



# PRIME MINISTER

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRIME MINISTER, THE HON P.J. KEATING MP  
AND THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION & TRAINING,  
THE HON K. BEAZLEY MP

PRESS CONFERENCE, 21 JULY 1992

E&OE PROOF COPY ONLY

PM: Well over the years I think some of us have come to you and said that we have used the term "truly historic agreements" but on this occasion it is an entirely true description that what we have completed with the States in a very cooperative manner is truly a historic agreement which will change the nature of vocational education in Australia forever and will give at least half of the school leavers of this country a third route to education and training. That is, after high school and universities, another route to education and training. And we have come from a position where three years ago the Commonwealth virtually knew very little about TAFE or about the training and vocational education paths and we have come from a position where we have been, as a Commonwealth, a Government topping up State funds for TAFE to now building on the One Nation proposals through this mechanism to build a truly national training authority where the States manage the operational basis of the TAFE systems, but where national policy is set by a Ministerial Council and where funding both State and Commonwealth is paid at a national training authority to be funded by interstate training authorities. And I think what will happen is that as a result that we will be able to build proper training profiles for State TAFE institutions to reflect the needs of the labour market and the young people of this country. I would like to pay tribute to the cooperative approach of the Premiers. This had to be of its essence, a cooperative matter. The States spend upwards of \$2 billion a year on technical and further education. The Commonwealth spends a comparatively small amount with the States, but that will now grow as the One Nation money is committed to it. And that is why there was never a

possibility of the Commonwealth taking over the system as to funding and as to policy. There always had to be a cooperative arrangement in running the system with national objectives and national focus. And even though this negotiation has not been easy it has been cooperative and can I say that as late as last Friday, Kim met with the NSW Premier and came to an agreement which was ratified today by the NSW Cabinet and that was the last and the major State to come to the agreement and he gave me the cheery news by car phone on Friday, hurtling back from Mr Fahey's home. So it has been quite a long process, but on the part of all the States, a degree of good will to arrive at something good for the country, for the nation, for the young people of this country and for those adults in the community who wish to extend their own training and open up vocational opportunities for themselves. So I would with those few opening words, invite Kim Beazley, to address himself to the issue in general and some of the more detailed issues which flesh out some of the powers of the body, etc.

KB: Could I say at the outset this is the sort of agreement that can only be negotiated between Prime Ministers and Premiers, it is not an agreement that you would ever reach by a decision making process involving directly the line departments. And that is fundamentally because it is a substantial shift. It is of a piece, I think, with the decisions by the Commonwealth to effectively take over funding of universities. It is of a piece with the decision by the Commonwealth to become the principal funding source of the private school system in the country were both essentially initiatives taken some considerable period of time ago. And like those initiatives in their different ways, this outcome is essentially the sort of outcome that you would expect to see in a Federal system, and a Federal system which awards the principal role in decision making on education matters to State authorities. This is the general point that I make, and appropriately the running on this as far as the Commonwealth side of the issue was concerned was by the principal officials in the Prime Minister's department and in the Prime Minister's Office, Don Russell. As far as the material that is before you is concerned, I draw attention to these features. Firstly, it establishes a meaningful process to get in place a set of national strategies, national objectives and national planning, is the first point that I would make. The second point that I would make on it, it establishes a process of accountability which ensures when we go through with each of the States from the training authority profiling on the needs of the totality of their vocational education and training systems, it is not just about TAFE, it is broader than that. As they

