THE AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BUNTINE ORATION 1984

ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, CANBERRA

MONDAY 7 MAY 1984, 8 PM

EDUCATION - ON HANGING IN THERE

May 1984

THE AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BUNTINE ORATION 1984

ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, CANBERRA

MONDAY 7 MAY 1984, 8 PM

EDUCATION — ON HANGING IN THERE

The Hon Justice MD Kirby CMG *

DOCTOR BUNTINE TODAY

The Buntine Oration is now established as one of the most important of the nation's fora for exploring educational issues. Most of my predecessors in the series have been full-time educators — or people who (like Sir Zelman Cowen) once wore the teacher's mantle. Occasionally a politician intrudes. In this, the twelfth lecture in the series, you have invited a person of dubious qualifications to speak on education. Though my own education was exceedingly long, I have never formally been a teacher. Though I am Chancellor of Macquarie University, and have sat on the governing councils of Sydney University and the University of Newcastle, I have not engaged in university teaching or research. I have neither the inside information of a professional nor the power of a Minister to take or reject the advice of professionals. True it is, in the business of law reform, I have assumed something of a function of community education in my own discipline, the law. But it is often asserted that the law sharpens the mind by narrowing its focus. The problem for the lawyer and the judge is often to perceive the broad currents that are flowing in society. Judges have been likened to a swan on the still waters of a river : graceful and elegant to look at, but paddling furiously underneath. I shall now paddle furiously in the waters of education. I hope you will conclude that I have done so with the stream and make allowance for the observations of an occasionally furious non-expert.

Walter Murray Buntine would almost certainly have disapproved of the choice of me as 1984 orator. He was, by the accounts of my predecessors in this series, a somewhat austere man. He was prominent in the development of education in the State of Victoria during the early decades of this century. He was a child of Queen Victoria's reign, being born in 1866. He was appointed Headmaster of Caulfield Grammar School in 1896.

He continued in that post to the end of 1932 when he retired. Between 1935 and 1938 he was a member of the Council of Melbourne University. He had a seat on the Council of Public Education in Victoria for five years during the 1930s.

Sir James Darling, in his 1972 Buntine Oration on 'Responsibility' talked of the overlap between Buntine's term as Principal of Caulfield Grammar and his own service in that school. According to Sir James:

> What I remember about Dr Buntine ... was a great rigidity of principle coupled with very human sympathy. Gentlemanliness and kindness were his most obvious qualities, although underneath there was a firmness of Christian character which made compromise with wordly values difficult, if not impossible ... We cannot today go all the way with these old Evangelical Christians for whom moral questions seem to be so clearly defined and for whom the shades of right and wrong were no better than the wiles of the devil to deceive and to betray. Such views, if held without charity and understanding, could sometimes be cruel and harmful.[1]

It was with trepidation, after reading this, that I saw that in 1940 and until the end of the Second World War, Dr Buntine gave his services continuously as a voluntary communications Censor for the Army. He sounds, as presented by the reminiscences about him, to have been a person of the Old School, literally.

Tonight, I propose to talk of issues of the New School. The topics that one could choose in addressing issues of education today are virtually limitless. Our newspapers are full of them. It is perhaps symbolic that the cover story of this week's Bulletin magazine deals with education at school. Instead of speaking of good old-fashioned things in which Dr Buntine would have felt comfortable, topics such as 'responsibility' (to which Sir James Darling addressed himself) or self-reliance (to which Michael Somari spoke), I propose, with the contra-suggestability of the Irish, to talk of topics that would almost certainly cause anxiety were the fabled educator we celebrate here with us tonight. My topics will include:

- our contining poor educational retention rates in Australia, and what we can do to encourage more of our young people to stay with the course;
- the funding of the education of the poor and disadvantaged, not those who attend Caulfield Grammar School, nor even my old school of Fort Street in Sydney, but those who need the special support of the State if they are to remain within the system; and
- finally, the old State aid debate and the funding of public schools and private schools in our country.

