

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Wednesday, 8th December, 1965*

The House met at 2.05 p.m.

PRAYERS[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]**BUDGET**

Hon. A. G. Montano Minister of Home Affairs: Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce for the benefit of hon. Members of the House that our Budget will be presented on Friday, December 17 at 1.30 p.m. and that the Debate will begin on Monday, 20th December at 1.30 p.m.

POLICE SERVICE BILL

Mr. Montano: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I unintentionally gave the House some wrong information which I should like to correct today. In reply to a question by the hon. Member for Naparima, I informed him that the members of the Police Association contributed financially to their Association. I should like to apologize to him for giving this wrong information. I was unaware that the Members of the Police Association do not contribute financially to the Association. I tender my apologies to him and and to the House for the wrong information given.

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: Spoken like a Minister.

WEST INDIAN VISITORS

Mr. Montano: Mr. Speaker, by a very happy coincidence, as we are about to begin this most historic debate on the Education Bill, we have with us this afternoon distinguished visitors from the West Indies,

whose presence I should like the House to take note of before we begin this afternoon's proceedings.

We should like to take note of the presence in our distinguished visitors' gallery of the Hon. Mr. Barrow, the Premier of Barbados whose presence in Trinidad is always welcomed. We have seen him here on many occasions, we have followed his career in Barbados with a great deal of interest, and his name figures as prominently in our local press as the names of our own politicians and our own distinguished members of the Government and the Opposition in this country. That he should be here today we are extremely grateful. We are very happy indeed to welcome him, and we should like to say on behalf of all hon. Members of the House and people of this country, that we are more than delighted to have him with us on this occasion, as on any occasion when he graces us with his presence.

We have with us, too, the Chief Minister of Montserrat, Mr. Bramble, whose presence we have noted on many an occasion. Mr. Bramble, as we all know, was a member of the Federal Parliament, and has from time to time visited us, and taken part in a hundred and one different international conferences here and on the West Indian scene. Mr. Bramble is no stranger to us, but we should like to formally welcome him here today.

We also have with us Mr. Lewis, the Minister of Communications from Jamaica, Mr. Copeland from Grenada, the Hon. Mr. Kasim from British Guiana, the Hon. Mr. Bushe from the Cayman Islands, the Hon. Mr. Tannis from St. Vincent, the Hon. Mr. Williams from St. Kitts, and the Hon. Mr. Bousquet from St. Lucia.

West Indian Visitors

Wednesday, 8th December, 1965

Education Bill

[HON. A. G. MONTANO]

Mr. Bousquet, of course, is very well known to us here in Trinidad; perhaps better known than some of the others whose names I have called. But may we say to our West Indian brothers that we are delighted that they have made time to visit us and to visit this Parliament and to say to them that this House and this country extend to them a most cordial welcome.

Mr. A. S. Sinanan: Mr. Speaker, it is my very pleasant duty today to join with the Leader of the House in expressing our very warm and sincere welcome to our good friends. I am particularly pleased to see the Prime Minister of Barbados among us, and of course to see my very good friend, Mr. Bramble, here. I am sure that he will accept what I say when I tell him that we still believe that Monsterrat is still a sub-continent. And my very good friend Mr. Bousquet—I am very happy to see him here, because today I shall win the argument that I am much slimmer than he is.

To our very good friends from the other islands, I join with the Leader of the House in saying how happy we are to see them here. It is a very happy atmosphere for us. It augers well for the future and for our future hopes and aspirations, and it shows that to them we are not a foreign territory.

We welcome them here as we have done in the past. We reassure them of the very warm friendship that exists here for them and for the mass of people they represent; and we hope that all of us would be of some service to them should they need any assistance by way of transportation or assistance in any other form, particularly Mr. Bousquet. We are happy to extend that to them also. I have great pleasure in joining in the sentiments of the Leader of the House,

Mr. S. Capildeo: Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, on behalf of my country, I attended a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Barbados. I had the opportunity of meeting the Premier of Barbados, Mr. Barrow, on many occasions during the short stay that I had in that island, and I should like to say to him in my country—that I felt that if anyone achieved high office and could be as humble as he was and as considerate as he was to visitors to his shores, then perhaps to a quarrel which began with the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister of my country since 1956—as to whether Plato was right that philosophers should be kings and kings should be philosophers, I found the answer in Barbados that philosophers could be kings and kings could be philosophers.

EDUCATION BILL

Order for Second reading read.

The Prime Minister (Dr. the Rt. Hon. E. E. Williams): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move,

That a Bill to make better provision for the promotion of Education in Trinidad and Tobago, be now read a Second time.

This Bill before us is an attempt to establish a national system of education in independent Trinidad and Tobago; and by a happy coincidence its presentation in this House coincides with the visit of some of our colleagues from the other West Indian territories and I take this opportunity of associating myself with the Leader of the House (and I was about to say the Leader of the Opposition but . . .) and the hon. Member for Siparia in their welcome to the Premier of Barbados, to the Chief Minister of Montserrat and to the hon. Ministers from several other territories. I should have thought that that

occasion alone ought to have warned the hon. Member for Couva to be careful in his differentiation between Plato and Aristotle.

The background to this Bill is a long record of partnership between State and Church in Trinidad and Tobago in which certain arguments have become familiar. The first one is that the religious school, the denominational school, provides a superior moral training to such a point that some forty years ago the entire Roman Catholic hierarchy was almost unanimous in its demand, that all governmentally operated schools should be abolished in Trinidad and Tobago, presumably as producing inferior moral training, and that Queen's Royal College, the Government secondary school should be converted into a school run by the Anglican denomination.

The second argument that has become familiar to us is that religious denominations build schools more cheaply, which may possibly be one explanation of some of the disreputable structures that we see all over the country, ghastly relics of the state's abdication of its basic responsibility to non-governmental agencies.

The third argument is that the denominational schools provide a superior preparation and that is repeatedly evidenced in the examination results from year to year. We have heard also the argument that the religious school provides an opportunity for a more dedicated type of teacher than one gets in a governmental institution and, finally, that the principal of a school knows best whom to select for training and how to train, and the best thing the Government could do is to adopt a *laissez-faire* attitude to the non-governmental institution.

It is in this context that one must view the deficient educational framework which this country has inherited with its independence; an Ordinance dating back to the 1930's and modified somewhat in 1951; regulations going back to 1951; no secondary school regulations before the advent of the Government in power in 1956—the regulations were introduced in 1958—the non-integrated school structure in which two things stand out: (1) the discrimination against the primary school and the primary school teacher, and (2) the so-called superior social status and stratification of the secondary school.

It is against this background that we must see today's Bill and the regulations that go with it though, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the revised version of two sets of the regulations have not yet been printed because the printing office has been disrupted in its schedule, the emphasis being placed, and necessarily so, on the 1966 Estimates. But hon. Members would have had the first draft of those regulations and would have received Cabinet's comments on the various proposals put forward in the context of those regulations, so they will be able to follow my presentation.

The new Bill in accordance with the basic Government policy of equating the various branches of the Public Service as much as possible, contains the same feature of a Personnel Department which is in section 62, the Special Tribunal in section 68, and particular attention to existing associations of teachers in section 71.

The first feature of the Bill before us that I should like to stress today is the unification of the teaching service of the country. There will hereafter be one single teaching service. I should like to place into the record of this debate what our

friends the members of the Working Party, appointed in February of 1964 to consider the role and status of the teaching service in the age of independence have stated on this particular subject in their report dated December 1964, and with which hon. Members opposite are no doubt familiar.

The Working Party on education at paragraph 230 of the printed report (it is possible that the numbering of the paragraphs might be somewhat different in the stencilled report) had this to say:

"The absurd situation to which the present arrangements could lead . . .

They were attacking the discrimination against the primary school and the primary school teacher.

" . . . may be further illustrated by tracing the careers of three young persons, each possessing the Higher School Certificate, two of whom enter the Mausica Training College at the same time, while the other takes up an appointment at a secondary school is paid a salary of \$180-\$320 per month. Of the two who enter Training College it is assumed that one elects to remain in the Primary School system. He would receive a salary of \$180-\$320 per month after graduation—the same salary as that paid to the person who had gone straight into the secondary stream without any professional training. If the second Training College graduate immediately upon graduation is appointed to a secondary school, he would receive a salary of \$330-\$420 per month—a commencing salary higher than that paid to head-teachers in primary schools with a minimum of fifteen years service after graduation from a Training College. It is obvious from the above illustration

that the tendency will be that few Higher School Certificate candidates will be willing to enter and remain in the Primary School Teaching Service. There is no doubt in our minds that the difficulties experienced in recruiting better teachers in the primary school system are due in large measure to the present salary differentials which exist between primary school and similarly qualified persons who hold appointments as secondary school teachers. We recognize that at some levels the scope and content of the teaching done in secondary schools are different from that carried on in primary schools. But at the levels with which we are dealing, there is a clear case for establishing that equal qualifications should attract equal rewards.

And earlier in the report on the role and status of the teaching service in the age of independence, the Working Party had this to say, at paragraphs 37 to 38:

"The implications of their conclusions. . ." that the schools were not producing people who were qualified to deal with the problems of Independence:

"were far-reaching. It involved, as we saw it, not only the reshaping of the curricula of the schools—as well as of the Training Colleges—to make them more meaningful in terms of the realities of life in the nineteen sixties, but also the eventual removal of the present sharp distinctions between primary and secondary education and between primary teachers and secondary teachers. It involved, indeed, a degree of integration, both of educational system and of the teaching service, not hitherto achieved or, as far as we were aware, even attempted."

Continuing with paragraph 38:

“At various times during our discussions on the teaching services, the need for integration was urged upon us; but there was clearly no general agreement as to what the term integration was intended to mean or how, irrespective of the meaning, it was to be accomplished. It evidently meant different things to different persons.

So the Working Party left us in the position that they had diagnosed the disease but, whether because they were unwilling or for some reason unable to do so, they did not prescribe.

2.25 p.m.

The first feature of the Education Bill is that it is an attempt to prescribe for the disease which has been so ably diagnosed by the Working Party and it establishes one integrated teaching service which is to be carried out by clause 53 of the legislation before the Chamber today. The Working Party, if I may add this to their comments on the Teaching Service and the need for integration, went on in their diagnosis to emphasize that incentives should be offered to teachers in the primary schools in particular. I refer to paragraphs 242, and 115 of the Report of the Working Party. I quote from paragraph 242:

“...but there is evidently need for some more effective means of persuading all teachers of the value and importance of continuing their own education throughout the whole period of their career.

Now paragraph 115:

“... the teacher's training ought to be regarded as a continuing process which ends only when he has ceased to be a teacher. Thus, in addition to their

formal training, teachers ought—and ought to be encouraged—to pursue private studies.

May I state here, and as hon. Members would have already been able to see from the classification proposals published by the Government and which are now circulating for comment from the staff association and as they will see more clearly when we publish the compensation proposals, which are not yet finalized, that the teaching service is integrated so that a salary of a teacher is related not to the social status or to the school in which he is teaching but to qualifications or lack of qualifications. The salaries have been so framed as to present powerful incentives to all teachers especially those who are not fully qualified to get the superior qualifications, which will attract the higher rates of salary.

The second principal aim of the legislation before us relates to the registration of teachers. Provision was made in 1930 or 1931 (I cannot remember which Ordinance) as some hon. Members would know, for registration of teachers, which was never kept, partly because it was never possible to decide who was a teacher. In this the secondary school teachers were completely left out of the scheme. This is to be rectified and a register is to be kept of all the teachers in the country and provision is made for that in clauses 47 to 49 of the Bill, the Minister being empowered where necessary to remove a name from the register, which means that that teacher would not be able to teach in any school—public or private—in the country. Where private school teachers are concerned, they too will be registered.

Clause 51 provides for an appeal of a private school teacher against the decision of the Minister. We have been able to

[DR. THE RT. HON. E. E. WILLIAMS]

meet some of the comments by various organizations permitting the normal appeal in such matters. The teacher could go to the Court of Appeal, and until the matter is finally disposed of, the question of the cancellation of his resignation cannot be settled by the Minister. In this connexion I draw the attention of hon. Members to the pertinent regulation governing the qualifications for entry into the teaching profession and I emphasize again that all this is of supreme importance in relation to the classification and compensation proposals which, no doubt, we shall have the opportunity very shortly of considering in this House.

In the third place, the Bill before us makes it absolutely clear, consonant in this respect with the provisions of our constitution, that, as clause 7 states—and I shall read it into the record of this hon. House:

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

As hon. Members would have seen from one of the comments submitted to us on the draft Bill, one of the organizations has stated that in this simple three line clause 7, there is written in a whole civil rights law that must be the envy of countries larger and more powerfully endowed with resources, social and economic, than Trinidad and Tobago is. This is particularly important—this question of equality. There is no discrimination or inequality of opportunity with reference to religious differentiation; all religious differentiations being accorded equal status.

On this particular day when the Ecumenical Council in Rome came to its conclusion—and hon. Members would have seen the report of a special correspondence in *The*

Economist for Saturday December 4, 1965, I think this is particularly pertinent to our discussions here today, the section of this Report of a special correspondent entitled *Verdict on the Father*, which reads as follows:

“On the question of religious liberty, the progressives in the council have achieved a notable victory. The baleful maxim ‘error has no rights’ has vanished forever from Roman theology. Religious freedom is no longer grudgingly accepted as a disagreeable, temporary necessity, but recognized as a fundamental human right. The era of concordats seeking a privileged position for the Roman Catholic church in many countries has ended.

It is in this context especially in relation to the Ecumenical Council that one must see the provisions in the legislation relating to an admittedly difficult subject—religious instructions in all schools.

I draw hon. Members attention to clause 29 of the Bill—the conscience clause, and the clause pursues to specify that:

“Religious instructions shall form part of the curriculum of every public school . . .”

And (3):

“The time during which religious instruction may be given or during which any religious observance may be practised shall be inserted in a time-table to be approved by the Minister. . .”

The regulations specify the terms and conditions under which the religion is to be provided whether in Government schools or what you call assisted secondary schools.

I met this morning, thus continuing a conference begun last week, with the Minister of Education and the principals of Government secondary schools; and we have included in the conference principals of

Government teacher colleges and technical institutes. And one aspect of this question that perhaps is not fully understood or appreciated emerged very powerfully this morning from the standpoint of one of the principals in a rural secondary school in Trinidad. He pointed to the difficulty of including religious instruction at a fixed time on a time-table. He himself professed to be all in favour of the provision for religious instruction; he was pointing to the administrative difficulties involved. He had no control over the people who are giving the religious instruction. He sets aside a time for it and they do not come, and the total mixing up of our population—all religious affiliations in a particular school—means that he has to divide them up and allocate them to classrooms; classrooms are too small, the work of the school the particular morning, if the time-table prescribes religious instruction in the morning, is disrupted with students moving from the first form to the fourth form, all in a particular room, allocated to a particular religion, and he might find a religion which has 272 adherents in his school and he has no room big enough to contain 272 students, and his school is without an auditorium.

Then when he assigns a particular period with the Act and, in fact, in accordance with the existing Ordinance, he finds on several occasions that the religious instructor does not show up, and he has no means of disciplining the religious instructor, who is given an obligation under the Act to provide a time-table subject at a particular time, and then he does not show up; and if he does show up the school principal has the problem of putting in several classrooms to one particular religion and the head of that particular religion says: "It is impossible for me to supply five or six qualified teachers

to teach at this particular time, and the principal, because of the time-table, cannot go on disrupting the life of the school in order to have the adherents of this particular faith get their religious instruction in instalments or sections day by day.

It is a problem. But in any case one would have to look to see how it works out in practice. The regulations spell out the procedures governing religious instructions in all schools.

A further feature of the Bill to which I wish to draw special attention relates to the position of teachers, all of whom are now placed under the Public Service Commission, the Public Service Commission which has control today of teachers in all primary schools, whether Government or assisted, all intermediate schools, and in Government secondary schools. The effect of the Bill is to put the teachers in assisted secondary schools under the Public Service Commission. As hon. Members would understand, this would necessarily involve a slight amendment, which would be taken up in due course, of the Teachers Pensions Ordinance redefining the secondary school teacher so that he is brought within the scope of the Public Service Commission.

2.35 p.m.

The Public Service Commission is the constitutional guarantee that we provide for teachers. The proposition that has been made by several associations, including the Teachers' Association, that we should have a special Teachers' Service Commission has not been accepted because it would mean a change in the constitution of the country. Rather we have thought that what we should do is bring the Public Service Commission up to full strength—it is not now.

Provision exists under the constitution for six members: a Chairman, Deputy Chairman, and four other members; and they will so organize their business that they can handle teachers' affairs with expedition. We are certain, in the light of our constitution, that that is the most satisfactory arrangement. The present arrangements are notoriously unsatisfactory.

I merely draw hon. Members attention to the powerful appeal presented by the Secondary School Teachers Association to the Ministry of Education and Culture on December, 11, 1964, on behalf of the teaching staff of Presbyterian schools against the appointments of two Presbyterian gentlemen as principals of two Presbyterian schools as an indication of the unsatisfactory nature of the existing relationship. The present provision in the Bill is designed to give teachers in assisted secondary schools, like teachers in all other schools in the country, and like all public servants, the security of tenure and the equality of opportunity which the constitution guarantees for everybody performing public service.

I do not wish what I am going to say to be construed as a threat, I mention it merely to give hon. Members the most complete picture of this subject. What I wish to add to this statement in respect of teachers is that the new immigration law, which is now being drafted by the Government, will pay particular attention to the question of work permits in an effort to protect the livelihood, to protect the security and to protect the dignity of fully trained and fully qualified nationals of Trinidad and Tobago from competition from outside, except such assistance from outside as is requested freely by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago of friendly countries.

