

Tuesday, 14th December, 1965

Sitting resumed at 1.42 p.m.

Senator M. T. I. Julien: Mr. President, last night when the adjournment was taken, I was, as you will recall, night watchman, and I was about to "execute a stroke" when "bad light stopped play." I believe I was in the midst of a sentence when I was stopped, and if I do not connect, you will know the reason.

However, I believe I was rounding off the point that parents have a very grave obligation, far above the state, to have their children educated in the school and in the faith and belief of their choice and I was saying that you must sympathize and understand that this was the reason which must have motivated some of them in adopting the particular methods of protest which some of them did, and I refer especially to their conduct and behaviour, and among them quite a few who should have known better. I do not now condone them.

Like Senator Sir Patrick Hobson, I deprecate the vituperation which was levelled at one another and the "mud-slinging" that went on. I think it was indecorous and unnecessary. Moreover it is time that our people get to learn that in a democratic society even though you desire to make a protest you should do so in a normal democratic way. Further, I think that if this normal method had been adopted there would have been less hard feelings and a greater willingness to compromise on the part of both sides.

However, I believe we should be tolerant of them and above all, the state should be tolerant of its people. It would appear that the State was at one time rather conscious of this, because very soon after independence, I think, it adopted the motto

of "discipline, production and tolerance"; and one of the three things it emphasized in a pamphlet published and distributed by it was tolerance. I would, with your permission, Sir, refer to it, because I think it is rather relevant at this stage of our development to restate it. I quote:

TOLERANCE

"TOLERANCE is another virtue which is indispensable in the citizens of a nation such as ours, who are of many different racial origins or hold different religious or political beliefs.

Now, to practise tolerance does not mean that you must shrug your shoulders and accept moral standards or forms of behaviour which your religious training or your conscience tells you are wrong. It does not mean that you must tolerate slackness or slovenliness in any form. You must at all times have a clear idea of right and wrong, good and bad, and must at all times accept only the right and the good and reject the wrong and the bad.

But at the same time, you must remember that the essence of democracy is the right of each individual to hold whatever religious faith he wishes and to practise it; to hold whatever political opinion he wishes and to express it.

Each member of the community is equal in the sight of the law to each other member, regardless of social class, racial origin, political or religious persuasion.

It follows then that though you may feel strongly that your own views and opinions are right, another is as entitled as you are to feel the same way about his own views and opinions. You may consider him foolish, you may disagree completely with him, but you must

[SENATOR M. T. I. JULIEN]

remember always that he is entitled to find your views foolish and to disagree completely with them.

To be tolerant means to agree not to disagree. This is normal behaviour among members of a family, and must be normal behaviour among members of a community if it is to be a healthy and a happy one.

In a family some may prefer Dougla to Sparrow, or Casuals to Malvern, but this does not prevent them from living together harmoniously.

In a community the same thing applies, but it is a much more difficult affair, especially in a community such as our new nation. This is so because there is much more scope for disagreement than among members of one family. There is bound to be more room for different shades of opinion and of colour, different religious beliefs and different opinions on political and social problems.

That is why we must all make a conscious effort to be tolerant of the views of others, so that we can all pull together in spite of any differences so that we can all live together as one healthy, happy and harmonious family.

In this way, by exercising tolerance, we can set an example to older and bigger nations. We can show the world how one nation, consisting of peoples of various origins and religions, can be a healthy and happy nation.

Let us be that guiding light."

May I commend not only the preaching of this, but also the practice of it, to all those who preach and advocate it.

Having got these off my chest, that is, the narration of the various misconceptions of the facts which I have enumerated and given you a précis of the role of the church,

of the state and of the parents in a democratic society such as ours, I should now go back to the first question I posed at the beginning of my speech: "Does the Act, in its present form, coupled with the regulations and assurances given concerning the Concordat, infringe any of the principles of the constitution?"

I must say, Sir, that my answer to that is unequivocally no; but I am afraid I could not say that of the original draft which was first published for comments. Therefore I believe that the public, that is, the church, the parents and all those who protested the original draft, were right to do so; for they were merely exercising their rights as members of a democratic nation under a democratic constitution.

There are, from what I gathered reading the papers, some people who complain that not a comma, not a full stop not a semi-colon has been changed in the old Bill; others say there have been minor amendments. For the benefit of those who appear so ignorant of the changes made—and in my view many of them fundamental, and they are so many as 31—I shall now take some time to go through them almost clause by clause so that all persons, not only those who are ignorant or pretend to be ignorant of them, would know the changes that were made and would be in a position to decide for themselves whether they are fundamental or not.

1.50 p.m.

The first amendment is in respect of the definition clause, clause 2. I refer to the definition of the word "school." There are some people who think a school is merely a building. I think that idea is very fallacious. A school is more than a building; it is an institution. I feel that this is the first important change made to the original Bill.

The next change of fundamental importance, in my view, is in respect of clause 51 of the old Bill, which is now clause 54. We had been told that Cabinet had accepted the principle that the transfer, appointment, promotion and dismissal of teachers shall, as in the case of the primary schools, be the first concern of the denominational boards, subject to the approval of the Public Service Commission. While it is true that this particular new clause only partially gives an indication of this, yet we have had, first of all, I think, the word of the hon. Attorney General, and I believe a little later that of the Leader of the Senate, that provision will be made embodying this principle in the Public Service Commission Regulations.

I must say, Sir, that there have been two schools of thought on this matter. There are some who claim that the denominational boards should have exclusive control in such matters; there are others who claim that the Public Service Commission should have this exclusive control. I do not agree with either claim. I do not agree that the Public Service Commission should be the sole persons to have control over the transfer, promotion, and dismissal of teachers; nor do I agree that denominational boards are the ones who should have exclusive control. I say this, Sir, fully conscious of what I am saying, for I speak from my own experience. As many of you know, I am the son of a Primary school teacher and therefore am fully aware of the grave injustices which have been perpetrated against teachers from time to time by some of these denominational boards. Therefore I could not sit here and say to this Senate that denominational boards should have exclusive control of teachers. On the other hand I cannot see

what harm would be done to Government by allowing them to retain the initial machinery in such matters, and having their decisions finally approved by the Public Service Commission; so that if any such injustices are being perpetrated and if any grievances have to be brought I can think of no better tribunal and no better machinery for the purpose than the Public Service Commission.

The next important change refers to what I referred to last night as the Concordat. It is true that the Bill itself does not show either the principle or the spirit or the intendment of the Concordat; but again we have had last night two gentlemen—the Hon. Attorney General and the Leader of the Senate—giving us the assurance that those principles, that spirit and that intendment shall be embodied very soon in the Public Service Commission Regulations which, I understand, will be promulgated very soon.

The next in importance is clause 5(e). In the original draft the Minister was given complete control to prescribe curricula, textbooks and other matters in connexion with the public schools. This is now modified to some extent by the Education (Schools and Teachers' Colleges) Regulations, 1965, in page 15. And with your leave, Sir, and for the purposes of the record, I shall read the changes made. The relevant Regulation is 72. Regulation 72 reads:

“72 (1) The Minister shall from time to time prescribe courses of instruction to be followed and the textbooks to be used in connection therewith in all schools to which these regulations apply, but may modify any such course, or any such prescribed book list to suit the character or the local needs of each school.

(2) In an assisted school no books or apparatus to which the Board of Management of such school formally objects shall be introduced or imposed.

(3) The Minister may appoint a Curriculum Committee which shall comprise such number of members as he may determine, and which shall include, among other persons, representatives of the teaching profession drawn from both Government and assisted schools.

(4) In determining the curricula to be prescribed for schools, the Minister may consult the Committee appointed under paragraph (3).

(5) The Minister may appoint a Textbooks Committee which shall comprise such number of members as he may determine, and which shall include, among other persons, representatives of the teaching profession drawn from both Government and assisted schools.

(6) In determining the textbooks to be used in public schools, the Minister shall, as far as practicable, prescribe identical texts for use by pupils in the same or corresponding class in each category of public school and may for this purpose and any other purpose he considers necessary consult the Textbooks Committee appointed under paragraph (5).

(7) The Minister may in any case where he is of the opinion that the price charged by any wholesaler or retailer for any textbook or equivalent for use in schools is in excess of the mark-up fixed by the Minister to whom responsibility for Commerce has been assigned, cause a complaint to be made forthwith to the Industrial Court against such price in accordance with the provisions of section 28 of the Industrial Stabilization Act, 1965."

The next change, as I see it, Sir, at least in my order of importance, is the safeguarding of the religious character of assisted schools and the making of teaching of religion compulsory in all schools. These are reflected in regulations 74, 75 and 76, in page 16.

Regulation 74 reads:

"74. At the time stated by the timetable of the Government school for the giving of religious instruction, a Minister of religion approved by the head of a religious body or any person authorized in writing by him or by a religious body shall be permitted free access to any Government school for the purpose of giving religious instruction under his or its direction to the pupils of such denomination of such Minister or authorized person."

Regulation 75 reads:

"75. Where any of the pupils on the roll of an assisted school are of a denomination other than that conducting the school, the manager of such school shall provide facilities satisfactory to the Minister outside school hours to representatives of all denominations for the purpose of giving religious instruction to such pupils."

Regulation 76 reads:

"76. A teacher in an assisted school may be required to give religious instruction according to a syllabus approved by the head of the appropriate denomination or religious body, so, however, that no teacher whose religious persuasion is other than that of the denomination of the body responsible for the conduct of such school shall be required to give such instruction."

2.00 p.m.

The original draft Bill had omitted the provision permitting the building of new assisted schools. Apparently, this must have been an oversight, but opportunity has been taken in the new regulations to include them, and I shall only read parts of it. Regulation 2 states:

(1) Subject to the Act and these Regulations, schools may be established and maintained in such localities as the Minister may from time to time consider necessary.

(2) In any locality where all the children of school age can be accommodated in a single school with not more than four hundred school places, the Minister may either cause a Government school to be established or may permit a religious denomination to establish a school in such locality in accordance with the provisions of these Regulations, so, however, that in any locality in which there are fewer than four hundred children of school age, the Minister shall permit only one such school to be established as aforesaid."

Then it goes on to tell you that if a board of management desires to establish such a school what the machinery should be, and it goes on right down to regulation 14. So there is the answer to that charge.

The next clause of importance according to my thinking is clause 8(2). I think it also sets out a fundamental change. The old draft did say there would be a National Advisory Committee but they never said who would be the personnel of that committee. Under the new Clause 8(2) it states, the teaching profession, parents of children attending public schools, members of the Parent-Teacher Association,

religious denominations and organizations concerned with community development, librarianship, and such areas of national affairs as the Minister considers appropriate.

Clause 8(4) has been amended. The old Draft had restricted the Committee to give an advice to the Minister only when he asked for it, but that nonsense has been cut out and they can always give advice. Clause 8(5) of the old Bill, which gave the Minister power to reject any such advice has been found very foolish, because nobody will want to work under that provision, so that has been deleted in its entirety.

Clause 10(2) is amended by setting out the personnel of the local advisory committees and the same persons who have been appointed, as I read earlier, under clause 8(2), for the National Advisory Committee, have been appointed as representatives on that committee.

Clause 10(4), was amended by removing the restriction on the local advisory committee from giving advice only on matters asked for. Now they are permitted to give advice on any matters they think fit. Clause 10(5), which gave the Minister power to reject the advice has also been deleted.

The definition of assisted schools in the former clause 11(5) was by no means apt. It called therefore for a new definition and that has been inserted in clause 11(5) of the new Bill which states:

"An assisted school is a public school, the Board of Management of which has received or is in receipt of public funds for building or extension or re-building or for the equipment and facilities provided for the school."

Clause 12(2) has been amended, actually making it compulsory for the Minister

Education Bill
[SENATOR M. T. I. JULIEN]

Tuesday, 14th December, 1965

Education Bill

to seek and consult and obtain advice of the Board of Management. It has therefore been redrafted embodying that wonderful provision.

Clause 17(1), which seems to me a very wonderful provision, seems to be in conflict with clause 84(2), and I should like the Leader of the Senate to take note particularly of what I am saying here, because it has worried me. I shall read it so that you will understand the point I intend to make. Clause 17(1) reads:

“Subject to the provisions of this Act and of any regulations made thereunder a Board with regard to assisted schools under its management—

(a) shall have the control and management of all matters relating to the establishment and maintenance of new schools.”

I find absolutely no fault with that, but let us turn to clause 84(2) so that we can see where the conflict lies. I shall read 84(1) first so that you will know where the conflict lies:

“Every public school will conform to the standards and comply with such requirements as are prescribed.”

But this is how 84(2) reads:

“Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Minister may from time to time, make such regulations as are necessary or expedient for the due control and administration of assisted schools.”

So here you have in one breath 17(1) giving that control of management to the boards of management and 84(2) giving the Minister the power to make rules for that control. I should like him to resolve that conflict, and to have my own way I would rather

that he remove the power given to him under 84(2) and leave the powers given to the boards of management under 17(1).

Clause 17(1)(f) was similarly amended. The first draft clause 17(1)(f), you will remember, was rather offensive. As a matter of fact, in my view, it was *ultra vires*. There they insisted on having boards of management account for funds that Government did not give them. Many people who gave the funds, members of the community, parents and so on, and under the draft Bill they would have had to account to Government for the funds that did not belong to them, and I think that was absurd. However, that absurdity has been deleted by the provision of the new clause 17(1)(f) making it obligatory on their part to account but only in respect of public funds.

Clause 18(1), was again amended and redrafted for the same purpose, excluding private funds from its ambit.

Clause 19(1) also had to be redrafted and amended to comply with the same factor that I just mentioned. There will be no necessity for them to send any accounts to the Minister yearly in respect of private funds.

Clause 19(2) is new. It says:

“For the purpose of verification of the accounts referred to in subsection (1), the Minister may require such additional information, in such form as he may in any particular case direct, as he considers necessary.”

I think that somebody has asked for that and it has been included.

Clause 22(1) is also new. It is a prohibition on the imposition of charges or other requirements on pupils.

Objection was taken to the old clause 25, which is now clause 26. This has been amended in two respects. In the draft Bill clause 25(b) read:

“Ensuring the protection of school premises, property and stock against improper use.”

That is now to read as follows:

“Ensuring that school premises, property and stock are protected against improper use.”

There was also some slight amendment to clause 26(c), as the old Bill said:

“Making recommendations relating to the discipline of teachers”;

and 26(c) of the new Bill reads:

“The submission of reports on matters relating to the discipline of teachers.”

We go now to clause 27(f), which amends the old clause 26(f).

2.10 p.m.

Clause 28 (1) and (2) is the next—it now permits consultation with the boards of management. In the old draft the Minister could have done what he liked without any consultation taking place, but that has been rectified.

A very important clause has been included in the new Bill before us—I refer to clause 29; it is what is known as a conscience clause:

“29. (1) No child shall be required as a condition of admission into, or of continuing in, a public school—

- (a) attend or to abstain from attending any Sunday School or any place of religious worship; or
- (b) to attend any religious observance or any instruction in religious subjects in the school or elsewhere

from which observance or instruction he may be withdrawn by his parent; or

- (c) to attend the school on any day specially set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which the parent belongs.”

(2) Religious instruction shall form part of the curriculum of every public school, and the facilities for religious observance in such school shall be provided in such manner as is prescribed, save, however, that any pupil may be withdrawn by his parent from such instruction or observance without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school.”

If that is not fundamental, I wonder what is.

Mr. President : May I interrupt; Senator Julien's time has expired.

Motion made, and question proposed, That the hon. Senator's time be extended by fifteen minutes—[Senator L. Wight].

Question put and agreed to.

Hon. Senator's time extended accordingly.

Senator M. T. I. Julien : Thank you. I think this is the second time in my whole career in the Senate that I have had to use an extension of time, but I think education is a very important subject and deserves it.

Old clause 33 (a) has been redrafted; it is now clause 35, and old clause 33 (b) has been deleted entirely. It gave the Minister power to deprive a teacher of employment in a private school if he was found unsuitable to be in charge of children. I do not know why this was removed and I really should like the Minister of Education to enlighten me on it. I should have thought that if a teacher were removed as being unsuitable to be in

charge of children that there would have been some good reason for it, but perhaps there is some better reason for deleting it.

Old clause 39, which is now clause 41, is amended to permit consultation by boards of management. Old clause 48, which is now clause 51, has also been amended giving a right of appeal not only to a judge in chambers but also to the Court of Appeal—a very admirable provision for a new nation.

Clause 54 (3) merits some explanation. If the intention of this subclause is to give the Public Service Commission sole control in the appointment of teachers, it seems as though there might be some conflict if and when the Public Service Commission regulations are made and the machinery there adopted for such appointments is the one we envisage and spoken of by the Leader of the Senate; that is to say, that in the first instance the boards of management would be the ones to initiate the procedure. It seems to me that it would have been safer to have prepared the clause with the words: “subject to the Public Service Commission regulations” or something like that, thereby giving some indication of the procedure we are asking to have adopted.

Clause 42 is new; it is trivial so I do not intend to read it.

We go back to clause 84 (2). I merely wish to point out again to the Leader of the Senate that I should like him to delete that subclause because in my view it conflicts with clause 17 (1) (a).

Mr. President, I am quite satisfied that these are certainly fundamental amendments to the original draft Bill. I shall now deal with the regulation-making clause generally. In my view, in the case of every important subject, such as the subject of education, no regulations should become law until they are presented to Parliament and approved.

It is true that there are some rules that are normally brought here for that purpose, there are others again which become law automatically as they are made and we have to pass a resolution here if we wish to negative them. But I think in cases such as education, where there has been and will always be so much controversy and so much bitterness we can avoid all this by inserting in such Bills a paragraph such as I have suggested in the amendment I proposed and which I shall endeavour to move in the committee stage. This is how the amendment will read :

“ 84. (13) No regulations made in this Act shall be of any effect unless first approved by resolution of each House of Parliament which will retain its right to amend any such regulations.”

I have worded it this way because there seems to be authority for the proposition that even where these regulations have to come before the House for approval you may either reject or approve them, but you cannot amend them.

Finally, I should like to say that I could not vote in favour of this Bill except I had the assurances for which I asked of the Leader of the Senate during my speech and except we have his assurance that any regulations made in future under this Act will first be brought here for scrutiny and debate. I would not say “ratification” as Senator Lange said, because I do not see the purpose or virtue in that, but I prefer to say, “for scrutiny”.

Before I close please permit me, Sir, to take this opportunity to congratulate my Colleague and Friend, Senator Pierre, for the lucid, fair, and equitable manner in which he presented this Bill. The presentation was without heat, without rancour and without vituperation. This is surely

indicative of what a good Christian education and a good Christian training and upbringing can do to one.

Thank you, Senators, for your patient listening.

Senator L. A. E. Wight : Mr. President, I too have to admire the way Senator Pierre presented this Bill. I say so with all sincerity. In fact he has made me a slow bowler instead of a fast one.

2.20 p.m.