UNDER-EDUCATED AUSTRALIA

Turn first to under-educated Australia. What is the position, why is it happening and what, if anything, should we do to change things?

There is no doubt that Australia's educational system, evolved from England, appears to discourage retention in education beyond school leaving years. In comparison to like societies (other than Britain and the other country so closely modelled on it, New Zealand) our failure to keep young people in education is striking. In comparison with the rapid increase in educational retention in our economic competitors in Asia, the position is very worrying indeed.

I realise that statistics are somewhat eye-glazing. But Dr Ken McKinnon, Vice Chancellor of the University of Wollongong, recently called a few vital statistics of a non-attractive kind to notice:

- Of every 100 young people who start secondary school in their seventh or eighth year of schooling, approximately 89 are at school at the end of the 10th year. Some 44 continue into the 11th year of schooling and there are further losses so that only 35 out of the 100 who started survive into the Higher School Certificate year.[2]
- In contrast, those who leave before the end of the 12th year of schooling in the United States of America are labelled 'dropouts'. Great efforts are expended in discovering the causes for such 'dropping out' in the United States, simply because it is expected that every young person will complete 12 years at school.
- In 1982 only 12 out of every 100 who started secondary school seven years earlier commenced at a university or college of advanced education in the following year. Between 1976 and 1981 enrolments increased marginally but full-time enrolments actually declined. The transition direct from school to higher education actually declined by 18% in our country.
- The proportion of each age group participating in higher education in Australia was about one quarter of the equivalent rate in the United States.[3]

The statistics prepared regularly by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) show that countries which are considered most technologically advanced have significantly greater participation rates in higher education than Australia has.[4] Taking the percentage of the population aged 19 to 24 years who were in full-time education, in Australia it is 7.3%. But compare that statistic to:

Canada	16.2%
Denmark	19.8%
Greece	17.6%
Italy	19.2%
Japan	14.7%
Switzerland	19.6%
USA	26.7%

The only countries with whom we can be compared (apart from Turkey and Yugoslavia) are countries which have inherited the same English model of education : Ireland, New Zealand and England itself. This is one of the least attractive of the inheritances of colonialism. It is educational colonialism. It is a vision of education as being the province of a very small group of highly talented elite people, almost invariably men and tending to look upon distributive disciplines such as law as much higher in the pecking order than more creative disciplines such as agriculture, engineering and veterinary science. These are attitudes that tend to put words on a pedestal much higher than mathematics and infinitely higher than science and technology.

In 1957 the Murray Committee reported on higher education in Australia. It looked at community needs and, unsurprisingly, concluded that university responses to those needs were inadequate. The Murray Committee affirmed a basic principle:

> Every boy and girl with the necessary brain power must in the national interest be encouraged to come forward for a university education and there must be a suitable place for everyone who does come forward ... It is the function of the university to offer not merely a technical or specialist education but a full and true education befitting a free man and a citizen of a free country.

We can criticise the sexist language (not then so out of place) in talking of a 'free man'. Indeed, it has always been, and still is, a distinct advantage to be a man in the Australian educational system:

- women represent only 16% of academic staff in Australian universities;
- only 2% of professors in Australia are female;
- only 46% of women academics have tenure compared with 84% of men.

Though these statistics are confined to the university sector, they permeate the whole educational system and cry out for change and equal opportunity.[6]

But though one may criticise the language of the Martin Committee, there was merit in what the committee sought to do. It sought to ensure a university education for all those able to cope. I realised that this attitude might, in turn, be criticised as merely continuing the infatuation with the English elite universities, sometimes distorting the whole educational system in the process. Nonetheless, the ideal of the availability of education for those able to perform in it, was one deserving of approbation and aggregate to all levels of education . In the consequence new universities were built, new places were found and new staff was recruited. How often have I heard it said that this was the great achievement of the Menzies Government? How often is it said that if Sir Robert Menzies looked back on his life and claimed credit for one major thing alone — it would be university expansion in Australia.