We now have assistance from the Government of Canada, the Government of the United Kingdom on a smaller scale, and we would hope to get similar assistance from the Government of the United States of America, purely as a stopgap arrangement to meet the time which necessarily must elapse before we have a full complement of trained teachers for the secondary schools. There is now virtually complete freedom for anyone qualified to come in and teach in a secondary school. I give the categorical assurance that that freedom will continue in the interest of the Trinidad and Tobago children, and in the interest of the Trinidad and Tobago society, and will continue for so long as it is not used to interfere with the equality of opportunity and the right to the highest employment in church or state of nationals of Trinidad and Tobago. As a matter of fact, I unhesitatingly state that one of the principal problems being encountered by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago in this particular stage of our independence, in terms of our relations between church and state, is that in the field of the church, non-nationals rather than nationals are so much in evidence. It is unfortunate that it should appear that the last stronghold of the colonial relationship should be in the ranks of the church.

The Bill also provides for the financial accountability of assisted schools. The new draft before the House makes it clear that this accountability extends to public funds, to grants from the state for public purposes. But we have thought it necessary, because of some misunderstanding, to clarify the former definition of an assisted secondary school. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. Members, to the new clause 11(5), which reads as follows:

“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 rebuilding or for the equipment and facilities provided for the school.”

And the pertinent regulations, those relating to schools and teacher colleges, specify, in some respects in minute detail, the procedures that must be followed in respect of grants to assisted secondary schools. This relation to accountability necessarily brings up the question of responsibility, and the Bill, in clauses 17 to 19, makes quite clear the duties that are imposed on Boards of Management, and later on on the managers of assisted secondary schools.

A further feature of the Bill relates to the advice to be tendered to the Minister at various levels. Our conception of constitutional propriety is such that we have not been able to accede to the pleas and the requests of those persons who suggest that this advice should be mandatory. The Minister must appoint. The Minister is the person responsible, through the Cabinet, to Parliament and to the country for the operation and management of his department, and it would appear to us to be a constitutional impropriety to impose in a Bill limitation on the power of a Minister. I do not say this in an argumentative sense because I could well understand that the point of view is not accepted by all Members of the House. I merely state it as the Government's stand on the matter. The committees are not mandatory. What we have done is to specify the scope of the representation, the national committee in section 8, and no doubt hon. Members would have seen that, contrary to what some thoughtless people have been saying, this matter about advice on education is not a matter of religion or principals; it is a matter which involves

religious bodies who manage schools. It is a matter which involves principals of schools, whether primary or secondary, assisted or governmental; it also is something involving the teaching profession as such and expert educational opinion which is something vastly different from a teacher with serious administrative responsibilities. It involves the parents of children attending public schools and above all parent-teachers associations which have been increasing in number, if not necessarily in virility and vitality in the country; and it involves associations concerned with community development, experts in the field of library services and such areas of national affairs as the Minister considers appropriate. It might be a Chamber of Commerce; it might be a trade union, it might be a professional body such as the lawyers. Very many people are involved in this question of education and we have made it clear, mandatory if you like, that the Minister in seeking expert opinion must not limit himself to the narrow boundaries in which thoughtless people would seek to confine the ministerial responsibility.

The same thing goes for the local advisory committees that the Minister has to appoint. The pertinent regulation—hon. Members will excuse my inability to give the correct number of the regulation. I only have the first draft—the number might have changed—in the first draft it is regulation 72 where the Minister was to set up a curriculum committee and a text-book committee. Those two were to be very representative of the teaching profession among other persons, and representatives of the teaching profession were to be drawn from both government and assisted secondary schools.

I have just been meeting the principals of Government Secondary Schools and I can testify as to the quality of the principals

we have in those institutions, and the value of the advice that they are in a position to tender. The conference is going extremely well. It is based on a tour that the Minister of Education and I have made of almost all the secondary schools, and we ended up the conference this morning, this phase of it, by appointing committees of the principals to study such questions as staff recruitment, libraries in schools in respect to both quality and quantity, the deficiencies of laboratories and workshops in secondary schools, the amenities such as playgrounds, cafeterias, and so on, and the special problems of Tobago. We feel that it is necessary for the Minister to have the advice that is as representative as possible of all interests in the country concerned with education.

We have noticed an unfortunate tendency in some governmental institutions to reproduce the literary bias which dominates the curriculum in the so-called grammar schools and which has been one of the principal reasons for the enormous weaknesses that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago experience today in particular fields where we have to keep issuing work permits because we have no qualified nationals. The Bill gives the Minister the necessary power to classify and to redesignate schools in consultation with the governing body, or the competent authority if it is a private school, whether denominational or non-denominational. This is necessary in order to modernize the curriculum; in order for us to take into account such national recommendations as, in addition to what the Working Party has said in its report on the role and status of the teaching service in the age of independence, we have got from people like UNESCO whose report has already been made available to hon. Members opposite.

It is for the Minister to decide on the state of the labour market whether more students or less students should be doing GCE; whether some should be going for technical and vocational certificates; whether some should be doing another type of certificate, whether we should, as the UNESCO committee has recommended, set up a number of junior secondary schools, or whether, as Government are now considering in connexion with the Development Programme for 1966, we should, having first dealt with primary schools and then in the last few years concentrated on secondary schools, whether the time has not come for us to turn our attention deliberately and consciously to the vocational secondary school which would be the need in places like Marabella, Fyzabad, Laventille—a reduction of the literary bias which had dominated the curriculum of Trinidad and Tobago for far too long.

The terms and conditions of employment of teachers have been equated as far as possible with the civil servants and there is a special set of regulations dealing with them, with one difference perhaps, that the school teacher has the school vacation and it is really quite impossible for anybody to argue that over and above a secondary school or a primary school vacation, a teacher should also have annual leave as if he were a civil servant. His leave must be the period of his vacation. But the teacher's life is a hard one and the new regulations modify the original draft by extending the period of the long vacation by an additional week partly because—and I hope the teachers do not misunderstand me—partly because the planning that is now going on in the Government of Trinidad and Tobago would require the facilities of schools which are heavily under-utilized in terms of capacity during vacations and

after four o'clock in the afternoons and on weekends. This planning would require the schools' facilities to be made available on a shift basis perhaps for children 12-plus in the primary school, and as evening school for upgrading untrained teachers or pupil teachers. And the school vacations would serve the immensely valuable purpose of providing a long session in which you could hold a short summer course for teachers or for particular students in the primary school.

I turn now to the regulations governing the Common Entrance Examination. Some aspects of the position that have just come to light I should like to make available to hon. Members. The position in respect of the Common Entrance Examination—hon. Members would have seen the regulation in the first draft, which was regulation 60, and which itself contained a minor error, suggesting that, over and above the first 500 places where parents and students had completely uninhibited choice, the remainder were then divided up on the basis of 80 per cent. to the Government and 20 per cent. in the principals' choice. In actual fact the 500 are included in the 80 per cent.

2.55 p.m.

We have been looking at this question, which has given a certain amount of difficulty. The difficulty originated in this way. In 1964 the principals claimed the right to take anybody they wanted. I am referring to the principals of assisted secondary schools. Those persons whom they did not want the Minister had to place, almost as if he were selling fish or meat in the market after market hours. That was most unfortunate especially in terms of the results of the principals' choice. The Ministry put its feet down in 1965 and said it would not

tolerate that. The situation in 1965, which has led to criticism—some of the principals appealed to the Prime Minister—is not as bad as in 1964, but still bad, as I shall indicate.

This is the background to the appropriate regulations. I have identified 166 names, most of them taken in by the principals on the basis of what they call the "20 per cent. intake", their right to take in 20 per cent. That right is supposed to be exercised on the basis of the pass list. The Ministry therefore gives a cut-off point below which a student would not qualify. Of the 166 names that I have investigated 96 did not qualify. It is a clear, deliberate and conscious violation of the prescription laid down by the Ministry. Ninety-six did not qualify. Twenty-nine did not sit the examination at all. One in every five students admitted in the 20 per cent. intake ought not to be admitted at all on the basis of the clear and distinct policy enunciated over a period of years by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. Sixteen of those admitted came from preparatory schools operated and owned by the secondary schools involved; fifteen came from other preparatory schools. In other words, the private school at primary level was becoming the chief feeder of the public schools, publicly financed, operated under public prescription.

The situation in respect of particular schools is as follows. Iere School took in four, three of which were not qualified. Bishop Anstey High School took in six, two did not sit the examination, four did not qualify and one of them made a mark—I am not free to give out the mark—which represented, if my memory is correct, one-third of the maximum score. We do not say that students fail, but by what stretch of the imagination was it possible for any

principal to conceive that a student, whether a late developer or not, with that particular score could have qualified to be a charge on public funds for secondary education?

Passes on comprehension. Naparima College took in ten, five failed, five did not sit. There is no justification for people not sitting an examination. It tends to make the preparatory school or the secondary school itself a social menace. The Government prescribe a procedure to be followed, specify the details of that procedure and then somebody allows a student who does not conform to that procedure, with the connivance of the principal, to get by without taking the examination, so that the talent of the country is being discriminated against in favour of persons who are led to believe that what matters in Trinidad and Tobago is not an examination but is contact; it is a father's influence or a father's status. This is surely an intolerable situation which the Government will not condone for one single moment more. We shall not budge except to alter the present position in respect of the 20 per cent. intake. People must take the examination and must be on the pass list.

Fatima College, 20 per cent. intake, eight did not sit, one did not qualify. Do we need to go any further for an explanation of the steadily declining standards in examinations? Government are not going to justify a situation where they have placed a child of talent who has passed the required examination, has come high up on the list, in some schools as if one were selling meat or fish after hours in the market, while somebody who does not qualify and who does not sit the examination is allowed, principally because he goes to a preparatory school and has influence, status, contact, to get a position out of public funds. The thing is a public scandal.

Trinity College: nineteen were taken in, nineteen did not qualify. Seven were admitted from Trinity Junior School, one did not sit the examination. Holy Name Convent: of those taken in, twelve did not qualify, one did not sit; nine came from a preparatory school possibly operated in conjunction with the convent.

St. Joseph's Convent, San Fernando: eight taken in, all qualified. They were taken from the pass list. So it does not have to be a violation of the Government's regulations. If St. Joseph's Convent in San Fernando can do it, though all of them came from the Convent's preparatory schools other schools can do it.

St. Joseph's Convent, St. Joseph, took in eight, six of whom did not qualify. It is obvious that St. Joseph's Convent, St. Joseph, takes in on public funds people from only a particular type of primary school. As one goes down the list one gets the impression that a Catholic student in a Governmental institution is discriminated against in favour of a Catholic student from a Catholic institution.

Naparima Girls' High School took in nine, six did not qualify and three did not sit the examination. Holy Cross College took in eighteen, two did not sit the examination and the others failed to qualify. Presentation, Chaguanas, took in seventeen, nine failed to qualify. St. Mary's College: The total number taken in, I think, is thirty, eight did not sit the examination, eight came from the preparatory school operated by the college and six came from other private schools; none of them qualified on the basis of what was indicated by the Ministry as the cut-off score.

In 1956, as I have said the situation was a little better.

Mr. S. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, in quoting the figures, I understand the Prime Minister to say that 166 students were taken in on this 20 per cent. basis and they did not qualify. I should like him to give me the total number of students that was taken in 1964 on that 20 per cent. basis in all secondary schools?

The Prime Minister: I imagine for the most part it is the list that I have here. If you want the figures I will get them for you. I will get them done for you statistically. The list I have is what the Ministry gave me. These are the facts. I would hate to think that all of them that they took in were not qualified.

In the 1965 results the Ministry submitted a list, which included the 20 per cent. intake, made up of a total 339 names. I got 68 who were below the cut-off score and ought not to be admitted; 15 did not sit the examination. In Fatima College, the worst one: 7 did not sit, and only 6 were below the cut-off score out of a total of 20 names. St. Joseph Convent, San Fernando, all above the cut-off score. Holy Name Convent, all above the cut-off score; Naparima College: two did not sit the examination. This was after the Ministry had put its foot down. Presentation College, Chaguanas, all above the cut-off score. Presentation College San Fernando: all way above the cut-off score. If they are selecting people they should select people who are in accordance with the Government's prescription. St. Mary's College: all above the cut-off score—an improvement over 1964; Naparima Girl's High School: above; St. Joseph Convent, Port-of-Spain: all above; St. Augustine Girls': all above; a great improvement; Bishop Anstey's: 4 below the cut-off score—all of them who were below the cut-off

score came from Bishop Anstey's Junior High School, a perpetuation of the junior preparatory school which is most deplorable. Hillview College: 18 were below the cut-off score one did not sit and only 5 of the 24 they took in were eligible really from the pass list. Trinity College: 2 of the 14 came from the Trinity Junior School and one did not sit the Common Entrance Examination. St. Joseph Convent, St. Joseph: above the score. Holy Cross: above. Iere: for the most part, above; Holy Faith Convent: above.

I have some figures for St. Benedict College, La Romain: A total of 28 was taken in, 22 were below the cut-off score, 5 did not sit the examination and, the worst case which was recorded, 3 of the students were over age. The Government fix an age limit for the examination yet 3 of them were over age. I understand that in many countries it is possible to give football scholarships and cricket scholarships. There is a role for sports in the school. Such scholarships are not to be awarded out of public funds. We do not have places for eligible people, and you take in over age candidates and use public funds in the process!

One further aspect of this question . . .

Mr. Sinanan *rose*

The Prime Minister: You must have been the goalkeeper but you are too big to move. You want to go outside with the football. Where you are concerned I must take my weapons.

One further aspect of this question of the private schools. I draw your attention to the regulation that specifies—perhaps it may not be a regulation, it may be in

[DR. THE RT. HON. E. E. WILLIAMS]

the Bill—that no public teacher, no teacher in the public school must devote any part of his time to duty other than public school assignment. He must not teach in a private school. I think hon. Members would be familiar with it. I forgot to take a note of it and I do not want to waste the time of the House.

A further point in the legislation to which I should like to draw your attention, relates to expulsion and suspension of a pupil. The Bill is very clear on it. I should like to tell hon. Members opposite that the Ministry is very conscious of the need of speed in this matter to find a place for the pupil. If the child is to be removed from a particular school we must find a place where the child can be put especially with compulsory school age. It is not easy to deny the right of a child to stay in school.

I may say that in making it the decision of the Cabinet, hon. Members might know in general terms of the information when a child was expelled from a denominational school and parents of the child and other public-minded citizens appealed to the Cabinet. This was in violation of all existing directives. The head of the religious denomination involved wrote to the Prime Minister seeking to bring pressure on the Prime Minister to get the Cabinet to endorse the decision of the principal—a most offensive document which I have here. The Cabinet decided that the child was to be reinstated in the school and we believe that the proper place in which that authority must reside, since what is involved is the constitutional rights of a child or perhaps the arrogance of a particular principal, not to mention possibilities of racial discrimination always very much in evidence in certain quarters in Trinidad and Tobago—the best guarantee of the child's welfare is the Cabinet of the country.

May I just indicate to hon. Members that within recent days Cabinet have supported a principal's decision to suspend a boy from a school. He is involved with the Police Department and the boy who has reached to a certain age is expelled from the school for the safety of the school children and the safety of the school teachers. Cabinet would not hesitate to expel but this must be the last resort and only Cabinet must be trusted to exercise that power.

The compulsory school age under the law remains at 6 to 12 and clauses 75 to 83 provide for the school attendance officer, and the child not being found in school during school hours, or found in pool betting shops or in rum shops. Private schools are to be controlled by sections 30 and 37 of the Act; and "control" includes registration and the special regulations provide for the control of private schools.

The business aspect of education, I am afraid, is very much to the forefront these days and Cabinet in clause 22 had to make it quite clear that no principal is to impose any unauthorized charge. May I read it:

"22. (1) Except with the written permission of the Minister, a Principal or Board of Management may not impose a charge of any kind whatsoever on pupils in a public school—

- (a) in return for any service provided by the school or by the Principal, Board, or any teacher;
- (b) as a contribution in respect of any activities normally undertaken as part of the curriculum of the school.

(2) A principal or Board of Management may not require any pupil in a public school to procure his books

stationery, uniform or other appliances required for participation in the courses or other activity of the school from any particular person or supplier."

And teachers are not to indulge in business activities in any trade without the permission and approval of the Public Service Commission.

3.15 p.m.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, we are now in the process of implementing this Act and paying attention to accelerated training of the untrained teacher and the pupil teacher, to the expansion of secondary vocational schools, to more appropriate training for the 12-plus children in primary schools, to more evening and week-end vocation classes. We are contemplating a further request to the Government of Canada, whose Prime Minister is due here very shortly. In appreciation of the sterling services being rendered by his compatriots to the educational system of Trinidad and Tobago, we should like to see whether it would not be possible to increase the number of Canadians participating in our school system. And the same request is going forward to the United Kingdom and to the United States. We are now seeking expert advice from the United States of America in respect of audio-visual aids and mechanical aids in such matters as language teaching; we shall pay attention in the 1966 Development Programme to a special fund for upgrading the government secondary schools and for providing efficient equipment and facilities; and discussions are taking place at this moment with major investors in Trinidad and Tobago in respect of additional facilities for technical and vocational education.

We believe that we are on the right road with respect to a national system of education in an independent Trinidad and Tobago and we are fortified in this belief by the reports of the 1965 General Certificate Examinations which are now available and which I think hon. Members would like to hear something about.

I went out of my way to make a particular comparison between the different schools on the basis of the argument that the non-governmental schools provide a superior form of training. I compared Queen's Royal College and St. Mary's, and St. George's College and Fatima in 1965 "A" Level Examinations, and this is what I found—which is what most people here who are familiar with both institutions would recognize as prevailing over the years: St. Mary's College led slightly in French, heavily in mathematics, physics and chemistry, and geography; though St. Mary's was poor, Queen's Royal was poorer. Queen's Royal led in Latin. They were both equal in Spanish. Queen's Royal College led in botany, zoology, the general paper, history; and St. Mary's did not do as good as Queen's Royal did in economics and public affairs or geology. One school emphasizes one thing, another school emphasizes something else.