establish those profiles they will do so in accordance with policy set, in the first instance by the Ministerial Council advised by ANTA, and they will have an accountability also for the operations of the system not just to ANTA but also to their own State ministries. Thus also will proceed the activities of the State Training Boards and I think that, as I said, the complexity of this as well as the elements of its simplicity reflect the nature of our federal system. I think another point that I would make on that is the question of effort, which I think is terribly important. In here there is a guarantee from the States that they will maintain effort as far as their training activities are concerned. Now exactly how that is defined in terms of both outcomes and financial arrangements will of course be discussed through with the individual States via the Ministerial Council process and via ANTA, but that is a very important first commitment. What it means is that the additional Commonwealth resources which come in over the years are not dissipated and there will be, therefore, genuine growth in the system as a result of the decisions taken here today. There is also an agreement that once those definitions are arrived at on effort that States which are not performing to that effort will from their own resources, not from the resources that are coming through from the Commonwealth, will meet those from their own resources any inadequacies as far as that effort is concerned. As far as the Commonwealth is concerned, we are agreeing via this to put all the sorts of long-term training funds that we have been operating on our own to this point, for various purposes sometimes cajoling industry into an effort, sometimes cajoling the States into an effort, using the sort of seed money method of the Commonwealth trying to have an influence over a national agenda, we do effectively surrender those positions and the Commonwealth resources are put into the National Training Authority. And we will seek in the main though we maintain our own labour market programs, in the main we will seek, as the States will seek, to exercise policy influence in this area via the processes in the Ministerial Council and the National Training Authority. Finally, the National Training Authority is to be an authority which is biased in its decision making processes very much towards the needs of industry in terms of the training outcomes and requirements that operate both on the State systems and private providers who are assisted. It is also an Authority that is there to be an authority of people with substantial expertise. And I would believe that over time the Ministerial Council will find that it is readily accepting of the sorts of propositions about what ought to be happening in our national training system that emanate from this body. There is obviously an

absolute requirement on those of us who are participants in the Ministerial Council to make sure that we get the personnel to serve on that Board that delivers that sort of outcome.

PM: Why don't we leave it to you to put questions.

J: Prime Minister, if all were to go well, what would a TAFE look like in say, ten years from now. Would it be of the European polytechnic style?

PM: Well I think the objective would be to lift it to a status which is the kind of status enjoyed by the European polytechnics. That is, as the national and State training profiles are implemented, as the resources are committed, as the status and quality of the system rises, that must inevitably be the outcome. Because we can't truly create a third path in there without such a system. I have said before, that Australia in a sense faces a training emergency if it wants to be the kind of clever country it needs to be and this has started, of course, by this Government lifting those retention rates in secondary school from three in ten to seven in ten, making the tertiary places available and now picking up the other system, TAFE, and giving it some national structure and status. And that is why I think that this body is a historic change, I mean, Kim has compared it to the Commonwealth funding of universities or the funding of the private schools system, it is of that status. But again, it will have that can-do quality about it where the States and State Minister will still have the touch on the system at the local level but where the bigger national priorities are being brought to the policy of the institutions.

J: Prime Minister, you said in your opening remarks that Commonwealth takeover of TAFE was quote never a possibility. Isn't that exactly what you proposed in your Sunday Program appearance?

PM: Yes. I put the proposition to them that we take it over as to policy and as to funds. They wouldn't have that. They wouldn't accept that. That is, for the growth money that we were adding to the system, they thought it was not reasonable for us to subsume funding and control for the vast block of funds they put to the system. The One Nation proposition was Commonwealth growth funding, joint control. The Sunday television performance proposition was an offer of total Commonwealth control. Now Victoria wanted to agree to that, for instance. One State wanted to agree to that, Commonwealth control of Commonwealth funds. We may have ended up with two States in it, but we wouldn't have got all the States. Whereas I think what we have here is something which everybody can sign up to and where

we are going to get those national objectives down into the system and where the States feel they have got a legitimate role in it and where the balance of roles is played out in that Ministerial Council.

- J: Could you just elaborate a bit, Mr Keating, on what the balance of roles will be in the Ministerial Council between the Commonwealth, the States, employers and unions and so forth?
- PM: Well, first of all there is a simple majority in decisions on the Ministerial Council. Each State, each Territory is represented with one vote regardless of size, so the ACT has a vote as against NSW, and the Commonwealth has two votes and a casting vote. So it gives the Commonwealth a fair bit of leverage in the system. But again, that is pretty much as we have it in some of the other fora we meet the States in. But invariably votes are never taken. Most of these things run by agreement. This, as Kim said, will be run by a professional body of acknowledged experts, they will be the people largely making the policy and the Ministerial Council is relevant in a sense in the event of a dispute between a State Minister and the Authority, then the Ministerial Council prevails. Now this may happen, but the likelihood is that the body will run by agreement.
- J: Mr Keating you said that the Federal money is channelled through this Authority. If in the event the Federal Government did not agree with the Ministerial Council's decisions or priorities, if the States jacked up against it, does the Federal Government keep to itself the right not to put in that money?
- PM: It puts in money for its commitment, the growth money of vocational education.
- J: ... you mention the labour market, Commonwealth labour market programs, will you be maintaining your existing funding and putting it on top of the One Nation funds or will it come out of the One Nation?
- KB: Basically those aspects that are concerned with vocational education and training arrangements of a long term nature directly, like for example the funds which we will ultimately commit to the Carmicheal processes will go through this Authority, as well as what we specifically put down for vocational education and training. But where, for example there is a requirement to immediately meet a particular problem which emerges from the recession for example, the sort of job training type activities, then the Commonwealth keeps those resources discrete. The objective here is not to