Let every due credit be given to Menzies and his government for these achievements. They were notable. They were worthy. They deserve our national appreciation. But the result of it all, many inquiries and new universities later, is still a shockingly low national retention in education. We are still a country that bundles our young people out of education into the workforce too soon. Going on in education is the exception not the norm in under-educated Australia. There are some fellow citizens who are suprised and a little hurt when they read on the eve of Anzac Day the OECD estimate that Australia devotes a relatively low amount of its resources to national research and development and is not expected to improve its position in the near future. We spend 1.04% of our gross domestic product on research and development.[7] We are in this respect spending the lowest proportion of any comparable nation except Italy. The OECD has concluded that our research and development pattern is 'unique' among developed nations. Not 'unique' in a way we can be proud of. Whilst most countries have been increasing expenditure on research and development as a proportion of gross domestic product (reflecting the technological and scientific age in which we live) Australia's spending during the 1970s has fallen. The record of the private sector in Australia is especially pathetic, 78% of the research and development funds actually coming from government through bodies like the CSIRO. Hidden behind their protective barriers of tariffs and other cosy arrangements, Australian manufacturing industries have all too often become complacent. They have not encouraged research in-house. They have not provided the jobs that will induce young people to embark upon a career of research-oriented education.

The problem of keeping more young Australians in education is recognised at the highest level. Senator Susan Ryan, in her address to the Unesco General Policy Debate in Paris last October, revealed our predicament frankly before the world community:

> The need for ... reform is clearly demonstrated by the low participation rates of Australian students in the later years of secondary schooling. Despite our relative affluence and the universal provision of secondary schooling, only one-third of our young people complete a full six years of secondary education. This figure is far too low and compares unfavourably with other OECD countries. It is particularly unacceptable to our government because it is the children of poor families, of some migrant groups and of Aboriginals who are failing to complete secondary school and are thus, at a time of high unemployment, seriously disadvantaged compared to middle class students who generally do complete secondary schooling.[8]

Senator Ryan's conclusion has been questioned.[9] But certainly the Federal Government has been supporting the thesis in a careful way with policies designed to increase participation rates in secondary and tertiary education. Funds have been made available to certain universities and colleges of advanced education in the expectation that 3 000 additional students will be selected from groups designated by the government to be disadvantaged, 'Aborigines, migrants, low income groups, women and the handicapped especially those who live in outer Metropolitan areas'.[10] Specifically, Senator Ryan has rejected, on behalf of the Federal Government, the notion of broad across-the-board expansion of the tertiary system in Australia. The government was not prepared, she has said, simply to 'pour vast amounts of money into tertiary education without qualification'. The government 'would not preside over an uncontrolled expansion of the tertiary system as occurred in the 1960s'. That expansion, she declared, had produced 'a rather stultifying uniformity of values and priorities among all educational institutions'. The injection of money could not in itself solve the problems of higher education in Australia. To gain and maintain political and community support, the higher educational system would have to be 'seen to contribute to national economic recovery and social equity'. Institutions should 'strive for the greater correlation of the social composition of their student bodies and the composition of society at large'.[11]

KEEPING THEM IN

Views of this kind have turned educational pundits to proposing specific ways in which disadvantaged groups can be advantaged:

* In June 1983 Dr Tannock called for a national policy to raise participation in education to the end of the year 12 from 35% at present to 100% by the end of the decade. He pointed out that our rate compared badly with the retention at school in Japan, the United States and Canada. He aimed to entice nearly half a million 16

to 18 year olds back into the education system. But to do this it would be essential to create a variety of educational institutions with more choice and curricula more relevant and interesting to the students leaving education in droves.[12]