It is rather ironical that during the course of this week we should have celebrated Human Rights Day. It is recognized within this concept that parents, having given life to their children, have a most grave obligation to educate them and therefore must be recognized as the first and principal educators of their children. It is on these grounds that I intend to develop my argument against certain clauses of this Bill which is designed to make better provision for the promotion of education in Trinidad and Tobago.

The Constitution clearly states that parents have a right to send their children to the school of their choice, but if the day were to come that all schools would be state-controlled there would be no choice; it would merely be Hobson's choice—and I am not referring to Sen. Hobson, though that could easily be the summary of his speech.

When the constitution was drafted, a meeting took place at Queen's Hall where all the citizens were given a chance, not only to produce recommendations but to put forward criticisms. It was not only a healthy exercise, but a tremendous amount of good came out of it. In fact, after the constitution was finalized, if we look at

Hansard of Tuesday 15th May, 1962 we shall see that these were the words of the Attorney General:

“ I need not remind the members of this chamber, however, that a constitution is more than a document, more than a set of formal rules; a constitution is a living and organic thing.”

Those words have great significance to the right of a parent to choose a school of his own choice. When I use those words, “ the right of a parent to choose a school ” I should like to remind the Attorney General that I am not reading anything *into* the constitution; I am reading the words *of* the constitution.

A parent having the right to the choice of a school is something which the Prime Minister and I have very much in common, and that is, we each have an only daughter and anybody who has an only child knows fully well that nothing but the best is wanted for that child. He, like myself, has chosen a denominational school for his only child. Would we have made that choice if the denominational school would upset the child's morals or academic studies or in any way harm her character? As parents, would we not know that the best training on grounds of morality, religion and all that goes to make a good citizen is provided in a denominational school? I say this with sincerity and without any sarcasm.

If we look in *Hansard*, in connexion with the Constitution, after the Queen's Hall Conference the Prime Minister in the House of Representatives had this to say. I quote from column 1173:

“ . . . a number of changes were agreed to by the Government to these proposals...”

[SENATOR L. A. E. WIGHT]

Proposals at the meeting at Queen's Hall—

“... which as you know members of the Government team on the Select Committee presented to the Select Committee. For example, the proposal very strongly urged at Queen's Hall that there should be in some appropriate place a preamble in the Constitution which would include a suitable reference to Almighty God, as stated by many, almost all the religious denominations that submitted memoranda”

That was finally accepted.

“Another amendment sponsored by the Government in response to the request of the citizens had to deal with the substitution for the controversial Chapter II in the Draft of a Bill of Rights along the lines of the Canadian Bill of Rights, with appropriate modifications including the introduction of safeguards. We are very happy, Mr. Speaker, that there should have been such a tremendous endorsement by the community as a whole”

The Prime Minister was gratified that there should have been a tremendous endorsement with regards to human rights. We do subscribe to human rights as laid down by the United Nations of which we are a member, and the right of a choice of school is within the bounds of our human rights.

Senator Julien has pointed out many of the amended clauses for which we too are particularly grateful, hence the “slow bowling” today. It has tidied up the Bill and shown that Government do intend to see, if not entirely, that character of the denominational schools is not totally destroyed, though, to some extent it is partially.

We have no quarrel whatsoever about supervisory control. It is obvious that the Ministry must be responsible for standards

in schools, and we fully support that all teachers must be registered, and certainly all teachers, whether they teach in the primary schools or secondary schools, must have an equal opportunity for promotion and recognition. All these fundamental things we have absolutely no quarrel with.

Like Senator Julien, I am very happy over the fact that the National Advisory Committee has taken on a new look. Before the amendment, the Minister did not have to accept the recommendations, in fact the Committee would have been made up of people of his own choice but I am glad to see that the composition of the committee is more or less the same as it is in the present Ordinance, Ch. 16. I am very happy about that.

Let me say here and now that we do not for one single second think that the present Minister of Education would ever transfer indiscriminately members of the teaching community—that is, a member of the clergy, nuns and priests for instance—who have not only taken certain vows as regards their teaching profession but also vows to a community life, and suddenly send a nun for example off to Icaicos or some far away place. We do not think that for a minute, but our criticism on this point is that the Minister of Education cannot live forever and when laws are made surely you must look into the future. Just imagine if C. L. R. James were the next Minister of Education, how he could abuse such powers? We do not expect it of your Senator Pierre.

Senator Pierre: You want him?

Senator L. A. E. Wight: I do not want him. You can have him.

2.30 p.m.

With regard to religion, here too I should like to emphasize a fact that possibly many

people do not appreciate: religion is a very deep study. The fact that religious instructions can be given for half-an-hour daily in schools amounts to little. From the Christian point of view, to know a few hymns or a few Bible stories is neither here nor there. Religion is a deep study, it embraces theology, it embraces many other subjects, and you might think it is not important. You might think it is hardly necessary if you are going to be an engineer or a member of some profession. But religion is like an insurance policy; it is a guarantee that you enjoy the twilight years of your life. It is something you can cling to for comfort. When the twilight years appear it is not Geometry or Latin or subjects of the sort that you turn to. That is why we feel it is so very very important that the various denominational bodies should be allowed to teach not merely for half-an-hour every day but also be allowed to keep the denominational character of their schools.

That is why we feel sufficient safeguards are not included just by having them in the regulations, and that is why we intend to support Senator Julien's amendment.

Safeguards are laid down in the present Ordinance; I have the Ordinance here. I believe Senator Pierre knows what I am referring to. In case he does not, let me refer to it :

“ Chapter 14, No. 1, Section 5:

“ Regulations made under the last preceding section shall have no force or effect until they have been approved by the Legislative Council.”

I do not think there is any harm in having that included in the present Bill.

I should also like to refer to Act No. 21 of 1963. This was debated in the Senate on the 2nd of July, 1963. This is what

the Attorney General said in reply to a couple of questions I had asked :

“ If I may be permitted a few words in reply to a question raised by Senator Wight, I should just like to say that the general explanation underlying the two sections to which she referred, and also clause 12, is this. It must be remembered that control over the employment of teachers still remains within the body which employs the teachers . . . ”

Those are his words, Sir. Up to then complete control remained with the body which employed the teachers :

“ . . . But I assure Senator Wight that within the limits imposed on Government, that is to say, the fact that the ultimate control and employment of teachers vest with the employing body, these clauses have been put in merely to alleviate what might be possible hardship.”

So we have here the assurance from the Attorney General, when this Pension's Bill came up, that the sole control of teachers was with the employing body. But so many assurances have been given before, which now make us wonder why so many changes are necessary. A lot of controversy could have been prevented if the Minister had agreed to meet the principals. Perhaps he did so finally, but they had a great deal of trouble to see him. All points could have been cleared up, and there would have been no bitterness.

We understand that, one of the reasons, why Government had to bring this Bill, as the Prime Minister said, was that there was too much discrimination in schools on social grounds, on religious grounds, and so forth. Once again, I have to refer to his very words in the House of Representatives

Education Bill
[SENATOR L. A. E. WIGHT]

Tuesday, 14th December, 1965

Education Bill

in connexion with this matter of discrimination. This is what he said on Friday 11th May, 1962 :

“The point is that this society last year, under this Government, took a very drastic step forward in the direction of integration, in the direction of the elimination of the conventional discrimination inherited from the colonial regime. That was free secondary education and the common qualifying examination. I got my Colleague, the Minister of Education and Culture, to analyse for me the secondary school places for the year 1962, that is, on the basis of the 1961 examinations. The position is that a total of 3,167 pupils were admitted to all types of secondary schools—the grammar the assisted school and the secondary modern schools. . . .”

He was about to prove how integration had taken place, and I continue to quote :

“Thirty-six in every 100 of those, according to names, came from what can be considered the Indian section of the community.”

Then the Prime Minister went on to say that at Presentation College in Chaguanas 59 Indians were admitted out of 88. I want to remark on this, Sir. Presentation College in Chaguanas is a denominational school run by the Roman Catholic Board. There is no discrimination, because it is well known that of the people of Indian origin in our country most of the Christians are Presbyterians while the non-Christians are mostly Muslims, and Hindus. I make this passing observation because here we have a denominational school and 59 out of 88 admitted to its classes were possibly not of the same religious belief. And I can also give the assurance that in these denominational schools children who are not of the same religious beliefs are

not taught religion; they are exempted. The point I am making is that there has been integration, and I do not see why there should be grumbings from the opposite side about disintegration and discrimination and all that sort of thing.

The Prime Minister goes on to say :

“Could any reasonable man see discrimination in that particular situation? do not think so. . . . The fact is that the free secondary school, entrance to which is determined by the common qualifying examination, demonstrates better than anything in this society, now or in the future, the equality of opportunity for all people irrespective of racial origin, irrespective of colour, and irrespective of one of the fundamental considerations in our society, one of the most potent and vicious forms of discrimination in this society—family status.”

What I have pointed out here is that in 1962 the Prime Minister agreed that discrimination was a thing of the past and no longer existed—I agree with him, that it did once obtain—and now this is the sort of red herring we are getting today as one of the reasons for introducing this Bill.

2.40 p.m.

I should now like to touch a subject very dear to my heart, and that is finance in connexion with schools. The denominational schools are willing to expand and thus give the best possible education to the majority of the population. Government have tied their hands seriously by not passing school plans on many occasions and by not being willing to provide the necessary finance. This is something I shall try to explain in a very simple fashion. For instance, we have absolutely no quarrel—how could we?—about the denominational

boards being made to account for every single farthing. Of course they must. That is their duty. But that is just by the way.

I am sorry I have to be always quoting but I shall now quote a few words of the Minister of Education in connexion with the debate on the Teachers' Pensions Bill on Tuesday, 2nd July, 1963. He said in part:

"Under building grants the amount that the Government pay is two-thirds the approved capital cost . . ."

We all know that capital—

"... for 1962 the amount was \$140,333. The Government pay the entire staff, that is, from the Principal right down."

We all know that.

Now, to practical subjects. The Minister of Education says, that for each laboratory Government provide \$1,200. It is a contribution, because what sort of laboratory could you get for \$1,200? A couple of Bunsen burners, a microscope and what else? The fact that denominational schools have such very well equipped laboratories and science rooms is really no credit to the Government. The Bunsen burners may belong to Government, but I can assure the hon. Senator that the amount of money spent to equip many of those laboratories is not money given by the Government. I also notice on this "Meeting-the-Children" tour, every now and then the Prime Minister says:

"What a disgrace. What sort of library is this? Better has to be done."

Well, sure, better has to be done! I agree with him; but how do you think better has been done in the denominational schools with regard to libraries and woodwork rooms?

The hon. Senator said with regard to woodwork rooms in denominational schools that Government provide \$600.00—a lathe! When we toured the university the other day we were told of the tremendous amount of money that would have had to be spent on equipment for this type of work. Some of these denominational schools have very up to date science rooms and they certainly did not cost \$1,200, or in the case woodwork rooms, \$600.00. For a domestic science room Government provide \$600—a stove! What about the fridges and all that go with it? Anyhow Senator Pierre thinks it a huge sum. The amount paid in 1962 was \$42,000.

When Senator Pierre presented the Bill last night he said, for instance, that in a school of 1,000 children the amount paid per term was \$16 per child, over three terms that would be \$48,000; over ten years that would be \$480,000. This amount over ten years is chicken feed for hundreds of children who are getting a first class secondary education. Next year we shall spend over a million dollars on a pavilion at the trade fair—chicken feed!

But even to impress him a little more I turn now to the figures of the Auditor General on the accounts of Trinidad and Tobago for the year ended 31st December, 1964. The Ministry of Education in that year was allocated \$18,000,595. If you remember, we had an Appropriation Bill here two or three weeks ago and in fact I think that the Ministry of Education was the only Ministry that had a surplus balance of a couple million dollars. I shall give the exact figure—\$2,045,000. There are many headings under which this money was saved. For instance, building grants to the assisted schools; in the estimates for 1964 there was provided a sum of \$20,000,

but only \$9,000 was spent, so there was a saving of \$11,000. Now, there is an explanation: Head 41—Savings resulting from failure of denominational board to complete projects. No doubt that was due to the fact that their plans took too long to be passed. Polytechnic Institute—a saving there of \$57,000. Head 48—saving of salaries due to vacant posts. I thought there were all sorts of means of having posts filled today. Anyway I am glad to see that the Carnival Development Committee got \$97,000 out of \$135,000. Equipment for vocational centre, Point Fortin; a saving there of \$11,000. Let us see what that says—order for equipment outstanding. in fact, from Heading 47 to 62 the reason given in each case for a saving is always “Order for equipment outstanding”. No wonder the Government schools that the Prime Minister visits have such abominable libraries, equipment and the rest of it. But that is no fault of the denominational schools. Is he using it as some sort of indirect condemnation of denominational schools because they are so well equipped and the Government schools are just catch as catch can with regard to equipment?

Some people have argued too that the denominational schools abroad are not financed by the Government, but that too is a bit of a red herring, because one of the features of the English national education is a dual system. That is, there are denominational schools both in receipt of aid from public funds and private funds. The dual system in England means that schools of the public system of education may be owned either by the local education authority or by voluntary bodies such as the churches. A voluntary school is a school owned by a voluntary body such as the church; its teachers, however, are paid by the local education authority in whose area the

school is situated. This is the dual system which pertains in the U.K., which is very similar to the denominational system in Trinidad and Tobago.

In aided schools in the United Kingdom, that is the voluntary schools, in which the manager or the governor is responsible for repairs to the exterior of the Building and for capital expenditure on alterations required by the local educational authority, up to 75 per cent of the cost and all running expenses are met by the local education authority of the district in which the school is.

2.50 p.m.

The managers of these schools have substantial rights in the appointment and dismissal of teachers. So that is a system which obtains today in the United Kingdom. We are not the only country in which the schools run by churches are aided by public funds. In any case the state is merely the trustee of the money. I think Senator Pierre will remember that as part of his religious instructions; I certainly do.

To prove again that the amount spent on education is inadequate despite the fact that we have a surplus balance of \$2,000,000 at the end of the year—which could very well go towards building more schools, and in fact the surplus fund has probably been transferred to some other Ministry—I now refer to the Educational Planning Mission of Trinidad and Tobago, June 1964, UNESCO. It is possible that the Minister has not had time to read this report. When I get these books I usually enjoy reading them. I now quote from the UNESCO Commission Report, page 11, paragraph 20:

“Another way of judging whether a country’s educational system is adequate, in the aggregate, for its economic plans,

is by considering how much of its Gross Domestic Product is used for education. In Trinidad and Tobago, about 3 per cent is currently used—considering government expenditures only. This is well below the 5 per cent which countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are aiming to spend by 1980. For a country with a Gross Domestic Product of about \$600 U.S.—one of the better off and fastest growing of the developing countries—3 per cent cannot be considered as being an entirely adequate outlay at the present moment.”

We got this Commission to sit and they found that in other developing countries the aim is to spend 5 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product on education. We are spending 3 per cent. But the Minister keeps howling and bawling about the terrific amount of money given to denominational boards for salaries and so on. Even in America they are becoming more and more interested in what they call parochial schools.

In another report on education in *Time* magazine (October 15, 1965) we see this :

“ What United States schools need then is plenty of help. And teacher-turned-President Lyndon Johnson has galvanized Congress into doing something about it. In the past six months Congress has smashed long standing barriers and churned out a most significant series of education Acts in the nation’s history. It is as a consequence of this legislation and other Bills now shaping up under federal auspices, the nation’s public schools and some parochial school children for the first time will get direct federal aid. About \$775 million will go this year to finance the improvement of projects that the schools themselves develop.”

So even a country like the United States is in this modern age recognizing the value of

“parochial schools” as they call them. Therefore, we are not taking a step backwards if we give fair recognition to the denominational system.

I think two Senators have referred to the concordat. I am not going to do so to any extent. What did disappoint me was the disregard of paragraph 5 of the concordat which states that the “ existing relationship between Government and the governing bodies of teachers in assisted secondary schools will remain, subject, however to negotiated changes inevitable with the introduction of a free secondary education.” What disappoints me is that despite this paragraph which mentions “ negotiated changes ”, the draft Bill came up without negotiations being held. I think that is a black mark against the Government because even if it were a gentleman’s agreement without anything being written it should have been observed.

I turn to paragraph 7 of the concordat and to the last three lines which read as follows:

“ Where however the need arises for converting an existing denominational school into a secondary school the denominational character of that school will be allowed to remain.”

We know that religious instructions will be taught in the schools but what we are stressing is the need of the denominational character to remain.

I also feel that the principals have been treated with scant respect. I am very amazed at the fact that a man of dignity, and so very popular until recently, like the Prime Minister, could see fit to go on a public forum like Woodford Square and say to the public, “ We consulted the people whom we had to consult. The principals

[SENATOR L. A. E. WIGHT]

of secondary schools have no *locus standi*." That, Sir, is tantamount to a man saying to his wife in front of their children "Don't worry with what your mother says, she has no standing in this house." The Prime Minister is telling the public to take no heed of the principals of assisted secondary schools because they have no standing in the community and they mean nothing; in fact the Government have consulted those people whom it was necessary for them to consult. It has also come to our notice that at a meeting held in connexion with this Bill the Prime Minister referred to Rev. Fr. Valdez as "That man Valdez", a very uncouth reference.

Mr. President : May I interrupt? I do not think that Senator Wight could justify that and I ask her to withdraw it.

Senator Wight : I withdraw it but I believe it.

3.00 p.m.

How can a principal operate a school without certain rights? If he expels a boy he can only do so for a certain period then that boy returns to school. We do feel that until the case of expulsion is heard by the Ministry, and a decision is taken by the Ministry that boy or girl should not be allowed to return to school. If the decision is in favour of the child returning, fair enough. But what is happening in some of the schools is if a child is expelled because possibly it has a bad moral effect on the other children—and after all you only have to have one bad apple in the barrel for all the others to go bad—the principal's hands are tied until such time as the Ministry is able to take the matter up; and this will take a certain amount of time for a decision. I do really and seriously think that until the

Ministry has taken a final decision that child should not be allowed to return to school.

As you know, Mr. President, there is an amendment before the Senate to be moved by Senator Julien and one to be moved by me. We have only brought two amendments and I do feel, again sincerely, that some notice should be taken of these amendments. I do feel that if some notice were taken of them and there could be some favourable or affirmative voting we should be doing the country a great service and there would be no further rancour or bitterness over this Bill. I have asked for the following words to be added to section 5 (e):

"Provided that nothing in this section or in any other part of the Act shall be deemed to authorise interference with the denominational character of assisted schools or shall hinder the right of these schools to give religious instructions in their particular religious beliefs provided that individual students are not interfered with as regards their beliefs."

And I also want to add the following as subsection 5 (h):

"make provision for safeguarding the religious character of an assisted school."

Mr. President : The speaking time of Senator Wight has expired.

Motion made and Question proposed. That the hon. Senator's time be extended by 15 minutes. [*Senator A. R. Sinanan*].

Question put and agreed to.

Hon. Senator's time extended accordingly.

