



"Righteousness exalteth a nation..."

**SOCIETY
To
OUTLAW
PORNOGRAPHY**

Vol.11, No.3

345



MARCH, 1982

50¢



"Seek that you may excel..."

**COMMITTEE
AGAINST
REGRESSIVE
EDUCATION**

(OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF 'STOP & CARE')
[Registered by Australia Post - Publication No. 0542921]

Editor/Director: Mrs. H.S. Joyner P.O. Box 162, Margate, 4019. Phones (07) 284 1311 & 284 3575

Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill

REJECT THIS EVIL EDUCATION BILL

HERE'S WHY - CLAUSE BY CLAUSE

AND WHAT WE PROPOSE AS AN ALTERNATIVE

Inside is a copy of the SUBMISSION dated 18/2/82, prepared by Mrs. Rona Joyner, Director of STOP & CARE, and forwarded initially to the Premier and other Cabinet Ministers and then to other selected Members of Parliament. The details included are the result of her intense research and thorough understanding of the Bill, and are the reason she has continued the strong campaign against it that she set in motion on Friday, 27th November last year. **THIS BILL MUST BE AXED NOW.**

* * * * *

CONTENTS OF SUBMISSION UNDER SECTION HEADINGS

[TOGETHER WITH REQUESTED ALTERATIONS TO CLAUSES IN THE BILL]

1. The State Has No Mandate to Educate the Whole Child.
 - (a) [Change the All-Encompassing Title 'Department of EDUCATION' to the Original Correctly Descriptive Title of 'Department of Public INSTRUCTION', and then confine the emphasis throughout to INSTRUCTIONAL LEARNING instead of using schools to DICTATE AND CHANGE CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES AND EMOTIONS, as though our children belong to the State.]
 - (b) [Alter Clause 31 of the Bill, so that the word 'instruction' continues to be used in Sec.35.]
2. Too Much Power to Bureaucrats.
 - (a) [Clauses 7,8,9,13,15,20,21,24,5,25,33,37,39,53,& 54 require amending by deletions and insertions of alternative amendments, in order to provide for greater control over education by the ELECTED GOVERNMENT.]
3. Why Have Trade Unionists on Education Boards?
 - (a) [Rewrite Clause 33 to remove TRADE UNION CONTROL by excluding Unionists from the Board (as in other departmental boards). Balance the membership to give consumers of education more direct representation than their servants (teachers and bureaucrats) have.]
 - (b) [Rewrite Clause 37 - (i) to remove discrimination in favour of one religious denomination, and (ii) to halt 'control by unionism' through the constitution of the Board.]
4. Does the Government Really Have Sufficient Control Over its School System?
 - (a) [Rewrite Clauses 33, 37, and 38 to help restore control to the elected Government.]
5. The Bill is Anti Free Enterprise - Teacher Registration Puts Teachers' Livelihood in Jeopardy.
 - (a) [(i) Delete Clause 40 to avoid the likelihood of abuses, and (ii) retain Clause 45 that repeals the section introducing Teacher Registration.]
6. A Vast Monopoly Over Education!
 - (a) [Delete Clauses 53 and 54 - (i) to preserve the principle of separation of Church and State (which protects the Church's divine commission to TEACH ALL NATIONS), and (ii) to retain freedom for private enterprise.]
7. The Bill is Anti Family - Teachers to Inform Against Parents!
 - (a) [Delete Sec.67 and 68 from Clause 54 of the Bill.]
8. A Former Referendum Result is Now Overturned By Repeal of its Principal Clause!
 - (a) [(i) Delete Clause 17 to prevent illegal removal from State Schools of the officially printed "BIBLE LESSONS" book (specially legislated for to fulfil the terms of the Referendum held to put the Bible into the curriculum) and (ii) Insert a clause to renumber Subsec.(2) as Subsec.(1) to restore it to its correct position as the principle clause in the Referendum questions.]

CONCLUSION

In view of the very great number of deletions and alterations (affecting half the clauses in the Bill) that would be necessary to make this Bill acceptable to the moral majority in Queensland -
WE RECOMMEND THAT THIS BILL BE WITHDRAWN AND CANCELLED FORTHWITH.

EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM? OR STATE CONTROL!

This is the issue to be dealt with at the PUBLIC RALLY to be held in the ROMA STREET FORUM on SUNDAY NEXT, 28/2/82, at 2.30 pm.

This Rally has been organized by the newly-formed COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENCE OF EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM (CFTDOEF), in association with THE COMMITTEE AGAINST REGRESSIVE EDUCATION (CARE), and FESTIVAL OF LIGHT/COMMUNITY STANDARDS ORGANIZATION (FOL/CSO). [FULL DETAILS BACK PAGE]

THE MOTIONS to be presented to the RALLY for acceptance are produced here for your perusal. Your presence at the RALLY will be visual support for the work of these committees.

PLEASE NOTE PARTICULARLY RE OUR SUBMISSION: In order to clarify our comment (under No. 5 heading) on Clause 38, we point out that when teacher registration (as enacted in 1970) was made compulsory by amendment in 1973, legislation seemed to victimise non-registered teachers, but did not appear to prevent an unregistered teacher from earning a livelihood in a self-employed capacity.

However, under this new bill a non-registered teacher (albeit highly qualified) may not be employed in "any place" by "any person" to "perform the duties of a teacher." Is a student paying a person for private coaching regarded as an 'employer'? What church can expect its members to undertake 3 years' Teacher Training and become a State registered teacher before they can perform teaching duties in a church kindergarten?!

ONCE AGAIN we are following the anti-Christian trend of America. In Ohio a new set of "Proposed Rules Governing Licensure of Day Care Centres" has been published, outlining the licensing and control of all church nurseries, Sunday Schools, Vacation Bible Schools, "church operated" day cares, and "church operated" preschools.

1. This meeting moves that the Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill be withdrawn in toto because it is based on the false premises that the State and not the parent is responsible for the education of the child and that the State should control all education in society.
2. This meeting requests the Minister to invite responses from and enter into full discussions with the general public with regard to the formulation of any future Bill related in any way to education, and most importantly with regard to the preparation of the regulations pertaining thereto.
3. This meeting requests that the Principal Act be amended to assert the right and responsibility of parents to determine the type and manner of education of their children and to delegate the task of schooling to whomsoever they see fit.
4. This meeting moves that instead of the Principal Act requiring compulsory attendance at a State school, it require compulsory schooling of a type and manner acceptable to the parent, and consequently that the State shall provide tax supported public instruction for the children of those parents who desire it.
5. This meeting resents the unwarranted expansion of bureaucratic control manifest in this Bill, giving the State a monopoly over all education, and denies the implicit assumption that the Department of Education has total knowledge and expertise in this field.
6. This meeting reaffirms the principle of separation of church and state, which allows the teaching role of the church to be exercised free from state interference, subject only to the preservation of public order and morality.
7. This meeting recognizes that the present State education system is not religiously neutral, but is increasingly conveying the values and attitudes of the religion of secular humanism, whether consciously or unconsciously.
8. This meeting requests that legislation be written upholding the traditional family as the basis of Queensland society, and directing the State education system to recognize this and other values of the Christian ideology incorporated in, inter alia: (a) the Australian Constitution, (b) the taking of oaths in courts of law. (c) the opening prayer of the Queensland Parliament, (d) the universal honoring of Christ in our calendar and dating system, and (e) the Referendum of 1910 providing Bible lessons in State schools.
9. This meeting would publicly note that church and other private schools were first in the business of schooling and that the state merely later provided "free" compulsory education for children not already catered for in church or private schools.
10. This meeting acknowledges that the growth in Christian schooling results from a renewed awakening of Christian parents to their comprehensive responsibilities before God as directed in His Word, and from the deterioration of moral and academic standards in the State education system generally.