* In case Dr Tannock's approach sounds like the 'broad brush' specifically rejected by the Minister nine months later, consider the proposals of Professor Michael Birt, Chairman of the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee, made at about the same time as the Minister's speech. Addressing the Annual Conference of the Institute of Directors in March 1984, Professor Birt called for a doubling of the number of student places available in universities and colleges. At present we cater for 350 000 students. Professor Birt called for a restructuring of higher education so that Australia's higher education system would more closely approximate American style 'liberal studies' colleges and specialised universities and institutes — leaving universities to the narrower range of highly specialised activities of teaching and research traditional before the effort was made to cram into them the growing number to meet the demand for improvement in our educational statistics.[13]

* Addressing the special problem of very high dropout rates in country students in rural educational services conducted by the New South Wales Education Commission, a review published last month found that not one of the 24 rural State electorates in New South Wales had a retention rate higher than 40% after year ten. Only ten of those electorates had an average retention of more than 30%. The report found that children and teenagers in country schools, especially girls and children from disadvantaged backgrounds such as Aborigines, the handicapped and migrant children were severely disadvantaged. Numerous recommendations were made. They included establishment of special residential schools for isolated children; additional resources for student counselling in country areas; expansion of support programs for teachers in small schools; expansion of curricula in country schools; close monitoring of improvements in retention of disadvantaged groups; full-time Aboriginal educational consultants and so on.

To the problems of disadvantage and geography, of British educational traditions and elite attitudes, we must now add the special consideration of the 1980s. I refer to the acute choice that some young people must make between career security and continuing education.[14] Faced by the uncertain prospects of continuing education and the prospect of an immediate job, the dropout syndrome typical of our country is reinforced in hard times. Indeed, if the dropouts stop to think about it and read the newspapers, they will know that the tertiary degree today is worth much less in the pay packet in Australia than it was 15 years ago. A recent study by the National Institute of

Labour Studies at Flinders University found that in 1968-9 the average earnings of male graduates were 2.33 times higher than those of males who had left school at 16. By 1981-2 the advantage had dropped to 1.7 times the earnings of males beginning work at 16. In the younger age groups, the earning advantages of being a tertiary graduate had fallen to only 30 to 40% more than workers without a degree or diploma.[15] The Australian Bulletin of Labour concluded:

> Clearly acquiring a degree has become less financially rewarding than it was 15 years ago. The average male graduate will now not recoup his potential foregone while studying until he enters his 30s, whereas in 1968-69 he recouped them by age 25. It is unsurprising, therefore, that the growth of demand by young males for places in tertiary education institutions has considerably slowed and there has been substantial growth in part-time studies.[16]

This development may be reassuring to the supporters of egalitarian Australian. But in terms of rewarding efforts and the deprivation that is inherent in the sacrifice involved in continuing education, it is scarcely an inducement to continue with education, whether at school, college or university.

Some commentators have suggested that the cure lies in making the curriculum more interesting and relevant to a time of vast sociological and technological change. The Independent Teachers' Association of New South Wales recently criticised secondary education in the State as being still dominated by university academics and bureaucrats. The Association called for radical reform of the system claiming that, until there was such reform, secondary education would remain irrevocably locked into university needs and hence irrelevant and unattractive to very large numbers of Australians not interested in university who would just drop out.[17] Others suggest that the course adopted by Federal and State Governments of tackling particular target groups is the right road ahead. Whether these target groups are racially or socially disadvantaged or whether they involve specal effort, say, to get more female teachers in mathematics and science to encourage girls to take these subjects, is a matter of debate.[18] Some commentators see in our Australian problem evidence of a deeper world malaise. For example, Professor John Ward, Vice Chancellor of Sydney University, has said that the Western world is in danger of losing support for education. Specifically he questioned whether education was reaching beyond the willingness or ability of people to grasp its message.[19] He urged governments, universities and other educational authorities to find ways to improve the participation of young people in secondary school and tertiary education:

> We need more skilled people and we need an end to the frustrations of early school leavers who have poor employment prospects.[20]

PAYING FOR IT

It is one thing to identify a problem. It is another to reflect upon structures and institutions that can address the problem. It is still another to set up committees of learned commentators and citizens to debate, as we can endlessly debate, the issues of education from the abolition of the cane to budget policies, curricula contents and school retention. But in the end, addressing our scandalous, persisting and even deteriorating figures on educational retention will require great effort of national will. And somebody will have to pay if we are to turn things around.