Senator L. A. E. Wight : Mr. President, there is a lot in this Bill about private schools but I am not going into that because in the

present Ordinance practically everything is the same as in the new Bill and therefore I cannot see the reason why so many "below standard" private schools should have mushroomed. Private schools are lacking qualified staff and so many other things. All the conditions for private schools are contained in Chapter 14, No. 3. I am not going to read it in detail but it stated there must be a private school register, returns to be furnished by the proprietor of the private school. It gives all the details required, such as address, situation of school, size of classroom, number of latrines, provision to supply drinking water, the full name and address of every teacher, &c... Foregoing particulars—again another long list, and it also talks of fines—\$50 for not carrying them out. What I do not understand is why these schools that are undesirable—some of them are very good—should have mushroomed. Was the Ministry not following up this trend carefully? Is there no sort of supervision available to ensure against classes becoming insufficient in size and ventilation, &c? These schools could not have mushroomed if the right supervision had been given in accordance with this Ordinance. So we cannot blame people for starting schools and not making the right provisions because this is always overlooked. This is similar to the case I put forward every year with regard to income tax. The "scouting talent" is non-existent and had supervisors kept an eye on the situation such schools could not have mushroomed. I do not understand how and why this situation should have ever taken place.

I started by saying I would develop my contribution along human rights and the constitution, therefore I should like to end with two quotations both in connexion with human rights; one from the Archbishop of

Port-of-Spain. This is what he wrote:

"We protest against the seeming intent of the State to monopolize our schools and colleges leaving to their owners little more than the bare property rights and denying them the right to the enjoyment of their property, its use, management and administration. This is contrary to the law of subsidiarity which states it is a fundamental principle of social philosophers unshaken and unshakeable and retaining its full truth today that it is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order for a central organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by subsidiary bodies who are willing to do so. The record of our Catholic schools and colleges show carefully their efficiency. Such a centralized monopoly is blatantly unjust and undemocratic. It is contrary to the universal declaration of Human Rights to which this nation is a signatory.

3.10 p.m.

The last quotation, Sir, is from the Hall of Justice on Human Rights Day when the judges and practising lawyers assembled. Mr. H. Hudson-Phillips, Q.C., said, *inter alia*:

"Too often, and I say it with regret, political parties in power in these self-same newly created and emancipated states have shown a disposition of impatience, intolerance and oppression towards their political opponents and to their own other nationals. Some have gone further by manifesting truculence and even hostility to other countries. This might be a passing phase but it is, I apprehend, My Lords, the very abrogation of the basic principles of the Declaration of Human Rights of our new international Magna Carta. It is my view that we lawyers, by virtue of our training and education, must never fail to

[SENATOR L. A. E. WIGHT]

remember those two political maxims in this new era: firstly, that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom even in a confessed democracy; secondly, that power corrupts—and absolute power corrupts most absolutely. We, more than any others in every body politic, must be the watchdogs of constitutions.”

How true!

“We lawyers more than any others must be the happy warriors prepared by every legitimate means to fight for all the liberties and freedoms.”

I am not a lawyer, but I do intend to be a watchdog and use every legitimate means to fight for the freedoms as laid down in our constitution.

Senator Rev. R. G. Neehall: Mr. President, I should like to state that I cherish the privilege enjoyed by citizens of a democratic nation, to add my voice to the many voices that have been raised over the past few weeks either in support of or in protest against this Education Bill, and I trust that the same grace will be extended to me as I am always prepared to extend to others as summarised in the words of Voltaire: “I disagree with your opinion, but will die for your right to express it.” Unfortunately, in the heat of the controversy some seemed to be unwilling to allow others to enjoy this right. I think the Senate is cast in a new role because of this controversy, and that is the role of casting oil on troubled waters, for it is clear to me, as it must be to any reasonable individual, that nothing is to be gained in the present situation by allowing this apparent conflict to develop any further. The educational needs of our children and of the children of all parents in this nation can only be met adequately at the present time by the same type of co-operation that

existed in the past between the Government and the denominations, and if this Bill does anything to improve the quality of that co-operation, then I believe it is our duty to support it.

I should like to begin my concrete remarks by asking for some clarification to be given later by the Leader of the Senate—arising, out of what may be only typographical errors. On page 9, clause 6, subclause (2) reference is made in line 3 to “abnormal pupils.” I do not believe that modern education will permit that adjective to be used in reference to any pupil and nothing will be lost to the sense that is intended by this clause if the term “abnormal” was completely deleted.

On page 11, clause 11, subclause (3), a clause which I believe Senator Sir Patrick Hobson found to be a little confusing, the word “portion” in line 4 should be changed, I believe, to the word “section.”

On page 13, clause 15, subclause (1), in the penultimate line, the sentence reads:

“... save that the Minister may require the school to ...”

It should be

“... be controlled jointly ...”

That is purely typographical.

On page 24, clause 42, I believe the sense of this statement demands that the comma after “development” should be removed.

On page 30, clause 55(c), I believe the term “Personal” should be changed to “Personnel.” I find no other reference to that particular office. It is the second line on page 30.

On page 32, clause 63, the fourth line. I believe it should read:

“... in subsection (1) of section 67 the Personnel Department shall be subject to the direction of the Minister of Finance.”

Page 43, the clause is 84, and this is subclause (9)(d)—“providing for the certification of teachers completing courses of training,” should be the correct wording.

And in the Education (Private Schools) Regulations, 1965, I wonder if an omission has not been made here in the form of Application for Registration of a Private School, as no reference is made to the financial arrangements for the running of the private schools. I believe that this had been one of the chief criticisms of several of the private schools of our country, that they have been run entirely for profit and there has been no check at all on the money paid in fees.

Now the Bill that we are debating is entitled: “An Act to make better provision for the promotion of education in Trinidad and Tobago.” Some of the criticisms that have been made in the course of this controversy have been based on the fact that some people regard this Bill as a final solution to all the problems confronting us in the field of education. The Bill does not purport to be such a solution. It does not propose any solution to the problem of the shortage of school places both in primary and secondary schools. It does not propose any solution to the problem created by the shortage of school teachers. It does not propose any solution to the problem created by the lack of sufficient revenue to meet all the demands confronting us in the field of education. So to criticize the Bill on the basis of what the Bill never set out to achieve is a negative sort of criticism that has no basis at all in fact.

3.20 p.m.

And secondly, the Bill is also being criticized because it is looked upon by some as the first step to the establishment

of complete state control. I have had the opportunity to consider some of the steps that were taken by other governments when moving toward the establishment of complete state control and if there is any resemblance between those provisions and the provisions in this Bill, then I am either blind or completely unintelligent. There have been some of course who have gone to the extent of expressing suspicions that there are ulterior motives—ulterior motives in the minds of those who have drafted this Bill—and that state control ultimately is the object. Now, I should like to give three or four reasons why this is completely, again, without foundation.

Would the drafters of an Act that was intended ultimately to lead to complete state control allow the denominational bodies to retain full and complete control over their property? There is no suggestion here whatsoever that the properties of the denominations are going to be interfered with. Secondly, would the drafters of an Act who were concerned about the ultimate establishment of state control, allow for representatives from religious bodies now engaged in educational work in the country to serve both on the national advisory committee that is visualized and on the local administrative or education district committees? Thirdly, would such persons who were interested in the ultimate establishment of complete state control provide within the framework of the Act itself, the means by which new assisted denominational schools can be established? There is one country, not very far from us, which in attempting to set the stage for ultimate state control, used as a means by which it could be accomplished, the placing of a complete ban on the building of any new schools that would be under the control, even partly, of denominations.

[SENATOR REV. R. G. NEEHALL]

Now, it defies me to find in this Bill which we are debating today any symptoms that could be said to be symptoms related to the desire to establish ultimately full and complete state control. In one newspaper there were at least four letters bearing such headings as "Another Cuba," "No Moral Training," "One Man Control," and "Fear for the Unborn." This is the reason why I say that some of the criticisms have been not only hysterical but they have been hostile. Some of the reactions to this Bill have been extreme, to say the least, and I hope that the reactions in the Senate will help to pour oil on the troubled waters.

What this Bill sets out to do—and to those who believe in state control this is obvious—is to entrench for many, many years to come the dual system of control. We have never had state control here absolutely. We have never had denominational control absolutely. We have had a system of dual control. And if there ever was any document that entrenches dual control, this Bill is it. I can quote clause after clause and regulation after regulation that will prove that this is the main burden and the main purpose of the Bill before us. However, some of the fears expressed by the religious bodies, and which have been taken care of by the amendments both to the Bill and the regulations, are not to be overlooked; and I should like to quote, Mr. President, with your permission, from a document that reveals something of the thinking that has been going on around the world, in most of the churches that are involved in programmes of general education in nations of all the continents of the world. I think it would be helpful to us to bear in mind that the criticisms and some of the fears expressed by religious bodies have not been based on pure emotion; that there has

been serious thinking done around the world on the involvement of churches and religious bodies in programmes of general education or secular education as it is sometimes called.

This document is part of what was produced by a group of churches which form the World Council of Churches, made up both of clergymen and laymen, distinguished educators from around the world representing all the various conditions to be found in several continents. First of all, a quotation that comes under the heading:

"Education as instrument of state policy.

As national states become more and more concerned with national welfare and with ensuring fundamental human rights to all their citizens, education inevitably becomes primarily a national concern, and only secondarily a concern of private agencies. Even private education has to be co-ordinated with the public effort, and thus to come under some overall national planning. But precisely because education is just as much an instrument for influencing attitudes as of assuring human rights, state control of educational policy is perpetually exposed to the peril of its being used in an ideological manner.

State monopoly in education.

State monopoly in the appointment and support of teachers and the prescription of text-books and curricula in public as well as private schools increases the ideological danger. Certain cultural strains which, though rooted in the nation, do not belong to the group in power, are in danger of being neglected. Political and economic ideas of one particular sort may dominate both teacher training and textbooks.

Private institutions may, under favourable conditions, constitute an effective check on state monopoly.

Education as instrument of economic policy.

There is an additional danger, particularly in newly independent countries. The quest for freedom and dignity demand for their fulfilment, the economic independence of the nation. Political emancipation does not automatically issue in economic liberation. Economic development thus becomes the most immediate goal on the road to full independence, and the educational system becomes subservient to the economic needs of the nation. The same peril, though in a manner mitigated by the interest in culture, exists in older nations as well, while in countries dominated by a communist ideology children are regarded as future participants in a classless society where their role will be determined by their work.

Education for world citizenship.

In view of the growing inter-dependence of the nations in all fields of human activity, it is important to give, in the total process of education, an appropriate place and due emphasis to education for world citizenship.

This task involves not only adequate information about and understanding of the work of the increasing number of international agencies, both non-governmental and inter-governmental, established for the purpose of promoting international co-operation in specialized fields. What is required above all is to foster, in schools and outside, among the young and the adult, the spirit of international understanding and tolerance, the sense of moral and human solidarity

with the groups and nations whose socio-economic systems and ways of life may be different from those to which we are accustomed as a result perhaps of the less internationally-minded education we have ourselves received. Education as a national system also stands in peril of limited loyalties. No educational system that does not ultimately lead towards loyalty to the whole human race can be fully adequate for our time. Some would say that nationalism has its value as a temporary phase of human development, on the path towards a multi-cultural international human society. Others would regard nationalism as an enduring factor, modified and changed by, as it contributes to, a vigorous internationalism.

Whatever our hopes and aims in this regard, the ability to understand and appreciate other cultures has even now to be inculcated through national educational systems. Educational curricula and processes prevent this and teachers are often not trained or suitable for what is needed of them in this respect.

These fears expressed in this statement have been operating in the minds of some of our denominational groups. We must remember that almost all denominational groups involved in education in Trinidad and Tobago are part of international communities. All these denominational bodies stress both in their religious and in their educational work the fact that beyond our national loyalty we have a loyalty to the whole human race of which we are a part. It is the fear that a system thus orientated entirely towards the development of a neo-nationalism would deprive the citizens of this country ultimately of an opportunity to share in the development

[SENATOR REV. R. G. NEEHALL]

of the world and to appreciate what it means to be world citizens. This is one of the reasons why churches in Trinidad sometimes appear to be a little one-sided in that a majority of their leaders are from countries abroad. I agree that there is something lacking, as Senator Julien pointed out, in any religious body that has been operating here for many centuries and that has not been able to develop and train a sufficient number of religious leaders who belong to this country and are citizens of this nation. However, even if that should happen the denominations of which I speak will still cherish the right to maintain the international obligation both of their leadership and of their membership, and this is one reason why sometimes, particularly in those churches that are governed in an authoritarian fashion and not in a democratic fashion, that the leadership is vested entirely in people from abroad.

There is no conflict between the state and the church therefore. State control is not what is being proposed in this Bill but a system of dual control with new limitations being placed—and I should like this to be stressed—both on Government and on the denominations. If one reads the Bill carefully one will see that by allowing certain rights to the denominations in the field of education the Government automatically place certain limitations upon themselves; that the system of dual control is now being enshrined; that because of the loyalties and exigencies of the moment or the age, of our present history and our economic position, this is being done. I should like to suggest that this should be a reason to make happy those who believe that there is something that can still be contributed by the denominations in supporting and co-operating with Government in the control of schools.

Generally speaking, religious bodies have co-operated well in the past. I have no reason to believe that they will not co-operate in the future. But the point is, are they prepared to co-operate as equal partners or is part of the controversy arising out of the fact that there may be some who think of the church as being in a superior position by divine right and therefore should be co-operators or partners in the sense of controllers? There are others who would suggest that there should be a sort of competition, that the co-operation should be a competition between two bodies engaged in the control and maintenance of educational institutions, the church on one hand and the state on the other hand. I should like to suggest that both of these developments would be inimical to the best interests of this young nation, and that the church is called upon by this Bill to co-operate as an equal partner—not as a controller and not as a competitor.

One of the assurances demanded by the religious bodies, in the course of the discussions that took place, seems to be that denominational boards should continue to have the first word in the appointment, transfer, promotion and dismissal of teachers. We have heard from the lips of the Leader of the Senate himself, who serves as the Minister responsible for the administration of the various provisions of this Bill, that the denominational boards will not be deprived of that word. The fear was that the Public Service Commission would have the first, last, and every word in the promotion, dismissal and appointment or transfer of teachers. We are grateful for this assurance because I believe it is one of the assurances that the religious bodies needed in order that they might continue to give the kind of co-operation and the kind of service that they have

rendered in the past. I am not suggesting that all is well. I am not suggesting that some of the criticisms made by representatives of the state and the denominational boards have not been justified. What I believe is this: that when part of the picture is painted the rest of the picture should be provided by someone and this is what I shall attempt to do a little later in my address.

Another comment I should like to make because it is a fact that has loomed large in the debate on this Education Bill concerns the concordat. I believe that social historians in the future and others who objectively and dispassionately attempt to write the educational history of this country will probably record that the concordat was the most unfortunate event that ever occurred in the educational history of Trinidad and Tobago. I say this because were it not for the concordat the church would not have been able to hold the Government to a promise which the Government apparently made in the concordat, as it was so well read to us by Senator Lange, a promise that was made and not kept. I should like to suggest that the sooner we forget the existence of the concordat the better it will be for education in Trinidad and Tobago.

Another interesting development that has taken place because of this Bill is that we shall have here for the first time a unified teaching service. Primary school teachers have very often been more highly qualified in terms of their profession as teachers than some secondary school teachers, and they have been aggrieved because for a long time they were not given this recognition. There are many secondary school teachers who are academically qualified but not professionally qualified and primary

school teachers will rejoice because of the fact that the unified teaching service will now give to them a recognition that they deserve because of their professional qualifications. On the other hand, the unified teaching service now brings to secondary school teachers benefits and protection not enjoyed before. Denominational boards are administered in some cases entirely by clergymen, in other cases by clergymen and laymen on an equal basis, and in some cases, as in the case of my own church, almost entirely by laymen. There is an impression that in all churches clergymen predominate in the administration of educational institutions. Nothing could be further from the truth as far as my own church is concerned.

3.49 p.m.

The secondary school teachers have sometimes complained that they have been the victims of the whims and fancies of these administrative committees and what is more in many cases they have been subject to the whims and fancies of the principals. They will now get protection. Now, there will also be an incentive given to those who are not entirely qualified to become professionally qualified, and I believe this will be a good thing for the whole teaching service and for education in general.

However, I do not share the optimism expressed yesterday by the Leader of the Senate when he pointed to the integration of the teaching service almost as a guarantee that there will ultimately be integration of the diverse elements that make up our society. It is going to take a great deal more than the unified teaching service to bring about this desired goal. By integration I do not mean the abolition of diversity, because I think that would be to

[SENATOR REV. R. G. NEEHALL]

impoverish integration considerably, but I mean the adjusting of sectional interests in such a way that although within the boundaries of their own concerns they may be as sectarian as they want to be, yet when they overlap into the area of national concerns their sectional interests are made to serve the national interests and not to dictate what they think on the national stage.

I am greatly concerned about some of the symptoms still evident of disintegration perhaps or the lack of integration in our society. The education of our children is certainly one of the chief instruments, by which this goal is to be accomplished and I trust that in the administration of education, Government and those other bodies involved would recognize the fact that to perpetuate any sectional interest at the expense of the development of national identity, national purpose and unity will go down in history as a social crime if not a sin.

I should also like to complete a picture that has only been half painted and which has created a number of misconceptions concerning one educational institution in this country under the administration of a denomination. It is passing strange to me that the very people who, in a protest against the church concerned, provided the basis for all the statements that were made, and who signed a document which provided the foundation for that address—a document in which they claimed that the church was not competent to appoint principals and generally to administer the affairs of a secondary school in this age in which modern education has become such a technical and complex matter—are the same signatories on another document which was submitted as a memorandum to the Cabinet concerning the present Bill that

is before us. Some of the things that these same people ask for include the preservation of the denominational character of the existing assisted secondary schools. That is memorandum No. 20. In memorandum No. 9 an association, in a very strongly worded letter, accused the church of which I am a Minister of being incompetent to administer the affairs of a secondary school and yet they also make statements like this; "We are very much concerned about the preservation of the denominational character of our assisted secondary schools." As far as I am concerned the fact that these signatures appeared on both of these documents, which contradicted each other, shows that the statement arose out of pure self interest and that there was no careful, scientific, analytical assessment made of what the churches' responsibility really was in reference to that particular institution.

I have also been concerned in the course of this controversy, which is soon coming to an end when the Senate completes the pouring of oil on the troubled waters tonight, about the misconception that has been left to go abroad that clergymen are not competent to be educators and administrators. This is based on a very ancient idea that clergymen are specialists in religious affairs but which has been shattered in our own time. It was also based on a false interpretation of both the Bible and of Christian theology that religion is a specialized pursuit that is confined to certain rituals, rites, ceremonies and places and when you close the church on a Sunday you lock God in and hold him captive so that he can have no influence whatever on the rest of your life. I want to shatter this misconception. Many of the clergymen of our nation were qualified and possessed the skill and talent, the training and experience to be many other things before they accepted the divine

call to serve as clergymen, but by so doing they did not abrogate their right because of the fact that they were clergymen—not in spite of, but because of the fact—to participate fully in all the affairs of the nation for which they might have been qualified and in which they might have experience. These men have given yeoman service in the field of education in Trinidad. I dare say that many of the hon. Senators seated here today would attribute some of their present standing in education to very distinguished and competent clergymen and priests who were all skilled in the art of administering secondary or primary schools and who were also well versed in the techniques of education. [*Applause*].