AFTER THE BILL - WHAT ??

A common reaction to this Bill when its full import was felt was one of despair - "If this is the policy of our 'conservative' Government, what hope is there for Christian parents and other responsible people?" But there IS hope, for the TRUTH of the matter is that Mr. Gunn's Bill does NOT espouse stated National Party Policy. In our protests against this Bill and our pleas for the preservation of Parents' Rights and Christian freedom, we have the support of the NATIONAL PARTY MEMBERSHIP in their policy statements, cited below.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL PARTY OF AUSTRALIA (Queensland)

Objects (inter alia): To fear God and Honour the Queen;

To maintain Democracy, Liberty and individual enterprise;

"POLICIES FOR THE EIGHTIES" (A National Party Publication)

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS -

The National Party believes that a choice of school is to be encouraged. In keeping with this philosophy of freedom of choice, and at the same time maintaining the concept of equality of opportunity, the Party believes independent schools should be encouraged, and they should be enabled to operate without the loss of their independence.

Because the 'Voucher' system embodies these principles of free choice, equality of opportunity, independence, and also justice, merit is recognized in the system. With a view to furthering this claim, the Party requests the Government to investigate the feasibility of the Voucher system.

It should not be forgotten that independent schools relieve governments hence the community, of a considerable cost in regard to education.

NOT A MINORITY

Do not accept the unfounded criticism that you are in a minority, for in regard to education, you share the beliefs of the Party that Queenslanders have consistently voted into the position of Senior partners of the coalition. As a member of the National Party, I find I can readily and constantly promote these statements as being worthy of acceptance by responsible people of all political persuasions.

Members of STOP & CARE will be encouraged to know that support is ever growing. As a direct result of the controversy over the Bill, our membership is now over 5,000 in number.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHRISTIAN EDUCATION MOVEMENT IS THAT OF BIBLICAL THEISM. This worldwide movement towards Christian Schools is not a denominational movement. It is totally unrelated to denominational terminology and distinctives. It is not a movement of men; IT IS A MOVEMENT OF GOD. Do not allow the State to prohibit the work of the King of Kings.

THERE IS ROOM FOR POSITIVE AMENDMENTS TO THE EXISTING ACT

I believe the existing Act is inadequate in some areas, and I believe positive changes would include the following concepts. If you share this opinion, start writing now (to the Premier, to your Local Member) urging these WORTHWHILE CHANGES. (Please send copies to me also.)

1. Separation of Church and State must be clearly spelled out, allowing Christian Churches to practice their God-given commission to exercise a teaching role, and to be responsible to God, and not the Government, in this undertaking. Therefore Church schools and their teachers MUST NOT be subjected to registration by the State.
2. Parents must be recognized as the prime educators of their children, and in this capacity be recognized as responsible decision-makers in the delegation of this teaching duty to institutions or persons of their own choice, or to the State.
3. The title of the Department should be reverted to the Department should be reverted to the former designation - "Department of Public Instruction" - for this clearly expresses the limit of the mandate given by the people. The department is to instruct only - the education of the WHOLE child will be determined by the parents and will come from many different sources.
4. Trade Unionists should not be allowed on Education Boards, because the proclaimed Marxist principle is for Trade Unionist (ie. Worker) control, and this should be carefully resisted.
5. The power of the bureaucrats should be significantly reduced and limited by legislation. Elected Representatives are the ones who have been given a mandate with regard to formulation of education policy - not faceless public servants - and Cabinet should watch very closely what is added or subtracted through the later writing of Regulations and By-laws by the Department and/or Boards.
6. So that a diverse source of education and instruction may be available to the public, Churches and commercial enterprise should not be hindered in their provision of such programmes or institutions. It should be noted that diversity in education and free enterprise are NPA policies.
7. Because the age of consent law only protects girls under 16 years of age, the Education Act could well cover this omission, by providing for girls (and boys) who are outside the protection of the Age of Consent laws, specific protection from heterosexual and homosexual abuse (both physical and verbal) by teachers.

8. Restore accountability in education by deleting the words "other than by full-time schooling" from Regulation 54. This Regulation (which presently provides for the Board of Secondary School Studies to arrange external Junior and Senior examinations for part-time or correspondence students) would then include all students, at State and non-State schools. This would remove any need for registration and inspection of Church schools to establish standards.
9. Probably the most important amendment of all is that, instead of the Education Act requiring compulsory ATTENDANCE at the State School, it should rather require compulsory SCHOOLING of a type and in a manner acceptable to the PARENT, and that therefore the State shall provide tax-supported public instruction for the children of those parents who might desire it. The Voucher System (in the NPA Policy) could be the fairest method of paying for such diversity in education.
10. The fact that this dangerous Bill could have been made law, quite unnoticed by the public and without any opposition to it, had it not been noticed by a few vigilant people, SHOWS THE DANGER OF A SINGLE HOUSE OF PARLIAMENT. PUSH FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN UPPER HOUSE. The protection afforded will be worth the expense.

#####

WHO IS RUNNING THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT?

WHO IS CHURNING OUT THESE DISCREDITED, UNWANTED HUMANISTIC SCHEMES???

WHY ARE THEY ALLOWED TO REMAIN IN OFFICE??? CALL FOR THEIR SACKING!!!!

"As Christians we are not only to KNOW the right world view, the world view that tells us the truth of what IS, but consciously to ACT upon that world view so as to influence society in all its parts and facets across the whole spectrum of life, as much as we can to the extent of our individual and collective ability. . . . The danger in regard to the rise of authoritarian government is that Christians will be still as long as their own religious activities, evangelism, and life-styles are not disturbed. (*I thank God this Bill disturbs MANY*)

"We are not excused from speaking, just because the culture and society no longer rest as much as they once did on Christian thinking. Moreover, Christians do not need to be in the majority in order to influence society." ('How Should We Then Live' by Schaeffer, p.256)

TELEGRAPH

FEBRUARY 18, 1982

* ONE lobbyist? ALL OF YOU who contacted MPs know that in actual fact, the Government took appropriate action in view of the facts clearly and honestly presented to it. RIGHT IS MIGHT!

* **SOMEONE with a pipeline to Premier Bjelke - Petersen has effectively railroaded amendments to the Education Act.**

This has become clear as the full impact of Cabinet's decision to defer the amendments for six months is realised.

* **The lobbyist** with the influence certainly does not come from the Queensland Teachers Union which has raised a number of objections to the amendments while welcoming some changes.

Let us retrace the steps which have led to Cabinet's decision which amounts, according to Cabinet sources, to the complete scrapping of Mr Bill Gunn's amendments in their present form.

On November 26 last year the government was nearly defeated in State Parliament by a combined Opposition and Liberal backbench push for a deferral.

Like the Teachers Union, the Opposition and some backbench Liberals were concerned about the centralising of power to the Minister under the amendments. They simply asked for more time to consider what was proposed.