The weaknesses of some of the religious schools in the fields of history and the social sciences are notorious the world over and has always been recognized as one of the principal differences between the different types of schools in Trinidad and Tobago. St. George's led Fatima in Latin, chemistry and the general paper; Fatima led St. George's in Spanish, French and physics though it was bad enough for Fatima.

[DR. THE RT. HON. E. E. WILLIAMS]

In respect of the "O" Level Examinations, where some of our new schools have just begun to take the examination—Point Fortin, North-Eastern, St. James, Diego Martin, Woodbrook, and a couple of others I think, but not yet the Couva school. And what was curious, Mr. Speaker, was that the best marks among the established schools—I have not taken all of them—is if you compare Point Fortin with schools like St. Mary's, Fatima and some of the others, Point Fortin led St. Mary's and Fatima in Latin, led St. Mary's and Fatima in French—a heavy lead over them—led them in Spanish—so did the North-Eastern—led them in mathematics. Point Fortin equalled St. Mary's in mathematics in the percentage of passes. Point Fortin has done well and North-Eastern has done as well; unfortunately with too much of a literary bias.

Diego Martin passed all the students it put in in physics and had a record for the country.

The Woodbrook school did fairly well in chemistry though not quite as well as Fatima. But still, in the absence of laboratory facilities, which I have seen, it did remarkably well. Arima did well in biology. In English, Diego Martin did well, almost as well as Fatima or just a little behind St. Mary's, but much better than Presentation College in San Fernando. In English literature Point Fortin did twice as well as St. Mary's and so did North-Eastern. In history, North-Eastern, Tobago, Woodbrook, Diego Martin were all above St. Mary's and Fatima, and this suggests that our schools are doing quite well indeed. The average of passes in Latin for the new schools was superior to the religious schools. It was higher also in French—the average for the new neighbourhood state schools;

was nearly as good in Spanish, nearly as good in physics, and somewhat behind in English literature; in others they were weak.

In many cases this was the first year the schools took the "O" Level examination. They have had teaching problems, problems of staff. A place like Couva has been so concerned with providing physical space for the number of students inflicted on the school, they had no time even to think of a curriculum, to think of training for a particular examination. The schools have been doing wonders. A place like San Fernando Secondary School is bursting at the seams. Impossible! And over-emphasis on women students simply because the girls are being discriminated against perhaps in the assisted secondary schools more than the boys.

What we want is staff. I would imagine that the results would be even better this year with the presence of numbers of Canadian and United Kingdom teachers, graduates in particular subjects.

We have a long way to go, but for the first year for schools that unfortunately tend to perpetuate too much of the literary bias that has been the bane of education in Trinidad and Tobago—with that reservation they have been able to hold their own in these literary subjects with some of the schools that are several years older. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are well on the road with this Act to establishing a national system of education in independent Trinidad and Tobago, a system of education which, if I may close with the words of section 7 of the Act:

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

And I think we could rest satisfied with the 1965 results which show that in one respect the older schools are paying the price for social discrimination, keeping out the better students from their classrooms, and the newer schools are going, in the not too distant future, to achieve results superior, or at least equal to the results of the older schools.

It is in this context that I present this Bill as a necessary measure of integration of our society, a necessary national system for an independent country.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

Question proposed.

3.25 p.m.

Dr. M. A. Forrester: Mr. Speaker, Christmas is close upon us—Christmas long recognized and revered as the season of peace and goodwill. And the Government of this country, in order presumably to emphasize their compelling passion for peace and their abiding love for goodwill, deemed it necessary to bring this highly controversial Bill to this House at the present time. It looks like a certain nasty Christmas present but I am not at all surprised. In fact, few people of this country are any longer surprised with anything that the Government do, up to the present time we have lived, and to some extent, thrived under a system of education in which the Government on the one hand build schools which they control and maintain, and certain religious bodies on the other hand, with or without assistance of Government, also build schools which they control and maintain. But the Prime Minister of this country has always been violently opposed to this system. And as far back as 1954

when he delivered two lectures on education in the Public Library in Port-of-Spain, it was quite obvious that he was at daggers drawn with the religious bodies on this particular question.

I shall refer in the course of my speech to these two lectures in order to show that the complete control of education in this country has always been a sort of fetish with the Rt. Hon. Gentleman and that the present Bill before the House is but the poisonous fruit of that fetish.

In his first lecture, one of the complaints he made about this denominational system was that the state had somehow abandoned to the church its right to educate, that it had in fact abdicated this right to the church. But at the time, I pointed out that it is not possible to abdicate a throne on which you never sat, that all history indicates that the Church has always been interested in education in accordance with its Divine command from its Founder "to go and teach all nations", whereas the interest of the state in matters of education has been of very recent origin in comparison. It would seem to follow that for the state now to claim a monopolistic right to educate is not a question of resuming something which they had abdicated but it is a clear instance of usurpation of a right which never belonged to them.

I believe, however, that in this part of his argument the Rt. Hon. Gentleman was confusing rights with duties. In my humble opinion he has never been famous at distinguishing between categories. It is indisputable that the state has a duty to ensure that all its citizens are properly educated as far as possible, and in the pursuance of this duty the state is bound, morally bound, to accept and encourage all the assistance which may be offered

to it by other organizations which are competent to educate, and which are willing to dedicate themselves to the service of education. But that the state enjoys any monopolistic right to educate is a proposition unsustained by logic.

In the course of his lecture the Rt. Hon. Gentleman drew attention to the fact that, as recently as 1911—it is not really recent—only the children of the wealthy were assured of secondary education, that only the wealthy could afford to pay for secondary education for their children, and that the Government of the day only provided four exhibitions annually to secondary schools. That is perfectly true, but the fault does not lie with the church, but with the state—with the colonial Government at the time which was not particularly interested in the education of the masses.

As a matter of fact the situation was even worse than what the hon. Gentleman stated at the time because the Government's competitive examination was not restricted to children of parents in the lower income brackets, and therefore very frequently these exhibitions were won by the sons of parents who could well afford to pay for the secondary education of their children. It is undeniable that the poor were at an utter grave disadvantage.

There was an additional point which the Rt. Hon. Gentleman did not mention, possibly because he was not aware of it. And it is this, that the church not to be outdone by the generosity of the Government, if generosity is the right term, also awarded four exhibitions annually to children from primary schools and these exhibitions were tenable at St. Mary's College and there was no restriction as to religious persuasion for the children. There was one condition made, namely that the children

should have attended a Catholic school for a period of one year preceding the examination. In other words the church was willing to have children of any denomination come in to one of their schools for a year and to compete against, and often they won as against children of the Catholic faith. There were actually boys who won no exhibitions but who were educated free of charge at St. Mary's College. I happen to know that, Mr. Speaker, because I was one of those boys. I was educated at St. Mary's College because of merit shown in the Government competitive examination.

3.35 p.m.

In my humble way I did what little I could to show my gratitude to the College by winning for it, in 1918, the Jerningham Gold Medal. But the point I am making here is, that at a time when the state was practically indifferent to the education of our people, the Church, with its limited resources was pulling more than its weight in this particular matter and therefore this country owes a debt to the religious denominations which it would be difficult, if not impossible, ever to repay.

The Prime Minister in this lecture of his went on to say—and I quote what I believe to be an authentic copy of his lecture:

“The obvious solution is a clear recognition of the fact that man's inalienable right in a modern democratic society includes not only the right to life, to vote, to petition, to assemble, to speak his mind freely, to get a just wage, to organize in Unions, and to curse his government to hell or to laud it to heaven, but also to include in his childhood and adolescence the right to a free education by the State until he is, say, eighteen.

Now it will certainly be very extraordinary if I found it possible to laud Government to heaven; but neither shall I curse them to hell. That type of low vulgar abuse may be acceptable in Woodford Square and in other places, but it has never been a part of my educational makeup, and while I agree that a citizen has a right to education, I maintain that that fact only further emphasizes the duty of the state to accept and encourage all the assistance which can be offered by bodies competent to educate, without imposing restrictions which those bodies consider to be inimical to their interests, religious or otherwise.

There is only one other point I want to make from this first lecture of the Prime Minister and I quote once more:

“What we need in a British West Indian Federation is a British West Indian philosophy of education. That inevitably means British West Indian control.”

I can understand that a British West Indian philosophy of education would call for British West Indian direction in education, but why the indication of a direction should be coupled with the control of anything or anybody is a matter which is not correspondingly clear to me. At any rate the British West Indian Federation which the rt. hon. Gentleman envisaged has had a remarkably short existence. He himself has not been able to keep it alive and there are people who actually think he was one of the main instruments of its destruction. But since no such federation exists it would seem impossible now to talk about British West Indian control of education and therefore the rt. hon. Gentleman necessarily has to fall back on his Trinidad philosophy of education and the Trinidad control. Whether the Prime Minister would be so provincial in his outlook is not a matter which I propose to discuss this afternoon.

The second lecture added little to the views he had expressed, but provided us with some highly interesting revelations. He was replying to critics and his reply inspired another critic, to whom he took a very long time to reply and failed to reply adequately. That critic is my humble self. In that second lecture he mentioned a number of philosophers, ancient and modern, among them Aristotle, Voltaire, like himself, “Yapping a solemn creed with solemn sneer”, and finally John Dewey. It seems someone had quoted John Dewey against him and in the course of his reply to this critic the Prime Minister made the following highly interesting admission. Once more with your permission, Sir, I quote:

“If any critic of my educational views quotes Dewey against me it is not only another example of that ignorance which permeates the reference to Aristotle it is also infinitely amusing because my ideas are not only fully consonant with his own, but they have, if I may put it that way his imprimatur.

Imprimatur is the proper word in this situation. An “imprimatur” is given to Catholic publications by a Bishop of the Catholic Church and the *nihil obstat* which accompanies it is given by some other highly qualified theologian. We are now hearing from the rt. hon. Gentleman that his views received from an appointed Bishop by the name of Dewey the “imprimatur”. He went on to quote several passages from Dewey, one in particular which he called Dewey’s positive approach to education. I shall not burden the House by reading Dewey’s *Positive Approach to Education*. Dewey’s approach, positive or negative, to anything is of no importance. His mental befuddlement has been described as distressing, and that is a description with which I fully agree. But in the article which I

wrote at the time, I reproduced this entire quotation from John Dewey's *Positive Approach to Education* and, taking it to pieces bit by bit and sentence by sentence, I showed how it should be treated with the utmost ridicule. From that time I have heard nothing from the rt. hon. Gentleman about John Dewey. Even when he made his belated reply to me—I was out of the country when he made it—he made no attempt to defend John Dewey. I do not know if he really has, because if he had I would then have had to remind him that John Dewey was the person selected to be the architect of the new school systems in Soviet Russia and China. And since the rt. hon. Gentleman, on his own admission, agrees entirely with Dewey's atheistic views on education, it is high time, I think, that the people of this country should begin to realize the grave danger which confronts them.

3.45 p.m.

I make passing reference to the curious debate which arose at this time between the rt. hon. Gentleman and a learned Benedictine monk. They seemed to be both quoting Aristotle from two opposite positions. But what was curious about this debate was the fact that at the end of it one of the combatants, to wit, the rt. hon. Gentleman himself, announced that neither of the combatants had won, but that we the people had won. Well, that was extraordinary. But in 1962 we won independence without having to fight for it, so perhaps this was merely a straw indicating the way in which the wind was blowing.

But all this Aristotle and Dewey business was going on at a time before the rt. hon. Gentleman had indicated his intention to enter politics, although I myself, in my final article, prophesied that he would. And

so when in 1956 he made his political debut with his then new People's National Movement, the church naturally became exceedingly apprehensive, because the church knows all about John Dewey's atheism, and the Church remembered that the rt. hon. Gentleman had stated very clearly that his own views coincided entirely with the said John Dewey's. When the elections came around, our people were swept away on a wave of nationalism and failed to notice the impending danger. I repeat that it is high time now for them to recognize the grave danger which confronts them, for in the U.S.A., where John Dewey opposed religious instructions in schools—and the rt. hon. Gentleman has this afternoon suggested the difficulty of having religious instructions in certain schools—and where John Dewey opposed the denominational control of schools, it is still possible for those schools to exist as private schools controlled and maintained by private resources. But this Bill before the House makes it utterly impossible for these schools to exist here in that fashion, and subjects them to the domination of the state and to the whims and caprices of a Minister of Education whose religious convictions would seem to be of a very tenuous nature.

However, after their accession to power in 1956 things were quiet for a few years, and then in 1959 a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Julius Hamilton Maurice was appointed to go into this matter of education. That committee duly published a report known as the Maurice Report. It seemed to me at the time that the Maurice Report was the first step that was being taken by the Government to implement the ideas of the Prime Minister. And when the Government announced in this House that the Maurice Report was going to be

the basis of their educational policy it gave rise to a highly acrimonious debate, in which naughty things were said on both sides of the House. I myself was very, very loath to attack the Maurice Report. Our hon. President of the Senate, "Hamil," is a good old pal of mine, we sat together on the benches of St. Mary's College. All who sit there cannot win island scholarships; he did not. Nevertheless, there is no doubt about it that Julius Hamilton Maurice is a man of tremendous ability and of the highest integrity. I was therefore loath to attack the Report. But when "Hamil" wrote, or allowed to be written, a sentence such as the one I shall now read, I just had to do something about it. This is what I saw in the Maurice Report:

"Admittedly it might be debated as to what extent this dichotomous educational system with its 15 separate administrative denominational boards may have had the tendency to create, or will tend to create an unfortunate division of plural and parallel societies in Trinidad and Tobago."

Now, "Hamil" Maurice knows me too well to imagine that I would be intimidated by big words of Greek origin. This was suggesting that a religious division in the country was in some manner hampering national unity. Now there was not, there is not, and I sincerely hope that there never will be, any such hampering of national unity by the different religions. If there were, then we ought to forget this question of freedom of religion altogether. There is no reason to believe that national unity can only be achieved by a sort of irreligious unity. And so I wrote another series of articles in which I attacked the Maurice Report. I met with abuse from certain quarters, quarters which imagine always that abuse is the proper reply to argument; but I am never deterred by this.

3.55 p.m.

However, one of the very significant features which emerged from the Maurice Report which I shall now draw attention to, has already been mentioned by the rt. hon. Gentleman this afternoon. And it was that the denominational bodies can build schools more cheaply than the Government can. Now there is nothing strange about that. There is no mystery about it. It is no miracle. The people of this country are a religious people and they subscribe liberally to the building of church schools. Architects and technicians give their services at a lower cost than they would give to the Government. Merchants engaged in selling building materials are always prepared to advise religious denominations about materials which though being a little cheaper are nevertheless just as durable. They are things which they would not bother to do in the case of the Government. It is therefore strange, that, if the Government have all this interest in education which they pretend to have, they should not be anxious to increase the number of denominational schools, to provide more money for the establishment of those schools rather than to spend huge sums on building their own schools, and also insisting on complete control of denominational schools, some of which they never even helped to build.

However, in 1959, as in 1954, there was no intelligent reply to my criticisms but I woke one morning early in 1960 to find headlines in the local newspapers stating that a concordat had been signed between the state and the church. No one, Mr. Speaker, was happier than I. I had nothing further to say until today. But now comes a startling announcement that the Government, acting unilaterally, have undertaken to draft a Bill without prior consultation with the signa-

tories to the Concordat. In short, the Concordat has now become what the German Chancellor in 1914 called a mere scrap of paper. The German Chancellor's description of a solemn treaty as a scrap of paper led to the First Great War in 1914. The Government here are more fortunate than the Germans. There is not going to be any war, but the people should now realize the flouting of a solemn agreement is the most disgustingly dishonest act that could be performed by any government.

And now when people talk of this Concordat between state and church the newspapers report that the Rt. Hon. The Prime Minister asked, "What church?" Well the rt. hon. Gentleman when he announced his Concordat in 1960 knew what church, and if he does not know now, all I can say to him is that it is the same "blooming" church to which he has been referring with so much disrespect recently on public platforms. It is, of course, not surprising that a disciple of John Dewey should be disrespectful to the church. What is surprising is that a disciple of John Dewey should be regarded as a fit person to indicate the educational system of any country which is not communist. And I should like to say this, that I personally am convinced that the rt. hon. Gentleman with his educational qualifications might well have carved for himself a unique niche in the hall of fame, but I am also sadly convinced that his treatment of the religious bodies in this country may eventually gain him nothing better than a portrait in the gallery of rogues.

In one place he is reported as complaining of social discrimination in a Catholic school. In another place he is reported as complaining that 82 per cent. of the children in a Catholic school are Hindus. Well, this latter point surely indicates that there is no religious or

racial discrimination in Catholic schools. And it is extremely funny that any Member of the Government should complain of discrimination of any sort when the Government stand condemned before the bar of public opinion for their political discrimination.

Are we forgetting that in the last General Election at least one candidate of the Government stood unashamedly on a public platform and announced that when they got into power they would look after their own supporters and that the rest of us could go and drown ourselves in the Gulf of Paria? We are not forgetting that. And the one instance of social discrimination, if even it could be proved, is comparatively trivial when contrasted with the policy of political discrimination which the Government have persistently and unremittingly pursued.

Now we are hearing once more, as we heard in 1954, that he who pays the piper calls the tune, and this is interpreted to mean that as Government pay the teachers they have the right to control the schools. But Government do not have any money of their own. Individual Members of Government may be exceedingly wealthy gentlemen. It is being suggested that some of them have become exceedingly wealthy in a very short space of time. But that is not my concern. My concern is this: that they as a government own no money. The money which they administer is the money of the people—of you, Sir, them, me, and all of us. If then they pay the piper they pay him with the people's money and it is the people then who should call the tune. And I am fully convinced that the majority of the people in this country are opposed to this inimical piece of legislation. As a matter of fact,

religious bodies spend quite a lot of money on education themselves, money which the Government perhaps know nothing about.