May I also point out, since it is relevant to the visit of the hon. Prime Minister of Canada, that in many other countries of the world, clergymen have taken a stand on this matter and have participated with distinction in a variety of fields, including politics. There is in the province of British Columbia a Pentecostal Minister who has been Minister of Transport for several years. He has been able to fulfil both his responsibilities because he has a private plane. There is also in Canada the leader of the party that holds the balance of power today, with all the due respect to the hon. Prime Minister of Canada, who was a Baptist Minister, the Hon. Tommy Douglas, and for over twenty years served as the Premier of one of the provinces. In his mind there is absolutely no idea whatsoever of being contradictory. He has been fulfilling both his callings and he, like many of the rest of us, regards both callings as being directly under the influence of Almighty God. In the most recent election in Canada there were over twenty clergymen who ran in the elections representing all the major parties and some of them were successful.

The religious bodies of this country have certain sectarian interests—they would not be religious bodies if they did not have sectarian interests; some of the time they exercise their right to have such interests within the framework of their own community, but the religious bodies in this country also hold the key to the development of the type of national character that will make this nation proud, and for this reason, in spite of my personal views, I feel that Government have been wise in ensuring that these religious bodies will be able to contribute in future to the development of national character and integrity, purpose and unity by all being partners of a national system of education.

I see in this Bill an attempt to provide a national system of education but what I do not see in it is an attempt to make that national system entirely state-controlled. I believe that the two things can exist side by side, that the two things can be merged into one—a national system of education in which the existing bodies that now participate in education will continue to do so. Perhaps in the decades that are ahead of us the Government will be grateful that they were guided in this particular instance to accept the help that the religious bodies are willing to offer.

I am coming close to the end of what I have to say, but I cannot stop without at least mentioning a clause that has been mentioned by everyone else, and that is clause 29. Here in this Bill the importance of religious education is not only recognized; it is enshrined. Here in this Bill religious education is regarded as being so important to general education as a whole that it is to be a compulsory part of the daily curriculum, the daily time-table, in every school. I do hope that those religious

[SENATOR REV. R. G. NEEHALL]

bodies that have made a good deal of noise will rise to the occasion and seize this opportunity, which has not been utilized fully in the past, and that those teachers in Government schools who wish to serve the church in this regard will also co-operate so that this may be the opportunity to encourage the moral development of children in this country with a good deal of religious instruction.

3.50 p.m.

The church and the state—and this again, as Senator Wight read to us a little while ago, forms part of our constitution—are both under the control of Almighty God; the constitution says that. The duty of the state as well as the church is derived from the Divine and Supreme Will. This Bill sets the limit, both for the denomination bodies as well as for the state, and I should like to reiterate this because I think it is important in order that we might calm some of the fears that have been engendered in the minds of some of our religious leaders that what is going to be done here is that the Government will have freedom to do as they like and that the religious bodies will only have the freedom to do what the Government like. This Bill makes it quite clear that there are limitations on both sides.

One fear that I have is that the administration of education is going to become so much more difficult and such a heavy responsibility that the Ministry of Education, as it is organized at the present time, will have some difficulty in implementing the various provisions of this Bill. I should like to have the assurance from the Leader of the Senate that this matter is not being overlooked; that the heavier responsibility that is going to be placed on his particular Ministry will be matched with comparable and effective machinery.

In conclusion I should like to quote—and although I am not permitted to speak on behalf of my Church on educational matters, I am not forbidden from speaking for my church—I should like to quote from the monthly magazine of our church, which reported in 1960 on a meeting that was held on September 8, 1960, to lay down policy, in the field of education, for the Presbyterian Church. Towards the end of this document, in which specific recommendations were made and accepted by that body, we read:

“Noting that ‘in the light of the outlook, assessments and recommendations of the Report of the Committee on General Education...’”

which bears your name, Mr. President—

“...we find no necessity for precipitate action such as offering to hand over to Government any of our primary or secondary schools or the Training College,’ the report, as accepted recommends that we continue to participate in education through them (through the schools) so long as the following irreducible minima are met...”

If this Bill meets those irreducible minima, then I believe it is my duty to support it—

“(a) ‘The moral and religious character and personality of all appointees to posts are acceptable to our Church authorities.

“(b) ‘Staffing arrangements, including transfers and appointments, meet with our approval.

“(c) ‘We continue to exercise full freedom to promote our programme in religious education, with consideration of the Conscience Clause as at present.

“(d) ‘Required curricula and text-books are considered by us to be acceptable in our schools on religious or moral grounds.

“(e) ‘All properties remain in the control of the Church....”

“(f) ‘ Our Church continues to consider that our participation in a given form of education fulfils our responsibility to Christ more fully than would our termination of such participation... ”

I am happy to announce that I am fully satisfied that the Bill, in its various clauses and regulations, has met these irreducible minima.

Senator R. J. Williams : Mr. President, I am a product of this denominational system about which so much has been said. I am a product of Roman Catholic schools. I have run the whole gamut from Western Boys' R.C., Belmont Intermediate, St. Mary's College. I have spent all this time in an atmosphere which some people say washes the brain and numbs the brain and leaves it with the inability to think. At St. Mary's I spent seven years, taught by expatriate Irish priests. At St. Mary's I was subject to the intolerable discipline of being benched for riding around the Savannah persistently, and despite warnings, with a girl every afternoon at the tender age of 13. I see that the new Bill adds the humiliation that this beating must be witnessed. I cannot imagine anything more humiliating. I am proud to be a product of this system, and I am very grateful for it. Unlike Senator Wight, I do not have an only daughter; I have—well, let us say I have many sons. And I only hope and pray that God has given them the talent to be able to get into a school like St. Mary's, where my hon. Friend from San Fernando and I spent many happy hours together.

So, I am an ardent believer in this denominational system, and I do not want to see anything done to harm it. I do not want to see anything done which might bring about its destruction. I also happen to be a member

of a political party. I joined it in May of 1956 when it was considered unfashionable, irreligious, indecent almost, to be a member of this party. I am a member of this party, which has been variously categorized as Godless, irreligious, communist, totalitarian, racist, anti-white, all-black, reactionary, anti-Catholic, anti-clerical—all sorts of nasty names which you can pull out of a hat. I had complete confidence in this party now accused in certain quarters of bringing in legislation that spells the doom of the denominational system which I value highly. I had confidence in this party and I continue to have complete faith and confidence in this party. I continue to be proud to be a member of this party because I consider that this party is the rock on which the independence and political stability of this country has been built.

4.00 p.m.

Now, we have a situation where the opponents of the Bill consider that the Bill spells the ruin and the doom of the denominational system. And peculiarly enough we have a very funny situation that some of those opponents of the Bill, this uninformed opposition to the Bill, thinks that the Bill is going to mean the end of the denominational system, and peculiarly enough, some of the ill-informed and uninformed supporters of the Bill also believe that this Bill spells the ruin and damnation of the denominational system; and among them are many party members or people who support the party. Peculiarly enough these people want to see the end of the denominational system, and it is those very people who, when push come to shove, as they say, and they have a boy child whom they want to get into school, fill out the application for the Common Entrance Examination, and usually the first choice they

put is the denominational school. With all due respect to Q.R.C., it is either St. Mary's, or if it is in the South, Naparima or Presentation. This is the peculiar situation that has developed.

Hon. Senators have already spoken about all the ferment that has gone on and all the controversy about this Bill, and today I cast the hon. Senator Julien in many roles. In addition to being a solicitor and a Senator it appears that he is also a very good opening batsman because he has taken the shine off the ball and the hon. Senators opposite have "put on the slow bowler"—as the hon. lady Senator said—or the "spin bowler". He has also drawn the teeth of the hon. lady Senator from San Fernando, and for my part he has stolen an awful lot of might from them. One might very well say that he is also a very good cook, because the hon. lady Senator from San Fernando "boiled down like bhajee".

Senator Wight : I am waiting for the bouncer.

Senator R. Williams : But, Mr. President, Senator Julien, whom I heard described by one of his Colleagues as a *porto l'eglise*, has given some of the most cogent arguments in support of this Bill. He has proved indisputably that there is nothing in this Bill that any denomination should fear. He has stolen my thunder in the sense that in my own poor layman's way I was hoping to do exactly as he did, and this probably means that I will not have to call for any extra fifteen minutes.

And what Senator Julien has done—I do not know whether he realizes it or not—is that he has given arguments that have answered adequately, most if not all of, the protests and objections raised by His Grace,

the Archbishop of Port-of-Spain in his pastoral letter entitled, "The Catholic Church" on the draft Education Bill. And after hearing the magnificent and eloquent and well reasoned, and well thought out contribution of Senator Neehall, as far as I am concerned, I would move a motion now that the question be now put and we all go home, except that I want to make two points on the denominational system.

I would ask anybody today—and I do not care what party he belongs to—to consider the role of the churches in education and to imagine where we would be today if the churches had not gone into the education business. The figures I have from a fairly reliable source are—it is my party's newspaper and it is the Prime Minister's newsletter—200,458 children were in 458 primary and intermediate schools; 46,305 children were in 94 Government schools—a fantastic figure! and roughly 154,000 in denominational schools, denominational schools to which Government on behalf of the taxpayers make very generous contributions, despite the fact that the hon. lady Senator from San Fernando thinks they are not half as generous as they could be.

I do not have the figures handy, but I think I am right in saying that until 1956, Queen's Royal College was probably the only Government secondary school. But while it is true to say that Government today give fairly generous assistance to denominational schools, what about the days when Government's assistance was not so generous or the days when Government's assistance was non-existent? Who built the schools? Who supported the schools? It was the churches—we all know that—from its own resources. The anti-cleric will say they bled the poor and all sorts of jazz but it was the churches from their own resources,

it was the churches by asking the adherents of their faith to contribute, by giving bazaars, by giving bingos, whatever it was, to raise the money to build those schools and to support those schools. And who staffed those schools? Who staffed, specifically, those secondary schools? Foreign missionaries. Who were the people and the organizations which have brought education in Trinidad to where it is today? People like the Canadian missions, the Anglican church, the Holy Ghost Fathers, the Benedictines, the Presentation Brothers.

41.0 p.m.

I suppose that some might call them birds of passage. Some were birds of passage, but they were a very peculiar sort of birds of passage. It was not the bird of passage that we in a colonial society were accustomed to see. It was not the bird of passage who was the British official serving time out in the colonies and moving on to greener pastures, to retire eventually in the green, green pastures of the British countryside with a sinecure directorship in some large British—except these days it is American—company. This was a very peculiar brand of bird of passage. If he moved on, he moved on because he was called on to labour in the Lord's vineyards in places far less pleasant than this beautiful island of Trinidad and Tobago. Not all were birds of passage. I suppose one could have called Fr. J. J. English a bird of passage because he did move on after serving many years here. But he returned to labour for many years in Johnny O'Halloran's constituency and eventually returned home where he died. Fr. English, I suppose, had eaten of the cascaradura, but for the Irish, I imagine, the blarney-stone has a much stronger magnetic quality than the cascaradura. I said before that all were not birds of passage. Many of them stayed

because they came to love the country; many stayed because of their vows of obedience; many of them have been in Trinidad and Tobago longer than many people in this country who now claim our citizenship.

A birth certificate, a naturalization certificate, a registration of citizenship certificate is not the true mark of the patriots of this country. We all know that there are many people who were born here in Trinidad and Tobago but their hearts and minds and bank accounts are overseas. We know that their wealth gained in Trinidad is invested overseas in helping to develop foreign countries, but they have local citizenship. The true patriots are people like the Grants and the Mortons who settled in Trinidad to raise Trinidad families, whose families today have given a record of service in this country unequalled by anyone. The true patriots, not the paper patriots, are people like Fr. Graf whose influence and, I suppose we could say "lash," has been felt by at least three generations of our citizens.

I have not mentioned very much the Dominican Order because I am not too familiar with their history. Suffice it to say that they brought religion and education to the remotest parts of our country, Blanchisseuse, Matelot and so on. I remember Fr. Hennessy who lived at Maraval relating me a story once—those of us who knew Fr. Hennessy would know how ludicrous this is—of his having to ride a jackass to give communion at Matelot. He was a big man, about six feet three inches tall, with a bald head. It was men like Fr. Hennessy who have made the denominational system what it is, which system if abolished would mean the ruin of education in this country.

Others have recognized the worth of these people. Despite the heat and the

controversy that has arisen recently, despite the heat of political platforms which is not conducive to, shall we say, making prudent statements, others have recognized the worth of these people. I shall quote from a statement made during a speech by Dr. Eric Williams on June 14, 1956 in the now famed "University of Woodford Square":

"Ladies and gentlemen, this man who demanded the exclusion of the Roman Catholic clergy from municipal government is the man who dares to attack as godless and irreligious the PNM, which has demanded representation for all the religious denominations in the second chamber which we have advocated in our constitution reform memorial. We have done so because we recognize the contributions of all the churches to social development in general in Trinidad and Tobago with particular reference to education, social welfare work, and such health services as the Seventh-day Adventist clinics, and because of the stand taken by the churches outside of Trinidad and Tobago on several issues of vital importance to our people. Suffice it here to mention once again the policy towards trade unions enunciated by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII in the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* in 1893, the firm stand taken by the Irish clergy against imperialism in the past century and the opposition of Christian churches of all denominations to racial discrimination in the Union of South Africa and the United States of America which is so ably stated in the UNESCO publications, *The Catholic Church and The Race Question* and the *Ecumenical Movement and the Racial Problem*".

That is a quotation from the Re-statement of Fundamental Principle, a speech delivered

by Dr. Eric Williams in 1956. So you see, there are many people more learned and educated than I who have also recognized the contributions which these people have made, despite recent statements.

But while we recognize and we are grateful for the job that these missionaries have done, these missionaries who have ministered to our spiritual and educational needs, what is necessary, what is desirable, what is needed in the new conditions of independence, let us face it, is a national clergy. I agree entirely with the statement made that from the top down in every clergy there should be a national of Trinidad and Tobago. I do not mean mere paper nationals. Naturalizing oneself tomorrow may, I suppose, make one a national legally but it really will not make one a true national.

How does one go about developing a national clergy? If we need engineers we give so many scholarships in engineering, but do we put an advertisement in the press saying that so many people are required for priest work, please apply to the Ministry of Education? Obviously, this is not the way that it can happen because we all know that the priesthood is not a career that one simply chooses; it is a vocation, a calling. Unfortunately, so far in Trinidad and Tobago so few have been called and so few have been chosen. I think Senator Julien made the point that the churches most of all recognize that the success lies not only in getting more and more converts or keeping people close to the faith, but what is important is the number of native vocations that they get. And the churches have not done a bad job. I consider Senator Neehall a shining example of the kind of job the Presbyterian Church has done.

I come now to one of the greatest, if not the greatest, institution in Trinidad and

Tobago—St. Mary's College. At St. Mary's College today there are 20 Holy Ghost Fathers in residence, out of whom 14 are nationals born in Trinidad and Tobago. Incidentally, out of these 14 nationals 12, at least 12 of the native clergy—Jerry Pantin would be amazed to hear me refer to him as native clergy—twelve of them have university degrees, many of them with a higher diploma in education. St. Mary's has contributed two of their native priests to Fatima. They have four native priests in the parishes and one at the university at St. Augustine, who is a lecturer in mathematics. They have recently started a seminary in Arima and they have five boys up there, all of them with G.C.E. "A" Level; in other words, university material, and the plan is for these seminarians to eventually go to the university. They have four more who hope to enter in 1966. In the Holy Ghost Fathers Seminary in Ireland there are seven studying. This is a really fantastic record and I have not yet mentioned that the Holy Ghost Fathers have seven of our native boys who are priests helping Africans in Nigeria. I have always asked this question, why have them over there, why not bring them back home?

4.20 p.m.

I think we in Trinidad owe a debt to the mother house of the Holy Ghost Fathers in assisting them in whatever parts of the world they labour. So one can say that Trinidad and Tobago, long before any official organization, has been rendering technical assistance to its African brothers. So here we have an institution that is nationally oriented. I submit, and I think many of us realize it, that if all of us who clamour for a national clergy, are to have this we must have the denominational schools maintained and strengthened. In

other words to have a completely national clergy we must have denominational schools.

There is one small point I want to make about social discrimination and my Friend from San Fernando will be pleased to know that at last we have found a common ground of agreement. Social discrimination exists in Trinidad and Tobago and in all parts of the world in varying degrees. Do not let anybody fool you about "all ah we is one", and this is a happy example of all the races living together. Do not tell me social discrimination does not exist—black against white, light brown against lighter brown, white against black. It exists in many Catholic schools, but I do not think it is true to say that social discrimination is the general pattern in Catholic schools or in the religious schools.

Somehow or other numbers always seem to be controversial; first it was 60-40, now it is 80-20. One should sit down and listen to the views of the denominations and the principals of the assisted secondary schools, with which I do not agree, but which I understand. The point of view, as I understand it, is that for years private citizens have been supporting, out of their private means, the various denominational church colleges. For years they have built up an Old Boys' Association, they have ex-students. The colleges feel that they owe a debt to these people who have supported the college financially and otherwise and that they should place their sons into, let us say, C.I.C. And this is why the principals of the secondary schools felt they should have the right to choose the people even in the eighty per cent.

I put forward this point of view: "You mean to tell me if my son makes 79 per cent and I am a product of C.I.C. but John Quacoo's son from behind the bridge makes

Education Bill
[SENATOR R. J. WILLIAMS]

Tuesday, 14th December, 1965

Education Bill

83 per cent and you have room for only one that John Quacoo's son must get squeezed out in favour of mine. They answered and said, "Yes, because this is the debt that we owe to our past pupils".

I cannot agree with this sort of thing. That is why I feel that this 80-20 method of allocation of the places as contained in regulation 60 of the Education (Schools and Teachers' Colleges) Regulations is the only logical way to work it. I suppose you could say the Minister could be just as discriminatory as the college principal, but he cannot be, because the regulations state that he must use the order of merit and in making his selection he shall take into account the denominational character of the school and shall be guided by the following considerations: the choice of school by the parent or guardian and the religious persuasion of the pupil.

Those were two things that I wanted to get off my chest. I want to end up by saying that I have absolutely no hesitation in supporting this Bill.

4.28 p.m.

Sitting suspended.

5.03 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

The Minister without Portfolio (Senator the Hon. W. J. Alexander): Mr. President, it may sound paradoxical, but it is true that in my view the criticisms and arguments that have been advanced here today against this Bill at this sitting are the best arguments in support of the Bill. The conflicts and animosities that have been injected into the arguments about this Bill from the time it was published, inside and outside Parliament, reflect—if I might put it in this way—the pattern of the society which has been produced

by the system of education which the Government now seek to modify.