Faced with a revolt, Cabinet decided to defer the amendments for three months.

Since then the real issue has emerged: the registration of non-state schools only if they meet educational standards and

guidelines set by the department in the public interest.

Conspicuously, outspoken Liberal backbencher, Mrs Rosemary Kyburz, did not vote with her Liberal backbench colleagues for deferral. After Cabinet's decision last week for a further six month deferral, Mrs Kyburz issued a statement in which she blamed fanatics for the deferral.

On January 22, Mr Gunn, the Education Minister, forthrightly declared that the government would stand firm on the proposed amendments.

Mr Gunn warned that the government would not back down on the issue of registering non-state schools.

"We have a duty to all students that standards are maintained. Reasonable uniformity in curriculum is required so children can win jobs," Mr Gunn said.

"And only registered teachers must be allowed to teach."

Under the proposed legislation, schools not reaching or maintaining a suitable standard would be deregistered and closed but there would be a right of appeal to a District Court judge.

The Education Minister only had the power to prosecute parents if a non-approved school continued to function under the present Act.

Mr Gunn declared that the proposed changes were acceptable to the mainstream churches and he was confident a showdown would not be needed with some of the

schools run by Christian fundamentalists.

On January 22, Mrs Rona Joyner, director of an organisation called the Campaign Against Regressive Education, declared that some supporters of the "Christian alternative" schools were prepared to be jailed if the government closed their schools.

"a concerted drive by 5000 parents convinced the Premier to defer the proposed amendments," Mrs Joyner said.

She said there were at least 12 "Christian alternative" schools in the Brisbane region.

The Education Department had threatened at least one under the provisions of the proposed Bill.

Queenslanders will remember Mrs Joyner's extraordinary influence over our state's educational policies. Her influence effectively stopped innovative educational programs SEMP and MACOS.

The basis of Mrs Joyner's intervention has been her belief that education was taking a humanist anti-Christian line. Her intervention has also resulted in indefinite deferral of a human relationship or sex education course in state schools.

Such a course was strongly recommended by the Ahern inquiry into Queensland education.

In spite of his forthright commitment to his amendments, Mr Gunn has watched as they were rolled by the Premier last week.

Mrs Joyner had done it again.

EVEN ONE WITH GOD IS A MAJORITY - BUT OUR MEMBERSHIP LIST TOTALS OVER 5,000!!
IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO "GET WITH THE STRENGTH", AND BECOME PART OF THIS MINISTRY THAT GOD IS PROSPERING AGAINST SATAN AND HIS MISGUIDED HELPERS - FORM OR JOIN A GROUP.
BECOME A STOP & CARE MEMBER OR SUBSCRIBE TO 'STOP PRESS' MAGAZINE:

MEMBERSHIP to 31/10/82 (Free Magazine) \$5.00 NAME

SUBSCRIPTION ONLY to 31/10/82 \$6.00 ADDRESS

DONATION (to Office Help, etc.) \$

No. of Supporters covered by Membership P/CODE..... PHONE No.....

POST TO: "STOP & CARE", PO. BOX 162, MARGATE, 4019 (Mrs.H.S.Joyner, Director)

Submission

re

Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill

1. THE STATE HAS NO MANDATE TO EDUCATE THE WHOLE CHILD

Christ is the WAY, the TRUTH, and the LIFE, and the FOUNT OF ALL KNOWLEDGE. Therefore it is inconceivable that anyone should assume that it could be possible for any group of human beings (no matter how 'expert' they might be), to be capable of possessing total knowledge and expertise in educating the WHOLE CHILD - to the point of usurping the role of PARENTING!

Clause 3 - adding "and for other purposes" after the word "Education" in the long title of the Education Act.

Section 5 - (Department of Education):

The mentality behind this legislation is the UNESCO concept that education OF THE WHOLE CHILD is to be the responsibility of government and is to take place in state schools controlled by the Education bureaucracy. It seems not to be understood nor conceded that there is a vast difference between State SCHOOLING and State EDUCATION!

By SCHOOLING I mean 'instruction given to students to impart knowledge or factual matter'. In educational jargon it refers to COGNITIVE LEARNING as opposed to AFFECTIVE LEARNING.

"Cognitive learning is to do with the acquisition of information, while affective learning is concerned with CHANGES IN ATTITUDES AND EMOTIONS." (In 'Fundamentals and Fundamentalists' by Scott & Gower:).

EDUCATION covers both forms of learning and is a lifelong process, most of which happens primarily within the family and secondarily within society generally.

This important difference has, with successive changes in State School Curricula, been progressively blurred (albeit almost imperceptively in the early stages), especially since the change of name from 'Department of PUBLIC INSTRUCTION' to the 'Department of EDUCATION'. With the benefit of hindsight, we suggest that this change was made precisely in order that more and more time could be devoted to the peripherals under the guise of 'EDUCATING THE WHOLE CHILD', (and 'CHANGING HIS ATTITUDES AND EMOTIONS'), and less and less time could then be available for 'SCHOOLING IN THE BASICS' that leads to academic excellence.

State schools were made compulsory for children of not less than six nor more than fifteen years of age so that every child would be thoroughly SCHOOLED and able to take his place in the community as a knowledgeable adult with intellectual and manual skills well developed. That universities and employers are complaining that such is NOT any longer the end result of many students' years of compulsory attendance at State schools, it seems realistic to assume that parents are right in their belief that State Schools are no longer SCHOOLING (i.e. INSTRUCTING) children as they should be. To quote Scott & Gowers again, parents are objecting, and -

"It is the schools' overt forays into the affective domain which have caused the trouble."

A 'Department of Public Instruction' would have no role to play in the area of psychological techniques such as VALUES CLARIFICATION or HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS.

OUR REQUEST TO CABINET: (a) That Section 5 of the Act be amended by changing the all-encompassing title, 'Department of EDUCATION' back to the original more correctly descriptive title of 'Department of PUBLIC INSTRUCTION'; and
(b) That the educational philosophy reflected in all Departmental curricula and syllabi be brought into line with the original concept of Christian-based PUBLIC SCHOOLING, which fulfilled the mandate given to schools by parents - that the State provide for cognitive learning and leave affective learning in the home where it belongs.

* * * * *

Clause 31 - amending Sec.35 (Minister to Provide for Running of Colleges, etc.):

The Bill is obviously allowing for a change in content of courses by replacing the idea of instructing (cognitive learning) with that of education (affective learning - CHANGING ATTITUDES AND EMOTIONS).

OUR REQUEST: That, for the same reasons, Clause 31 of the Bill be erased, and Sec.35 of the Act be allowed to continue using the word "instruction", so the phrase "technical and further instruction" can be inserted in lieu of "technical and agricultural instruction".

* * * * *

The Bill gives the Minister for Education (and through him, by delegation, the bureaucracy) too much POWER AND CONTROL over parents, students, churches and all teaching institutions under private enterprise.

Amendment Bill Clause 7 - altering Sec.5A (Power of Delegation by Minister):

This gives the Minister the option to delegate to any departmental officer ALL or ANY of his powers, authorities and functions, other than this power of delegation.

Subsec. (3) says that the power or authority may be exercised and the function may be performed upon the opinion, belief or state of mind of the delegate.

Clause 8 - altering Sec.6 (The Corporation of the Minister):

This gives the Minister power to act above any law to the contrary, which power can also be delegated.

