teacher. Teachers, in fact, are elevated above the laws of defamation and libel, their observations, regardless of accuracy, being privileged. In the words of the Bill:

"A person who inserts or publishes in the records of a State School or who makes any allegation or comment on a pupil shall not thereby incur any liability if he has acted in good faith and without malice and with reasonable care."

Imagine! The cruellest of comments and the most unjust of personal assessments excused if done "in good faith"! SECRET DOSSIERS ON OUR CHILDREN, following them from class to class, perhaps even haunting them after they leave school, are kept from parents by Government legislation.

It does seem extraordinary that every other legislature in Australia is passing Privacy Bills expressly to provide access to personal files precisely to eradicate those injustices of Police States repugnant to democracies.

The framers of the new Education Bill, exemplars of modern education, advocate SECRET DOSSIERS ON OUR CHILDREN. This one clause reveals a great deal about their quality as human beings!

CLAUSE 13: P.& C. ASSOCIATION NOT TO EXERCISE AUTHORITY OVER TEACHERS -

Association of Parents and Citizens should also seek clarification of Clause 13 which forbids such groups from "interfering IN ANY WAY with the control and management of a State School". Does such regulation preclude advice about playground improvements, voluntary supervision by parents at sports meetings, or even fund raising?

Surely such associations will NOT be prevented from raising legitimate complaints by their members about incompetent teachers or unsatisfactory practices at the schools in which they evince so much interest. It appears that the Bill is entrenching that very defect levelled so often at State Schools; they are mere fund-raisers, and bakers of lamingtons.

CONCLUSION:

The most cursory examination of the Bill excites fears, and a profound suspicion of sinister consequences to follow its enactment lingers.

WHO DID FRAME THE BILL?? Who did convince those hardnosed and experienced cabinet ministers, famous throughout Australia, that the Bill merits their unqualified backing?.

THE BILL APPEARS TO BE MASSIVELY FLOORED!

[Contributed by Dan O'Donnell,
former lecturer in Education at NB CAE]

— PLEASE HELP OUR CAUSE —

1982 MEMBERSHIP EXPIRES ON 31/10/82

WE NEED YOUR DONATIONS OF \$5 OR MORE TO HELP US MEET PRINTING AND POSTAGE COSTS FROM NOW UNTIL JANUARY WHEN THE NEW YEAR COMMENCES. PLEASE GIVE TO THIS MINISTRY.

DONATION TO COVER TILL 1/1/83	- \$.....
1983 BASE LEVEL MEMBERSHIP \$10	-
1983 HIGHER LEVEL MEMBERSHIP	-
\$15 (up to 16 issues/yr)	-
\$20 (up to 24 issues/yr)	-