We have had the inglorious spectacle of religion against religion, religion divided against itself, one social organization against another, one teachers' organization against another teachers' organization, the Teachers Union divided against itself, political parties, of course, opposed to political parties, and even political parties divided against themselves over the introduction of this legislation. In my view that is a supreme argument for the necessity of this Bill.

I do not think I need to cite any sort of constitutional or historical arguments why the Government have chosen to bring forward this Bill. It seems to me that there are two unchallengeable and indisputable propositions which stand out in respect of the introduction of this legislation. The historical fact that this country of ours attained independence is, in my view, a supreme necessity for the re-shaping of the system of education which has gone on over the days of the colonial past to suit the needs and aspirations of an independent Trinidad and Tobago. As a natural corollary to that, I would say that there is no gainsaying the fact that the present system of education has, in spite of its glories, so to speak, serious defects. Some of these defects have been aired in this debate in this hon. Senate, and there are some of them to which some of us prefer to turn a blind eye.

I do not want to inject into this debate at this stage any sort of high tension because it seems to me—and I think I reflect the opinion of the Senate—that the speeches in this debate have been very moderate. The pattern was set, so to speak, by the very moderate speech made by Senator Lange, and the call for moderation made

by Senator Sir Patrick Hobson; and those who have enunciated any criticism against the Bill, I think, have done so in a spirit of honest sincerity, without any venom or animosity, and it is in this spirit I want to continue.

As I said, it is superfluous to try to advance any argument for the necessity for the introduction of this Bill by the Government. It is surprising, however, that the die-hard opponents of the Bill have, as is the wont nowadays, appealed to constitutional rights and freedoms enshrined in the constitution, and all that sort of thing. And it is very surprising that these same people who appealed to constitutional rights and freedoms and declarations of this liberty and that liberty, these are the very ones who seem to want to deny the representatives of the people, the Government, from coming forward in the interests of the people and in the national interests, and shaping the system of education of this country in order to meet the needs and aspirations of independence.

But if I needed any historical argument I would only need to allude to the foundation document of the People's National Movement, its statement of fundamental principles, commonly known as The People's Charter. Ever since the foundation of the PNM in 1956 it has been enshrined in the Charter that we would examine the system of education, which everybody knows is rooted in the colonial and imperialist past, in order to provide for the country a system more in keeping with the progress and national aspirations of the people. In the implementation of that pledge it is now an historical fact that in 1957 the then Minister of Education under the first PNM Government set up a national committee to enquire into the system of education

and make recommendations. The terms of reference of that committee are in the Education Report, 1959, of the Committee on General Education—you will forgive me, Sir, but it is a well known fact that you, Mr. President, were the distinguished chairman of that committee which produced that Report, which I consider a very famous landmark in the history of education in this country.

As I was saying, the terms of reference of that Committee were to consider the operation of the educational system of the country and make recommendations on future policy relating to the curriculum, the improvement of the academic and other standards and the integration of the diverse elements which comprise our population. It is well known, too, that after this committee produced its famous report the Cabinet met and made certain very minor amendments, and in a document called Cabinet Proposals on Education presented those recommendations to the Legislative Council and they were approved on the 25th July, 1960. Those recommendations, if I might say so at this stage, contained very far-reaching provisions, and it is surprising that at that stage when they were presented to the Legislative Council there was no dissent. But today when the Government, after years of consideration and deliberation, have brought forward a Bill for the implementation of some of those recommendations a tremendous outcry and hullabaloo has been set up, and even before the full intention of the Government became known, even at the stage when merely the Bill and not the regulations had been published, some people raised almost a hue and cry against it and paralysed themselves, I would say, by the fears of what the legislation would probably do.

[HON. W. J. ALEXANDER]

However, we have heard here at this sitting of the Senate that even the most ardent protagonists of those interested parties in our country could find very little fault with this Bill, and they themselves, I hope, would support it when the final question comes to be put.

5.15 p.m.

The criticisms of this Bill have been many, and I merely want to touch on some of them, the major ones, in a very general sort of way. One of the fundamental criticisms, particularly at the time of the publication of the Bill, was that the Minister of Education and Culture had been given too much power. In my submission that is a fundamental misconception on the part of those who advanced that criticism. And it was surprising the high places from which that criticism came. It was surprising that that criticism came from people who had vowed that they had read the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago, and who blatantly pronounced their standing upon the rights and freedoms in the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago. And it seems to me that they did not even take the trouble to learn, they could not even come to the realization, that in a ministerial system of Government, the Minister is at the head of a Ministry and he is responsible for policy direction and for the administration of that Ministry.

I think that that misconception in great part, was due to the fact that the subjection which has been engendered from the colonial past in the ways of thinking and action of some people has not yet left them. They are, some of them, very proud to be citizens of an independent Trinidad and Tobago, but their thinking harks back to the old colonial days and the old institutions;

they cannot divest themselves from the shackles of the colonial traditions.

Too many people in this country, even those who call upon the sacred pronouncements of freedom of rights and all that sort of thing enshrined in the constitution, have not read the constitution and really do not know of its provisions. These people who said that the powers of the Minister were almost unlimited and that the Minister could almost do what he liked, would prefer, some of them, that a committee, that an official, perhaps, of the Ministry should have that power; but the Minister who is the head of the Ministry, who is responsible to Cabinet, is not to have that power, in the view of these people. I cannot understand the thinking and the mentality of such persons, and as I said, they are to be found in very high places in this country. It seems to me—and I repeat—that the expression of that sort of thinking is one of the greatest arguments for bringing forward this Bill which will give us, to some extent, a national system of education.

As I said, my remarks will be very general. Most of the details have been gone into by previous speakers, and I would not want to take up the time of this Senate in going over the ground that has already been covered by previous speakers. It is the fashion to speak sometimes almost unrestrainedly of the contributions made to education in this country. Far be it from me, as a product of that system, to deny the very great contribution that has been made by the denominations, the religious bodies, and the earlier religious missionaries in the cause of education in this country. That contribution has indeed been great. As a matter of fact, for the purposes of the record, I should like to read, with your leave, Sir, a passage from the Maurice

Committee Report—as it has come to be known—the report of the Committee on General Education—in respect of that contribution. I prefer to use the language in it because I think it is so happily expressed there and expressed in terms which are much better than those in which I could express them.

This is what the Maurice Committee says in respect of that contribution, at page 32, paragraph 6 of that section of its report:

“On the one hand long before Government fully recognized its responsibility to its people the Christian church had played a great and important part in making provision for education. And this country like so many others is much indebted for much of its educational growth to the great part which had been played, and is still being played, with and without Government aid, by the many missions and communities of devoted men and women in holy orders, who came to these shores and established schools and assisted in financing certain educational services. More recently, the contribution by the non-Christian bodies has been given official recognition . . .”

I endorse those remarks of the Committee. As a matter of fact, it is a source of pride to me that I happened to be a member of that Committee and to serve under so distinguished an educationist as the chairman of that committee, our President. But when that is said and when some of the things that have been said here in respect of the contribution of the denominations have been said, there is still something more to be said. Some of us, of course, will prefer to leave that something unsaid, but there is an obverse side of the coin, and there is no doubt that, possibly owing to a lack of foresight and in the, if I may

put it that way, keen competition and rivalries between these bodies, some of the greater principles of education were sometimes forgotten. I prefer here again to refer to a summary in respect of the obverse side of the coin, to refer to a summary in the Maurice Committee Report. I consider this report such a Bible in respect of the history of education in this country that you will forgive me, Mr. President, if I refer to it from time to time during the course of my remarks.

On page 32 where the contribution of the denominational systems, which I have just read to you, appears, this is what the report says:

“But there has grown up with this service of the churches a number of drawbacks inherent in the very nature of the partnership and accentuated by the racial and—religious differences—of this population. And it is idle to deny that there are drawbacks, which apparently were never anticipated and evidently not forestalled, and to which reference has been made from time to time in this Report.”

And continuing:

“Admittedly, it might be debated as to what extent this dichotomous education, with its fifteen separate administrative denomination boards . . .”

Now, I understand from the Leader of the Senate that there are seventeen—

“... may have had the tendency to create, or will tend to create an unfortunate division of plural and parallel societies in Trinidad and Tobago. But it could be said here and now that the system appears to have grown up with no eye to our future maturity as a self-governing and single nation having a single aim and purpose and with a common loyalty as one undivided people.”

[HON. W. J. ALEXANDER]

It is in respect of this criticism, I think, that Government have thought it right and proper and their duty to bring forward this Bill in order to remedy some of the more glaring defects in a system which could not have taken into consideration the fact of our independent status and our right to progress as a single and united nation.

5.25 p.m

It has been said in another context—forgive me for repeating it here—that every system contains within it the germs of its own disintegration. With the best will in the world and the best efforts of those who have made great sacrifices over the years in respect to the denominational system, I do not think anyone would gainsay the fact that certain difficulties have crept into the system, certain glaring deficiencies which need remedying. This Bill, as Senator Neehall said in his very remarkable contribution to this debate for which I praise him, seeks to remedy some of those abuses which have crept into the system. It is not a Bill that seeks by any means, as some detractors of the Government have dared to suggest, (they have not read the Bill), to abolish the denominational system. If anything—and here I agree wholeheartedly with Senator Neehall—this Bill entrenches dual control in our education system and it does so in a sort of permanent way; it does so in a way which will be very difficult for any succeeding government, it seems to me, to eradicate or to make any attempt to eradicate it.

Violent critics of the denominational system have criticized the system with a certain amount of justification as wasteful, uneconomical and unproductive, particularly in a society with tradition such as ours of certain tendencies towards discrimination, racial and otherwise, and definitely—I do not think anyone can gainsay this—religious

segregation. The figures are there; they have been brought to the fore and highlighted in this very report which some of us probably have not taken the trouble to read. It is true of course that some of us prefer to ignore these facts.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am a product of the denominational system. I know it and I claim to know it—I believe that you, Mr. President will support me in this—as good as anyone else. I have been a pupil in it; I have grown up as a master in it and I have guided people in it. I claim to know it as good as anyone else. I want to make it perfectly clear that what I say is not in the spirit of harsh denunciation of the system but is really an attempt to correct the balance of opinion between those for and those against it. In a sense what I am trying to do is to put the record straight on this issue.

Another criticism that has been levelled against the Bill is that it would destroy the denominational character of the assisted schools. As a matter of fact, we have before us an amendment proposed by Senator Wight in terms which, she thinks, are calculated—if I interpret her correctly—to preserve that denominational character in the provisions of the Bill. I must confess, in spite of what I said about my knowledge of the system, that I am a little concerned to know what precisely is meant by the term “denominational character of the school”. Where is it to be found really? Is it to be found in the children who go to the school or in the teachers who teach in the schools? Is it to be found in the religion taught in the schools or the atmosphere? Is it in the aspects of the education provided in such schools or in the sum total of the aspects of the education provided in such schools? I fail to understand or to appreciate precisely what is meant by this nebulous, almost indefinable

characteristic of the denominational character of the schools. That is one reason why if I had to consider this amendment proposed by Senator Wight that it would make me think twice as a lawyer before I tried to enshrine something in terms which are so inexplicable or impossible of interpretation. As I said, it is very difficult to say what is meant by "denominational character of the schools" and it is very difficult to appreciate where it is to be found.

Senators may know that one of the reasons why the Government brought forward this Bill is because of the statistics which they have faced in respect of the pupils who attend denominational schools. I wish to refer again to this famous report at page 16. There is something said there about the denominational system which, I think, might be of assistance to this Senate. Paragraph 11 states :

"Now, the ideal of the denominational system, as a committee member stated it, is that each denominational school should have only children of its own faith attending it. But the Committee strongly disagreed with this sort of segregation or segmentation and considered it most undesirable for this cosmopolitan country. The missionary or evangelical objective of the early years in setting up a school is now long past and the Ordinance by its regulations 147, 149 provides against proselytising and the giving of religious instruction by teachers of one faith to children of another. However, with religion as the common bond applications for schools are still made and schools are put up whose pupil content is no longer denominational. And so conditions fell far short of the denominational ideal, which might be illustrated from the following figures..."

Then there is a very interesting table which

shows that a remarkable percentage of pupils who attend a particular denominational school are not of the religion of that denomination at all. Maybe that is a good thing. I think Senator Wight made some sort of reference to the sort of thing which obtains, for example, in Presbyterian schools, and possibly Senator Neehall will bear out and support that remark. I shall not read the table of figures. It is there in proof of the point made by the Committee, but I should like to read the paragraph which follows because it summarizes the sort of thing you have in this so-called denominational system.

5.35 p.m.

I am not making these remarks in any criticism of a system which has produced so much good, but I am trying really to put, for purposes of the record, the actual fact of the situation devoid of too much sentiment and devoid of blind and unreasoning bigotry. I quote :

"The above figures speak for themselves and are not without special significance. Eighty per cent. of the children attending Presbyterian primary schools are not Presbyterian. Sixty per cent. of the children attending Methodist schools are not Methodist; and so too with respect to thirty per cent. of the Muslim League; forty per cent. of the Anglicans, thirty-five per cent. of the Ayra Pratindhi Sabha; twenty-five per cent. of the Roman Catholics and seventeen per cent. of the Sanatan Dharma Maha Sabha."

There are several of these Hindu bodies; I think there are at least three of them—the SPMS, the APS and the KPC. That sort of thing is good in its way, but I sometimes wonder, and the committee was very much concerned about that state of affairs existing

[HON. W. J. ALEXANDER]

in a small country such as ours, a country of less than one million people and less than 2,000 square miles. It is all well and good to talk of denominational systems and dual systems in large countries where you have one hundred million people and one religion has one million, for example, in the United Kingdom with over fifty million, or in the United States. But in a small country this is where the critics of the system have some justification for their criticism. Where you have a small population such as ours with our limited resources, to have seventeen different denominations catering for the schools of the country is something which gives great concern and should give great concern to right thinking members of the community.

It is quite clear from the provisions in this Bill that we are not minded, as I said, to abolish that system, but no one can be against Government for trying to regularize that situation and to produce certain economies and standards of uniformity and for trying to prevent that sort of chaotic state in the authorities, and if it is possible to do so, to weld together the people of this country by starting at the only place where you could start—in the schools and with the children.

We sometimes pay lip service to the question of social equality, unity and living in harmony but we have to face the real facts of the situation and—forgive me for making this point because I am deeply concerned that is why I say over and over again in the party to which I belong that you could erect all the monumental works you like; you can improve the economy of this country; you can do what you like with all these things, but unless you produce a good system of education, producing good people, united and welded together with some sort of common

outlook and patriotism you will achieve, as far as I am concerned, very little.

Another criticism of the Bill reflected here in this debate is that the Concordat, this famous—and if I may take a leaf out of the book of Senator Neehall's I may say, this infamous—document called the Concordat has been disregarded. It has been said that the provisions have been violated. I think it was Senator Neehall who said—I am paraphrasing him very roughly—it would have been much better if that concordat had never been entered into at all, because he thinks as he puts it, that the concordat as it were gave a certain weapon to the denominational bodies and a certain warranty as it were for their outcry and demands as soon as the Bill was published. I do not go as far as that, but I do want for purposes of the record, to say something about that criticism which says there has been a violation of the concordat.

Senator Lange read out the concordat for us. He told us—I say so subject to correction—that he was more or less satisfied that the provisions of the Concordat, subject to one or two minor things, had been complied with in the Bill or in the Regulations. I hope I represent and reflect the views of Senator Lange correctly. Senator Julien, however, was rather critical of the position and of Government's attitude towards the Concordat, at least in his opening vitriolic remarks last evening. Today, he seemed to agree to a great extent and toned down some of the views that he expressed last evening. I hope I am representing him correctly. I want to get his remarks as closely as possible, not verbatim, but a summary of them.

In his view Government had committed a breach of the undertaking which they had given at the Independence Conference at

5.45 p.m.

Marlborough House to have the spirit and intendment of the concordat enshrined in regulations made by the Public Service Commission. I think that is a fair representation of what he said. I was a little surprised to hear Senator Julien talk about violation of the Marlborough House agreement!

Senator Julien : I was particularly careful on the point. I said Government, in my view, did not commit any breach. All I said was that they had agreed to it and up to now we have not yet seen the Regulations.

Senator W. J. Alexander : I am glad to hear his present pronouncement but I have a statement taken when he was speaking on the side of my copy of the Concordat which does not seem to coincide with what he has just said but I should prefer to preserve the harmony of this debate and take what he just said as what he meant. I was going to say that I was a little surprised to hear Senator Julien make such a remark because Senator Julien more than anybody else in this Senate would know that the question of the Public Service Commission Regulations is a matter for the Public Service Commission and not Government as such. The Public Service Commission makes its own regulations. The only person who has anything to do with them on the Government side is the Prime Minister who may approve them. I think he has had the assurance from the Leader of the Senate that the spirit and intention of the agreement made at Marlborough House at the Independence Conference—and I happened to be a delegate of this country, as he knows—has been carried out in the Regulations.

As we know, the primary school teachers have been put under the control of the

Public Service Commission. That system has been in operation now for the past three years—the leader of the Senate will correct me if I am wrong—and there has been no dissatisfaction with that. None of the fears that have been expressed by anyone as to a transfer of a man from a Catholic school to a Hindu school and all that sort of rubbish, none of those fears have been realized. And I would hate to think that anyone in this Senate would try to impugn the integrity and the impartiality of the members of the Public Service Commission by suggesting that they would depart in any way from the spirit of the concordat in that or any respect.

There are one or two other remarks I should like to make about this document. As I said before, Senator Lange read it and I will not burden you by reading it again. But this document has been elevated by the opponents to the Bill into an agreement between church and state. It seems to me that even lawyers quite loosely are referring to it as an agreement. I have a version. I do not know whether it is the revised version or the authorized version—the one that Senator Lange used—but I have a copy of it, and it seems to me that any person reading this document could get no such impression, could extract no such meaning. I am not now trying in any way to deny the assurances given by the then Minister of Education, approved by the Cabinet, on the provisions of this document. I want to make myself perfectly clear on that. But when someone talks of a document as an agreement it sorts of beats my comprehension when you read the very first paragraph of this document, which is in these terms:—

“The Minister of Education and Culture wishes to clarify, for general information, some of the proposals on education with

[HON. W. J. ALEXANDER]

reference to the re-organization of education so far as these proposals affect the Denominational Boards of Management, the Governing Bodies and Principals of Assisted Secondary Schools."

I have emphasized deliberately some of the words.

Mr. President : Sorry to interrupt you, but your speaking time has expired.

Motion made and Question proposed, That the hon. Senator's speaking time be extended by 20 minutes.—[The Attorney General].

Question put and agreed to.

Hon. Senator's speaking time extended accordingly.

Senator Alexander : I wish to thank hon. Senators for extending my time. I do hope I would not take up all of the 20 minutes. As I myself have to leave just now I shall hurry through the rest of my remarks as quickly as possible.

I was on the point that I had deliberately emphasized certain words as I read that paragraph. I cannot see how anyone could call this document an agreement between church and state—

"The Minister wishes to clarify, for general information..."