I do not as a rule quote figures in this House. The Government have their statistical office and they are always bringing figures but I am reminded of the three grades of lies—lies, damn lies and statistics. But on this occasion there has come into my possession some figures which ought to be of interest to this House and to the people of this country, and these figures cannot be disputed. In a certain Catholic parish for the past fourteen years, apart from the salaries paid to teachers, the Government have contributed in money, \$22,226. During those fourteen years, the parishioners in that parish contributed for the educational facilities in the parish, \$404,662.42 nearly half a million dollars as compared with the twenty-two thousand odd dollars which the Government provided. This gives an idea of who in that particular parish is paying the piper and who might therefore be expected to call the tune.

4.05 p.m.

As I am drawing to a close I do not propose to deal with any specific violation of the Concordat. I believe that that aspect of the question will be dealt with by other hon. Members on this side of the House.

In closing I want to point out that from 1954, and possibly before that time, the complete control of schools has been an obsession with the Prime Minister. I use the word obsession advisedly because you know, Mr. Speaker, and I know—I believe we all know—the sort of people who get obsessions. A medical Friend has reminded me that when these obsessions are associated with delusions of persecution the cases

are really bad and are often incurable. The Rt. Hon. Gentleman is always pretending that the British do not like him, the Americans do not want him, and that none of the big nations care anything about him; and now he feels that the church is against him. These things appear to me to be very near to delusions of persecution. If they are, then the signs and symptoms are exceedingly great.

4.05 p.m.

I shall not this afternoon make a prognosis; I shall not attempt to suggest where the Rt. Hon. Gentleman may end his earthly days. What I do say is that if Government persist in pushing this iniquitous piece of legislation through, as they obviously intend to do, then it will be the last crime which the Government will be allowed to commit against the people of this country. The day of reckoning, I am convinced, is near at hand.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, the Government have been in control of our education for the past nine years. The child who was nine years old when they came into power is now eighteen years of age. That child is now looking for work. He is unemployed. A new generation has added to the unemployment figure that the Prime Minister met of 18,000. Today it is 60,000.

Today, after nine years, the Prime Minister has realized that we must have a national system of education in conformity with independent Trinidad. Where does he get the idea that Trinidad and Tobago is independent? He fools himself when he thinks that Trinidad and Tobago is independent.

On Sunday last we gave to this country a little pamphlet proving to this country

[MR. S. C. MAHARAJ]

how successful his independence has been. I should like to quote from this pamphlet, which was put out by the Workers' and Farmers' Party:

"Thousands upon thousands can get no work today. The number of unemployed automatically increases every year. Those who work struggle with the fear of retrenchment and the cost of living which rises every day. The head of state, the Governor-General..."

The Minister of Home Affairs (Hon. G. A. Montano): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. While we have no objection to being reviled by this pamphlet, would the hon. Member show us the relevance of what he is quoting to the Education Bill before the House?

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: If the Minister had moved the Bill yesterday I would have felt that he had some right in Parliament, but it seems to me that he is just one of the pack that says "yes" or "no". Yesterday we debated a Bill which should have been piloted by the Minister of Home Affairs...

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is asked to indicate the relevance of the pamphlet.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: I am replying to the statement made by the Prime Minister. Obviously the Minister should know that.

Mr. Speaker: Will you kindly indicate how relevant you are? I want to rule on this matter.

Mr. Maharaj: I am telling you. The Prime Minister says that a national system of education in independent Trinidad and Tobago is desirable. I am proving that Trinidad and Tobago is not really independent.

Mr. Speaker: That has absolutely nothing to do with your quotation relating to unemployment in this country. I rule your quotation out of order and ask you to deal with the Bill before the House, that is to say, the general purposes of the Bill...

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: The Prime Minister did very little of that, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I have given my ruling on the matter; you may proceed with the general purposes of the Bill.

Mr. Maharaj: I shall. Whether right or wrong, I accept your ruling. I suppose that I could continue to reply to his statement. I suppose it is part and parcel of the debate. I have been here for the last fifteen years and as far as I know that is what we always did; we would reply to a Member before we stated our own views on the Bill.

The Prime Minister spoke about the ghastly relics of these religious schools. For his decrying of the existence of these denominational schools may I ask him whether St. Mary's College is a ghastly relic? That is one of the oldest Roman Catholic schools of this country. He spent a very long time in proving that this Bill, amongst other things, . . . [Interruption] of course, he said it is a ghastly relic of the past. He said it. He spent a long time on the integration of the teaching service. Who opposed the integration of the teaching service? Nobody opposed the integration of the teaching service. Do not take one little aspect of the Bill and make the country feel that because you inserted this one aspect that everybody is in favour and the whole Bill is acceptable. That is the mistake that most people make, even most parliamentarians, because a Bill is partly good and partly bad, it is acceptable.

The Bill before this House must be wholly good before it is acceptable. If there is one clause or subclause that is faulty or could be used in several different ways, that could thwart the whole aim and purpose behind this Bill.

I regret that the Prime Minister today could have seized on this debate the opportunity to attack the churches or the ministers of the churches in this country. He has virtually told us here that they were the last relics of colonialism. I regret, Sir, that you would not allow me to prove that the Prime Minister really is the last relic of colonialism of this country. He is the one that had been pursuing a colonial policy since August 31, 1962.

I should like to read more of this pamphlet. I hope you do not object, because he has accused the ministers and the teachers of pursuing colonialism in this country. I want to prove that he is the one. I read:

"The Cause

The cause of all this is the fact that we, all of us, a modern highly developed people, who can go abroad to very advanced countries and hold our own with their best; are living in an old colonial economy. In this colonialist economy, today as 300 years ago, big industry, oil, sugar, banks, newspapers, etc., are owned and run by and for foreign interests.

PNM came into power by promising to subordinate these interests to our local needs and abilities. PNM has not done this. Therefore PNM is compelled to subordinate local needs and abilities to the foreign interests."

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it permissible to read trash into the record of the House, particularly when it is not pertinent to the Education

Bill? What have we got to do with what PNM said that they were going to promise and what industry is being talked about here? We are dealing with the Education Bill. If these bits of trash have anything to do with the Education Bill, we will be pleased to hear it, otherwise I resent this thing being read into the record what I characterized yesterday as history.

Mr. Speaker: I rule that the quotation from the pamphlet is irrelevant.

Mr. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister what is the number of this PNM member's card?

Mr. Speaker: I think you may proceed now to the question before the House.

Mr. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, do not get anxious; I am very composed today. Yesterday happened to be my birthday so I wanted to work a little hard but from today it is a dedication to get rid of these iniquitous pieces of legislation that have come within these past few days. I shall prove that the whole thing is colonialism.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking that the hon. member obey the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, I must say that you are making it difficult for me to debate the Bill. If I cannot be given the opportunity to prove that it is the economic situation of the country that is causing the Prime Minister today to subordinate every section of the community, to batter their heads and reduce them to subordination in a certain way then it is impossible to debate in this House.

Mr. Speaker: I still insist that you should obey the Chair on the ruling that something is irrelevant.

Mr. Maharaj: I am saying that you are making it difficult for me to debate.

Mr. Speaker: I make nothing difficult for any hon. Member who follows the procedures of this Parliament.

Mr. Maharaj: I obey your ruling but I have the right to tell you when you are making it difficult.

Mr. Speaker: I have the right to tell you when you are making it difficult for me.

Mr. Maharaj: We both have rights.

Mr. Speaker: My right is the right of the Parliament as a whole and you must obey. That is all.

Mr. Maharaj: I remember your argument on whether the Prime Minister is greater than the Speaker. I am just an ordinary member of society in Trinidad. I have no greatness.

The Prime Minister in dealing with this Bill also used to a very great extent, with exceptions here and there, figures to find justification for introduction of this Bill. He has quoted 166 cases where a certain amount of discrimination was practised by some of these denominational schools in particular. You will admit that I drew to his attention certain acts of discrimination by some of these denominational schools and that was due to the system which they operated.

The Common Entrance Examination is a competitive examination. It goes by the number of marks each child makes and if the Government of the country had laid down the law for everyone, for every denominational school, that those with the highest marks would be admitted in the 3,000 places

that they are able to provide, there would be no quarrel about anything. But in 1964 they played politics, as usual, with the education of this country. They are the ones who bowed to the request of certain principals who asked for the opportunity to choose the children they need, with the result that if Mr. John Thomas's child made 480 marks and the other one made 430 and he happened to be a member of that religion, the one with the 430 marks would be accepted. They are the ones who prostituted this system.

In the governing of a country everything must be set according to standards. If it is a competitive examination it must be a competitive examination. How does he expect the people to look forward to educating their children? You have 25,000 children sitting the Common Entrance Examination and you provide places for 3,000 and the next 22,000 can go and drown themselves in the sea—to use the language that they are accustomed to use.

Everyone wants to have his child educated. He behaves as though those children who do not come up to standard should be thrown aside. That is the argument. Why does he not find places for the 25,000 children of the people? He says he is giving free secondary education. Which he? He is a father of children too. He wants to educate his child. What is he talking about? Those with social status and big-wigs in the country? Even though you are a big-wig and in big social status have you not got a right to see that your child receives education in the country? What nonsense is he talking about? He sets the example. There are others, perhaps, who could have afforded, like him; they might have all sent their children to England to be educated. Do not come with that sort of business.

4.25 p.m.

When I made that complaint in 1964 he read figures there where it was improved in 1965. Because I protested the system in 1964; it is upon my protest that they searched the records of the Education Department and they found that it was a genuine protest. But not because you have exceptions, not because you have certain causes of complaint, which you as a government could put right, should you go and try to destroy a whole system that you met in existence for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, all I can do is to give the country some hope. We are being battered down almost every day by the press of this country. We are being put up here as a bunch of criminals because we come out and say we want to exercise our democratic right to join political parties and to express political views. Our party is maligned all over this country. But I want to tell the Prime Minister that if there is one example of a dictator and dictatorship, it is over there. Three Bills have been moved in three days. The Minister of Home Affairs sits there, a Police Bill is moved. What happened? The Minister who is responsible for the Civil Service, is he incapable of moving the Bill or something of the sort? The other Minister in charge of Education in the House does not move the Bill. There is one man over there, the Prime Minister. He alone; and he is still the one to call other people dictators. But I want to assure them that from this same maligned party I could put out now twenty-five workers that would make better parliamentarians than seventy-five per cent. sitting down over there.

4.29 p.m.: *Sitting suspended.*

5.05 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking before the tea adjournment you cut me off in the middle of a sentence. I was then trying to prove to this House that in spite of the jeering, our committee could put out 25 workers and some of the best intellectuals in this country tomorrow and give this country the best Cabinet ever, a Cabinet responsible to the masses of this country. But my Friend, the Deputy Speaker, reminded me that it is unparliamentary to compare Members of Parliament with other people. So I bow to him for this, and I would not do it.

I should like now to deal with the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago. The Prime Minister dealt with another section of it I happen to be one of those persons who went to the Independence Conference. Under the heading, "The recognition and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms," we see:

"(f) the right of a parent or guardian to provide a school of his own choice for the education of his child or ward;"

That is inserted there, and its intention is not merely to provide a building that belongs to a denomination. In those days the Prime Minister in seeking independence was a little more cautious. He was not as arrogant as he is today, talking about the blooming churches and coming here and attacking ministers of religion. He was a bit co-operative and this was inserted to give parents the right to choose a school of their own choice. And "school" in that context does not mean student and mortar and boards; it means anything that goes with it.

I was surprised when I went through several of these memoranda submitted to the Government to see only one or two

[MR. S. C. MAHARAJ]

mentioned that. But that was the intention when this was inserted in the constitution. No one can deny that. So if a Bill today denies that right that was there when this constitution was agreed upon, it is certainly going back on an award at the Constitution Conference at Marlborough House. That is certainly going back on an award.

And so the newspapers would make us believe that among everybody, the parents, the whole set of people who were agitating against and opposing this Bill, opinions were divided as to the preservation of the rights of these denominational bodies. On going through these memoranda, one sees that opinions were scarcely divided at all. All with one voice said that the denominational character of the schools should be preserved. It cannot be said that in this Bill it is preserved to any great extent. It is preserved here and there.

I did not comment very much on this Education Act because I realized that it was a red herring across the trail in order to dim people's view and to erase from their memory the Industrial Stabilization Act. There are a set of Acts to discipline, to beat down the people of Trinidad and Tobago to subjection and this just happens to be one. But the Education Bill takes away some of their right. And I shall prove it by reading some of these memoranda.

Now, as I said, if one clause in a Bill is bad, the whole Bill should be rejected unless that clause is rectified. And if we look through these memoranda that were submitted we will see that two of the denominations that the country was made to believe supported the Bill *in toto* really did not do so entirely. I refer to the Maha Sabha Organization and the Tackveeyatal Islamic Association. While they did support it to a little extent they proposed several

amendments. It is the Anjuman Sunnat-ul-Jamaat Association of Trinidad and Tobago. They proposed that section 4, 2 (b), section 5 (d), section 7, section 8 (1), (2), section 10 (1), section 10 (2), section 10 (c) be amended. You cannot in the face of these number of amendments proposed, say that this body did support this Bill. As a matter of fact, there are several sections which I could say that I support. The integration of the teaching service is something we proposed. We proposed this before these Bills were brought in. The difficulty is that gentlemen opposite seem to be averse to My reading certain of our documents, but I think this one they propose—integration.

“The teaching service shall be integrated. Teachers shall receive equal pay for similar qualifications, reasonable salaries shall be paid to teachers commensurate with their contribution to society and with a view to maintaining the dignity and status on par with comparable workers.”

So the question of integration which the Prime Minister paraded so much is no great controversy here. Now while the Anjuman Sunnat-ul-Jamaat Association, did say that they supported the Bill, I do not think there are a number of lawyers or parliamentarians who sit on these school boards. They are men from the rank and file and the mere fact that they have proposed six or seven amendments shows that they do not agree entirely with the Bill.

And here is a paragraph of a letter sent to Government from the Maha Sabha.

“However, the criticism I wish to offer against Government is its failure to recognize the need for at least two assisted Hindu secondary schools so that the students who belong to the Hindu religion

will not be forced to attend secondary schools of other denominational bodies.”

Now it is not that I share these views. If these schools are supported by public funds they must be opened to any child, who can come in and receive education.

But in order to preserve the denominational character of the school they say this. And the Methodist Church while also supporting the Bill to a certain extent said:

“We have urged certain safeguards. This is not because we distrust the intention of the present Government but we endeavoured to look at the situation in the broadest terms. This has led us to feel that omission in the Bill of measures for the preservation of moral and spiritual value referred to in the first purpose of the Act would be injurious to the well-being of the people of Trinidad and Tobago under certain circumstances.”

If you go through all these memoranda you would see that all denominational bodies say they want to preserve the denominational character of the schools even though they support the Bill. It is only one body in the whole set of memoranda—the National Evangelical Spiritual Baptist Faith Arch Diocese Incorporated, No. 4 Riley Terrace, East Dry River, Trinidad and Tobago, who said this, addressed to His Excellency, the Prime Minister:

“At a meeting convened at our headquarters a unanimous decision was taken to support the Bill in all its stages. We believe the Bill is long overdue; our children have suffered too long due to the prejudicial practices of certain denominational schools.”

I do not think this body has any schools of its own. If the Prime Minister is relying on support from denominational bodies

for this Bill today he has certainly failed because they all have said with one voice that they want to preserve the denominational character of the schools.

5.15 p.m.

If you look at the memorandum sent in by the Teachers' Union, which I consider to be one of the documents with very fine comments on this Bill, you will see that they too, while they support the Bill, said that they wanted to preserve the denominational character of the school. When the committee stage of the Bill comes I intend to propose some amendments with the hope that Government would accept them and so preserve the denominational character of these schools.

I have no doubt today that Government are ramming down the throats of the people of this country a Bill that is objectionable in many parts. It is no use your coming here and building up a case against denominational schools. I think that is very wicked of the Prime Minister. It is well known that at certain periods he seems to be very co-operative with these denominational bodies and at another time he seems to go out in a tantrum and attack them.

This custom and tradition that we have met in Trinidad of denominational schools goes back to so many years. It goes back to the days when Government hardly provided any schools. Today, no one can say that Government have not got certain rights. They have got the right to set certain standards but within these standards the denominational character of the schools should be preserved. We too in our education policy have stated that these schools should be preserved and allowed to operate. And when I say allowed to operate I do not

mean only allowed to own the building the stone walls, the bricks, and the boards. they must have some other meaning to it.

We have always been accused here of criticizing Government and not putting on record our own views. I hope you will have no objection if I read into the record certain policies of our own education. I feel now that I have criticized Government to a little extent. I have a right to say what I think about the education system in this country. I would first start by our concept of our definition and purpose. This is taken from *We The People*, Friday, September 10, 1965. I challenge anyone in Trinidad to produce a better newspaper than this. It is far superior to *The Nation*. We might not have the money and we do not get enough advertisements but when you look at the matters contained in it, it is far superior to any other newspaper in this country. I quote:

"The chief aim of existing educational policy . . ."

[*Interruption*]. You seem to be nervous. San Fernando East is one of the safest P.N.M. constituencies, so what are you nervous about.

Hon. A. G. Montano: I am glad you know that.

Mr. Maharaj:

"The chief aim of existing educational policy is to ensure that the youth of the country receive enough institutional training and instruction to enable him to read and write and perhaps calculate just enough to serve his own ends. This perspective in education is obsolete, just as obsolete as the old colonial policy of injecting only so much and no more to enable the colonial masters to get

enough out of them and no more—a policy consistent with and only designed to facilitate exploitation. We feel sure any education policy deserving the name must have as its chief aim the utility of the individual both for his sake and for society's.

"Education therefore should aim at producing individuals that would make good citizens. And every form of institutional training and education must be prepared to equip the individual in life for service and duty to society generally. Aristotle often said man was born to be a citizen and for him man's normal status is good citizenship."