Clause 9 - altering Sec.8 (Regulations):

By omitting subsecs.(3), (4) and (5), Parliament's control over Regulations is taken out of this Act, and can then rely only on the Acts Interpretation Act, without any reference to that fact given within this Bill itself. This may not be sufficient safeguard to Parliament's control over the writing by the bureaucracy of the REGULATIONS under the Education Act.

Clause 13 - repealing and replacing Sec.13 (P. & C. Association not to exercise authority over Teachers):

The Bill in a number of instances puts the 'opinion of the Minister' (or of his delegate) above the FACTS of the matter - which could pave the way for a ministerial (or bureaucratic) dictatorship. This section instances one of a number of such. By adding the words 'in the OPINION of the Minister' (or his delegate), this new section may prevent P. & C. Associations from voting on matters such as whether or not Sex Education, MACOS or SEMP are acceptable to the parents of the school. Such could be termed 'exercising authority' or 'interfering', and parents would have no redress, and neither would anyone else, in any instance where this poorly drawn up Bill puts the determination of any matter within the realm of OPINION rather than legally defining the FACTS. It is of no value to appeal to a Court, since all the Minister or official would have to prove is that he had formed an OPINION, on reasonable grounds. What is 'reasonable' to a Humanist could be totally 'unreasonable' to a Christian, which makes it almost impossible to disprove.

Clause 15 - repealing and replacing Sec.16 (Use of Schools):

This section places the Minister or any delegate of his above the law in regard to issuing permits for the use of any school, college, etc., for any purpose (even not connected with education), "notwithstanding anything contained in this or any other Act or that the land in question is reserved for a particular purpose."

Clause 20 - repealing and replacing Sec.22 (Wilful Disturbance of School):

In all legislation, the meanings of words must be clear and precise, but section 22 does not define the offence. WHAT constitutes "disturbing" or "interfering with" children engaged in school activities, especially when not on school premises? What wide powers and opportunities for vandalizing or being a public nuisance this could give children, if responsible adults cannot interfere in any circumstances!

WHAT does 'upbraids, insults or abuses' cover? One dictionary meaning of 'upbraids' is 'scolds, reproaches, reproves, or chides.' Where is the crime in that? It is surely part of a person's right, even duty as regards one's child, to be free to reprove or scold a teacher in certain legitimate circumstances! It is well nigh impossible never to have any child within earshot while speaking to a teacher.

The current Act excluded children from prosecution, but the amending Clause 20 adds subsec.(2) to ensure the prosecution of pupils, and makes no age exemption! No mention is made of repeat offences, or how often a parent will be having to pay out! Will charges be laid against some children every time and others only once or twice? What of the unfortunate child who might be charged for something another child did?

The over-riding principle relating to Clauses 20 and 21 of the Bill is that the Criminal Code and Vagrants, Gaming & Other Offences Act provide the most effective and democratic way of dealing with serious misdemeanours - especially any that would draw such a heavy fine as \$500!

Clause 21 - repealing and replacing Sec.22A (Tresspass on School Premises):

By altering Section 22A, the Bill gives the person for the time being in charge of a school the power to cut short a parent's lawful right to be on school premises, and the Minister (or his delegate) can permanently forbid a parent (or any other concerned citizen) from entering school premises. In both cases the penalty is set at \$500 - more than for drink-driving! The Criminal Code would cover criminals - this Bill would intimidate parents and citizens!

Clause 24 - repealing and replacing Sec.26 (Provision of Special Education):

Section 26 of the Act provides special education "for children who require it" but the amended Sec.26 says "For EVERY handicapped child there SHALL be provided special education . . . which MAY be provided by or contributed to by the Minister." This section is unclear in its wording. "...there SHALL be provided special education" - but on whom does this compulsion rest? Such special education MAY be provided by the Minister. It MAY be given in registered or other schools, or by any other means APPROVED BY THE MINISTER for the purpose.

It seems the PARENT is the one being compelled to provide this special education - and this is too dictatorial! Parents of handicapped children must be allowed to exercise their rights to determine for themselves what is best in their own particular case. Any attempt to institutionalize EVERY handicapped child must be utterly RESISTED.

To add insult to injury, it appears from the wording of this section that parents of such a child (no matter how badly handicapped he might be) might even be forced to have that child given special education at their own expense.

Clause 5 - amending Sec.4 (Interpretation of 'Handicapped Child'):

The definition is very broad and vague, depending on "THE OPINION OF THE MINISTER", and covering blind, deaf or any other type or degree of handicapped child, of any age from BIRTH TO 18 YEARS! This would give the Minister (and through him the bureaucracy) total control over the rearing of any child declared to be 'handicapped'. Based on such a definition, Sec.24 above becomes even more objectionable, with its potential to restrict the freedom of numerous parents and children.

Clause 33 - replacing Section 36 (Constitution of the Board of Secondary School Studies):

Section 36, subsecs.(1) & (2)(i), of the Act gives power to the Governor-in-Council to "prescribe" and "otherwise prescribe" the constitution of the Board and to appoint who shall be chairman. Under the Bill the Executive Government loses all these powers, the Minister (perhaps his delegate) becoming the one who nominates the chairman - the Governor-in-Council's only involvement then being to appoint the members nominated according to this constitution.

Clause 36 - amending Sec.51A (Constitution of Board of Advanced Education):

Clause 37 - repealing and replacing Sec.51C (Constitution of the Board of Teacher Education):

Clause 39 - amending Sec.51E (Constitution of the Council of a College of Advanced Education):

As in the case of the Board of Secondary School Studies, so also in the above clauses, the effect of the Bill is to increase the Minister's influence by lessening Cabinet's interest in and control of membership of the boards.

(More on this later.)

Clause 53 - inserting Sec.63 of Part IX (Non-State Schools to be Registered):

This gives the Minister (or his delegate) power to dictate to every person running (or intending to run) any place of learning designated by the Governor in Council to be 'a school'. The powers granted the bureaucracy under this clause are so wide as to enable a hostile school inspector (and there ARE some!) to close down any church school - ironically on the basis of non-compliance with the Humanistic SUB-STANDARDS of the State system, which were what drove parents in desperation to seek an ALTERNATIVE system with HIGH STANDARDS, offered by Christians!

Under similar legislation in Victoria, schools using Accelerated Christian Education programmes are currently threatened with closure because of TOO MUCH EMPHASIS ON TRADITIONAL ACADEMIC CONTENT AND CHRISTIAN VIRTUES. (More on this Clause later)

Clause 54 - inserting new Part XII (Sections 66, 67 and 68)

(Sec.66 - Restriction on Conferring and Using Certain Awards)

(Sec.67 - Maltreatment of Children) (Sec.68 - School Records)

Sec.66 could be used to exclude all free enterprise places of learning (that are above the level of secondary education) - correspondence schools, accountancy and other degree-conferring institutes, commercial art training centres, theological colleges, etc. - from carrying on their normal business of training and qualifying graduates in various fields of education. What powers to give to any public servant with a YEN FOR POWER and HOSTILITY TO FREE ENTERPRISE!!

Sections 67 and 68 give to teachers legal privileges above those enjoyed by any other members of society, even above Parliamentary privilege which can be exercised ONLY within the precincts of Parliament. These sections are an open invitation for teachers to defame any member of a student's family with full protection at law,-

Sec.67(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."