It is no more and no less, in my respectful submission, than a statement of policy given by the then Minister of Education and Culture in respect of certain proposals—they were only in a proposal stage—certain proposals that Government had in mind to introduce at that stage. It is nothing more nor less than that, in my respectful view. It is not a comprehensive statement, even of policy; it is not by any means a final statement. It envisages quite deliberately that

changes would be forthcoming, and it did give some assurance, to be quite frank, that certain rights would be protected and certain responsibilities would be respected.

As I said, it is quite clear—and I think other speakers have emphasized this point before me—that the object and purpose of this Bill—which is very modest in its pretensions if you look at the preamble to it—is merely to make better provision for the education of this country. It is not any sort of radical earth-shaking document, as I understand it. It is very modest in its pretensions. If one were to compare the Cabinet proposals, which were decisions on the recommendations of the Maurice Committee Report, one would see how emasculated—if I may say so with great respect—those decisions of Cabinet in 1960 appear in this Bill. I still wonder, and I am still considerably surprised about the hullabaloo that was raised over the introduction of this Bill, a Bill which—I repeat—entrenches the denominational system; a Bill which elevates what was mere agreement and contract, so to speak, between the state and the denominational bodies, to a statutory position, giving it the force of law. That is the Bill that some of its opponents—I say this with a certain degree of moderation—with calculated ignorance or blindness of its provisions, have attacked so vehemently, outside of Parliament particularly.

I am very grateful today that all the speakers who have spoken in this Senate so far have set a tone of moderation and calmness about this legislation. As I said in my opening remarks, even those who have been critically opposed have expressed their criticism in a spirit of honesty and sincerity of purpose, which is truly admirable.

I now turn to what in my view are the main features of the Bill. In my view,

this Bill enshrines and guarantees the constitutional rights and position of the child, of the parent and of the teacher. This Bill gives the teacher and the teaching profession as a whole a new status and dignity. This Bill, in my view, strives to ensure a more equitable distribution and better control of the expenditure of public funds. It preserves and permanently integrates the dual system of control into the system of education of this country, and finally, I think, it endeavours to recognize in the operation of the system the principles of social justice enshrined in the preamble of our constitution.

5.55 p.m.

We have only to turn to the provisions of the Bill, and I would just refer hon. Senators to certain clauses which, in my view, enshrine and protect the well-being of the child in this community and ensure for it its social and legal entitlements. Clause 7 of the Bill, for example, reads:

“No person should be refused admission to any public school on account of religious persuasion, race, social status or language of such person or his parent.”

That is the protection of a constitutional right.

Under clause 13 the Minister is under a duty to provide such number of public schools as, in his opinion, are necessary to secure a sufficient number of school places for children of compulsory school age.

Clause 22 deals with a prohibition on the imposition of charges or other requirements on pupils. That ensures for the child that he is not made the victim of any unjust demands and charges in order to get an education. I do not want to go into any details, but it is quite clear that in some

schools there are so many extras—if I may put it that way—that a child has to pay that his poor parents cannot keep up in the race. This Bill protects the parent and the child from any such unjust demands.

Clause 29 is a provision which has already been referred to. It deals with a conscience clause which ensures that every person is protected in his right to worship in the faith or religion of his choice and not suffer any victimization for doing so in any way at all.

Clause 75 deals with the compulsory school age and the offences dealing with that particular provision. That ensures that the children of the compulsory school age are bound to go to school and get an education. And so throughout the regulations there are provisions ensuring the constitutional rights of the child. In a similar way, the constitutional rights of the parent are enshrined in this Bill, and in a more expressive manner the fundamental rights of the teacher. The teacher in this community has for far too long, particularly in recent years, not been given his just due, and this Bill seeks in several ways to give a new dignity and status to the teacher in the community.

This Bill, by the provisions for having a register, the provisions for security of tenure and such other things, ensures that the teacher is not victimized through sometimes having to serve too many masters, through sometimes being under too many authorities. This Bill by the integration of the Teaching Service, which it hopes to achieve, will ensure that the disparity, so to speak, and the discrimination against the primary school teacher, which existed for far too long, will be corrected, will be modified. If there is not horizontal integration there will be, at least, the beginning

of some sort of vertical integration in the Teaching Service. And this has been very long in coming.

This was referred to in the Maurice Committee Report on Education at page 41; and I should like to enshrine this passage in the record:

“The tradition of dealing with primary schools and school teachers has followed a colonial practice and has been quite different and separate from the tradition of dealing with secondary schools and school teachers. In the former case there has been the rigid dual control and administration of primary education exercised by the church and Government whose powers reinforce each other under the provisions of an exacting code of regulations. In the latter case there has been the complete absence of this control, and secondary education, though given generous aid from public funds has gone on without even the exercise of Government supervision except in the limited way of filling appointments to its own two secondary schools. . .”

There were only two at the time—

“...the staffs of which hold office as civil servants. The Committee is of the opinion that the policy in dealing with secondary education is quite wrong, and that the time has come for the effective administration of secondary education by Government, and that Government should integrate its policy in dealing with primary and secondary schools and school teachers. Accordingly the Committee recommends that the proposed code of regulations for secondary education as per draft of April, 1965, which has been for some time in draft form should be revised in the light of the recommendations made in this report

and that with proper exception its provisions be incorporated and integrated with those affecting primary education.”

All this has been agreed to as long ago as the Cabinet proposals on education. There was no furore then; there was no outcry then. Strangely today that Government is enshrining this in this Bill we have had all this tremendous criticism about these things.

6.05 p.m.

There is so much more that I should like to say about this Bill on this historic occasion but my time is running out; I am warned that I have just a few minutes more and I do not want to risk any extension of time and in consequence I would wind up my remarks.

I think it is only right and proper that provision should be made and machinery set up for the proper control of Government funds. After all, as the Leader of the Senate has said, who foots the Bill? It is the Government that pay the tuition fees of all pupils in the secondary schools as well as all salaries and pensions of all teachers in all schools; that give grants for the construction of denominational schools and grants for various purposes such as for the maintenance and extension of school buildings; all this apart from the fringe benefits of scholarships and study leave with pay for the improvement of teachers and so on. So why should not the Government provide machinery for the protection of the taxpayers' money? I do not think anyone could really have any quarrel with that.

Some people feel that this Bill has not gone far enough. As I have already pointed out, it does not carry out all the provisions that have been accepted from the report of the Maurice Committee on General

Education. Some of the provisions of that report are carried out in an emasculated sort of way. To some people this Bill has not gone far enough to eradicate some of the worst abuses and evils of a system which is a heritage of the colonial past. But I think everyone will agree—and from the expressions in this Senate on this Bill everyone agrees—that Government have made a conscientious attempt to redress the balance between their own rights and responsibilities in providing a system of education and the desires and the duties and responsibilities of the denominational authorities that have been associated with education in this country for so long.

The Minister of Education and Culture (Senator the Hon. D. P. Pierre): Mr. President, I beg to move,

That the business of this Senate be continued until all the matters on the Order Paper have been disposed of.

Question put and agreed to.

Senator J. F. F. Rojas: Mr. President, the Bill before us this evening is a Bill “to make better provision for the promotion of education in Trinidad and Tobago”. This is a very simple definition and a very laudable objective. I have sat here since yesterday evening and have listened with very mixed feelings to the various speeches delivered here. At one time I thought to myself that I should abandon any idea of speaking on this Bill. There was a fluctuation in my feelings and sentiments; sometimes I became emotional, sometimes very rational and very sober. I am happy to say that Senator Lange, who was supported by Senator Hobson, set a very good pattern with his contribution. The contributions of both Senators were very sober and they set the pattern for the debate.

When I consider what I have heard about this Bill in the discussions which took place in other places, when I consider what I read in the newspapers—the adverse comments and the derogatory remarks of various organizations and groups in connexion with this Bill—I am very happy that this Senate has maintained a high standard and a dignified approach in this debate which, I think, is unparalleled in all the discussions that have taken place on this Education Bill.

Much has been said on this Bill since yesterday and I am sure that the very speakers who have gone before me have dealt with all the important omissions and corrections which could be made to the Bill. At this late hour in the evening I shall avoid repetition as much as I can. I simply propose to make a few general statements. There is one important point which I want to advance here this evening for the good of this Senate, for the good of the denominational bodies and particularly one denomination.

Senator Neehall made a very commendable speech this afternoon. I have always thought him a very great orator and he has certainly displayed his capabilities this afternoon. He has served as a psychiatrist in curing a particular ailment from which I have been suffering for some weeks now. I had read in the press of a Presbyterian minister in Princes Town who, in the course of his acid denunciation of this Bill, not only condemned Government and other people but also took the National Anthem and made the most discreditable remarks about it. I then began to have second thoughts about members of these denominational boards, about the principals of these schools and these religious heads, and this particular religious body. I believe that Senator Neehall has done this evening a very great

service to the denomination to which he belongs and perhaps to all of us. He has certainly convinced me that one should not judge the denomination or a religious body by what one or two members of that denomination or organization may say.

6.15 p.m.

I believe that the purpose of the draft Bill was to induce discussion and a debate by all principals. That was the purpose of putting out the Bill at the time when it was brought out. Many things have been said during the debates on the Bill by all persons who were concerned with education, but it is the sort of thing which we must expect. To my mind, that is what the Bill was intended to do.

A number of changes were accepted by Government and it is very heartening to hear today from some of the speakers who themselves led the way in reiterating and pointing out the many changes which were advanced and accepted by Government. That is certainly a credit rather than a discredit to Government.

The most important thing which we have heard all these weeks and months during the discussions on this Bill is the need to preserve the denominational character of the schools. I have not seen anything in this Bill which seems to interfere with the rights of the various denominational boards to pursue their religious teaching and training, whether it be in the private school, the denominational school or the Government school.

In point of fact, I think this Bill was long overdue. I believe that Government have perhaps in their modesty and in a spirit of compromise not gone as far as

they ought to have gone in the changes which ought to have been made in the education system and policy of Government at the present time. As Senator Neehall rightly put it, this is an age in which we have to approach our education with the modern and revolutionary policy which embodies education not only for a section of the community, not only for those with sectional interests, but both national and international interests.

I heard quite a great deal being said about the concordat, and I wondered whether, in truth and in fact, there was any concordat. The people representing the views of the church and the denominational boards have expressed such great fear for the introduction of this Bill and what it proposes.

I attended one of the meetings of the Catholic denomination at one of their colleges and in the course of the examination of the Bill one of their Ministers of religion simply struck fear into the minds and hearts of the people as to what is going to be the power of the Minister of Education and what is going to be the results of the right of the parents to have their children receive religious training in the schools of their choice. Government were not diplomatic, he said; they ought to have called the denominational boards and discussed it with them before introducing the Bill. Quite a number of things have been said. It is too late to go into the details and sufficient has already been said. The Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England and the denominational boards have been loudest in condemnation, and above all the Roman Catholic Church. I tried to find out a little about the concordat and the background of the Roman Catholic Church in relation to this concordat.

I took the Webster New World Dictionary and tried to discover what the original concordat was. I came across Vatican, Vaticanism, Vatican City. I then tried to find out what the definitions of these were. I tried to find out what was the Vatican City and how it operates and it was . . .

Mr. President: I do not want to anticipate you too much, but I think you are being irrelevant.

Senator Rojas: I think it is important to point out that the Roman Catholic Denominational Board is an arm of the Catholic Church and the Catholic Church is an arm of the Vatican City and the Vatican City is a sovereign state. The Vatican City is a sovereign state with the Pope at the head and the denominational board represents the Vatican City as an arm of an independent sovereign state. This is not irrelevant to the point of issue.

Trinidad and Tobago is an independent sovereign state with its own right to introduce, organize, revise, advance, decide and draw up new programmes and policies for the educational advancement of this nation. We welcome members of the various denominational boards coming here to assist in the furtherance of education in this country.

I am a Roman Catholic; I have never been to a Government school. I have been to a Presbyterian school and a Roman Catholic school, and in my professional career I took my training in denominational schools—the St. John's College in Annapolis and the American University in Washington. These are denominational schools and the point I am making is that those who represent another sovereign state and operate as an arm of that sovereign state in Trinidad

and Tobago must adjust themselves to assist the Government of this country in their educational policy as they so provide .

6.25 p.m.

The Government of Canada have offered teachers to assist in advancing the Government policy in the education of this country. Those teachers are coming forward and serving under the direction of the Ministry of Education. They are coming here today to ask us in what way they could assist us in advancing the education of our country; they are prepared to make a contribution. They are not coming here to dictate the educational policy of this country; to tell the Government how the educational policy must be carried out, what must be done and if it is not accepted, what will happen. They are not coming to tell us that the Government are infringing upon the religious persuasion of the citizens of the country ped so on.

We welcome Roman Catholicism, and in the same way, the Church of England. But with the sovereign of the United Kingdom as the head of the Church of England, the Church of England is here as an arm of British imperialism. They came to assist in the educational programme of the country. We are willing to accept their assistance in advancing the educational policy of this country, but it is not for them to direct or dictate the policy of education. It is for us to provide, to organize and to draft our educational policy, and we are willing to accept their assistance in the furtherance of our education. But, please, independent Trinidad and Tobago, no longer under colonialism, must decide what its future educational policy is to be, otherwise it will be one sovereign power dictating to another sovereign power what their educational policy must be. This is an indisputable

[SENATOR J. F. F. ROJAS]

fact, and facts are stubborn things, but we can only face mankind with facts.

The quicker the denominational boards, and particularly the Roman Catholic Board, and the Church of England Board, realize that the old order has gone and that if they are willing to make a contribution towards the educational advancement of this country they must make it in conjunction and in co-operation with and under the guidance of the Government, the better for all concerned and the quicker will the country benefit from what they have to offer. But so long as they maintain ideas of the old order whereby these denominational boards—and I make particular reference to the Roman Catholic Board and the Church of England Board—continue to labour under the delusion that the old colonial order is still in existence and that they are going to dictate and direct the educational policy for the Government, so long will we have that sort of thing which has developed in recent weeks. It is good for those denominational boards to understand quite clearly—and it is for us to make it perfectly clear and make it as plain as a pikestaff—that Trinidad is an independent sovereign state. The Roman Catholic denominational board is an arm of a sovereign state, the Vatican in Rome, and that sovereign state must not dictate or direct the policy of another sovereign state. And if the Government subject themselves to that sort of attitude and behaviour, or allow any religious fanatic to direct them or to bring pressure to bear upon them to accept that dictation from any other foreign power, then the Government are not worth the consideration for which we have elected them to power, and they should resign.

I have heard quite a lot of things said about the Prime Minister having made

statements that were not diplomatic. I should like to see the Prime Minister make very diplomatic statements. I should like to have him say nice things in the course of his speeches. But let us not flatter ourselves to believe that the denominational boards, in the various meetings they have had, have been making nice pious statements and speeches. They have been saying a lot of derogatory things about the Government and the Prime Minister. But nobody seems to say anything about that; it seems quite all right. However that may be, the Prime Minister is a historian, he knows a little bit about the background and the history of the Catholic Church and the denominational boards and how they function all over the world, and it is because of that he has taken steps, with the history and knowledge and background of these organizations, to see to it that we, in our own little way, take steps now to introduce and to advance our educational policy to suit this independent sovereign state of Trinidad and Tobago and not any other sovereign state.

Senator J. B. Stollmeyer: Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity that I have had to sit here and listen and be able to speak after having heard some very fine speeches indeed. I know that Members of this Senate will not object if I make special reference to the controlled, reasonable and reasoned arguments of Senator Julien, and the oratory, the sincerity and the balanced views, and manner of their presentation, by Senator Neehall. It struck me at the time that this Senator was speaking that I should make reference once again to the fact that broadcasts of the debates in this Senate are not made. It seems to me an absolute pity that these two speeches, both so fine in

their own right, should not be heard by the entire population, or as many as possible of the people of Trinidad and Tobago, because I do know that tomorrow morning when I pick up the newspapers I will not be able to recognize the speeches of the hon. Gentlemen. I also think that the call for a lack of emotion by Senator Hobson at the outset of this debate was an extremely wise one, and it set the pitch and tone for practically everything that followed. We even found ourselves listening to a speech in support of the denominational system by my Friend opposite, Senator Williams. This was as surprising as it was welcome. Not the least, Sir, I should like to make reference to the moderate and sincere presentation of this Bill by the Leader of the Senate. This, in no small measure, set the tone for the standard of the debate which we have had.

Having said this, Sir, I am happy to say that I have modified my views on this Bill very considerably. At this stage I feel that I owe it to Senators present to speak only in very general terms. I believe that the denominational organizations were right in their condemnation of the first draft Bill. I feel that they should have been consulted as of right, because of the existence of this concordat. I know this has been bandied about a lot during this debate, and I do not want to prolong it, but the fact is that a concordat existed, and inasmuch as it existed and one of the provisions of it was that negotiations between Government and the denominational organizations should take place prior to any major educational change then, whether Government were legally bound to follow the provisions of this or not, is not the issue; the fact is they were morally liable to get together with the denominational

bodies and discuss this matter—in my view—prior to issuing a draft Bill of the nature that they did.

Be that as it may, I will also say this: I did not agree with the manner in which these organizations, the denominational organizations, presented their views to Government. I think they were ill-advised to burst into print as they did rather than use more controlled measures perhaps—for lack of a better term—of getting their views over to Government prior to making a public outcry. However, I have no doubt that the general outcry has done the service of producing some of the compromises, or the many compromises arrived at.

I do not think that it is out of place for me, at this stage, to remind Government of the virtue of humility. It is not easy for any political party to eat humble pie—as indeed I am doing now because I did set out to oppose this Bill and I no longer feel I should do so.

There are a few matters that still disturb me, but the major matter which was exercising my mind before this debate concerns the motives of Government. I was not certain in my mind exactly what motivated Government on many of the issues that appeared in the provisions of this Bill. I am now, however, satisfied in my own mind that the motives are honourable, and this removes much, if not all, of the fears that I hitherto felt for this legislation. I still do have the impression that there could be more consultation with the representatives of the governing bodies of assisted schools, and perhaps not enough attention was paid to their representations. I just make this general statement without being specific at this stage.

[SENATOR J. B. STOLLMAYER]

6.35 p.m.

I also share the fear that Senator Nechall does, that the administrative machinery of the Ministry of Education will break down under the strain. This particular Ministry has had to deal with free education for the past number of years and this has been no inconsiderable task. This Bill is going to put more burdens on the staff and senior officers of that Ministry, and I certainly hope that the staff is going to be strengthened materially in order to cope with all the new provisions that have to be complied with under this Bill.

One of the fears that I had was that the Minister would have, by virtue of this Bill, very considerable power; he is being given very considerable power indeed. I exercised my mind, and I wondered: well we shall not always have the present Minister of Education with us; what will happen if the devil is the next Minister? But, I think the Minister himself gave me the answer to this during the tea break. He said we cannot legislate for posterity, and I suppose if we are going to be the real watchdogs—Senator Wight included—and the watchdogs are the citizens of the country, it is up to us to see that bad governments do not get into power and that we do not have to suffer at the hands of a devil.