It is only in *We The People* you can get words like these and if I may quote from this document our policy on education dealing with History first:

"This is the age of the common man and democracy, therefore, the quality, content and quality of education has to take into account the social and cultural aspiration of the nation, the economic targets and goals and the satisfaction of individual fulfilment. The history of Education of Trinidad and Tobago for the past decade was void of the above principles."

I would not worry to mention the name of the party because that seems to bring a bit of nervousness with certain people in this hon. House.

Hon. A. G. Montano: No, tell us, man. Do not read it, tell us.

Mr. Maharaj: Well, if you encourage me and you want to hear I shall say:

"The aim of the Workers and Farmers' Party is to develop the greatest resources of the country, to up-level the society,

in which members can be free to criticize and/or appraise any situation as they wish, to form a vibrant public opinion and to provide educated citizens who are well-trained and qualified to supply a better quality of service with hands or brains to our community."

5.25 p.m.

"We propose to provide better citizens and a rapid and steady growth in the standard of literacy. To achieve these, greater demands will be made in the nature and amount of work our students should do to stimulate their intellectual and imaginative efforts which will aim to extend students' range of ideas, and to take students mentally and physically beyond the walls of schools and other institutions of learning.

"Our goal will be to fit our people to take part in the various activities of society, to establish a practical and decentralized democracy and to form an improved society where justice, equality of opportunity, social harmony and the fusion of our plural society out of which will evolve a unique Trinidadian and Tobagonian society, an example of multi-racial harmony, unique in the world.

"Stages and Types of Schools:

"The types of schools will be from Nursery to University. Students shall move automatically from one type of school to another, and those with ability and aptitude will have the opportunity of free University education to provide the well-trained mind from which source valued judgments and valuable decisions will emanate.

"Free Secondary Education and Text Books Standardization:

"The Common Entrance Examination will be scrapped. There will be free Secondary Education for all children who are 11-plus. The School Building Programme will be intensified to provide the required school places at all levels. The basic text books at all levels of education will be standardized and provided by the Government at a Secondary level.

"Nursery Schools:

"Nursery Schools will enable children to form the better type of habits in the formative years and provide a sound basis on which to develop our education and society, it will also free a substantial section of our community to make a more valuable contribution to our economy.

"Infant Schools:

"Infant Schools will be adequately staffed and they will introduce the children into the realms of formal education, while allowing the children's personalities to blossom.

"Primary Schools:

"Every child—

Mr. A. G. Montano: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: if the Member would like to tell us of his party's manifesto, could he not tell it to us rather than read it? He is regaling the House with a manifesto there which I do not think is exactly relevant to the subject here this afternoon. But if he would like to tell us about it, let him tell us rather than read it to us.

Mr. Maharaj: I am talking about the Education Bill. *[Interruption]* But you have always criticized me; you say I do not put anything into the record of what we are going to do. Can I continue, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I agree with the Leader of the House that the educational aims of your party have nothing to do with the Bill before us. I should also like to draw it to your attention that your time in this House is limited, and I should be very much obliged if you will deal with the Bill.

Mr. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, do you disagree that these items I am reading out here are all contained in various clauses of this Bill before the House?

Mr. Speaker: I do not agree with you at all. I have read this Bill.

Mr. Maharaj: In this Bill, Sir, there is everything about comprehensive schools, primary schools, infant schools—I saw it.

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear you on the clause in the Bill dealing with Primary Schools now.

Mr. Maharaj: Do not regiment me into debating some . . .

Mr. Speaker: I think I am going to regiment you. I shall regiment you according to the procedure of the House.

Mr. Maharaj: That is not the procedure of the House.

Mr. Speaker: It is. You must be relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Well, of course, I am relevant to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I am going to insist that you be relevant from now on.

Mr. Maharaj: Well, if you want to stop me from speaking . . . but I am perfectly relevant. You have your rights, I have mine . . . You came here by the election of the people. I did not come here by the back door.

Mr. Speaker: Your right is subordinate to the right of the House.

Mr. Maharaj: For fifteen years I have been doing this; everybody has been doing this. Why is it different today? As soon as the Government are in difficulty—*[Interruption]* . . . it was done in the debate on the Industrial Stabilization Bill, it was done in the debate on the Motor Omnibus Bill.

Mr. B. Ramdeen: Mr. Speaker, it is getting somewhat difficult in this House to know exactly what is going to happen next. Anyway, I am going to make my contribution to this particular Bill which, I think, is of paramount importance to everybody in this country—man, woman or child.

Towards the end of October, 1965, the Rt. Hon. The Prime Minister went into his University of Woodford Square. Whether it was in his capacity as the Rt. Hon. The Prime Minister of this country, or whether it was as political leader of a party, I cannot quite understand myself. I would have thought, Sir, that he went there as a political leader, as a politician. But the fact that the Government Broadcasting Unit has

broadcast his speech in Woodford Square seems to indicate that he went there as the Prime Minister of this country. Assuming, Sir, that he went there as the Prime Minister of this country, he went there and publicly stated, and his statement was broadcast, that children from areas like Laventille, Belmont, East Dry River and Gonzales are being discriminated against by certain denominational schools in this country, and that children of the more fortunate areas such as Ellerslie Park, St. Clair, where the Ministers are moving in, Lady Chancellor, and Cascade—people of such areas are given preference despite the fact that their children may not have done so well, or their children may not have taken the examination at all.

It seems to me, Sir, that the Rt. Hon. Gentleman and the members of his Government have very short memories, because it was on the 22nd December, 1960, that an agreement was signed between the Government, that is between the state, and the various denominational bodies of this country. Between 1961 and 1964 there was harmonious co-operation and co-ordination between the denominational bodies and the state, represented by the Ministry of Education. It was agreed by that Concordat that 80 per cent. of the secondary school places would be filled by the Government and that the remaining 20 per cent. would be filled by the denominational schools, provided that the students so taken would be taken normally from the pass list of the Common Entrance Examination. It was also agreed in that Concordat, which was so acclaimed by the Prime Minister of this country, that a panel would be set up comprising principals of assisted secondary schools, who would set the examination papers and who would be

consulted on the question of placing students. Between 1961 and 1964 this panel held several meetings at the Ministry of Education under the Chairmanship of the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education, and therefore it is extremely difficult to understand how anyone, any responsible person, especially the Prime Minister of this country, can state publicly that there has been discrimination in this country against children of people who live in the poverty-stricken areas in this country.

5.35 p.m.

This seems to indicate an attempt to instigate class feelings, to put the have-nots against the haves and also to create division because of the pigmentation or the colour of people's skins. As I said, between 1961 and 1964 everything worked very smoothly but towards the end of 1964 the pattern began to change. New interpretations were put on the agreement, the Concordat, by the Ministry of Education. Instead of consultation there were directives and unilateral decisions. We are told today in this House that the Minister has decided to put his foot down; that there must be no more contact in getting children into assisted secondary schools. I wonder what the Rt. Hon. Gentleman would say if he found out that right in his own ranks there are people who have got their children in assisted secondary schools without these children having passed any examination, that there are people there who have written assisted secondary schools in an attempt to get children in who have not passed the examinations. That could also be described as contact. One would have expected that he would take the beam out of the eye on that side, before he attempts to take the mote out of anybody else's eye.

For the last twelve months that panel which was set up as agreed upon in the Concordat was not called upon for any consultation. There was no meeting for the last twelve months or more. In Trinidad, according to this Bill which is before the House, the Minister may; it is optional, he may appoint an advisory commission. If the Government look at the Jamaica Act—I am sure they have looked at it, because some of the amendments obviously are taken from it—they would see that in Jamaica this advisory commission is mandatory; it is obligatory. The Minister of Education must appoint such an advisory commission and in Jamaica the number of members is specified—twenty-two; eleven by the Minister of Education, six by the body representing the teachers concerned, and five by the denominational bodies concerned. And the time for which they hold office is also specified and prescribed—three years. In Trinidad there is no such provision.

At this stage I should also point out that when there was discussion on this original agreement there were four amendments made which were initialled by the parties on both sides, the Minister of Education representing the Government and the principal of St. Mary's College representing the denominational bodies and the Roman Catholic authorities. When the copy of this agreement was reproduced by the Government it is very significant to note that the word "negotiated" before "changes" in clause 5, that very important word, was omitted. This seems to give rise. . .

The Prime Minister : I rise on a point of order. As Head of the Government I say that that is untrue. I have the original Concordat here with all the changes.

Mr. Ramdeen : I do not quite understand exactly what is untrue. If the Prime Minister says that, and gives the assurance to this hon. House that the word "negotiated" was not left out, well then if that is what he says I will accept it. I should like it made very clear that that is what he means.

The Prime Minister : I speak as the Head of the Government. If what I say is not clear to the hon. Member I have nothing further to say. I have the Concordat here. What he is saying is not true.

Mr. Ramdeen : I do not care whether he speaks as the Head of the Government or not. He has made a statement and if I do not quite understand what he has said I ask for further explanation. If he does not want to give it, it is quite all right with me.

On the 9th June, 1965, a circular was sent out by the Ministry of Education to the principals of assisted secondary schools giving them 48 hours notice to come to a meeting at the Ministry of Education and there, for the first time, the principals were handed a list of students to be placed in their schools. This was contrary to the practice between 1961 and 1964, a practice which was a direct result of the Concordat which was signed between the church and the state on 22nd December, 1960. No Agenda was circulated to the principals of assisted secondary schools. Total secrecy shrouded the whole meeting. When they went there they were handed this list without knowing what was the choice of any particular parent of the children who were on that list.

Henry II, a King of England, was called the law giver, and he said that what concerns all must be approved of by all. In this country we have had the Lee Commission

to consider regrading; we have had the Collett and Clapp Commission; we have had the Government Working Party on education. All of these met. The principals of assisted secondary schools were not consulted. It was only with the Government Working Party that the President of the Association of Assisted Secondary Schools, was called in, not to make any contribution, not to offer advice, not to be consulted, but to answer a few questions.

It seems that in this country we have ceased to have Government by consent. In Jamaica the Act provides that public schools can revert to being private schools. There is no such provision in our own Bill. I should like to read clause 5 of the Concordat. I quote:

“The existing relationship between Government and the governing bodies and teachers in assisted secondary schools will remain subject, however, to negotiated changes inevitable with the introduction of free secondary education and to a system of inspection of these schools by persons authorized to do so by the Ministry of Education and Culture.

“The governing bodies of these schools will continue to be responsible for the administration of these schools and for their maintenance, repair and furnishing.

“These schools will continue to qualify for aid.

“The principals of the assisted secondary schools will make available a minimum of 80 per centum of the first form entry places to those who by passing the test qualify on the results of the Common Entrance Examination for free secondary education.

The principals will be represented on the panel of examiners to be set up to administer the test.

“The principals will be free to allocate up to 20 per centum of the remaining places, as they see fit, provided normally that the pass list of the Common Entrance Examination serves to provide the pupils. Entry above the first form will be under the control of the Ministry of Education and Culture and will require the approval of the Minister.”

That was not the only assurance given by the Government that there would be no interference with the staff of these schools unless there was consultation. I should like to quote again what the hon. Member . . .

Somebody here has bad teeth. I should like these people in the gallery to know that are not here by right. You still have a few fanatics and office holders who are very much afraid of losing their office and are showing their loyalty to the Government in this rather unpleasant manner.

Let me quote from what the hon. Member for Tunapuna said on the 21st June, 1963 when he was talking about the Teachers' Pension Bill. This is what the hon. Member said:

5.45 p.m.

“This is intended to benefit at the moment 404 teachers in 20 assisted secondary schools. I think that this will be providing a great benefit to these deserving teachers, many of whom have spent the best years of their lives in giving tuition and training to many of our sons and daughters in this territory.”

That particular member should know.

The hon. Member also said during that same debate:

[MR. B. RAMDEEN]

“Generally, the purpose of this Bill is to provide for the payment of superannuation allowances to teachers in assisted secondary schools without affecting the existing relationship between the Government, the governing bodies, and the teachers in assisted secondary schools, whereby the power to appoint and exercise disciplinary control over these teachers is vested in the governing bodies and not the Governor-General acting after consultation with the Public Service Commission.”

Today we are seeing in this country an attempt to repudiate the agreement of the Concordat and to go back on the promises and assurances given by the hon. Member for Tunapuna speaking on behalf of the Ministry of Education and on behalf of the Government. At the last minute the Government pretend to graciously concede, to give way, to yield ground by making certain amendments. That is a policy with which I shall deal later on. And the Minister of Education, emulating, I suppose, his political chief, goes to Fyzabad and in the most intemperate language accuses the twenty principals of the assisted secondary schools of “howling” about this particular provision.

On the question of religious instruction we are being told that religious instruction is free, that religious bodies are free to go to Government secondary schools and give religious instruction. My information is that in the new Government secondary schools despite the fact that two or three years ago the religious bodies were given the assurance that they could teach religion through every form, religious instruction has been confined to the two lowest forms in such schools.

Then there is the point of consultation coming up again. The principals of the assisted secondary schools, people who are

responsible for the training of the majority of children in this country and who have in the past been always responsible and who are at the moment still responsible for the education of the majority of children in this country, have for more than 18 months now been attempting to have an appointment with the Minister of Education. Since 1960 they have been raising various matters with the Ministry of Education. In December, 1963, there was a meeting with the Minister in which certain oral guarantees were given but certain other matters were left outstanding. On the 22nd February, 1964, the Association wrote to the Minister. They received no acknowledgment from the Minister of Education, who, incidentally, is also responsible for culture. They received no acknowledgment. Subsequently an appointment was sought with the Minister of Education. On the 6th November, 1964, the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education, promised to try to arrange an appointment. On the 9th November, 1964, the Association forwarded a memorandum containing 11 points to the Minister of Education because they could not meet the Minister personally. About a month later they were given 48 hours notice—it seems that the Government have an obsession for giving only 48 hours, notice—to attend a meeting with the Minister of Education. When the delegates of the Association of Principals went to the meeting they were informed that the Minister was too busy to attend the meeting, and the Permanent Secretary had no authority to give any assurances or guarantees.

On 6th March, 1965, the Association wrote to the Minister of Education, and again on the 17th April, 1965, they received an oral acknowledgment. In early May a meeting was arranged but again when delegates of the Association of Principals went to the

Ministry of Education they were informed that the Minister could not find it possible to meet them. So for two years these people have been trying to see the Minister of Education in this country and the Minister has treated them with utter disdain and contemptuous disregard.

Every effort has been made in this country to alienate and antagonize the staff of the assisted secondary schools. The Hammond Report recommended that there should be parity with Government secondary schools in matters of salary. The Government Working Party supported this particular recommendation. Here in this House today we have heard the Right Hon. Gentleman saying that equal qualification means equal pay. In practice we found that after the last regrading in the Public Service—I think it was after the Lee Report—it was about 9 months after the Government secondary school teachers started receiving their new salaries, that the teachers in the assisted secondary schools were finally given the new rate of pay. At the moment interim pay has been going on for two years, teachers in the Government schools are getting interim payment but the teachers in the assisted secondary schools... [*Interruption*]. If somebody wants to say something I am prepared to give way. The teachers in the assisted secondary schools are not drawing any interim pay yet. No increment is given to teachers in assisted secondary schools for extra qualification. If a teacher has extra qualification to the basic qualification required to hold his post in a Government school he would get extra increment or increments, but this condition does not apply to the teacher in the assisted secondary school.

On the question of long leave—I understand that the practice may be stopped even for the teachers in Government schools—in the past the teachers in Government

schools enjoyed that privilege, if we may call it a privilege, but the teachers in the assisted secondary schools have been denied equal treatment.

On the question of sick leave the teachers in the Government schools can get more than fifteen days, the prescribed limit. They present a medical certificate from a Government medical officer; the teacher with the same qualification in an assisted secondary school taking more than fifteen days is not given any pay whatsoever.

Travelling allowances are paid to teachers in Government secondary schools but their counterparts in the assisted secondary schools get no travelling allowances.

All these acts of discrimination, what I may virtually call acts of oppression, have been applied in the hope that the teachers in the assisted secondary schools would have cracked under the pressure and would have come to the Government on their knees saying that they preferred to be under the control of the Government so that they could get conditions equal to those of the teachers in Government secondary schools. I want to pay tribute to them and to commend them for their loyalty to the denominational bodies with which they have been employed and for which they have rendered such good service.

On the question of scholarships, the teachers in the assisted secondary schools have been complaining that publication is always late. The principals of these schools are asked to recommend the best teachers they have in order that those teachers may be given scholarships, and when these teachers are given scholarships and they go abroad, qualify and come back, they usually want to go back to the denominational boards which they were serving before; but

the Government want to get the best teachers, they want to get them away from the denominational schools and take them into the Government schools of this country.

Already, at this moment, the assisted secondary schools are permitted to have not more than two-thirds of their staff as graduate teachers. In other words, if they have twenty-four teachers they are not to have more than sixteen graduates unless they had specific permission from the Minister of Education. Every attempt is being made to emasculate and to limit, to retard and to reduce the advance of denominational education in this country. They have attempted to take away the best teachers.

We have seen what has been the result of taking teachers from an established institution to staff a new institution. We have seen what happened to Q.R.C. Q.R.C., already poorly staffed, is perhaps the best Government institution in this country. The Government took staff from Q.R.C. to send to other new Government institutions of learning. This reduced the standard of Q.R.C. Q.R.C. is but a mockery of what it was before; not that it had always produced the best, maybe it did sometimes, but not in every field of endeavour.

5.55 p.m.

Only two-thirds of the teachers of these assisted secondary schools are permitted to be graduates and now the teachers of these denominational schools are also being made the principals of new Government schools. I cannot hold it against them if they accept this promotion, but this is another effort to emasculate and to weaken the existing structure of denominational education.

Another and more serious attempt is being made. According to Regulation 60—and I should like to be given the assurance that

my interpretation of Regulation 60 is wrong—the first 500 children who pass the Common Entrance Examination would have utter freedom of choice to any school they want to attend. Next, the places in Government secondary schools would be filled, and the last lot would fill the places in denominational schools. That, Sir, is more evidence of this attempt to reduce the standard and quality of the denominational schools in this country.