put through the process what the Commonwealth has to do from time to time to address a particular labour market problem is to put all the long term money through that process. So it will at the end of the day be more than just the funding that's been committed for training in regard to TAFE. Now of course there are a series of issues that are likely to arise from this, and the nuts and bolts detail we will have to discuss through with the States at the same time for example we are discussing through with the States the actual fine detail of the term effort, the maintenance of effort. But our disposition is, and indeed our agreement is, that effectively all the training money for long term activities will go through this way.

J: How much money are you looking at there to give the ....

KB: Well, those are budget matters that I'm talking through with my colleagues at the moment and I'm not going to foreshadow. But it will end up at the end of the day over the 18 months before this finally gets up and operating you'll see in this document here there are particular elements of a timetable in it. Now it will end up effectively at the end of the day more than the growth money that we're talking about.

J: Is there any particular formula for dividing the Commonwealth component of the funding between the States or could that change from year to year depending of perceived needs?

KB: It's basically in the first going to be divided per capita, but subsequent propositions will from the States, will of course be entertained by the Ministerial Council and the Board and be subject to their recommendations.

J: Mr Keating you said in your statement there'll be more opportunities for young people. Can you quantify that? How many extra job training places or whatever would emerge in the decade?

PM: Well there's roughly half of the school leavers do not undertake further training. In part this is because the system is not geared up to take them. It's 130,000. Now obviously no system comprehends taking everybody up, but this system over time should take a large proportion of them up. I mean this is a route and branch change of the education system of Australia.

KB: Some time ago a shortfall of .... I think it was, identified a shortfall of about 150,000 places in TAFE, some of that has been addressed by things already done but by and large that shortfall

remains. It would be our intention over several triennials, in accordance with the Finn timetable, to eliminate that.

J: Mr Beazley .... process of what you call effective training market does that

KB: I can't hear you

J: You contemplate the process of what you call an effective training market, I wonder whether you could explain what you mean by an effective training market. Does that take into account some sort of voucher system or some sort of provision of funding so that both private and public sector institutions can battle for the public purse?

KB: No, not a voucher system, you'd be aware that we do provide resources now, and so do the States, for training activities, in fact we buy places for training activities in private providers. Now we would want to leave ANTA and indeed if you read through the materials here it is suggestive of it, we would want to leave ANTA with, and the States want us to do this too this is no big deal as far as we're concerned, leave room for them to make recommendations about where the location of particular training activities ought to be. And this in part reflects the industry bias that I said at the outset was associated with this. It is quite obvious now that a large number of industries are beginning to get themselves very active in providing facilities and opportunities in training programs and to develop a view about what should actually be provided indeed there fund skills centres in TAFEs conform precisely to what their needs would be. So what this does basically is give this body authority to operate across the board and put their money into the profiling process into any particular process they like. It doesn't mean that we're going to introduce voucher systems, I think that's a terribly old fashion way of talking about education and to carry over from the way in which people used to talk about what ought to be done in the secondary school system, I think what this does is give us flexibility for more active industry involvement.

J: One of the criticisms that industry makes of the existing TAFE structure is that the products, if you like, of the TAFE system are not geared or cannot dovetail with industries expectations. How will that improve under this new system?

PM: Well part of the point of this is to construct a training profile which does reflect labour market realities and demands and the demands of industry and that's why on ANTA itself we should hope to have people who have that industry perspective and

experience so that the body does function to look after the needs of clients to the system rather than perhaps service providers. Which has been one of the criticisms of the existing TAFE system.

J: Has industry been sufficiently specific about what it actually wants, where it wants to end up?

PM: Well in some cases, in some cases to the point where we are actually currently contributing to joint training arrangements with particular companies or industry sectors. I mean I think industry is very much attune to the needs of the training market and what such a body could do and I'm quite sure that they will be very clear in putting a view as to what ANTA is capable of doing.