It has been said that education is as much a matter of atmosphere as of instruction. Now, I think that the traditions of our long standing schools observed this and it should be jealously preserved. This is the sort of maxim that the newer schools should be oriented towards. What I feel is that some of the existing assisted schools have set the pattern and the standard of education here, a very high standard of education, and the first step should be to try and achieve the standard set by this

class of assisted school, and I do not think that I am out of place at this stage to express some concern for my own Alma Mater which is Queen's Royal College.

I am not going to talk on this for any length of time, because I do not want to stir up anything afresh, but we had at Queen's Royal College a very long and strong tradition of which we were extremely proud for one reason or another. I should not like to say how many years ago, but approximately 10 years ago—it may have been 12 or 15; it may have been less—I think a downward trend in this noble institution started, and I believe that I am right in saying that the main reason for this is the dissipation of the staff—not enough staff, perhaps the qualifications of the staff not what they were; certainly the quality of the staff is not what it was in my day. I do not think this can be disputed at all. I will not go into names or details, but there are some of us here—Senator Hobson is not with us at the moment—but the old Queen's Royal College boys, I think, will feel as I do.

Under this Bill the Teaching Service now becomes a part of the Civil Service. Now this is all well and good, but the Civil Service Regulations have their drawbacks. One of them happens to be leave provisions, and I make this point: A Headmaster of Queen's Royal College recently took up his duties—this is about a year ago. I may be wrong, it might be a bit less. It so happens that this gentleman was due for accumulated leave. He had a year's leave due to him. He has now gone on one year's leave. You cannot blame him. He was entitled to it. But the fact is this: the College cannot afford to have a new headmaster going on leave so shortly after taking up his duties—on one year's leave.

This happens in the Civil Service, but this is the sort of thing that leads to inefficiency. This is just something that I feel makes you think, and there may be justifiable fears about the lowering of standards in other schools and in assisted schools, because they are now included under these regulations. I cannot myself see in an assisted secondary school any headmaster going off at anytime on one year's leave. I am not quite sure that his Board of Governors would not have a lot to say about that. I do not think they would allow it in the first instance. But these are some of the things that you are forced to allow, now that the Teaching Service is part of the Civil Service.

I support the view that the control of education should be dual; a combination of the church and the state. As this appears to be entrenched in this Bill I think that we in this Senate and the Government are contributing to the preservation of democracy.

Finally, as a safeguard, I find myself in agreement with Senator Julien's amendment, which asks that the changes in the regulations should come to Parliament for its approval, and I will commend this amendment to the Attorney General and ask him whether he will be so good as to incorporate it in the Bill.

6.45 p.m.

Senator Dr. A. R. Sinanan: Mr. President, the onus has fallen on me to address Members of this Senate when, I see, most of them are drooping, jaded, tired and probably hungry despite the excellent repast which we enjoyed at 4.30.

I have sat here and listened to many excellent speeches. I have listened to a lot of oil being poured. I have heard constant appeals for moderation, and I have listened to tributes being paid to the denominational system both by my Friend, Senator Williams,

and the Minister without Portfolio. It is these very tributes by these two gentlemen which lead me to suggest that less than justice was done to the churches by the very arbitrary and even aggressive manner in which the original draft bills were put forward for study by the electorate. I believe a speaker before me has said that a lot of bitterness and rancour could have been avoided if the Government had put forward for comment and consultation their views on the educational set-up of this country especially to the churches which, it has been admitted here today both by Members of the Government and by Senators on this side, by their great service in the field of education, were entitled to be consulted on any radical provisions which were to be made for the educational set-up of this country.

This Bill has a very short title, "An Act to make better provision for the promotion of education in Trinidad and Tobago". Anything that would make better provision for the promotion of education in Trinidad and Tobago is bound to meet with the approval of any reasonable person. But the Bill makes no mention at all—and I do not suppose it could, and I do not think the Leader of the Senate in his presentation or any other Senator on the Government side has made mention of this—of the crisis which exists in the educational set-up today. It is not a crisis, if I may go back to the words of the Attorney General, of adjustment or expansion or cost of living and things like that; it is a crisis of school places. This crisis has arisen because of a lack of foresight on the part of those people who have been responsible for the educational system of this country over the last nine or ten years. I have only to quote from this book to give Senators an illustration of what I mean.

[SENATOR DR. A. R. SINANAN]

This is a copy of the *Quarterly Economic Report* printed by a Government office. If people would study this book they would be able to use a little bit of foresight and plan ahead. I quote from page 43 of this book:

"If we go back to the year 1954 we would see that in the year 1954 there were 29,253 children born in this country. We would see that there were 6,807 people who died and if we assume that one-half of the people who died were children between the ages of one and eleven, then we would call that 3,400 children who died between the ages of one and eleven".

So if we subtract 3,400 from 29,000 we would get roughly 26,000. So all it needs is a little bit of arithmetic to plan because I believe 26,000 is the number of children who sat the Common Entrance Examination eleven years later in 1965. We can go a little bit further and give the Leader of the Senate, in his capacity as Minister of Education, a little bit of advice. We can show him how to plan ahead. For instance, if he wants to know how many children are going to sit the Common Entrance Examination in 1966 all I have to do is to refer him to this book where he will see that in 1955, that is eleven years ago, there were 30,216 children born; and there were 7,400 deaths; and if we assume that half of these were children all we have to do is to take one-half of 7,400, which is 3,700, and subtract that from 30,216 and we would get roughly 26,500. So I stand here tonight . . .

Senator Pierre: More than that.

Senator Sinanan: I am quoting in round figures.

So I can stand here tonight and tell the Minister of Education the number of children he can plan for. So it will be seen that all that is required is a little bit of foresight. What we are saying on this side is that if you print these books then you should make use of them. I know the present Minister was not the holder of his office in 1954 but that does not absolve him and his predecessors from the charge of having a lack of foresight. We are saying that the Government came into power in 1956, nine years ago, and they knew the figures so they should have been in a position to plan for the number of children who would be attempting to enter secondary schools in the future. That is just one aspect of it.

There is a crisis in the educational set-up today, and we are saying that no amount of legislation for the educational set-up is going to solve that crisis of school places. That is what we are putting forward. We are saying that if you are going to make better provision for the education of the children of this country you have got to start by making a concerted attempt to solve the crisis of school places. The one point on which all educators are agreed is that university education no longer suffices for today. The rate of technological changes and the development of new concepts and new information is so great that even the educators themselves can hardly keep up with the change in patterns. A discovery next week could render obsolete a textbook of last week. That is the situation today. The rate of change is so fast, the rate of new information is so rapid, that in a developing country such as Trinidad and Tobago the emphasis has got now to be on technological education. I say so as one who has an affinity not for technological education but for the humanities.

but I have to admit that the emphasis is on technological education.

I see Senator Julien is smiling. I only have to ask my Friend, Senator Williams, to tell Senator Julien of the many times and many hours we used to spend quizzing each other over Greek and Latin vocabularies. We were quite efficient at it. It was not too long ago.

Mr. President, in this country what we have got to aim at is that a child here has the same chances in the outside world as a child from Canada, from the United States, from New Zealand, from Russia or from the United Kingdom. We have got to devise our educational set-up so that when our youths leave this country and go abroad they must have the same chances as other youths who have been trained in more developed countries.

The Minister without Portfolio made at least one significant point in his lengthy and so rare address; that point was that if the Government were to fill the pockets of the people with money—those were not his exact words—if they were to achieve so many monuments, if the Government were to bring about a very buoyant economy in this country, they would have achieved very little—if they failed to achieve a good educational system. That is a very significant point and we on this side are saying that it is possible to achieve a good educational system in this country, but it needs boldness and imagination. For instance, we on this side can tell you that a child, as of right, should leave primary education stage and enter secondary education and there should be no barrier to that child entering university education. We are saying that education should be divided into two parts—primary and secondary. By primary education we mean the basic

three “Rs”—reading, writing and reckoning; and that should be given to the children between the ages of 1 and 9 years, and from 9 years the child should enter what is called secondary education. In his secondary and university career a student should be submitted to four examinations. Firstly, what we call the G.C.E. (Ordinary Level) which, in my day, not so long ago, we called the School Certificate, and as of right and automatically he should pass on to the G.C.E. Advanced Level (Higher Certificate); then the child should be submitted to an examination—a Diploma in Technology—because we feel that in this country the emphasis must be on technological subjects; and finally a Degree examination. A child should enter these various stages of education as of right with no barriers. There should be no barrier with regard to lack of school places or any sort of discrimination whatsoever.

6.55 p.m.

Now, Mr. President, you are going to ask, and anyone is quite entitled to ask, where are you going to get the teachers? One of the arguments put forward by the Minister of Education or anyone on the Government side talking on this subject is that there is always a lack of teachers. We have always heard, “We can build the schools but where are we going to get the teachers?” We know that in 1961 the then Minister of Education in the United Kingdom, Sir David Eccles offered to send teachers to what he would call in those days the colonies, under-developed countries, and he offered to send these teachers on contract and at the end of the contract they would return to the United Kingdom with no loss of seniority, no loss of promotion and entitled to their pensions. That is one way of getting teachers from

[SENATOR DR. A. R. SINANAN]

abroad. The second way is—and here I must pay tribute again to the Canadians—getting more teachers from Canada. Thirdly, we are saying that citizens of this country must be made to help one another.

What do I mean by that? We are putting forward a proposal that as a child enters secondary education at the age of 9 years he should be taught by a good student who is undergoing an examination for the G.C.E. Advanced or Ordinary Level, and that student who is going for that exam should be given a small grant by the Government. Similarly, a student who is submitting himself for the G.C.E. Advanced or Ordinary Level could be taught by a more advanced student who is going in for his diploma in technology and similarly a student going for a diploma in technology should be taught by the degree student and all of them should be given a small grant by the Government and so develop the philosophy of each one teach one, which I think is a good philosophy for this country.

These are the points we are trying to put forward to Government. We on this side feel that with a little boldness and imagination and with a concerted effort you can make this an education plan and you can succeed in doing something really worthwhile for the young people of this country, because to pass legislation to say you are going to promote education in this country when you have 26,000 children sitting the Common Entrance Examination and providing places for only 4,000 is I think, an exercise in futility.

What is needed in Trinidad and Tobago alongside our development is an educational laboratory. What do I mean by an educational laboratory? By this I mean an institute which would develop and stimulate ideas for new techniques in training which

must be suited to Trinidad and Tobago. The purpose of such an educational laboratory would be to produce new concepts in education and administration and to produce ideas for the drawing up of various curricula suited to this country at all levels of education. Side by side with that we have got to develop the concept of a partnership in education, and since Government pay the piper we suppose we can conceive Government will have to be the dominant partner.

The state and the church, the politicians and law makers, the educators and laymen—all have to get together and wipe out illiteracy in this country, and not only wipe out illiteracy but to improve our educational set-up so that it can become the equal of educational set-ups in any developed part of the world.

Certain Senators are getting restive. I want to close by referring to a point I have not heard referred to in this debate and that is a plea on behalf of the private secondary schools of this country. If I remember correctly during the debate on the Assisted Secondary School Teachers' Pensions Bill I was one of those people who drew attention to the very low standards of private schools in this country. What I am saying now is that Government have just as much a responsibility for the children in the private schools as they have for children in Government assisted schools. I stand subject to correction, but I believe that the number of children in private secondary schools is larger than the number of children in Government assisted schools; so that if we are going to pass legislation such as this and lay down certain requirements for private secondary schools I think it is only fair that we should make some effort to assist private secondary schools

to raise their standards. This assistance should be given in various forms such as grants for laboratories, playgrounds, &c. I make this appeal because I am concerned about the children who do not get into Government assisted schools and I strongly believe that Government should do something to assist the secondary schools.

Finally, I should just like to read what I think are the purposes and objectives of education:

“The objectives of education are:

- (i) the development of the spiritual, moral, mental and physical well-being of the pupil;
- (ii) the development of skills in the schools by which pupils acquire knowledge and understanding, that is, skills in speaking, reading, writing and numbering;
- (iii) the development of manual skills and physical fitness;
- (iv) the training of the power of clear thinking;
- (v) promoting in the pupils a constructive attitude of responsibility to the family, the local community, and the nation and the world;
- (vi) helping the pupils to appreciate the cultural heritage of the nation and making them determined to maintain and improve it.”
- (vii) Preparing the pupils to earn a living;
- (viii) Developing the interest of pupils in worthwhile cultural pursuits which will enable them to enjoy their leisure.”

And, finally—

“(ix) Awakening the aesthetic sense of pupils and encouraging creative expression.”

7.05 p.m.

These are the purposes of education. What we have got to seek in this country is that our educational set-up will pursue these purposes. Whether this Bill will achieve that or not, I do not know. But what I am saying is that before you can pass legislation such as this in the hope of making better provision for the promotion of education in this country, you have first got to solve the crisis which confronts you at present.

The Attorney General (Senator the Hon. G. A. Richards): Mr. President, in full consciousness of the passage of time and the knowledge that we still have two Bills to deal with this evening, I propose to make a few brief remarks on three points only. I myself hope that by the time this debate has come to an end we will have stilled forever two ideas that were prevailing in the community some time ago. I hope that my speech will do something to put an end to the suggestion that Government have abrogated the concordat.

Now, I accept Senator Alexander's approach. The concordat is really a statement of Government's policy that was assented to by some of the denominational bodies. But it must be realized that any policy approach or any policy statement made by a colonial government of a country that was subordinate to another must give way to the arrangements that are made in a constitutional conference for the evolution of a constitution to govern

[THE ATTORNEY GENERAL]

a new state, and it was really in the knowledge that it would be improper or difficult to maintain, with the full force of an agreement, the understandings that were incorporated in the concordat that in the report of the conference the sentence to which Senator Julien referred was incorporated. It was considered that that would be obviously the best way to deal with the matter—that the spirit would be incorporated, in so far as certain matters are concerned, in the regulations made by the Public Service Commission.

Well, I need not repeat the assurance which has been given, but I can add to it because I myself have been able to see in advance something of these regulations that are to be made, and I am able to affirm the assurance given by the Leader of the Senate that the spirit will be so incorporated. But I do wish that people will stop saying that Government have broken an agreement or abrogated something. The Independence Conference itself and the constitution entirely supplanted that, although it would be expected that the spirit would be preserved and observed. That is what has been done. In fact, though I do not propose to deal with the subject matter of the Bill or the Bill itself, we have gone very far beyond that, and, as many speakers have said, certain things have been enshrined and entrenched in the legislation far beyond what was contemplated at the Independence Conference.

The second point is that in some vague way it has been suggested that the provisions of the constitution have been abridged, and I was very happy to hear Senator Julien say that that is not so; and with the full authority of my office I declare that there is no single provision of the constitution that has been abridged.

A point that was raised by Senator Wight about the right of a parent to send a child to any school arises, I think, from a misunderstanding of the meaning of that provision of the constitution. Most constitutions contain provisions about freedom of worship and freedom of belief. Ours is one of the few that have any reference to education. When we consider the parent-hood, as it were, of the provision—it came from Canada—the intention of that provision in the Canadian Bill of Rights was to ensure that no Government of Canada—which Members of the Senate will remember, is composed of a majority of English-speaking people and a minority of French-Canadian people—would pass legislation forbidding them to start schools teaching the language and the culture and the religion of the people of Quebec. That, by and large, is the real origin of that provision. We have adopted it, but it merely means this: that no law could be passed which would forbid any person from starting a school or any number of citizens getting together to start a school. It has no reference to schools started by the state; and it is quite clear in the provisions of this Bill that there is no restriction whatever on private schools apart from the necessary provisions to ensure certain proper physical and other standards.

Finally I desire to give an assurance. An amendment has been put forward and two speakers have referred to it, the last being Senator Stollmeyer. We find ourselves unable to accept that amendment. But I do give the assurance that any regulations made under this Education Bill when it becomes law will be laid before Parliament. And, after all, we must remember that though there is no specific provision, a Member of either House of Parliament has always the right to put a motion on

the Order Paper seeking a debate on some provision or regulation which affects the Minister's administration in any field of education.

Finally, I desire to join with those who have paid tribute to the high level and the moderate tone of this debate, which does great credit to this Senate.

The Minister of Education and Culture (Senator the Hon. D. P. Pierre): Mr. President, I think previous speakers have dealt with many of the points to which I would have liked to reply, and because some of those replies, in my view, have been adequate, it makes my task of replying a little lighter, and therefore I shall be in a position to summarize quickly the points I wish to reply to.

Some speakers have said that the Government have broken the concordat. I want to say, as Leader of the Senate, that the Government are not guilty of any such accusation. I have all the documents here which, at one time, I was minded to deal with; but having regard to the tenure of this debate during last evening and today, I shall content myself by saying that Government have not been guilty of any breach of this concordat. There have been infringements, but not on the part of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. It has been said, in respect of the way in which the Government went about publishing this Bill, that the Government should have consulted and the Government should have negotiated. But the Cabinet Committee that was dealing with this Bill brought it before Cabinet, the draft Bill was approved for circulation, and the Bill was sent to the Trinidad and Tobago Teachers' Union, the Civil Service Association and the Association of Principals of Assisted Secondary Schools, at the same time that it was circulated among hon.

Members of Parliament. Without any requests whatsoever, lo and behold, some people, in their better judgment I believe, started to hold these meetings and to criticize the Bill. No request whatsoever was made for any interview at that particular time to the Government.

7.15 p.m.

The concordat speaks about negotiated changes being inevitable, &c., but it does not speak about any priority; it does not set any method or any time when the negotiation should take place. So on behalf of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, I think we acted correctly. We sent the draft Bill to these bodies and everybody is quite acquainted with everything that followed from then on.

Senator Lange referred to clause 21. He spoke about seeing some dichotomy in the responsibility owed by the manager to the board of management and to the Minister. But there are some directives that the Minister may have to give to a manager, quite distinct from the responsibility that the manager owes to the board of management. Notice in the Bill the responsibility for checking the register. The manager has been charged with this responsibility, but surely, this is a responsibility that the Minister delegates to the Manager, and there is no attempt, I am quite sure, to have the manager in a position where he has to obey two masters.

I am afraid that most of the replies I have to make are with reference to some of the points made by Senator Wight. She referred to some *Hansard* report of a speech delivered in the House of Representatives in 1962 by the Rt. Hon. The Prime Minister, who was then speaking about free secondary education and how it

Education Bill
[HON. D. P. PIERRE]

Tuesday, 14th December, 1965

Education Bill

had brought about integration. And Senator Wight asked, how now can we speak about discrimination? I hope I am interpreting here correctly. She asked, how could the Rt. Hon. The Prime Minister now speak about discrimination, and she intimated that it was only a red herring that had been introduced in order to justify the introduction of this Bill. Well, as I said, I have the information, but I do not want to make this debate degenerate into an emotional affair, but I am quite sure that when the Rt. Hon. The Prime Minister was speaking in 1962 about integration he was showing that several schools—and he was using one as an example and not wanting to speak of racial discrimination—took certain children only by their names who were likely to be East Indians, to show you that many children of different ethnic origins were getting into the secondary schools. But what he referred to was probably in answer to the charge of racial discrimination made against the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. But the type of discrimination which was practised and which was spoken about in the controversy over the Draft Education Bill is a different type altogether. But, as I said, I would rather not deal with it and I am not giving any details about it at this particular stage.