Similarly Sec.68(3) affirms that no person publishing allegations under this Act shall "thereby incur any liability".

OUR REQUEST: (a) That all the above amendments, together with Clause 5(a) (omitting definitions of 'Blind' and 'Deaf') and Clause 25 (repealing Sec.27) be deleted from the Bill; and
(b) That in view of the reasons given above, alternative amendments be inserted to provide for greater control over education BY THE VOTING PUBLIC (via their elected GOVERNMENT) instead of allowing the power of ONE MINISTER (in effect, his bureaucracy) to increase even beyond what it is at present.

* * * * *

3. WHY HAVE TRADE UNIONISTS ON EDUCATION BOARDS?

The constitutions of the Boards of Secondary School Studies and Teacher Education, as amended by the Bill, are too heavily weighted towards the bureaucracy, the teachers and the Teachers' Union, with far too little emphasis on community and tertiary interests.

Clause 33 - repealing and replacing Sec.36 (Constitution of the Board of Secondary School Studies):

The chairman, under the Act, is nominated by the Governor in Council, but the Amendment now gives that power to the Minister, or, through him, to the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy gains still more power through the Director of Secondary Education being ex officio member, and four other members being nominees of the Director-General. Thirteen are teachers or educationists, while five others only are from the tertiary fields.

Particularly strange and undesirable is the fact that, contrary to the case in, as far as I have been able to ascertain, every other Department, the Marxist principle of TRADE UNIONIST CONTROL is evident in both the Board of Secondary School Studies and the Board of Teacher Education. (See article Imba.Chronicle 30/12/81) Three members of the B.S.S.S. are representatives of Unions (antagonistic to the government, and in favour of discredited MACOS and SEMP). This gives the A.L.P. more representation on the Board, by three to zero, than the Liberals!

As well as this, the discrimination in favour of one religious school system over all the others (the chairman of the Catholic Education Commission is appointed outright) is unacceptable. Also it is not explained how, or by whom, the one teacher representing all other non-State secondary schools, will be chosen - nor how one person can be chosen who will truly represent parents (a very diverse group).

Three to represent industry, commerce and parents is far short of a fair ratio in relation to teachers and Unionists on the Board. It is top heavy in favour of the SERVANTS of the CONSUMERS of education, rather than giving a fair go to the PUBLIC who should be calling the tune.

OUR REQUEST: That Clause 33 of the Bill be rewritten to make the constitution of the Board more balanced by removing TRADE UNION CONTROL by excluding Unionists (as in other departmental Boards), and by ensuring that the CONSUMERS of education (parents, employers, students, and the tertiary institutions, also the Government) have more direct representation than do the SERVANTS (the teachers and bureaucrats).

* * * * *

Clause 37 - repealing and replacing Sec.51C (Constitution of the Board of Teacher Education):

In this Board also there is a degree of UNIONIST CONTROL, evident in the opportunity provided for two UNIONISTS (even left-wing extremists) to be made members. This is SOCIALISM.

The Bill also gives the Board of Teacher Education an unacceptable emphasis on the Catholic Education Commission in a State Education system, which is a discrimination against all other non-State education authorities. While a place on the Board is specified for the representative of the Catholic Education Commission, all other diverse non-State education authorities are allowed only one representative. How will this one be chosen and by whom?

OUR REQUEST: (a) That a more balanced membership be devised, without leanings towards any one religion, because governments should not legislate to establish any religion; and
(b) That 'Control by UNIONISM' should be halted by deleting from Clause 37 the new Sec.51C(2)(e)(ii) & (iii) which gives membership to representatives of Unions, whose A.L.P. leanings are those of the minority in government and in the community.

* * * * *

DOES THE GOVERNMENT REALLY HAVE SUFFICIENT CONTROL OVER ITS SCHOOL SYSTEM?

The Bill through both the constitutions of the two Boards and through the Functions and Powers of both Boards, gives almost total power to their respective corporate memberships.

Clause 33 - repealing and replacing Sec.37 (Functions and Powers of the Board):

Clause 38 - repealing and replacing Sec.51D (Functions of the Board):

The Bill, admittedly grants these powers subject to the Minister, but in actual fact does the Government really have sufficient control over what is taught and how it is assessed? Sec.37(1)(b)(viii) and Sec.51D(1)(b)(vii) give additional opportunity to those teachers, who wish to do so, to add the Humanist slant in the implementing of decisions and policies at school level - to the detriment of this conservative government, and of consumers of education generally.

The degree of support among teachers for MACOS and SEMP should be an indication of teacher attitude (wittingly or unwittingly) towards Marxist/Humanist principles in education.

It is fitting here to refer to the fact that many teacher trainers have used their influence in colleges to change the role of teachers from being inculcators of knowledge to being agents of psychological and behavioural change in students.

One source of documentation for this claim is in the book "FUNDAMENTALS AND FUNDAMENTALISTS" by Professor Roger Scott & M/s Ann Gowers:

"The conflict is about the role of the school and its emphasis on cognitive or affective learning. Cognitive learning is to do with the acquisition of information, while affective learning is concerned with changes in attitudes and emotions. It is the school's overt forays into the affective domain which have caused the trouble.

"Parents tend to see themselves as responsible for the transmission of values and attitudes, and to see the teacher as mainly responsible for teaching skills and knowledge. There is, however, AN UNDERLYING ASSUMPTION IN MANY TEACHER EDUCATION COURSES, and reflected by MANY PRACTISING TEACHERS, that THE CHILD IS ESSENTIALLY GOOD BUT HAS BEEN DAMAGED BY ITS PARENTS. The TEACHER'S ROLE, is, in part, TO COUNTERACT THIS DAMAGE.

"MRS. JOYNER VOICES A COMMON CONCERN WITH THIS, when as will be seen later, she attacks VALUES CLARIFICATION AND ATTITUDE CHANGING TECHNIQUES BEING USED BY TEACHERS."

OUR REQUEST: That this give further weight to the consideration of amendment to the Act by rewriting Clauses 33, 37 and 38 of the Bill as suggested previously.

* * * * *

5. THE BILL IS ANTI FREE ENTERPRISE - TEACHER REGISTRATION PUTS TEACHERS' LIVELIHOOD IN JEOPARDY

The Bill takes Teacher Registration right into the realm of TOTAL BUREAUCRATIC POWER - power even to prevent a teacher from earning his livelihood in his chosen profession on the open market.

Clause 38 - repealing and replacing Sec.51D (Functions and Powers of the Board):

Teacher Registration was introduced in the existing Act as a voluntary option, but under this Bill it becomes compulsory and the means to prevent de-registered teachers from earning a livelihood in their field anywhere. This is not free enterprise, for which the National Party is proud to stand at election time. See Part VII B of the Bill - "A person who is not a registered teacher shall not hold at any school any office or position in which he is required to perform the duties of a teacher (unless authorised to do so by the Board)."

Clause 40 - inserting Part VII B, Secs.51G-51Q (Registration of Teachers):

Sec.51G(2) & (3) compulsorily takes away a teacher's right to privacy, even as regards undefined particulars as may be prescribed later.

Sec.51H(a) lists 'good character', but does not say how it is defined or established.

Sec.51J has no parallel in the Act and is a weapon against any teacher's right to earn his livelihood. The Department should have a right to dismiss any unsatisfactory employee, but not to prevent anyone else from allowing him to perform the duties of a teacher in some other marketplace.