KB: ITAB the Industry Training Advisory Boards are to some degree subsumed by this process. The pilot in process is associated with Carmichael are going to heavily involve industry in defining in what it needs in terms of the non-industry training provision and all of that over time is going to be effectively overseen by the processes entailed in this document.

J: Just on Carmichael Mr Keating's statement yesterday indicated that the Carmichael scheme would take quite some time to get up and running. Could you give us some idea of the scopes that you see to get that started say next year .... how many people would be involved say in one year or three years out?

KB: I think you should let us reserve something for the Youth Summit and the employment package in the budget.

PM: In my view it might be worth while just walking you through a couple of the key points in here which, just to focus you in, the first the objectives are the objectives which we committed ourselves to in the statement yesterday in terms of national training authority objectives, the first lot of objectives. If you turn to page 2 you'll see under State training agencies, with responsibility for vocational education training within their own borders consistent with the agreed emphasis on agreed national strategic plan on training policy and the agreed State planning profile, not the relevant or something but the agreed State planning profile. State training agencies will be accountable to State Ministers and Parliaments for the operation responsibilities of their agencies and accountable to the Ministerial Council on matters on National policy. Now that link re-appears on page 3 at the bottom, Ministerial Council, the last dot point, to determine national goals, objectives and



priorities for vocational education and training, on page 4, the fourth dot point, to agree planning parameters and profiles for delivery of vocational education and training nationally and the sixth dot point, to resolve any dispute between ANTA and a State training agency or any other issue raised by a Minister. So in other words the Ministerial Council resolves a dispute between ANTA and a State training authority and a State Minister, and of course in the resolution of that dispute the Commonwealth sits there with two votes in the casting vote. Page 5, one, two, three, four, fifth dot point, to develop in conjunction with State training agencies an efficient and quality service provision, so even in an operational sense ANTA has a specific power to develop in conjunction with training agencies and efficient and quality service provision, that is the quality of operation the distinguishing feature between operations and policy where that may be blurred as we all know in public administration, in any administration it can be blurred that while primarily operations reside with State training authorities ANTA is in there expressly in relation to efficiency and quality of the delivery of services, so it has again an express role. On page 6 at 11, dot points one and two, to provide to ANTA policy advice, so State training agencies provide policy advice and develop in conjunction with ANTA detailed State training profiles. And on page 8 at point 31 under Funding Arrangements, the States will at least maintain their effort for vocational education and training on an ongoing basis, in other words there's the maintenance there of State effort, but when we move to outcomes on page 9 we say any state which is demonstratively under-achieving would agree to increase its efforts, so it's not as if the Commonwealth then picks up the under-achievers, as we did with Universities, with Universities what we had to do was when they were flagging behind the Commonwealth had to pick them up, this is not the case here. And they're the main points.

J: Prime Minister, I mean for example, if the Commonwealth decided that in order to rebuild Victoria's manufacturing base you needed to up their contribution to their TAFE system and the smaller States decided this was unfair for whatever variety of reasons isn't it conceivable that national objective could be overturned by a combination of the smaller States?

PM: I don't think so.

KB: At the moment now this has enormous focus because it really has required the Prime Minister and Premiers to break it all through. There's just no question about that. You can't make a shift like this

without the heads of the Governments of this country being involved. This program as it builds up with a very authoritative Board, well supported by industry. We'll sink back, not sink back that's a bad expression to use, we'll return to the activities of the line Departments, and they just basically don't operate that way. I mean I've had a couple of experiences now of so called MOVIC ministerial meetings which will effectively be the Council the Ministerial Council and we rely very heavily on the advice of our officials in an organisation called VTAC which supports MOVIC. There'll obviously in this particular instance be a lot of discussion around the funding formula and it's quite possible the funding formula will continue from time to time to be of very direct interest, but the way in which the profiles are developed, over time, more and more expertise will come to play in this. The idea I think of the sort of States ganging up to roll the Commonwealth and another couple of States I think is just outside the framework of how those operations take place, it's just not a ... people can invent sort of thin edge of the wedge arguments about anything associated with any part of our federation but I think the practicalities of life mean that on a day to day basis that sort of thing just won't happen.