In November, 1964, the principals of the assisted secondary schools were called in and were given one week in which to present a plan of their planned expansion and the cost of such a plan. More than a year has elapsed and no action has been taken. The only conclusion to which I can come is that this is the dog in the manger attitude; the Government are incapable of providing a sufficient number of school places in this country and they will not permit the denominational bodies to expand.

Aid has been withheld from a particular secondary school run by the Roman Catholic denomination. I refer to the St. Catherine High School in Sangre Grande. I think it is now called Holy Faith Convent. I am very sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not here because sometime ago I heard him lavish praise on the performance of the students of that particular institution at an arts festival. I hope that he remembers that he has a responsibility also to those of his constituents who may be Roman Catholics and whose children go to St. Catherine School. He owes a responsibility to them to see that that particular school gets state aid.

On the question of property rights Government have shown contemptuous disregard for the provisions of the Concordat. Let

me read paragraphs 1 and 7, Sir, with your permission, and then I shall illustrate the flagrant disregard and the complete violation of these provisions. Paragraph 1 reads:

“In relation to property, the ownership and right of direct control and management of all denominational primary and secondary schools may be assured to the denominations in whatever modification of the existing system may subsequently be introduced in the New Education Ordinance, and all existing rights, so far as property is concerned, will be respected.

“7. All new central schools may be established only by Government for the simple reason that these schools are to be fed from the primary schools of all denominations, as well as Government schools, which may be in the area served by the central schools. 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.”

I want to speak of a violation in the case of the Belmont Intermediate School. The inflow of pupils at the primary level was stopped; they did not permit children to go in at the primary level and when they had a sufficient number of school places the Ministry of Education sent 163 children to that school to fill the vacant places as secondary school students. There was no thought of the provisions of clauses 1 and 7 of the Concordat. There was no thought given to the question that the denominational authority should be consulted; there was no thought given to the fact that the denominations had a right to appoint 20% of the children to be taken into the school, if they accepted the fact that the school should be converted into a secondary school. There was no consultation.

Sections 11 and 12 of the Jamaica Bill provides for such consultation. The Concordat locally provides for such consultation, but these are only bits and scraps of paper. I am almost tempted to say they are trash in the eyes of the Government. Seven new classrooms in the Belmont School were made without one cent aid from the Government and these also are being commandeered by Government without any consultation with the particular denominational body. This may be described in language which would jar on the ear of the Rt. Hon. Gentleman, but it may be described as financial robbery because \$5.40 or less per term is being paid for the children in that school, whereas the denominational body should be receiving \$16.00 per term because the school is now converted into a secondary school. I am almost tempted to borrow some of the language used by the Rt. Hon. Gentleman in this House in the debate on the Maurice Report on Education. I shall resist the temptation.

Every year in this country 24,000 children, at least, take the Common Entrance Examination and at most 4,000 of them can be placed in secondary schools. Government today ignore and blind themselves to the fact that a Himalayan problem exists in our midst; and instead of attempting to find the remedy to cause or encourage the expansion of denominational education in this country, Government are attempting to strip the churches and to violate the Concordat.

It was Stalin, who, on Radio Moscow on the 20th August, 1950 said, “Promises are like pie crusts, made to be broken.” Stalin was a Roman Catholic who became a renegade to his faith. Hitler also was a Roman Catholic; he also had a Concordat with the

[MR. B. RAMDEEN]

church which he also violated. It seems, Sir, that in Trinidad history is repeating itself. By violating this Concordat today, Government are inculcating disrespect in the minds of the people in this country for what one recognized as a word of honour and the due respect that we give to a church whatever denomination that church may be.

Today Government claim that they seek to bring about integration in this country. In that same meeting in Woodford Square, the Prime Minister speaking about Presentation College, Chaguanas, said: "Presentation College, Chaguanas, which took in 57 students, of whom 7 were Roman Catholic, 50 out of 57 were non-Catholics; of the 50, 38 were Hindus and 8 were Muslims; so the parent's choice today means Presentation College, Chaguanas, is a Roman Catholic school run principally for Hindu boys." The audience laughed. I was tempted to be critical of them, but because of the behaviour of some people who make no contribution, except noise in this House, I shall be charitable to the people in Woodford Square.

6.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, in this country integration already exists, and we have had the best evidence coming from the mouth of the Rt. Hon. Gentleman himself. If that Gentleman is offended because Hindus, who have not been permitted to have a secondary school of their own in this country, despite the efforts of this Government to deny them a proper and full education, to deny them equal rights with anybody else, are still finding places in Roman Catholic and Presbyterian schools—if that offends the Rt. Hon. Gentleman then I cannot be held responsible. I remember that I moved in this House a motion for the opening of Hindu Primary Schools, Hindu Primary

Schools which were kept closed for six years; they may have been cow sheds, but it would have been better to have children in cow sheds and relics of colonialism than to have them grow up to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. If that is why the Rt. Hon. Gentleman is offended then that is no fault of mine. But the fact that the head of the Hindu community or a man professing to be the head sits silent while this takes place against the community of which he is supposed to be the head; if the leader of a political party, who is himself a Hindu prefers to absent himself rather than to speak in defence of people and children to see that they have equal rights, equal opportunities, a career open to talent as the Government boasts; if these people will abscond, if they will remain silent, I shall not remain silent.

In truth and in fact there is no discrimination in the denominational schools against children because they may live in John John or Shanty Town or any such area.

We boast, or Government boast, that we are aspiring today to national standards. What national standards? The national standard of the best secondary school in this country run by the Government? The editorial of the *Trinidad Guardian* of the 27th July 1963, was about a college in the doldrums and the first two paragraphs read:

"Some really disturbing statements were made on Thursday at the Queen's Royal College Speech Day. We are told that the number of School Certificate passes was exceptionally low, and that the school was going through a period of great difficulty. The acting Principal, Mr. A. A. Gopaul, listed some of the

difficulties, and these make appalling reading when we bear in mind that QRC is this country's leading Government secondary school and should set the standard for other such schools.

"Mr. Gopaul said there was overcrowding in the college, they were understaffed, poorly housed, short of furniture, without a principal. In short they were inadequately equipped to carry out the vital work expected of them.

"This is a shocking indictment of those responsible for the running of Q.R.C. and we say this, with the full knowledge of the commendable efforts the Government are making to spread secondary education throughout Trinidad and Tobago.

"The point we wish to make is, that if the leading Government school is in such a bad condition how can one expect the other schools to strive for higher standards."

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister on that same occasion went into the University of Woodford Square and he said he would list the thirteen schools in order of merit, selected by the parents of children who were the first 500 in the last Common Entrance Examination. It is very significant that he chose the number thirteen. Not because it is unfortunate, but the reason is that if he had not reached 13 there would have been no mention of St. George's; if he had not reached 12 there would have been no mention of Q.R.C. So that the people of this country have quite clearly demonstrated that they prefer to have their children go to the denominational schools rather than to the Government run secondary schools in this country, and that includes the Ministers of Government.

This Bill will not provide more school places; it will not improve the standard of education in this country; it will not stop discrimination, for the simple reason that there is no discrimination, at least not in the denominational schools; and it will not bring about integration because integration already exists. What this Bill is likely to do, is to allow the Government to discriminate against children, because we remember that the Government, after the Maurice Report on education, after the debate on the Cabinet proposals, after they had accepted the proposal that numbers and not names were to be used by children taking this examination, continued for a long time after to allow names to be used and not numbers so that they could discriminate at will.

This Bill will allow for the victimization of teachers or for the favouritism that we have known to be associated with the Government at political levels, to be extended to teachers; and the most important reason, perhaps, is that this Bill will virtually destroy the influence of the church, especially the Roman Catholic Church.

Sir Learie Constantine warned us of the day of apartheid in reverse. I am afraid that we are seeing an example of xenophobia in this country. What have the white expatriates in this country done for us and for our children, and for our forefathers, in fact? I say forefathers because right now there is in this country, at one of the most prominent or perhaps the most prominent, the most eminent, the most respected school in this country, a gentleman who has given more than sixty years' service to this country. In fact he started teaching in this country, perhaps, before any hon. Member of this House was born, including the Rt. Hon. Gentleman. People have

come from away. The people that we try to paint now as white-skinned expatriates who are now called the last bastions of colonialism, have come into this country and they have given the whole of their life span in the service of this country.

And what have our own local intellectuals contributed? Comparisons may be odious, but in such an odious situation I think a comparison will smell like a rose. What have our intellectuals done? We had an island scholarship winner, who held political office, who went abroad and asked people to come back to this country, to their native land, to show a sense of loyalty and patriotism, because we wanted nurses in this country; and when he lost his political office he also lost his sense of loyalty and of patriotism, and goes to live in Canada. We have another son of the soil, not one of the "last bastions of colonialism," but a real son of the soil who also won an island scholarship, who also enjoyed the fruits of political office and who also prefers to sell his services abroad. And we had another island scholarship winner . . .

Mr. Speaker: The time of the hon. Member has expired.

Motion made and Question proposed, That the speaking time of the hon. Member be extended by thirty minutes.—[*Mr. P. G. Farquhar*].

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Ramdeen: I shall not speak of the other gentleman.

We on this side of the House—perhaps I can speak only for the Liberal Party, but I know there are some other hon.

Members I can speak for—we fight for the most prized possession of men here or elsewhere; and this reminds me of a Greek Civic Oath that I saw in a technical college in Derby, and these were the words:

"We will never bring disgrace to this our city by any act of dishonesty or cowardice: We will fight for the ideals and sacred things of this city, both alone and with many. We will revere and obey the city's laws. We will strive unceasingly to quicken the public sense of civic thought. Thus, in all these ways we will transmit, not only not less, but greater, better and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

That is why, Sir, we fight as we fight, that our children in this country may grow in spirit and in stature, and in the fear of God, and that we will not this day give up to Caesar the things which belong to God.

This Bill was built on a corrupt foundation. The cornerstone of this Bill is infidelity and breach of faith. No matter how good the Bill is—if the Bill had been good—I still could not possibly have accepted this Bill if Government had not first consulted the denominational bodies as agreed upon in the Concordat. If they had consulted the denominational bodies and then brought a Bill, despite the objection of the denominational bodies, I would have had respect for the Bill and for the Government. As it is I cannot accept the Bill no matter what amendments they make. That does not in any way imply that the amendments have made the Bill acceptable. They have violated the sanctity of an agreement. This Bill seeks one thing, power, complete and full power over staff, curricula, administration and, what is most important, the mind of the child.

6.15 p.m.

With your permission I should like to quote from a book by Dr. Fred Schwartz—*You can trust the Communist to be Communist*, page 112

“The Communists want the children. They do not care so much about the adults whom they consider as already contaminated with the disease of Capitalism and consequently of little use to them. When the Communists rule the world, the diseased social classes will have to be eliminated. But the children are different. They can do something with them.”

The Prime Minister has publicly said that he wants the children, the adults of this country have been spoiled by colonialism. Now he is making a tour of the children despite the fact that he and his Minister of Education for two years had no time to meet the Principals of the assisted secondary schools.

This Bill and the Maurice Report on Education remind me of the communist's attack on India. They attacked, they retreated, and they attacked again. They show their strength to soften up the enemy. It is the big stick method being used. It is the unhallowed perversion of the might of the state. The Concordat is being brushed lightly aside today. There is a resolute advancement in the Government then an abrupt turn, then another turn, and another more savage advance. The action of the Government is like a rising tide; it rushes in, then it recedes, and then it rushes in a little further than it was in the wave before.

The Prime Minister of this country has said that in the next 20 years we would not be able to recognize the educational structure of this country. Of that, Sir, I have no doubt. He has a willing supporter—I will not use the word accomplice—who is prepared to keep him in office for the next 20 years; but not all of us are prepared to see our way of life and our educational structure so changed within the next 20 years that we cannot recognize them.

Permit me, Sir, again to quote from that same document, page 153:

“The Communist goal is fixed and changeless, but their direction of advance reverses itself from time to time. They approach their goal by going directly away from it a considerable portion of the time Lenin wrote the text-book, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*. Chinese Communist school children are taught to do the dialectical march taking three steps forward and two steps back. If we judge where the Communists are going by the direction in which they are moving, we will obviously be deceived.

“The Communist method of advance may be likened to the hammering of a nail. It is a very foolish person who brings the hammer down with a crashing, resounding blow and then keeps pushing. When the first blow has spent itself, back must go the hammer in preparation for the next blow. A person seeing the reverse movement of the hammer as an isolated act in time and not understanding the process of which this was a part, might find it difficult to believe that this hammer was driving in the nail. When he sees the backward swing as portion of a complete process, he realizes that the withdrawal is as important as the downward thrust to the realization of the objective.

"For those not trained in dialectical thinking, it is very difficult to understand that the Communists have a fixed and changeless goal, but that their method of approach reverses itself all the time."

In 1960 we had three steps forward two back. In 1965 we have made three steps forward two back. The Maurice Report was the down thrust of the hammer and we are given in the Concordat a reverse movement of the hammer. This Education Bill is another downward thrust of the hammer; the amendments are the reverse movements of the hammer. The pattern is clear and if the pattern is allowed to continue I am positive that in the next 20 years we shall not be able to recognize the system of education in relation to what it is today.

The Prime Minister himself says that the church is the last stronghold of colonialism. Of course, only to one particular church is special reference being made. I should like to quote in support of what the Prime Minister has said, an authority of world repute, who holds the same opinion as the Rt. Hon. Gentleman, that the church is the last bastion of colonialism. To support that point of view, permit me, Sir, to quote at some length a few extracts from a book—*The Red Barbarians* by Roy Macgregor-Hastie, page 161:

"Christianity, just as much as prostitution, is for Mao a 'distraction' and foreign. If he had had his way he would have stifled it in 1949. But Liu reminded him that it had not done any harm in the Soviet Union to incorporate a clause in their Constitution enshrining freedom to worship—and Article 5 of Chapter 1 of the Chinese Constitution was consequently enacted to make the same sort of show of 'intellectual liberty'. But

Mao insisted that the Christian Churches be told under just what conditions they would be allowed this 'freedom to worship'."

And then the author goes on to write:

"In June 1950 Chou En-Lai was told to call a meeting with the leaders of the Protestant Churches. Chou explained to them that Mao himself was hostile to their continued existence but in conformity with our policy of tolerance for all minorities the Churches would not be outlawed."

Again he went on:

"Chou En-Lai went on to say that Chairman Mao had agreed to the Churches continuing without hindrance. But they had to send all their foreign missionaries home and keep only Chinese pastors."

And further on again:

"Catholics, according to Mao, are all bad. Their priests are mostly foreigners, responsible to a foreigner in Rome whose predecessors have spent the past half-century indicting Communism and trying to suppress it."

And further on, the last quotation:

"In 1950 Mao started a systematic persecution of Catholic priests with the aim of expelling all of them, or driving them into exile, an aim frankly stated. By the end of 1954 there were no foreign bishops of the Catholic Church ministering in China. Replacements were automatically found to be *non persona grata*. Chou En-Lai had suggested some Party-approved 'Chinese bishops' to the Vatican, but this offer has been received with stony silence, as might be expected. The Protestant Church may well become something Chinese and not specifically Christian. The Catholic Church is likely

to be put under such pressure that it will disappear, just as the Nestorian Christian Church did a thousand years ago."

Sir, the hon. Member for St. Augustine made it appear that the Rt. Hon. Gentleman may be a disciple of Dewey but I do not think that is quite correct because only recently the Rt. Hon. Gentleman seemed to indicate his willingness to learn something about a particular religion and one would have expected that living in a society like ours he would already have some knowledge of Islam.

That brings me to this point which I think is relevant to prove or disprove the statement made by the hon. Member for St. Augustine. I find this statement relevant and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall quote.

Hon. A. G. Montano: Who is the Member for St. Augustine?

Mr. Ramdeen: I beg your pardon, the hon. Member for Nariva. I do not know where the hon. Member for St. Augustine has gone to. You should know.

Hon. A. G. Montano: You do not know where he comes from either?

Mr. Ramdeen: He comes from Caroni. I quote from page 192:

"The most impressive phenomenon of the past few years in Africa has been the decline of Christianity and the resurgence of Islam. Over four million new converts have been made since 1950. Most of them were formerly Christian. Islam, with no white priests and no white idols, appeals to the African.

Mao Tse-tung, who has no feelings either way about Islam, is not above fellow-travelling past a mosque."

Mao Tse-Tung may have taken an interest in Islamic literature. We also have our Islamic fellow traveller now. This attack, this aggressive attitude against the church, one church in particular, in which the clergy are white skinned people, is not a disease of recent origin, it is a malignant and deep-rooted disease. There is a book called *Chalk Dust*. They say copies may still be had. The author of that book is the Education Officer of the PNM, which forms the Government. *Chalk Dust* is a virulent and obscene attack against the Roman Catholic Church. The celibacy of these people is mocked, their honesty parodied. They are described as a master race, the devil is painted as a white man not with horns and tails but with the vestments of an Irish clergyman and the whole theme of the book written by the PNM Education Officer is that these white people, like chalk dust, must fall off the face of a black nation, and we may be considered today to be a black nation.

I see that the Muslim community gives its support to this Bill. I disagree with them completely, but I also respect their right to hold an opinion. That is their democratic right, if they care to support the Bill nobody has the right to deny them that right. Somebody mentioned that you have the right even to err. That also is a democratic right, but what I cannot reconcile is their present attitude to their past attitude.

I remember the ASJA Board dismissing some of the teachers in its secondary school in San Fernando. I went to the Ministry of Education in the hope of getting them

to be put under such pressure that it will disappear, just as the Nestorian Christian Church did a thousand years ago."

Sir, the hon. Member for St. Augustine made it appear that the Rt. Hon. Gentleman may be a disciple of Dewey but I do not think that is quite correct because only recently the Rt. Hon. Gentleman seemed to indicate his willingness to learn something about a particular religion and one would have expected that living in a society like ours he would already have some knowledge of Islam.