The Department should have no monopoly over employment (or otherwise) of teachers. Some schools could afford to pay the daily fine to employ the teacher of their choice (who might quite satisfactorily serve them), but others could not. This would be discrimination against small schools.

This Section also interferes with non-State schools' rights to use parents as aids. The Government must be seen to be what it claims to be - a free enterprise government.

Section 51M replaces Sec.62I (Removal of Name from Register), and in doing so has left out the original subsec.(1)(d) which established that a teacher had to

be "a patient within the meaning of 'The Mental Health Acts 1961-1964' or otherwise incapable in law of managing his own affairs" before he could be deregistered under the Act. This puts individual teachers at great risk, especially Christian teachers, in view of what has been added by the new Sec.51M(4) and the new Sec.51N. Sec.51M(4) and Sec.51N provide for a panel of four teachers (plus a chairman from the Teacher Education Board) to determine the mental health of any teacher and to recommend to the Board either his deregistration or his suspension as a teacher, as they see fit.

regis-
Even
etc.,
Edin-

This is a SCANDALOUS ALTERATION to the Act, and can only have SINISTER CONNOTATIONS - the victimization of Christian teachers who are already considered to be 'quite insane' because they believe in CREATION rather than EVOLUTION, and worship GOD rather than the Humanist doctrine of the SUPREMACY OF HUMAN REASON - RATIONALISM. American Dr. Madalyn O'Hair, with her conviction that a believer in religion is INSANE, won a case in USA against prayers in school. (Tba. 'Chron' 30/12/81)

One of the aims of the curriculum is often stated as "assisting the child to clear REASONING and RATIONAL decision-making", tacitly indicating the Humanist philosophy of the Department.

Section 51M in the Bill, in replacing Sec.62I, has also inconspicuously dropped the Section 62I(2)(b)(i) relating to the punishment of a registered teacher who "has been guilty of habitual DRUNKENNESS or of addiction to any deleterious DRUG". Likewise, almost imperceptively, the meaning of the sub-clause on punishment for "MISCONDUCT" was changed, so that the misconduct must now be such that is detrimental to 'the relationship of teacher and pupil'. What constitutes 'detrimental' is unclear!

OUR REQUEST: (In view of the abuses that this Section on the Registration of Teachers is demonstrably capable of perpetrating against innocent teachers) that Clause 40 of the Bill be repealed in toto, and Clause 45 (Repeal of Division IV of Part VIIIA) be passed - i.e. that Registration of Teachers be discontinued (the performance of school-leavers has not even improved since Registration was experimented with!).

Any serious misdemeanours, incompetencies, genuine mental disability, etc., are correctly dealt with under the Public Service Act rather than by a process of registration that can have far-reaching ill-effects even on teachers remote from the State system.

* * * * *

6. A VAST STATE MONOPOLY OVER EDUCATION!

The KEY PURPOSE of the whole Bill seems to be its attempt to create a vast STATE MONOPOLY over Education by -

- (a) DECLARING any non-State place of learning to be 'A SCHOOL' for the purpose of registration and control, and
- (b) RESTRICTING the conferring of AWARDS to such persons only as are AUTHORIZED BY THE STATE.

(a) Clause 53 - inserting Sec.63 of Part IX (Non-State Schools to be Registered):

The Bill imposes a penalty of \$1000 on anyone who runs an UNREGISTERED SCHOOL. No school can be registered unless "IN THE OPINION OF THE MINISTER", it provides SATISFACTORY FACILITIES" and "EFFICIENT AND REGULAR INSTRUCTION IN A RANGE OF SUBJECTS AND ACTIVITIES ACCEPTABLE TO THE MINISTER" (or his delegate!). In practice, this could give the Minister (or a bureaucrat whose philosophy is quite unknown to us) almost totalitarian powers, because all a Court of law could be required to prove is that what the Minister or bureaucrat had acted upon was indeed HIS OPINION. And where would that leave a parent or the controlling body of a church school? As I said earlier, philosophical disputes cannot be determined on the basis of what is a reasonable opinion. What is 'satisfactory' or 'efficient'?

"Instruction received in a registered school shall be taken to be an 'efficient manner of instruction'". However, it is subject to reversal on the basis of an 'opinion'! Sec.63(7)(a) says that, again IN THE OPINION OF THE MINISTER (or his delegate), if a registered school is not providing SATISFACTORY facilities and EFFICIENT and regular instruction in a range of subjects and activities ACCEPTABLE to the Minister, (or his delegate), then the school may be deregistered and ordered to be CLOSED. Again the penalty is \$1000 for non-compliance!

While the Bill gives non-State schools the right to exist, it demands so much CONFORMITY to the State Curricula, syllabi and teaching methods, even to the extent of employing only State-registered teachers, that non-State schools are, in effect, really STATE CONTROLLED! No longer independent, they are extensions of the State!

Clause 40 - inserting Sec.51J (Unregistered Teachers not to be Employed):

Clause 53 - inserting Sec.63B (Meaning of "School"):

New Secs.51J(3)(a) & (b) and 63B(a) & (b) both define "SCHOOL" in ways that are far too broad, opening the way for virtually any place of instruction to be gazetted as "A SCHOOL", thus placing it under unreasonable regulations associated with

registration of non-State schools.

Even Sunday Schools, coaching colleges, theological colleges, business colleges, etc., could find themselves required to register and be subject to control by the Education bureaucrats. Imagine the reaction of churches confronted with the requirement that only registered teachers be allowed to teach in Sunday Schools - "in the best interests of the pupils"! How long will it be before the PREACHER has to be registered in order to TEACH!

IF this is NOT the intention of the Bill, then WHY are Sunday Schools, Church and business colleges, etc., not listed as EXEMPT from all provisions of the Bill?

Section 4 defines the age of compulsory school attendance as "not less than six nor more than fifteen years of age", so it appears that the Bill is giving undue power to the Minister (and the bureaucracy) when it includes "pre-school" within the meaning of the term "school" in order that Church pre-schools may then be registered and CONTROLLED by the State.

(b) Clause 54 - inserting Sec.66 (Restriction on Conferring and Using Certain Awards):

- (i) No person may confer, or indicate that he is competent to confer, any award, degree, diploma, certificate, status, title or description (or abbreviated words or letters) as of a tertiary educational institution - Penalty \$500;
 - (ii) No person is allowed to print or publish anything to induce anyone to believe that he can or will confer any such award - Penalty \$500;
 - (iii) No person may use or induce anyone to believe that he possesses any such award (with a view to obtaining for himself an advantage) - Penalty \$500;
- unless that person is duly authorized to confer such an award, or the award has been conferred upon him by an authorized person.

Having this Part-made law would give the finishing touch to the State's vast EDUCATION MONOPOLY envisaged by the 'planners'. Only a State-authorized person would then be able to confer, or publish that he is able to confer, any AWARD or status (or abbreviated letters), in Queensland or elsewhere, as from a TERTIARY INSTITUTION.

To complete the stranglehold, Section 66(4)(c) clinches the question of what constitutes "a TERTIARY INSTITUTION" - it is any

"institution in Australia that provides education at a level above the level of education provided at secondary schools, or any institution from time to time declared by the Governor in Council by notification published in the GAZETTE to be a tertiary educational institution for the purpose of this section"!!!