PM: The reason I walked you through the document a moment ago was just to demonstrate the sort of tension, the creative tension that's in the design, that is that prerogatives of the States and the Commonwealth and the national interests here are I think, set nicely in balance. I noticed in the Australian newspaper today someone was sold a pup. You can sell people pups easily around this building, on the basis that this was a sort of walk over for the States. Well if you just go through those points you'll see where the national ..., where ANTA's powers are clear and where the ministerial powers are clear in resolving disputes between States, training agencies, ministers and ANTA, where States have to maintain their financial effort, where the Commonwealth will not be bringing up under performing States.

J: Will this do anything for the jobless?

PM: Who wrote the Aus story, by the way? Sorry, my apologies.

J: In the short term could this tell us the number of unemployed young people? .....youth places will be available next year when it becomes .....?

KB: Well, yes I think it will. I think that the growth money, given that it is going in on the basis that the States maintain effort, will allow a pretty

substantial addressing of those sorts of requirements. I think Dave Phillips ... 100 million provided about 30,000 places, 30,000 to 40,000 places from recollection. So, that came through in the last set of money so you can, on the basis of that, start calculating what 70 million next year will do, what 140 million the year after will do and being able to plan with 70 million knowing you are getting 140 million. I think that what this will provide is a very substantial ballast to back up other elements of the labour market program, which we will be bringing forward as short-term measures to deal with the unemployment problems, where they require a TAFE element to the resolution. An awful lot of Commonwealth training programs, not just TAFE but also private provider elements. An awful lot of Commonwealth short-term labour market programs require access to TAFE provision. Now this will massively increase the compacity of TAFE and the private providers to back those programs up. So, without wishing to identify, because you can't place by place, a resolution, the capacity to support other elements to the labour market programs put people in training, take them out of an area of just hopeless unproductive unemployment. It is a massive effective back-up to that.

J: (inaudible)

KB: Well it will have its own act, we will have to legislate to establish a separate Commonwealth training authority in conformity with the conditions that are laid down here. There will be, of course, a requirement for us to also pass, as we always do, a vocational education and training act with ...what we don't do now but will do next time, is with a triennial funding base in it and then there will be a cross-over between those two Acts. Now the one act will give the Commonwealth Minister authorities to dispense funds and the other Act would oblige the Commonwealth Minister to dispense funds in accordance with this agreement.

J: .. bodies in terms of accountability will go to, for instance, the Senate Estimates Committees?

KB: Yes, as with all areas of my portfolio, and indeed as the statutory authorities have found from time to time they will find themselves explaining life to the Senate Estimates Committees.

J: Prime Minister you nominated the Finn Committee yesterday in your background paper on take-up rates for TAFE, 15-19 year olds, have you any idea about how much additional spending over and above the \$720 million that will require to achieve that sort of objective?

PM: No, I mean you could have a stab at it, but I think the point was the Finn and Deveson Committee smoked out what the Commonwealth needed to have smoked out about the way the TAFE system functions in this country, and to focus on long term pathways for the transition from school to work. Now, that's where we started it, we then got into the act with capital and recurrent, we then added to that with the One Nation money and we have now taken it up for this. So, all the things which Kim (Beazely) is doing now with Carmichael, those long lines of transition between school and work really couldn't be, I don't think, over time anyway, successfully accomplished without ballast in this system. That's going to cost money and the growth is obviously going to come from the Commonwealth, I mean, the Commonwealth over time will be spending more than the One Nation money on vocational education.

J: ... interface between employers and training, getting people trained for jobs. Obviously an important part of that is going to be on the job training and related to that the issue of a training wage. Is it your objective, in the discussions you will have tomorrow, to get a broad agreement on the structure of ..?

PM: I think Kim made the point earlier we are not here portending tomorrow's outcome, or trying to second-guess them, that's for you to do.

J: (inaudible)

PM: Well that is just another way of asking the same question. Which I got on to in about 3 milliseconds. And I hope within 5 milliseconds to put an answer back to you saying that is what he asked.

J: ... could have a role to play in whatever is decided in the context of the Carmichael?