That brings me to this point which I think is relevant to prove or disprove the statement made by the hon. Member for St. Augustine. I find this statement relevant and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall quote.

Hon. A. G. Montano: Who is the Member for St. Augustine?

Mr. Ramdeen: I beg your pardon, the hon. Member for Nariva. I do not know where the hon. Member for St. Augustine has gone to. You should know.

Hon. A. G. Montano: You do not know where he comes from either?

Mr. Ramdeen: He comes from Caroni. I quote from page 192:

"The most impressive phenomenon of the past few years in Africa has been the decline of Christianity and the resurgence of Islam. Over four million new converts have been made since 1950. Most of them were formerly Christian. Islam, with no white priests and no white idols, appeals to the African.

Mao Tse-tung, who has no feelings either way about Islam, is not above fellow-travelling past a mosque."

Mao Tse-Tung may have taken an interest in Islamic literature. We also have our Islamic fellow traveller now. This attack, this aggressive attitude against the church, one church in particular, in which the clergy are white skinned people, is not a disease of recent origin, it is a malignant and deep-rooted disease. There is a book called *Chalk Dust*. They say copies may still be had. The author of that book is the Education Officer of the PNM, which forms the Government. *Chalk Dust* is a virulent and obscene attack against the Roman Catholic Church. The celibacy of these people is mocked, their honesty parodied. They are described as a master race, the devil is painted as a white man not with horns and tails but with the vestments of an Irish clergyman and the whole theme of the book written by the PNM Education Officer is that these white people, like chalk dust, must fall off the face of a black nation, and we may be considered today to be a black nation.

I see that the Muslim community gives its support to this Bill. I disagree with them completely, but I also respect their right to hold an opinion. That is their democratic right, if they care to support the Bill nobody has the right to deny them that right. Somebody mentioned that you have the right even to err. That also is a democratic right, but what I cannot reconcile is their present attitude to their past attitude.

I remember the ASJA Board dismissing some of the teachers in its secondary school in San Fernando. I went to the Ministry of Education in the hope of getting them

[MR. B. RAMDEEN]

to intercede on behalf of the teachers, to get some sort of discussion, some compromise. The ASJA Board absolutely refused to let the Ministry of Education have any say in the matter at all. I enquired from the Minister, "How is it you have no say despite the fact that you have given \$50,000 of taxpayers' money of this country to the secondary school fund of the ASJA Board?" Despite the fact that that contribution was made, the Ministry of Education had no say. They were not permitted to have any say; so I find it difficult to reconcile their past conduct with their present stand.

But it seems to us that there is contact in every field and at every level because while they were given \$50,000, St. Catherine's Girls' High School in Sangre Grande, a Roman Catholic school, cannot get any money from Government. Montrose Vedic School applied for a grant of \$200 to buy a duplicator. They were not given any grant, but the ASJA Board was given a grant of \$200 to buy a duplicator. I can give you more examples of that, but time will not permit.

On the question of the Minister of Public Utilities, I was a little fearful that he would be absent. I am very happy he is present because I should like him to get a copy of the *Trinidad Guardian* of the 10th May, 1953. There he will see a picture of himself sitting at a meeting of the TIA Board discussing the Ohrini affair. The Minister, who insisted that this particular employee should continue to work and no denominational board had a right to enforce that kind of discipline was bitterly criticized by the board, and the board of which this gentleman was a member, found that the Minister was motivated by hatred, malice, and partiality, and when Moulvi Amir Ali attempted to defend the Minister of Educa-

tion of that day the Minister of Public Utilities who was then Chairman of St. George County Council joined issue with the Minister, he quoted the Koran, and the actual Arabic text was printed in the *Trinidad Guardian*. I have the copy and I can refresh his memory. The Minister on that day and on that occasion felt it was the right of his denominational body to enforce discipline on the staff. Today whether he will stand by his quotation from the Koran or whether he will stand by his Government we shall see. I should like with your permission to quote what Dr. Ansari said at the 42nd meeting of the Indian National Congress at Madras in 1927. I quote from pages 825-826:

"For over a generation the leaders of public opinion in the country advocated and practised a policy of complete co-operation with the Government. That policy was doomed to failure from its very inception. Co-operation is possible between groups with common ideals. Where objects pursued are diametrically opposed there can be no co-operation. Co-operation in such circumstances can only mean surrender of the most cherished ideals on the part of the weak to the wishes and desires of the strong."

Mr. Bhadase Sagan Maraj, professes to speak for the Hindu community. He claims to be the head of the Sanatan Dharma Maha Sabha, a matter which is in controversy. But if he is the head and he allows Government to build a Government school instead of making efforts to make a Hindu school in an area like Orange Valley, where one hundred per cent., perhaps of the children are Hindus, such a gentleman has no right to speak for the Hindu community. He will not speak for me as a Hindu.

Teaching of religion has already posed a problem in the schools. It has been made clear by the Prime Minister himself that there are hurdles which may be insurmountable. That is a point with which I agree completely. Religious training is not a matter of teaching religion like Latin, French or Maths. No priest, no Imam no Pundit can go to a school and teach religion for a prescribed period of time. Religion is a way of life, it is the very atmosphere and essence of existence in a school, and to attempt to teach religion like an academic subject is an utter waste of time. It is bound to fail and Government are attempting to enforce that idea because they are convinced that it cannot work.

I repeat that this Bill will not provide more school places in this country; it will not improve the standards or stop discrimination, because there is none, at least not in the denominational schools, and it will not bring about integration because integration from the examples given by the Prime Minister already exists in this country. This Bill I again repeat will allow Government to discriminate, it will allow them to victimize and favour teachers and it will virtually destroy the influence of the churches in this country.

6.35 p.m.

In conclusion, Sir, I quote these words of Kwame Nkrumah, used in the House of Assembly when he moved his "Motion of Destiny", as he called it, on the 10th of July, 1963:

"To negotiate with forces that are hostile on matters of principle means to sacrifice principle itself. Principle is indivisible. It is either wholly kept or

wholly sacrificed. The slightest concession on matters of principle implies the abandonment of principle."

One last quotation, and I am finished, Sir, is by C. R. Dass in his Presidential Address to the Indian National Congress at Gay in India in the year 1922. I quote:

"The truth is, that law and order is for Man, and not Man for Law and Order. The development of nationality is a sacred task and anything which impedes that task is an obstacle which the very force and power of nationality must overcome. If, therefore, you interpose a doctrine to impede the task, why, the doctrine must go. If you have recourse to law and order to establish and defend the rule of law then your law and order is entitled to claim the respect of all law-abiding citizens; but as soon as you have recourse to it not to establish and defend the rule of law but to destroy and attack it, there is no longer any obligation on us to respect it, for a Higher Law, the natural law, the law of God compels us to offer our stubborn resistance to it. When I find something put forward in the sacred name of law and order which is deliberately intended to hinder the growth, the development, and the self-realization of the nation, I have no hesitation whatever in proclaiming that such law and order is an outrage on man and an insult to God."

Mr. P. G. Farquhar: Mr. Speaker, if a stranger had walked into this building and looked at the Order Paper posted outside this Chamber and read that an Education Bill was to be debated he might have assumed that the Government had devolved a new policy for education and was seeking legal authority to put it into

effect. The stranger would have been wrong. The Government do not have, have never had and will never have a policy for education or for anything else.

It is no accident that the Education Bill comes as one of a series of Bills relating to the Public Services. An Education Bill had to be drafted in order to give effect to Government's proposals relating to teachers' salaries. The Education Bill is not before us today because the Government propose to take action to promote or control education; the Government as at present constituted are incapable of promoting or controlling anything, and after the passage of this Bill their impotence in the field of education will remain. The passage of this Bill will confer upon the Minister of Education the authority to command, but no Bill can confer upon anybody the power to control. This Government have never understood the distinction between the authority to command and the power to control.

As an example of what happens when these two things are divorced, we heard recently from the Prime Minister himself that a command had been issued by the Government that certain equipment should be supplied to the San Fernando Technical School. Not only was the command not obeyed, but it took the Government three years to discover that their command had not been obeyed. In these circumstances where there is such a failure of communication, where the Government can issue orders but apparently have no means of communication to determine whether their orders have either been understood or obeyed, it seems rather absurd to speak of a system of control.

The Government have taken this opportunity to give the Minister, not the power to control, but the authority to constrict. The Minister does not want to be a steersman, he wants to be a brakesman. He does not want the power to steer because he has no sense of direction, he wants the authority to stop. It is not clear exactly what the Minister wants to constrict or what he wants to stop, but I have no doubt that we shall all of us learn about this in the course of time. If the Minister fondly imagines that by acquiring unlimited authority to intervene in educational affairs he is thereby acquiring unlimited power to control, he betrays his ignorance of the science of control, and I should like to give a practical example which would illustrate the problems relating to control.

In a temperate country in winter it is desirable to control the temperature in buildings. The objective is to ensure that the building is neither too cold nor too hot. If it is winter you need to have a boiler to produce the heat, but you cannot keep the boiler working indefinitely because the building will get too hot. So one of the ways of solving this problem is to have a man to operate the boiler, and he switches the boiler up when the room temperature is cold and switches the boiler down when the room temperature rises and he feels that it is too hot. This man is free to intervene to turn the boiler up or down whenever he feels that the building is either too hot or too cold. He is given unlimited authority to intervene. What happens in practice is this, that acting on his feelings the temperature at the best of times tends to be erratic—too hot at some times and too cold at others. At the worst of times the man who is supposed to intervene falls asleep, and when he

does the result is either that the occupants of the building freeze or fry, depending upon whether he fell asleep when the boiler was up or down. So alternative methods of control have been devised, and instead of having a man you introduce a thermostatic switch. A thermostatic switch does not have unlimited powers or authority to intervene. As a matter of fact, the thermostatic switch is strictly limited in action. All the thermostatic switch can do is work within predetermined limits. When the temperature falls below a certain point the thermostatic switch comes into operation and turns the switch on, when it reaches the upper point of tolerance the thermostatic switch goes off. The man has got unlimited power of intervention, the thermostatic switch has not. The man, despite his unlimited power of intervention, is unable to control. The thermostatic switch, strictly limited in action, strictly circumscribed by predetermined rules, achieves the objective of control without the freedom of action of the man.

The conclusion is obvious: if you want to effect an efficient system of control it is absolutely essential that there should be certain objective criteria laid down, and the power to intervene in the system should be within strictly circumscribed limits.

6.45 p.m.

If you do not have this you do not have any system of control at all; you have chaos.

No one objects to a system of control. Indeed a system of control for education or for any other field of endeavour is welcome. What we do object to is the unlimited authority to intervene that is conferred

upon the Minister and we object to it precisely because it does not carry with it the power to control and the only possible result can be chaos rather than cosmos. A system of control for education or for anything else requires first, a clear statement of objectives to be achieved and a precise definition of standards to be maintained. Secondly, it requires an effective system of supervision and communication.

I have spoken about the necessity for communication before. There is no point in saying that you are controlling anything if it takes three years for messages to reach you. You must know when your orders are not being obeyed. That is an efficient system of communication. You also need an efficient system of supervision and the effectiveness of supervision depends upon the prescribed span of control.

Now, it is suggested on theoretical grounds that the control of all appointments and promotions of teachers should be under the Public Service Commission. I am not concerned to argue whether this in theory is desirable or not. I am not concerned with what may be desirable in theory; I am concerned with what happens in practice. What happens in practice is that there are head teachers of assisted primary schools who have been acting as head teachers without increments since 1961 because the Public Service Commission has not yet managed to get around to dealing with their cases.

Now the idea of having the Public Service Commission to control the appointment and promotion of teachers is presumably to ensure that unsuitable or unqualified persons are not permitted to perform certain functions but if the supervisory authority is unable to get around to deciding

[MR. P. G. FARQUHAR]

whether particular persons are suitable or not for periods in excess of four years—and we do not know how long it will take the Public Service Commission to get around to dealing with this, can you in fact say that you have got a system of control? All that happens as a result of the supposed control of the Public Service Commission in these cases is that certain teachers are denied their right to increment without just cause. In other words, the control system does not result in greater efficiency; the control system does not ensure that unsuitable persons are not appointed; all that the control system achieves is the victimization of particular individuals.

There is nothing in this Bill to suggest that the Government have worked out a clear statement of objectives to be achieved and a precise definition of standards to be maintained. There is nothing in this Bill which suggests that Government have established or can establish an effective system of supervision and communication. We are presumably conferring the power to control, this is what is said, the power to control on certain persons and we do not know the direction in which they are supposed to steer. I would have thought that, instead of giving legal authority to and conferring formal power upon the Minister, we would have heard something definite of the direction in which the Minister was supposed to steer. But perhaps we have not been told what the objectives are and what the direction may be, because the objectives and the direction cannot be prudently disclosed at this time.

Statements have been made that imply that private educational authorities are incompetent to perform their proper functions. If these statements are true—and

I am not for the moment concerned to question them—it does not follow that the Minister must be given the authority to intervene in the day to day administration of the school. The intervention of the Minister in the day to day administration of assisted schools cannot cure the alleged incompetence. Responsibility for the day to day administration of schools or any other organization cannot be shared between the Minister and the persons who are charged with the administration. You have either got to have the Minister running the schools or not. It is either one thing or the other. If the Minister considers that these educational authorities are incompetent the only solution is that he must assume full responsibility himself. It is not necessary for me to consider what would happen if the Minister did this. Apparently he does not even dare to contemplate the prospect himself.

But let us be frank. The Government do not want to control educational policy or to control the administration of education, and even if they did want to, they are incapable of doing it. The simple fact is that school places are scarce and in relation to the demand for school places they are getting scarcer. Jobs are scarce and again in relation to the demand for jobs they are getting scarcer. The Government want the power of placement in schools and in employment. The Government want the power to determine who shall be educated and who shall be employed. The charges of social discrimination by assisted schools are an indication of what the Government have in mind.

The Government have in their regulations recognized the right of the denominations to exercise choice in respect of 20 per cent. of the admissions. This is a right that the

denominations have earned by virtue of their own financial contribution to the establishment and maintenance of their schools. This is not a privilege; it is a right which can only be extinguished if and when the Government buy the schools from the denominations and take them over completely. The Government have not suggested that they are going to take over the denominational schools completely although this is the logical conclusion of the arguments which they raise. And why do they not want to take over these denominational schools? Because they want to have the power of placement in schools without accepting the responsibility for running the schools. They do not want to accept responsibility for running the schools themselves because the denominational bodies are too convenient a scapegoat to lose for the time being, so they serve their purpose as scapegoats, bearing the blame for everything that is wrong in the education system while the Government insist upon having the power to intervene and to interfere. As I have said, and I want to repeat it, what the Government are interested to achieve for the moment is the power of placement in schools as well as the power of placement in employment. All else is vain hypocrisy.

It is not necessary for me to illustrate the absurdities of the Government's pretensions. Anyone who requires such an illustration need only turn to the speeches of the Prime Minister. Neither is it necessary for me to add to what has already been said about the work of the denominational system. The system has worked and is working. This is more than can be said for any system which the Government attempt to operate. It has been suggested that the religious bodies are too conservative; it has been suggested that they

are unaware of the demands of the modern world. I am rather amazed not at the conservatism but at the archaism of the Government.

I have heard this Bill defended on the ground that it only seeks to put the Minister of Education in the position once occupied by the Director of Education in the colonial past. The persons who use this argument cannot be called conservative, they must be called anachronistic. All we are seeking to do is to put the present Minister of Education in a position once occupied by a colonial Director of Education! What are we doing?

7.00 p.m.

Certain arguments have been advanced that state control of education is desirable in principle. These arguments, as I have heard them, also seem to me to have an 18th century flavour. It seems to me that the advocates have read nothing more recent than Voltaire. It is futile to argue with these matters of dogma. It is futile in any event to argue with those who only speak the language of abuse. I do not propose to undertake an exercise in futility, and I shall conclude my remarks.

People are not convinced by arguments; they are convinced only by facts. The people of Trinidad and Tobago will learn in time and they will learn from time. The children will suffer to learn and they will learn to suffer. The school of suffering is the only school in this country which is free and open to all. It is written:

"The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge."
The parents who have been eating sour grapes for nine years will either change their diet or they die. As for the Members

*Education Bill**Wednesday, 8th December, 1965**Education Bill*

[MR. P. G. FARQUHAR]

of this Parliament, who have to make up their minds about these matters dealing with education and who are charged with the responsibility of setting the direction for the people of this country, what can I say to them? There are many things that I might say but I think I should avoid saying them this evening. Let me content myself with saying:

“Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.”

7.05 p.m.

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: Mr. Speaker with your permission, may I make an appeal to the Leader of the House? It is now 7.05 p.m. and no one speaker can utilize the entire time limit if he goes to speak for the whole period. May I then table a request to the Leader of the House to agree to a postponement now, since this debate definitely has to go on till tomorrow.

Mr. A. G. Montano: There are still six hon. Members who have to contribute—or, at least, five on that side, and one on this side to reply. I am afraid if we do not continue, tomorrow evening at 8 o'clock we still will not be through. We should at least go until 8 o'clock.

Mr. V. Jamadar: Mr. Speaker, the end of the day's happening in this House is already a matter of history. The Government majority in both Houses and their unconcern for the views and feelings of other people have settled the issue finally long before our meeting today. In this hon. Chamber today we merely go through the motions without any hope of influencing a harsh and intractable Government.

During the last few days, hon. Members on this side, despite the dozens of proposals and several hours of debate, have not been able to get Government to make a single change in the Bills so far. All of us here know the result of this great parliamentary battle upon which we are now engaged. We shall play our part in this great Chamber of make-believe and await the day of reckoning.