All that needs to be done to put us back into the days of JOHN BUNYAN, and to CONTROL ORDINATION OF MINISTERS, is for the State to designate Theological Colleges as 'tertiary educational institutions', and then refuse to authorize some or all of them to confer awards or forms of recognition on their graduates. Thus, finally, ministers will all be STATE-TRAINED with State licenses - just as in the seventeenth century.

Apart from the likely attack on church activities, this Bill also has the potential -

- (a) to PREVENT A COMMERCIAL FREE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTION from conferring Awards;
- (b) to CRIMINALIZE the use of Awards obtained from private training institutions - e.g., my Accountancy Degree and the right to use letters was conferred on me, after graduation, by the Federal Institute of Accountants, which so far as I know was not 'duly authorized' under any Act.

Employment Agencies that conduct courses and issue certificates would also be in strife. The Education Department certainly does not want to have competition that might show up its own incompetencies and inadequacies in the SCHOOLING of our youth.

OUR REQUEST: That Clauses 53 & 54 be deleted to preserve the principle of separation of Church and State (which protects from interference the Church's divine commission to teach all nations), and to protect private enterprise and the right of the employer to set standards - without any oppressive regulations and State monopoly over the education or qualifications of his workers.

* * * * *

7.

THE BILL IS ANTI FAMILY - TEACHERS TO INFORM AGAINST PARENTS

It attempts to force teachers into being informers 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.

OUR REQUEST: In the first instance, that Secs.67(6)(a), (b) & (7) and 68(2),(3) & (4) be deleted from Clause 54 of the Bill, but preferably that the whole of Secs.67 & 68 be deleted from the Bill.

* * * * *

8. A FORMER REFERENDUM RESULT IS NOW OVERTURNED
BY REPEAL OF ITS PRINCIPAL CLAUSE

Last, but by no means least, this monstrous Bill illegally overturns the Referendum of 1910 which, by the will of the people, declared as obligatory on Head Masters of Queensland State Schools, the teaching of Bible Lessons from a specially prepared book of selections from the Authorized Version of the Bible.

Clause 17 - altering sec.20 (Religious Instruction in School Hours):

Bible Lessons from this "special book", is voided - without the authority of another Referendum! Subsection (2) was the principal clause of the Referendum of 1910, which through this Bible Lessons book, selected the lessons to be read by the Head Master. This was done to provide an in-built PROTECTION for the rights of parents and children, as regards the religious content of the lessons, and gave parents confidence.

This special book of BIBLE LESSONS, issued by the Department, is dated 1911, and the use in the classroom of THAT specially printed "SPECIAL BOOK" fulfilled then, and still continues to fulfil, the requirements of the Referendum (i.e. the wishes of the majority of the people of Queensland). Nothing else does so.

Omitting subsec.(2) also causes the omission of "in accordance with the Regulations" and thus by-passes the requirement that the Principal be responsible for providing the Bible lessons. The Bill now gives every class teacher the right to select and read his/her own lessons. This gives a Marxist teacher the opportunity to select Humanist/Marxist propaganda material and to make a joke of the Bible lesson, even brainwashing children against God.

OUR REQUEST: That this illegal voiding of the main clause of the Referendum be prevented, and furthermore that this clause (which was wrongly re-numbered as subsec. (2) in the 1964 Education Act) be returned to its correct place as Subsec. (1), and the present Subsec. (1) be given its correct numbering as Subsec. (2).

In any case, there must be no obligation placed on class teachers who may be antagonistic to Christianity to conduct the Bible lessons. Provide instead for a Christian to do it.

* * * * *

CONCLUSION: In view of the very great number of deletions and alterations that would be necessary to make this Bill acceptable to the moral majority in Queensland - WE RECOMMEND THAT THIS BILL BE WITHDRAWN AND CANCELLED FORTHWITH.

WHO IS STEALING YOUR CHILD?

Like an Old Testament prophet, Dr Francis Schaeffer has been warning us of the fate of our declining Western culture. He gives this special warning to all Christians: "as we look back to the time of slavery and the time after the Industrial Revolution, we are thankful for Christians such as Elizabeth Fry, Lord Shaftesbury, William Wilberforce, and John Wesley who spoke out and acted publicly against slavery and against the noncompassionate use of accumulated wealth. I wonder if Christians of the future will be thankful that in our day we spoke out and acted against abuses in the areas of race and the noncompassionate use of wealth, yet simultaneously and equally balanced this in *speaking out and acting also against the special sickness and threat of our age - the rise of authoritarian government?* That is, will we resist authoritarian government in all its forms regardless of the label it carries and regardless of its origin? The danger in regard to the rise of authoritarian government is that Christians will be still as long as their own religious activities, evangelism, and life-styles are not disturbed." (from "How should we then live." p256.)

BUT COULD SUCH A RISE OF AUTHORITARIAN GOVERNMENT HAPPEN HERE?..... YES! IT HAS ALREADY BEGUN. In late November 1981 the people of Queensland voiced their widespread disapproval of a Bill entitled "The Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill." Queenslanders were shocked to find that this Bill would remove from parents their God-given and precious freedom to choose the kind of education they desire for their own children and bring *ALL* education under the control of a few bureaucrats. **THIS BILL ASSUMES THROUGHOUT THAT CHILDREN DO NOT BELONG IN THE CARE OF PARENTS ALONE BUT BELONG TO THE STATE!** One expert on Constitutional Law has publicly described the Bill as "monstrous" and says that it must be "unequivocally withdrawn". In spite of all this, Mr Gunn, Queensland's Education Minister is resolved to see this pernicious legislation become law. It is clear that those who want to bring in this Bill have little regard for public or legal opinion.

UNLESS THE CHRISTIAN PEOPLE OF QUEENSLAND REJECT THIS LEGISLATION IN MASSIVE PUBLIC PROTEST IT WILL BECOME LAW IN MARCH OF THIS YEAR.

WHY SHOULD THIS BILL BE WITHDRAWN?

A. THIS BILL REMOVES FROM PARENTS THE RIGHT TO DETERMINE THEIR OWN CHILDREN'S EDUCATION AND TRAINING AND GIVES A FEW BUREAUCRATS POWER TO CONTROL OR CLOSE ANY NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOL.

This Bill under Part IX – Non-State Schools, Section 63 (4) (b) states: "A person shall not establish or maintain a school not being a State School unless the school is a registered school." Penalty \$1000.

Again Section 63 (7) (a) states: "If, in the opinion of the Minister, a registered school is not providing satisfactory facilities and efficient and regular instruction in a range of subjects and activities acceptable to the Minister, the Minister may require the person maintaining the school to show cause why the school's name should not be removed from the register and the school ordered to be closed."

Firstly this Bill acknowledges the right of private, church and Christian and parent-controlled schools to exist. But then it proceeds to demand conformity to arbitrary and unseen regulations on vital areas of curriculum and staff; obviously a meaningless freedom, as all schools are in effect to be STATE CONTROLLED.