PM: Look, let's face this fact, the truth is that in the growth of the labour market in the '80s a lot of the problems of the transition from school to work, for untrained people, was overlooked in the great sweep of employment through the '80s. Not by us in terms of getting the stock of trained people up, obviously through participation and in the first instance in tertiary where we had a clear Commonwealth financial responsibility. But we are taking that further, to make that transition between schools and work through vocational education and the pathways which are comprehended in the Carmichael recommendations, which Kim has been trying to work through to some sort of conclusion, that is transferring a report in to policy. It is there that this matters, it is there that we will look immediately beyond, as I

said yesterday, in the two things, the first is that big transition from school to work, and the other for those teenagers whose later teenage years will have preceded as fundamental change, ... those who are currently unemployed. Now, that's the problem we will be focussing on tomorrow, and also those people where with this in place or not in place will just never take up structured training there will always be a proportion of people who will never take up structured training and trying to find a role for them as well, that's in a sense what Geoff was asking me about earlier, and which we will be trying to at least focus upon tomorrow.

J: ..... I mean if it was a long term structural decline in those types of jobs, I mean how do .....?

PM: Well I don't want to go through all that today, that's for tomorrow.

J: (inaudible)

KB: Yes, I agree with you that there is a problem there, but I think it is changing, I think there is a growing realization that technical and further education does provide you with a type of education most likely to be directly related to employment. Now, as I think as other elements of the agenda start to impact like the Carmichael proposals, like the increasing involvement in, for example, of industries and creation of things like skill centres of which there have been some forty odd created over the last few years. As this all begins to come through what a young person looking at their life after secondary school has ... before them is the prospect of some very highly relevant, well structured, certificated forms of training open to them and many may well chose, I think, presented with that and with a qualitative improvement that always invariably comes with more money, will look at a really genuine choice. I think you will find parental attitudes change, and I think you will find young peoples attitudes change when confronted with that, but it will take a couple of years.

PM: And the hobby courses have been stripped out of the system and the focus only with apprenticeships is changing and that's why the State training profiles are going to matter enormously. Because that's where the status will be, it is with them that will come the status, but the point I made earlier is the key point I think, that is it is the bigger issue of the transition from school to work, which Kim is working on, which is the issue. This is part of the facilitation mechanism of that.

J: Why did you describe it as a training emergency?

- PM: Because I think that the nature of the economy we are going to have, the nature of investment in the 1990s is going to be not chasing inflationary gains but chasing production, that is, we will be looking at product, product innovation and exports, import replacement, and it is going to require, that structure, more trained people than we have been able to provide in the past and particularly more jobs for people who are trained as distinct from those who are untrained.
- KB: My department estimates that 80 per cent of the jobs which will come into our community between now and the end of the decade will require year 12 standard of education or above, in order to fill it. We are not yet at a position where we could say that we are necessarily meeting those targets, and in those circumstances that requires activity on our part.
- PM: I think one of Australia's great comparative advantages has been education. In the last 25 years we let that slip, and to climb back up the international division of labour we have to re-assert again that comparative advantage. And this is about some of that re-assertion.
- J: Is it your intention to have a national certification system for TAFE?
- KB: Well, of course those sorts or issues are going to be the life blood of ANTA, the attitudes and the views that they develop on that over time will be very important. And as in virtually all other areas of education, people looking at issues of national certification, I think in this circumstance industry is so diverse that you are more likely to sort of get national recognition of forms of certification, as opposed to national certification that's more or less what we are aiming at at this stage, I think the other objective would be, as they used to say in the Indian newspapers when I worked there, ... in its tendencies.
- PM: That will send everyone back to the dictionaries.
- J: ... any of the logistics, like where this is going to be headquartered and those sort of things?
- KB: We haven't worked out headquarters yet, that will be a matter for the board, the authority.
- J: How big a constraint is the fact that the TAFE systems have a lot of people in them who are permanent staff who are teaching things of less and less relevance?
- PM: Well that's part of the whole .....system, isn't it, I mean that is what it is about, in part.

J: So some of the money can be used to redundancy packages etc, etc?

KB: Well I am not sure about that. I think that basically what is happening in the States at the moment is a serious addressing of those problems now. That is happening all over the country, it is not a problem which has been ignored hitherto, people have got on to it. I think there is obviously going to have to be as curricula as changed as a result of all these investigatory processes and this process itself. Then there is going to have to be a considerable amount of re-training for some teaches and all of them to be able to deliver the outcomes that people want. But it is premature to talk about the resources being used in any specific set of programs to address any individual teachers problems at this point.

PM: Look, can I just say it is always a pretty good indication when some of you leave you have had enough, so I think we will leave to.

ENDS