Then she made the charge against the Ministry of Education and Culture with respect to balances not being spent. Well, let me inform hon. Senators that the Ministry of Education and Culture is not responsible for spending money for the construction of buildings. The votes are under the Ministry of Education and Culture and we pay on a certificate presented—if it is a denominational board—authorized by the Ministry of Works. So where the school is a denominational school, the manager of the school or the denominational board

would apply for payment of a certain sum of money; the amount of work carried out would be assessed by the Ministry of Works; that is certified and the Ministry of Education would pay. So, if in one year the denominational body may have some difficulty with the local authority in respect of the passing of the plans, if the money is not paid, then it is not through any fault of the Ministry of Education and Culture; and if in any one year Government buildings are not constructed, it is not the fault of the Ministry of Education and Culture. There may be several reasons why the buildings were not constructed.

She spoke about orders for equipment that the Ministry has not made, but quite recently here, we have had to introduce an amendment to the Central Tenders Board Act in order to expedite the procedures. If a tender is above \$500 the Tenders Board deals with it. The Ministry of Education and Culture cannot in the circumstances be responsible if in any one year \$2 million dollars remains unspent.

With respect to salaries of vacant posts, the most that the Ministry of Education and Culture can do is to come to Parliament and ask that the posts be established. That is what we have done. When that is finished our responsibility is nearly at an end. The initial action must be taken by the Public Service Commission. There are advertisements for posts, and when the replies to the advertisements come in they are sent to the Ministry of Education and Culture for comments and sent back to the Public Service Commission which will make the appointments. But if they know that people are not available, what are we going to do? Put shadows or ghosts in the posts and pay salaries? Therefore, in any one year you must have a surplus.

Then she said that the state are the trustees of the moneys of the parents. Well, this is a so-called principle that has been noised about in several quarters, and I want to say here that I do not subscribe to this principle at all, if it can be called a principle. The state, the Government of this country, are not the trustees of any money of the taxpayers or anybody at all. The Government are answerable only to the electorate. When an election comes we give an account of our stewardship, and, of course, we have Parliament which votes the money and so on. But we are not really any trustees of the moneys of the parents or moneys of the taxpayers from that point of view, and I want to deny this on behalf of the Government. We do not accept that as a principle at all.

I want to assure Senator Wight that I have read the UNESCO Report, and I know that mention is made in the report of the Gross Domestic Product being three per cent. I, as a Minister, should like the Gross Domestic Product to be brought up to five per cent., but we carry on our business in a democratic fashion. We meet in our Cabinet and there we have our discussions, and the competing demands and the priorities are worked out. So the fact that it has not been raised to five per cent., is because the other priorities prevent us from so doing.

I want to congratulate those hon. Senators who have spoken before and who have congratulated the Government for the amendments made to the draft Bill. When a Bill is published for public comment the intention is not to invite any controversy over the Bill. The draft Bill is not the last say of the Government and therefore we were much surprised at this hue and cry raised over the Bill.

7.25 p.m.

I do want to congratulate those Senators who have made some brilliant speeches in this debate, particularly Senator Neehall. I do want to assure him that when the criticism was made with regard to ministers of religion in the role of teachers, surely no one was referring to ministers of religion who have distinguished themselves throughout the ages and who are found in universities heading important faculties. No doubt the criticism was made in this sense—I think Senator Neehall will agree with me—that the mere fact of being a minister of religion does not qualify a person *ipso facto* to be a principal of a secondary school. I think it is in this light the criticism was made. I do believe that the Senator is broadminded enough to appreciate the context in which the criticism was made.

I want to assure Senator Neehall and other members of this Senate that my Ministry has already looked into this matter of the staff necessary for carrying out their responsibility under this draft Bill.

Senator Julien spoke about John Stuart Mill but he did not say which one, whether the father or the son, so I presume it was John Stuart Mill. I want to give Senator Julien a little advice: as a student I was always taught that whenever one wishes to interpret the writings of a particular author one should attempt to go back to the philosophy of the age in which the author lived and wrote. I am quite surprised to hear Senator Julien using John Stuart Mill as an example of a champion of church education or against state education. John Stuart Mill was a great advocate of the *laissez-faire laissez-passer*.

Senator Julien: It is obvious that the Leader of the Senate did not understand

Education Bill

Tuesday, 14th December, 1965

Education Bill

[SENATOR M. T. I. JULIEN]

me. The persons I championed were Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Augustine. I was merely giving a picture of both sides and comparing them.

Senator Pierre: Mr. President, Senator Sinanan has put into the records of this Senate what I consider to be the DLP philosophy of education. Time does not allow me to deal with this philosophy: I think I am competent to deal with it. However, we shall leave it in the records until an opportunity presents itself for us to deal critically and constructively with this philosophy. May I assure him that the educational achievements of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and of the party to which I happen to belong will forever stand as a milestone in the history of Trinidad and Tobago unchallenged by any subsequent government.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole Senate.

Senate in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 5

Question proposed, That clause 5 stand part of the Bill.

Senator L. A. E. Wight: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 5 be amended by adding to paragraph (e) the following:

“Provided that nothing in this section or in any other part of the Act shall be deemed to authorize interference with the denominational character of assisted schools or shall hinder the right of these schools to give religious instructions in

their particular religious beliefs provided that individual students are not interfered with as regards their beliefs.”

The Attorney General: Mr. Chairman, I think that is both explicitly and implicitly contained in the provisions of the Bill and I am sorry that I cannot see my way to accept that amendment.

Question put

The Committee divided: Ayes, 4 Noes, 15

Ayes

Bleasdel, T. T.
Sinanan, Dr. A. R.
Wight, L. A. E.
Julien, M. T. I.

Noes

Pierre, Hon. D. P.
Richards, Hon. G. A.
Crichlow, V.
Jagansingh
Beckles, L. E.
Williams, R. J.
Shears, T.
Tull, C. A.
Simonette, N.
Date-Camps, Dr. A.
Neehall, Rev. R. G.
Lange, R.
Rojas, J. F. F.
Stollmeyer, J. B.
Walke, B.O.

Amendment Negatived

7.35 p.m.

Senator Wight: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 5 be amended by adding the following as subclause 5 (h):

“Make provision for safeguarding the religious character of an assisted school.”

I do not think I need say more on this because it is self-explanatory.

The Attorney General: I am afraid we cannot see our way there. I am against it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause 5 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 6

Question proposed, That clause 6 stand part of the Bill.

Senator Neehall: I should like to propose a minor change to subclause (2); that the word "abnormal" is redundant and that it be deleted.

The Attorney General: I shall accept that.

Senator Julien: We are all in agreement with that. We do not know what an abnormal pupil is today.

Question put and agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 10 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 11

Question proposed, That clause 11 stand part of the Bill.

Senator Neehall: Mr. Chairman, I suggest an amendment to line 4 of subclause (3) that the word "portion" be changed to "section."

The Attorney General: No.

Question put and agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 14 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 15

Question proposed, That clause 15 stand part of the Bill.

The Attorney General: In the line before the last of subclause (1), the word "the" occurs, but it should be "be."

Question put and agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 54 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 55

Question proposed, That clause 55 stand part of the Bill.

The Attorney General: In line 2 of paragraph (c) of subclause (1) the word "Personal" should be changed to "Personnel."

Question put and agreed to.

Clauses 55 to 70 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 71

Question proposed, That clause 71 stand part of the Bill.

The Attorney General: I beg to move,

That the words "the Catholic Teachers' Union" appearing in lines 8 and 9 be deleted.

The reason for this is that it is intended to include only those associations that actually had negotiation status before. I understand that only the Trinidad and Tobago Teachers' Union was so recognized. That of course does not mean that other bodies of teachers may not form associations which should be recognized, but it should not appear in this definition.

Amendment put and agreed to.

Clause 71, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 72 to 74 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

7.45 p.m.

Clause 75

The Attorney General: In subclause (2), the line before the last, the word "fifteen" appears; it should be "twelve". Members would know that the compulsory age is 12, so this is obviously a typographical error. The word, "twelve" then, should be substituted for the word "fifteen".

Question put and agreed to.

Clauses 75 to 83 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 84

Senator Julien: I should like to move two amendments here, Sir. I hope to hear from the Leader of the Senate on the first—84 (2). I think 84 (2) should be deleted because it seems to be in conflict with clause 17 (1). Also at the end of the clause I should like to add the following:

"(13) No regulations made under this Act shall be of any effect unless first approved by resolution of each House of Parliament, which shall maintain its right to amend any such regulations".

The Attorney General: I am afraid we must resist both amendments. In the first place, we do not accept that subclause (2) is contradictory to clause 17 (1). All that this provides is that he may make regulations that may be necessary or expedient for the due control and administration. It does not mean by that that

he will control these bodies. He has the power there to make regulations which will indicate certain considerations they must follow in their administration. We do not accept that it is contradictory.

Secondly, as to the insertion of the other subclause, we cannot accept that for a number of reasons. I do not know that we need go into all of them here. Well, in the first place, all of these Public Service Organizations Bills have that common feature. Also many of the powers that might be exercised by the Minister in regulations occurred in the substantive Education Ordinance, and in that one the provision was the same as this here: regulations were not laid before Parliament as a necessary concomitant of their effectiveness. That is the reason why I gave the assurance in open debate that, in spite of the fact that we would be unable to accept the amendments, these regulations would be laid as a matter of proper parliamentary courtesy, just as we have been laying all of these things. It is not from any desire to conceal anything from Parliament that we find ourselves compelled to resist the amendments.

Senator Lange: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say this in connexion with the amendments. I made a very strong point regarding these regulations, and I should like to say, Sir, that I accept the assurances of the Attorney General to bring these regulations before Parliament, and therefore I shall be voting for the Bill.

Senator Rev. R. G. Neehal: Mr. Chairman, before you move on there is a textual correction also to be made on page 43, line 5 of subclause (9) (d). The term "completion" should be deleted.

The Attorney General: It should be "completing".

Question put:

That subclause (2) of clause 82 be deleted.

Negatived.

Question put:

That the following subclause be added to clause 84—

"(13) No regulations made under this Act shall be of any effect unless first approved by resolution of each House of Parliament, which shall maintain its right to amend any such regulations".

Negatived.

Clauses 84 to 90 ordered to stand part the Bill.

First Schedule and Second Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Question put and agreed to, That the Bill be reported to the Senate.

Senate resumed.

Bill reported, with amendments, read the Third time and passed.

7.55 p.m.

BILL BROUGHT FROM THE HOUSE

Fire Service Bill

Bill to make provision for the classification of the Fire Service; to provide procedures for the settlement of disputes between the Government and the Fire Service; to provide for matters concerning the relationship between the Government and the Fire Service; to amend the law relating to the Fire Service, and for matters connected with and incidental thereto.—[*Hon. G. A. Richards*] read the First time.

The Attorney General (Senator the Hon. G. A. Richards): Mr. President, I have the honour to move,

That a Bill to make provision for the classification of the Fire Service, to provide procedures for the settlement of disputes between the Government and the Fire Service, to provide for matters concerning the relationship between the Government and the Fire Service, to amend the law relating to the Fire Service and for matters connected with and incidental thereto, be now read a Second time.

Oh, I am sorry, Mr. President. I had omitted to move that the Bill be taken through all its remaining stages forthwith. I do so now.

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. President: You may proceed.

The Attorney General: As I somewhat prematurely said, Mr. President, I beg to move,

That this Bill be now read a Second time.

As Members of the Senate will have noticed, the first part of the Bill follows quite closely and it is almost an exact reproduction as it were, of the pattern of the Civil Service and the Police Service Bills, in that the first portion is devoted to interpretation. Part I of the Bill deals with the establishment, objects and structure of the Fire Service, classification and matters of the sort. Part II deals with the duties of the Personnel Department in relation to the Fire Service. It will be the same Personnel Department which will deal with personnel matters affecting the Civil Service, the Police Service and the Teaching Service. It will have the same powers, the same procedures, the same means of arriving

Fire Service Bill

Tuesday, 14th December, 1965

Prison Service Bill

[THE ATTORNEY GENERAL]

at agreements or, in the case where no agreement is arrived at, to forward the consequent dispute to the Minister of Finance within the same time as prescribed in the other Bills. Part IV deals with the special tribunal which is the same tribunal which will deal with disputes coming from the other Services; and Part V makes provision for the establishment of a Fire Service Association to make representations and to negotiate on behalf of members of the Fire Service.

As from clause 33, those are mainly re-enactments of the provisions that now occur in the Fire Brigade Ordinance, with very minor changes. There are matters necessary to be dealt with in giving certain powers and authority to the Fire Service and making provisions that peculiarly fit the nature of that Service.

Regulations are proposed to be made under this Bill when it becomes law and I believe that Members of the Senate have seen those regulations. It may be that a few minor changes may be made in the regulations, I cannot say at this stage—what the changes will be. So far as we are concerned, they appear to be in order and they follow mainly the provisions of the regulations that have been made under the Civil Service Bill.

Well, I do not think I need go any further into the provisions of this Bill in view of lateness of the hour. I am sure Members of the Senate are well seised of it and its provisions and can see at a glance what it aims at. I commend the Bill for the acceptance of the Senate.

Question proposed.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time

Bill committed to a committee of the whole Senate

Senate in Committee

Question put and agreed to, That the Bill be reported to the Senate.

Senate resumed.

8.05 p.m.

Bill reported, without amendment; read the Third time and passed.

BILL BROUGHT FROM THE HOUSE**Prison Service Bill**

Bill to make provision for the establishment and the classification of the Prison Service, for the establishment of procedures for negotiation and consultation between the Government and members of the the Prison Service for the settlement of disputes, and for other matters concerning the relationship between the Government and the Prison Service.—[*The Attorney General*] read the First time.

Motion made and question proposed, That the next stage be taken forthwith.—[The Attorney General].

Question put and agreed to.

The Attorney General (Senator the Hon. G. A. Richards): Mr. President, I beg to move, that the Bill be now read a Second time.

Here again this Bill follows the principles and provisions of the Civil Service Bill, the Police Service Bill and the Fire Service Bill and even to some extent the Education Bill, as regards negotiations and such matters. It is arranged in more or less the same manner.

Part I of the Bill deals mainly with definitions, and Part II establishes the structure of the Civil Service. Part III deals with the Personnel Department. Part IV deals with the functions of the Special Tribunal

in relation to the Prison Service, and Part V deals with the Association of Prison Officers and the manner by which they may be recognized and the way in which they will negotiate with the Personnel Department. The remaining sections empower the Governor-General to make regulations for the Prison Service.

There is nothing in any existing law that has been incorporated in this Bill, for the simple reason that there really is no legislation covering this area. The terms and conditions of the Prison Service have depended by and large on very ancient regulations which were made under the old English Prison Act and they exist only by a provision in the constitution that matters deemed to be laws in force shall continue to be law, but quite obviously some legislation will have to be made in such matters.

In this case the regulations relating to the Prison Service have not been completed and that is why Members of the Senate have not seen any. I anticipate that the regulations will shortly be completed and published and that they will be circulated in the usual way and eventually laid before this Senate.

With those few remarks, I beg to move.

Question proposed.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole Senate.

Senate in Committee

8.15 p.m.

Question put and agreed to, That the Bill be reported to the Senate,

Senate resumed.

Bill reported, without amendment: read the Third time and passed.

PAPER LAID

Report of the Auditor General on the Accounts of the Cocoa (Rehabilitation) Board for the year ended 31st December, 1963.—[*The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister*]

FELICITATIONS

The Minister of Education and Culture (Senator the Hon. D. P. Pierre):

I crave leave to state that it is quite unlikely that the Senate will be meeting before Christmas, having regard to the date announced by the Minister of Finance for the Budget Speech. It is quite likely that the Senate will be debating the Budget for 1966 shortly after the Christmas week-end.

In view of this, I want on behalf of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and particularly Senators on this side of the Senate to extend to all Senators, the Season's Greetings and best wishes for a very happy Christmas and a bright and prosperous new year, and particularly to you, Mr. President, for the very efficient way in which you have presided over the debates in this hon. Senate. We owe a great deal to you for your timely interruptions in developing, in this Senate, a high standard of debate.

In wishing you the season's greetings, Mr. President, I wish you would convey to your dear wife our best wishes for health and happiness during the new year.

Senator T. T. Bleasdell: Mr. President on behalf of the party I represent, I wish to associate myself with the kind wishes expressed by the Leader of the Senate.

In this season of goodwill I hope that the friendly relations which existed in this hon. Senate will continue in the new year and in later years when we reverse sides in this hon. Senate.

Felicitations

Tuesday, 14th December, 1965

Felicitations

Senator the Hon. D. P. Pierre: Before anybody joins in this I want to correct my omission and I am quite sure the Leader of the Opposition will also want to correct his. In this expression of goodwill for the Christmas season we have not included the clerks and official reporters who have taken notes so efficiently during the year. I do want to associate them with the remarks I made previously.

Senator Bleasdel: I join in that and I also include the police.

Senator B. O. Walke: Mr. President, on behalf of the Members of this side of the Senate I wish to extend season's greetings. You will know, Sir, that I so wanted you to have a very Merry Christmas and to really enjoy the true spirit of Christmas that I have asked you to be an honoured guest at our 14th Annual Spirit of Christmas.

May I also extend, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the Senate, greetings to your wife and every blessed wish for the new year, 1966.

Mr. President: On behalf of my wife and myself I want to say "thank you" for your kind wishes. It has always been a pleasure to preside over this Senate. This is an honourable House, a House of fine women and honest men and I do not believe that there has been any trouble created by anybody. We behave as human beings and not as "political animals," as somebody else described certain members of a certain House. This, therefore, is a pleasure and I am very happy to know that you appreciate it.

I do hope we will all have a jolly Christmas even though we have to come back before we are fully recovered from Christmas. I am sure I can anticipate the same dignified

behaviour that has manifested itself so clearly during this debate on the Education Bill on whatever we have to say with respect to the Budget or any other subject.

I appreciate what Senator Stollmeyer said in respect to the broadcast. I have tried long ago to get the broadcast for the Senate. For some reason, which I do not understand, we have not been getting the broadcast of the Senate. It is not so much because Senators want to hear their voices, but I think the country loses the point of view which is expressed in this Senate.

Without trying to be invidious by way of comparison, I think it is quite clear that the approach of the Senate on the Bill is one that was quite different. I can only promise to see whether these debates of the Senate will be broadcast and I shall be grateful for any assistance anybody can give to see that this is done.

There is such a thing as Government time, though Government time might be more filled than the time allowed, but I think the debates of the Senate are of an extremely high order in many cases, and they should be broadcast so the people might know. The big difference is of course that some people make the point that the broadcast of the debates of the other place is an appeal to the constituents. We shall be appealing to the the whole country, and I think it is considerably worthwhile and it will benefit this country.

Thank you very much for your kind wishes and I take much pleasure in reciprocating them to you and your families

We adjourn to a date to be fixed.

Senate adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 8.26 p.m.