I agree with Dr Ken McKinnon that the availability of student assistance has a marked effect on the ability and willingness of students to enrol and to continue in the educational system, however we organise it.[21] Dr McKinnon points out that since 1976 in excess of 50 000 teacher education scholarships have been abolished in Australia. The number of students eligible for tertiary education assistance scheme (TEAS) allowances has actually declined by 10 000 from its 1978 peak of approximately 72 000. Of the students who enrolled in 1981, only 42% were eligible for a TEAS allowance. This figure compared with 56% who were eligible in 1976. There are later figures than these cited here and they indicate that some improvement in the overall figure of eligibility is being achieved. The latest figures for 1984 indicate that an expected 69 000 students will be eligible for the TEAS allowance compared with the 62 768 who were eligible in 1981.[22] It is also noted by Dr McKinnon that even amongst those students who receive the TEAS allowance, only a third of them received the maximum benefits. Many of them have their benefits reduced by reference to the earnings of their parents. Considered in conjunction with the rise in the real costs of rent, travel, books, stationery, medical charges, an occasional milkshake and so on, the position we have arrived at is quite unacceptable. In fact it is little short of a national scandal. Piously to call for higher school and educational retention whilst chipping away at the funds that are needed to improve that retention is indulging in a dangerous form of hypocrisy or self-deception. I speak bluntly because the problem we face is a serious persisting and apparently deteriorating one. It has grown more serious over the past decade. Who can doubt that Dr McKinnon is right when he says:

> Considered in conjunction with the rise in real costs ... the increasing numbers of unemployed parents, the lack of means of support while studying must discourage many potential students especially when the dole provides better support than even the full TEAS allowance.[23]

What is the position so far as TEAS and the dole is concerned? An adult student wishing to matriculate, provided he or she can meet a variety of tests including a means test, can receive a grant of $62 a week. Once the student has matriculated and again can meet all of the requirements, he or she may receive a tertiary allowance as an adult up to a maximum of $62.25 per week. An additional supplementary allowance of $42.70 will be paid for a dependent spouse and $10 for a dependent child.

A school leaver at 18, wishing to gain further education, may obtain, under certain conditions, a tertiary allowance of $40 per week where the combined family income is below $12 983. Above that figure, the allowance is progressively reduced to a cut-off point of $20 132 a year. I understand that this figure relates to the total income of all members of the family residing at home.

The self-same young person can receive unemployment benefits, with no means test other than as to his or her own income, of $45 a week.

The burden on our young people is accentuated where they want to take a course which is not available in the State in which their parents live. Take a lad whose parents live in Adelaide and who wants to take a course in agricultural engineering. If he moves to Toowoomba where he can do that course, someone must pay his board in addition to costs of books, union fees, medical attendance and perhaps a little for entertainment not unimportant during the years of deprivation. But if his family earns over the 'cut-off' figure this lad, living interstate, will not be entitled to any allowance unless, during the long vacation, when seeking a temporary job, he can induce the local Commonwealth Employment Officer to put him on the dole.

As a country we can either pay our young people not to work, with no questions asked, or pay them to study, to improve their skills, their adaptability and their potential contribution to a world of rapidly changing technology. It is hardly surprising that many school leavers opt to be 'unemployed' rather than students. This is particularly so where they cannot obtain entry to their preferred course of study due to quota limitations.

These problems that I have mentioned are only a few of the problems that face young people constantly told by pundits like me to stick at education, to hang in there and to cure the problem of under-educated Australia. There are many other problems. Students are not entitled to any support to cover travel costs. This, it is said, is a State matter not a Federal responsibility. Whereas Victoria provides nothing, South Australia does allow for student travel at a reduced rate. This also applies to the unemployed. Of course, the unemployed are better off in South Australia, as they travel free of charge between 9 am and 3 pm.