Secondly this Bill removed the freedom of the parent to choose his child's curriculum, for the Minister has the power in this Bill to close any school whose curriculum he dislikes! It should be well noted by Christian parents that a curriculum is *never* a neutral document. Every curriculum embodies the philosophy of the people who write it. Speaking at a Conference at Macquarrie University, Dr Goodman, former Reader in Education at Queensland University noted that:

"A battle was developing in Australian schools between Christianity and secular humanism for the minds and souls of the children. Schools are being used to change values through psychological conditioning techniques.... The emphasis on learning knowledge and skills has given way to emphasis on the child's emotions and feelings, his attitudes and values, analysing and directing them in accordance with the ideas of behavioural psychologists and the humanist educators."

"The thrust of the humanist teachers," he said, "is towards 'freedom'. The child must be free to develop his own personality. This calls for freedom from physical punishment, freedom to choose his own moral values, freedom from parental authority, freedom from religious 'indoctrination', freedom in sexual matters and freedom to make his choice in all other matters.

As Christian parents however, we are constantly commanded throughout the Bible to instruct our children in the ways of the Lord and to ensure that they are not led into any error, such as secular humanism.

Ephesians 6:4 instructs fathers to bring their children up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord.

Proverbs 22:6 *"Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it."*

Deuteronomy 6:5-7 *"And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."*

Obviously, from Scripture, CHILDREN ARE A HERITAGE OF THE LORD AND GOD HAS GIVEN PARENTS TOTAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR CHILDREN INCLUDING EDUCATION. This legislation denies parents the right to choose their children's curriculum, by giving the Minister and his advisors *total control*. This is an unwarranted invasion of our religious freedom. Some would say, that this sort of control would never be abused in Australia, but already schools have been closed or had approval denied in the South because they were "too Christian".

B. THIS BILL REMOVES FROM PARENTS AND CHURCH SCHOOL BOARDS THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE THEIR CHILDREN'S TEACHERS' AND GIVES TO A FEW GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES POWER TO CONTROL OR REMOVE PRIVATE (NON-GOVERNMENT) SCHOOL TEACHERS:

The Bill states under part VII (B51 g) "Unregistered teachers are not to be employed (1) A person shall not at any time employ as a teacher in any school a person who is not a registered teacher unless authorised to do so by the board." Penalty: \$500 for a first offence. For a second or subsequent offence - \$10 for every day. This means that the educational bureaucracy will be able to control not only non-government school CURRICULUMS, but also every person who TEACHES IN them. Anyone who does not conform to their ill-defined requirements could be forbidden to teach or ordered to cease teaching.

Clearly registration of teachers has little effect upon quality. Dr. Donald Erickson, of Park Forest, Illinois, is a Professor of Education and Director of the Mid-West Administration Centre at the University of Chicago. In discussing the registration of teachers and schools he commented "I am afraid that matters of buildings and teacher certification and curriculum and what not, are so external to the teaching, learning encounter, that they don't get to the heart of the issue. And I myself, could take you to many schools that are approved under standards like this, that I would characterize as among the worst schools in the world." If there is genuine concern over academic standards there should be a return to objective testing on a statewide basis and the results published school by school thus making teachers and administrators more accountable to the tax paying parents. Registration will not remove radical and immoral teachers from Government schools but could remove many excellent people now involved as teachers and teachers' aides from Christian schools.

REGISTRATION OF TEACHERS? (LIKE THE REGISTRATION OF SCHOOLS) HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH QUALITY! IT TOO IS AN OMINOUS BID FOR AUTHORITARIAN GOVERNMENT CONTROL.

C. THIS BILL WILL REMOVE FROM PRIVATE EDUCATORS OR CHRISTIAN COLLEGES THE RIGHT TO GRANT ANY AWARD FOR ANY SUBJECTS STUDIED AFTER HIGH SCHOOL.

Section 66 (1) A states: "A person who confers or holds himself as competent to confer an award that is called by a name or is in a form that is likely or is intended by that person to induce a person to believe that such an award is of a tertiary institution commits an offence against this Act unless that person is duly authorised to confer such. (PENALTY: \$500)

This legislation makes it an offence to offer *any* form of qualification not officially authorized by the government to anyone studying *any* subject after completing high school. To offer "a degree, diploma or certificate", or even "status" will be punishable by law should this legislation be passed.

Under this legislation, for example, a *church or theological college* could not give any qualification or even status to someone who was to carry out a spiritual ministry *unless authorized to do so by the State!*

THIS KIND OF LEGISLATION HAS BEEN USED BY GOVERNMENTS OF TOTALITARIAN COUNTRIES TO STAMP OUT RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

D. THIS BILL IS ANTI-FAMILY. Section 67 (1) Maltreatment of children

(1) A teacher in a State or registered school who forms the opinion on reasonable grounds that 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, 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 purpose of section 76 K (1) of the Health Act 1937-1981.

(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...

22 (1) (c) A person who upbraids, insults or abuses a teacher or teacher in training in the presence or hearing of a pupil who is then in or about a school or who is, with others, then assembled for school purposes, whether on school premises or not commits an offence against this Act. Penalty \$500.

God has delegated the authority for the welfare of children to the parents ALONE. This Bill makes a mockery of this authority. Whereas teachers are paid by parents, through taxes and fees to assist them in their God-given role, this Bill makes teachers watch-dogs towards the parents - in effect, the paid informers of the State, above correction by the parents and above the law! This is a reversal in roles that past generations would not have tolerated - NOR WILL WE.

AS IT STANDS, THIS LEGISLATION COULD BE USED TO CONTROL, FINE AND EVEN IMPRISON THOSE ENGAGED IN NON-GOVERNMENT EDUCATION. THE BILL COULD BE USED IN FACT TO BRING ALL TEACHING UNDER TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENT CONTROL.

Those who are pushing the Bill keep insisting that the government has absolutely no intention of using it to take away the freedom of those involved in non-government education. Such assurances are not to be trusted. Once a Bill becomes law, then WHAT THE LAW STATES IS WHAT THE PEOPLE MUST LIVE WITH!

WHAT YOU MUST DO NOW!

Write a letter to the Premier, the Education Minister, Mr W. Gunn and your local member stating why you disagree with the proposed Bill, in your own words, and concluding - "I therefore submit that this proposed Education Act and Another Act Amendment Bill BE WITHDRAWN IN TOTO."

Mobilize your church to write and so guarantee your own freedom.

WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT NOW!

TOMORROW WILL BE TOO LATE:

Extra Copies Available

For enquiries, contributions or further information contact

The Committee for

THE DEFENCE OF EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM

P.O. Box 169, CLEVELAND, Qld. 4163, Ph: 286 2498 or 286 3095

We NEED YOUR DONATIONS

A PUBLIC RALLY THAT NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT!

EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM?
OR
STATE CONTROL!

On behalf of all parents concerned about the implications of the proposed "Educational Act and Another Act Amendment Bill" introduced by the Hon. W.A.M. Gunn on the 26th November, 1981, the Committee for the Defence of Educational Freedom wishes to advise that a Public Rally is to be held on the 28th February, 1982.

The object of the rally is to show to the Minister that all freedom loving parents, citizens and students do not wish to be subjected to total Government control in the field of primary, secondary or further education.

Prominent Speakers!

WHERE: Roma Street Forum

WHEN: 2:30 PM

DATE: 28th February, 1982

WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT NOW!

TOMORROW WILL BE TOO LATE:

For enquiries, contributions or further information contact

The Committee for

THE DEFENCE OF EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM

P.O. Box 169, CLEVELAND, Qld. 4163, Ph: 286 2498 or 286 3095