Take a young female student who last year decided to go back to school, matriculate and take a degree in social work to enable her to help people. At the age of 22 she had to prove that she had been in the workforce for 104 weeks and had no income above $2 000 a year, and was living away from home, before she was allowed to move from the dole to secondary education assistance. Such young people, regarding the system as unjust, may turn to its manipulation, may be forced to work part time in order to avoid begging for educational allowances which will not usually be enough to keep them anyway. Or, offered the prospect of a job, they may squander their intellectual birthright and grasp the employment opportunity in hand rather than pursue the mirage of continuing education.

Fortunately, it is clear that the present Minister for Education (Senator Ryan) is fully alive to the injustices and anomalies that exist in tertiary education assistance scheme allowances for students. She has recently declared that she intends 'fighting' for higher allowances during the current Budget deliberations. She said that she agreed with critics that the present TEAS allowance was inadequate, even allowing for the increase in it by 6% in last year's Budget. Speaking at a graduation ceremony at the Canberra CAE, in this city, she referred to an options paper on income support for young people presented to the government in February of this year. One of the main recommendations of that paper was that TEAS allowances be increased to the level of unemployment benefits to encourage young unemployed people to undertake further education. Another option suggested in the paper was for universal youth allowances to replace TEAS and other student allowances with the one benefit that simply depended on the student's age. We can applaud these statements of a sensitive and concerned Minister. But I must say to you that my heart fell when I read the Minister's statement of the obvious but grim-sounding news that 'funds are limited':

> The current TEAS scheme which benefits about 100 000 students costs nearly $240 million a year. If the government were to increase the TEAS allowance by just $1 a week it would cost another $5 million a year. If we lowered the qualifying age for independent status from 25 to 21, it would cost around $150 million in a year.[24]

These are ominous words. But somebody must do the sums on opportunity costs for Australia. Somebody over the Lake in Treasury, reflecting on the sums that must inevitably be done in the preparation of a Budget, must look to what we are losing by failing to prepare our young people (as the Japanese, Korean, Singaporeans and others are preparing theirs) for the world of science and technology.

Barry Jones says that when he rewrites Sleepers, Wake! he will add to the impertinent seven laws, an eighth namely:

> 'Employment levels are culturally determined'.
> 'It is the culture which determines whether a 16-year-old should be at school or in the labour force or whether the appropriate retirement age is 55, 60, 65 or 70. This is not to discount economic factors (which come first in most analyses) and human psychology at will. However, I would argue that it is postcodes which determine lifestyles and life changes far more than technology'.[25]

CONCLUSIONS

Postcodes, disadvantaged geography, disadvantaged suburban areas, disadvantaged linguistic and cultural background, disadvantaged Aboriginality, disadvanged sex, all of these add up to a tremendous educational problem for undereducated Australia. It is a problem not irrelevant to the funding of our schools, particularly not irrelevant to the improvement in the quality of our public schools to arrest the socially expensive shift towards fully-funded private education. That is a debate for another day. I have already nailed my flag to the mast of public education. People who, like me, took advantage of public education, must speak up for it. All too many of them, as they climb the ladder of social success, fall into tongue-tied silence when the proponents of private education, educational democracy, free choice and fully-funded educational diversity speak out loud and clear. My concern is the concern which Senator Ryan herself has identified. It is the concern about those groups who must look, in their overwhelming majority inevitably, to the public school system for their education. If ever we are to tackle their basic problem and to achieve the goal and dream of the education on merit, we must tackle the problem in the public schools where most of the disadvantaged groups exist.

Above the Old Bailey in London is the Biblical inscription : 'Defend the widows and children of the poor'. I have always thought the latter injunction to be a special obligation of a just education system. Defend the children of the poor. Make sure that the children of the poor get a better deal in under-educated Australia. Do it through recognising the extent to which we continue to slip behind our competitors in keeping people in education. Do it by reconsidering the structures of education. Do it by shifting funds to the schools, normally public schools, where the children of the poor are to be found. Do it by increasing the allowances that will permit them to continue in education and removing the anomalous inducement that sometimes makes it more advantageous for them to lie on the beach, drawing the dole or to take a job unworthy of their intellect.

Do it by recognising the opportunity costs that are paid by Australia with its low educational retention, born of its colonial origins and expectations, so shockingly low by comparison to like countries and competitor neighbours. Do it by recognising that it will cost the nation money and that sacrifices will be needed but that what is at stake is something more than 3 000 places in tertiary education or a few counsellors in outback country schools.

We have a great national educational problem on our hands. It has been long identified. It goes to the heart of the capability of our country in the next century to adapt to the times we live in. Those times are the times of mature science and technology. It is the fate of our generation to be born at a moment in history when three great technological changes have occurred at once : nuclear fission, the microchip and biotechnology. How will our population react to these changes if it is not readied for them in the schools? There are some who say that we should just concentrate, as a nation, on the things we can do cheaply : dig out the minerals (but even here the coal mines may be closed), sow the wheat (but even here the drought may come again); graze the cattle (but even here the EEC, by dumping, may steal away our markets) shear the sheep (but even here the wide comb dispute may compound nature's occasional unkindness). If we want to maintain our place in the world, the key to that ambition is to be found in the schoolroom, in the college, in the university. Down the track we are walking lies under-educated Australia in a world which is increasingly becoming better and more educated. We must make a choice. Otherwise a future generation will say of these years that they were the years that the locusts had eaten, when we were alerted to the dangers yet showed ourselves incomptent or unwilling to adjust to the vital necessities of change. I am sure that if Dr Buntine were here tonight, he would address us with evangelical fervour about the urgency of our national educational predicament. I think you will have gathered that it is my view at least that a little evengelical fervour on this subject would not go astray.

FOOTNOTES

* Personal views only. Chairman of the Australian Law Reform Commission, Chancellor of Macquarie University, Member of the Executive of the Australian National Commission for Unesco.

1. Sir James Darling, 'Responsibility', Buntine Oration 1972, mimeo, Australian College of Education, 4.

2. KR McKinnon, 'Participation in Higher Education', Institute of Public Affairs (NSW), Report (June 1983), 2.

3. ibid, 3.

4. ibid, 9. See also Table 1 (OECD figures), 8.

5. The Murray Committee, cited by Sir Zelman Cowen, Centenary Oration, University of Auckland, 8 May 1983, mimeo, 5.

6. Letter by the Federation of Australian University Staff Associations (FAUSA) to the author, 6 March 1984, 2.

7. The OECD report is summarised in the Age, 26 April 1984, 1.

8. Senator Susan Ryan, Australian statement in the Unesco General Policy Debate, mimeo, 27 October 1983, 8.

9. R Manne and M James, 'Head Counting and Higher Education' in Australian Society, 1 March 1984, 7.

10. loc cit.

11. Senator Susan Ryan, Address to graduation ceremony and opening of Aboriginal Studies Resource Centre, Armidale College of Advanced Education, 31 March 1984. See New Release M40/84.

12. The Age, 13 June 1983, 12.

13. Professor Michael Birt, cited the Australian, 16 March 1984, 3.

14. K Windschuttle, 'The Future : Career Security Only Through a Tertiary Education', Sydney Morning Herald, 21 March 1984, 9.

15. Canberra Times, 20 March 1984, 11.

16. ibid.

17. Australian, 9 July 1983.

18. See eg Sydney Morning Herald, 16 July 1983.

19. The Australian, 26 May 1983.

20. ibid.

21. McKinnon, 5.

22. Senator Susan Ryan, 10 May 1984, Senate Hansard, 1933.

23. Sydney Morning Herald, 19 April 1984.

24. ibid.

25. Mr Barry Jones MP, 'Changing Employment Patterns and Trunkated Development in Australia', Address to the Royal Society of New South Wales, mimeo, 2.