Parliamentary democracy is a fine institution. It is the finest political institution in sincere and capable hands; but every day that passes convinces me that parliamentary democracy is ill-suited to a community where political motivations are based on sentiment and not on principle, truth or justice. What is happening in Trinidad and Tobago today could never happen in Barbados or in Jamaica. The Government have no mandate from the people to bring this Bill here today. The mandate it has from the people is to preserve the very thing it now seeks to destroy.

Today, for the third time in recent months, in three major matters we are witnessing popular betrayal by the Government and certain of their supporters of the aspirations of the people. The Government had pledged to defend and support the working class movement. They have instead stretched the trade union movement on the rack and scattered and broken them into three to four pieces.

Government had pledged to consult the people on federation. There was no honour in that pledge. The Prime Minister and our hon. Friends opposite honour their solemn virtues to our people in much the same way as the girls in scarlet honour their virtue. Today we face another breach of faith. This Education Act will result

in incalculable harm to our country and the well-being of our people. In my view, it is likely to do irreparable damage to our education system. This Bill interferes with our basic philosophy and concept of education and this interference is justified on administrative grounds. This is no ground at all.

We have from time immemorial in this country enjoyed the blessing of a dual system of education. Church and state have worked together often with church showing greater initiative and drive to create a system of education which places us conspicuously in the forefront of all other emergent and newly independent nations. All our notable scientists, lawyers, doctors, artists, writers and historians have been the product of this system—a system which the Prime Minister is now taking the first step to whittle down and eventually destroy.

Why this haste to weaken and destroy a good thing? Is it because our friends have more and greater experience in matters of education than our venerable and time-honoured institutions? Scan the faces opposite and compare them one by one or altogether with some of our busy educationists and you will see a picture of inexperience and abject ignorance attempting to point the way to their betters. It is this flagrant abuse of power which is today's most heart-breaking part of this debate. Those who have served, those who have poured their wealth, experience and blood into the nation's welfare are denied even an audience to put their views over to our little demagogue. Such, Sir, is the folly of the power of majority rule.

Under PNM rule many have become troubled about the future of our country. Our future will depend upon our willingness to safeguard and defend our democracy in the face of the selfishness and ambition of some little men. Democracy, I maintain, offers us the best chance of success for it is not insignificant that the vast majority of the developed countries of the world have had a tradition of democracy. It is clear that social and economic development show a definite relationship with the change from patriarchal to representative rule; the finest ideas develop in an environment of free and divergent views in an atmosphere of a critical examination of facts. Put in slightly different terms, "Diversity is the keynote of progress".

Today, some of our hon. Friends opposite will have us believe that integration of the teaching service is the answer, the magic potion to resolve all other educational problems. Integration alone is not the answer, just as patriarchal rule is not the answer either.

In our view the true greatness of our country lies in building our democracy on the fundamental concept of unity in diversity: out of many, one nation.

Speaking at San Juan on Saturday night, the Prime Minister said that, the Education Bill was no accident, the Minister did not have the power he ought to have in order to produce a racial and really integrated system, not only for the children themselves, but also for the country which is providing opportunities for the children. This seems to be a complete change in the Prime Minister's concept of a development of our nation; for I remember clearly that in the early years his theme song was, unity in diversity. In those days there was none of this type of talk. At that time he expressed full support for the present system.

Today in spite of what he would persuade us to believe, which we refuse to accept or believe, he is pushing through this Parliament a Bill which will emaciate and eventually destroy private schools and the denominational system.

7.15 p.m.

Our educational system for as long as we can remember has been based upon dual control. This system has worked in the past and continues to serve the nation well at present. I have not heard any cogent or convincing arguments that would lead me to believe that there are grave flaws in the present system. The denominational system has done more than its fair share in educating our sons and daughters. It has demonstrated the capacity to turn out, not only successful students, but good and great men and women in our community. In my view, and contrary to views expressed in certain ill-informed and prejudiced minds, and in Government circles, it has not outlived its usefulness. As a matter of fact, in view of Government's announced bias in favour of technical, scientific and vocational education, emphasized by the Prime Minister as late as Saturday last, and today in his speech in this hon. House, it seems to me there is not only great need but great urgency to preserve the denominational and independent character of our church schools.

Here more than anywhere else, if we are to build a nation of men and women who will have the intellectual background and experience to stand up to top flight men in the world, the tradition of liberal education, well established in these schools should not be destroyed. No one denies the need for more scientific, technical and vocational education; but this should not be at the cost of our well established and highly successful church run schools.

Mr. Speaker, Government's responsibility to the nation is more schools and more school places and not the ruination of well established institutions. In education our aim should be levelling up not levelling down. It is not a question of liberal education competing with technical, scientific and vocational education, it is more a question of one being complementary to the other.

Professor Paul Woodring, speaking on the future of liberal education, has this to say:

"The liberal arts tradition is one that has been corrupted as often by pedantic scholars as by those who prefer vocational training. But, in its best form, it stands for a kind of broad education that frees men of the limitations of ignorance, prejudice and provincialism. Such education is needed now even more than in the past because the leadership of a complex society requires the ability to make valid judgments based on a broad understanding of many fields of knowledge not closely related to vocational competence.

"Specialized or technical training prepares an individual for his first job, but not for the decision he must make as a free man or for the changes in careers that will come during his lifetime. Liberal education, because it is education for versatility, is the best preparation for those who live in a changing world.

"The liberal arts tradition has always had to fight for its existence. Its values, which are delayed and intangible, are not readily apparent to practical men. Many prefer a kind of education that gets immediate results that are measurable in terms of dollars and cents."

While many are condemning the great majority of our private schools, let me say that they have filled a tremendous void in

our education needs. Regulating their activities is a good thing but let us not by our acts today weaken and destroy them, and so undo the valuable service which the Government have been unable to provide and which they with considerable handicap and limitations nevertheless provide.

The denominational schools, like all private institutions of learning, have always demonstrated the capacity to insist on greater discipline and higher and more objective standards, and are less subject to the debilitating influences of Government officials and of the interference by politicians. This is one of the finest characters of these schools, and one of the strongest reasons for that preservation and development. It is universally accepted that their excellence is due to their independence and that this independence should be securely safeguarded if the quality of the education is to be maintained.

Professor Bernard Baum, argues strongly in favour of the preservation, not only of denominational private schools but their independence from political influence, control and direction. In an article entitled "The Problems are Enormous", Professor Baum says—and I shall quote this article at some length because it deals with political interference and the effect of political interference in the development of a high level of education in Government controlled schools.

The learned Professor said:

"A distinction frequently drawn between the private and the state college seems to credit the private institution with a special charisma for the higher academic purpose and its achievement. According to this view, the private college has the character, the means, and the motivation necessary for quality education; the state

college does not. The designation, private college, is used as if it were synonymous with liberal arts college, despite the fact that 'private' colleges have a wide variety of objectives and curricula. The essential characteristics of all such colleges are presupposed to be very much alike. It is also assumed that they will generally meet our critically changing conditions in higher education by becoming more firmly than ever the domain of academic excellence, dedicated unfalteringly to the highest development of the 'whole man'. They are expected to provide an environment in which young people may become more sensitive to truth and beauty through the proximity of great minds and by means of residential and other arrangements that bring students and faculty together in creatively exciting ways. There are, in fact, very strong reasons for being pessimistic about the ability of state colleges to develop excellence in their academic endeavour. This does not mean that they are inescapably doomed to mediocrity, but it does mean that it is unlikely they will ever manage to eliminate the formidable obstacles to their acquiring the foundations of excellence: concentrated attention upon educational goals and presuppose mature values and finely developed sensibility in students, a faculty with eminent professional qualifications, a curriculum intellectually and creatively centred, a general atmosphere of respect for learning and the questioning mind, freedom from administrative interference, first of all, with the educational aims and processes of the college and only thereafter with book-keeping, plant maintenance, intercollegiate athletics, and so on.

"Three principal, interrelated factors obstruct quality education in state colleges: the political pattern of control..."

[V. A. JAMADAR]

And this is the important point which I shall deal with—the political pattern of control. The Government, through the Prime Minister today argues that political control will develop better schools than non-political control. This Professor, a professor of English at the Mansfield State College, Pennsylvania, argues that political control is most detrimental to the effective development of higher educational institutions:

“The political pattern of control over state colleges need not be direct or crude in order to have its blighting effect. True, if the state college presidency itself and certain of its top custodian posts come under a political system and appropriations are governed by party considerations, then the entire campus can become contaminated by expediency and favouritism. Insecurity and frustration can result not only among administrators whose jobs are in a precarious balance but also among members of the faculty, and particularly those most able and most sincerely dedicated to sound principles of education. There are, however, subtler ways in which the close webbing of the political processes of the state to its public colleges can exert an unwholesome influence. In such colleges it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to supplant the idea of control through an hierarchy of power by the principle of decision-making through consensus. Because the institution of public administration must operate by means of an hierarchy of power, in the active relationship of state to college authority an analogous principle of control is readily presumed. Thus, the power structure in the political area tends to condition or predispose the college administration to function similarly, with maintenance staff, secretaries, buildings and grounds custo-

dians, and faculty all lumped together as employees of the state, directly under the president as a kind of superintendent of plant.”

7.25 p.m.

“This reflective pattern of authority and subordination is reinforced by the prevalent design of organizational control that incorporates both academic and state officials, from the college president to a politically appointed board of trustees, up to the chief officer of the state agency for education, to the governor, with the state legislators wielding the big stick of financial control. The results of such a line of ascending authority are to distort the character of the state college presidency and to nurture timidity throughout the academic community. The structure of power motivates the president to become primarily a guardian of the public property and moneys placed under his care. Perhaps one cannot blame him overmuch if, fearful of scrutiny from above (and below, from local party hacks), ever mindful of his political vulnerability, he worries more about justifying another lawn-mower than about the quality of instruction in English or mathematics. Anxiety and excessive caution at the top are communicated to the faculty and even to students. Timidity among deans and instructors manifests itself in extreme conservatism in such matters as student self-government and discipline, as well as curriculum and instruction. Apprehension over possible umbrage and reprisal from political or special interest groups, extending into the classroom, tends even unconsciously to encourage the uncandid and stereotyped and to deter the venturesome mind. ‘Play it safe’ is the rule in state control schools.”

"In a campus atmosphere of timidity and servility one can hardly expect innovation, bold thrusts of mind, strong convictions freely expressed—all those qualities of mind and heart that are critically needed by any nation that has undertaken to preserve the values of a free society. When educators themselves become 'organization men', the very well-spring is tainted. Without substantial autonomy and without full faculty participation in defining objectives and developing academic policies, a state college cannot be expected to provide an education of quality."

Mr. Speaker, the real problem of our education system is the grave shortage of school places for an ever increasing number of children. What is required is not the destruction of the present dual system of education or the lessening of the authority or control of the denominational boards or the increase in power and authority of Government education officers. What is urgently required is an increase in the volume of expenditure on education by the nation.

You will note that I have used the phrase "increase in the volume of expenditure by the nation". I fully realize that there is a limit to what Government can afford. I do not feel that Government have reached this limit yet. I also feel that there are many untapped sources of revenue which can yield substantial sums if citizens of our country are assured that their money will be well spent on the educational needs of their children.

The mushrooming of innumerable private schools everywhere in our country is eloquent testimony of the willingness of our people to go without, to tighten their belts and to save, to give their children a better life than they themselves have enjoyed. If the

Government were wise, this is what we would have been considering today: the essential problem of finding ways and means to improve the level of our nation's contribution to the educational output both qualitatively and quantitatively.

The Education Bill is good in many parts. There are many fine features in it, but there are some parts which we cannot accept.

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is the desire of the Government to get through this Bill, so we will stay on and co-operate.

I want to preface my remarks by stating that I have listened to the hon. Member for Nariva very carefully and with great interest, and I am tempted to think that he is one of those gentlemen on whom the lamp of the church must have made a great impression. And so he is endowed with a great amount of light. I am about to use an extravagant metaphor, suited to the extravagance of the occasion, that is to say, attempting to deal with him is like darkness endeavouring to illuminate light.

Be that as it may, I want to correct one very serious inaccuracy in the records of the House. The hon. Member for Nariva misquoted the Prime Minister very badly, I think, when he said that the Prime Minister had said that the church only provided education for the rich. I do not think the Prime Minister said anything like that. If I can remember well, the Prime Minister said that certain people in the country, because of their contact or their influence or their social prestige, were able to get their children into a secondary school, even if they had failed the examination, and failed to meet the required standard, in preference to other children who had met the required standard. And it is in that perspective

[MR. L. F. SEUKERAN]

that he gave us a record of the schools where children, because of contact, social prestige, wealth, friendship or family relationship, whatever they might have been, found themselves into a secondary school. And the Prime Minister went further, I think, and said, he had no objection to that, nor do I. For that matter, if you want to do it in a private school of your own, you could do it. The objection lies in the fact that these children were benefiting from having this type of education at the expense of the state. In other words, by now Trinidad should know that the Government of this country pay for the education of every child in every assisted secondary school. In whatever school he may be, so long as he goes to a public school a recognized secondary school, the Government pay \$48 for him, each and every child. So that it is rather unfair to the taxpayer who foots the bill to have his child who has qualified, who has passed the Common Entrance Examination with high marks discriminated against while somebody else's child who was not brilliant enough to pass the examination is accepted.

7.35 p.m.

There is only one other argument I want to answer because the others do not deserve any answer, and that is the great emphasis that was placed on the Concordat between the Government and the heads of the denominational secondary schools. What Concordat are we talking about? An agreement between the Government and two or three Principals of two or three religious bodies? What about the vast number of Muslims in the country—60,000. Were they invited to the Concordat? What about the 300,000, odd Hindus? Were they a party to the Concordat. What about the Baptists and Adventists and all the minor religious bodies

and the other Christian denominations? Were they a party to the Concordat? What about the 8,000 or 9,000 teachers in the private secondary and elementary schools? Were they a party to the Concordat? Were they who form such an integral and vital part of the teaching profession consulted? What about the children—the thousands and thousands of children in this country who have no school places, and those who have a school place and do not get a square deal; were their parents consulted in this Concordat? So that when you talk about a Concordat and you condemn the Government to go to hell because you break it then something must be wrong with this type of arbitrary Concordat.

I should like to see a Concordat between the people and Government of Trinidad and Tobago. That is the kind I would like to see. Now that the tumult and shouting has subsided and the emotions and sentiments pervading the atmosphere for the last few weeks have receded, perhaps we can, as representatives of all the people, discuss this Bill with calm equanimity, with reason, and with tranquillity and endeavour to take it in terms of the greatest good for the greatest number, and we must relate it to the taxpayer who pays the tremendous educational bill and only whose urge and will we have any right to discuss in this Chamber.

Any such equation must take into account the 220,000 children of school age in Trinidad and Tobago in the public sector. It must take into account the 25,000 children in the private sector, it must take into account the 9,000 coming of school age every year—that is the rate of increase in the school population per year. It must take into account the 8,000 primary and secondary school teachers who are paid out of public

funds and the 26,000 pupils who take the college exhibitions as well as the teeming thousands who are condemned as unfit for presentation for the college exhibition and at the early age of 11 are condemned altogether by the present system of education. That is what we are trying to prevent in Trinidad today. We must take into account the 300,000 Hindus, the 60,000 Muslims who have struck a new high in the school buildings programme, and above all any such consideration must take into cognizance the \$16 million odd per year that the Trinidad Government expend on secondary schools and the \$30 million odd which they expend on schools generally. It must endeavour to get the maximum value out of the education system for the whole population.

We must think in terms today in a large measure of what type of education we must provide for the children. The aim of any such education has to be in the words of Sir Graham Balfour:

“It must enable the right pupils to receive the right education, from the right teachers at a cost within the means of the State, under conditions which will enable the pupils to profit by their training”.

And who can doubt that the mass of the pupils do not benefit by the training they receive under the church system? The 16 odd grammar schools operated by the denominations in the country today do not fulfil the needs of a population suited to an independent country.

We shall for the moment content ourselves by leaving the primary schools severely alone because they have not been the subject of much controversy and heat in the newspapers. In the secondary schools less than 5 per cent. of the pupils qualify with the H.C. certificate, less than 3 per cent. proceed to universities, 8 or 10 per cent. pass in the

first and second grades and a large bulk of them pass in the third grade which the Government themselves do not recognize as being worthy for recruitment to the Civil Service. Who can doubt then that our secondary school system today is based on class, on creed and economic status and is more equated for the intellectual elite? There is no question about that. As I go on I shall build that argument so you will be able to appreciate it. Can we therefore in the age of independence, have our educational system classified in a manner where only privileged people receive a privileged type of education? And no matter who says what, that is the order in Trinidad and you know it, Sir, and I know it and the bulk of the people who have children in schools know it.

The time has come when the gap between the scholar class, the learned intellectual class, trained in church schools and the remainder of the population more interested in matters of practical and everyday life must be bridged. That is the responsibility of Government and they are in duty bound to evolve a national system that will best serve to satisfy the needs and aspirations of the whole society. To quote the Maurice Report which somebody condemned we find these very significant words:

“What is wanted is a new pattern that will remove the contradictions in the existing system of administration and bring it into line with a uniformed and comprehensive system such as will conduce to the growth and realization of a common social and national objective.”

The Minister of Home Affairs (Hon. G. A. Montano): I beg to move that the House continue in Session until the conclusion of the business on the Agenda.

Question put and agreed to.

7.45 p.m.

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: Mr. Speaker, if the Maurice Report could be condemned for anything, it could not be condemned for that, because that is the aim of every developing country in the world—Trinidad is no exception.

The challenge of carrying an undeveloped country on the path of self-sustaining growth is an exacting experience. Talent, perhaps, Sir, is one of the most precious national resources, and in a developing country the government is bound to give it the fullest scope for development, unhindered by social and economic handicaps. That is the challenge facing Trinidad and Tobago today, Sir, and the Church would do well to accept that challenge.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me say that to the churches we owe an eternal debt of gratitude for the services they have rendered to education for over a century at no cost to the state. Of the services of their devoted, dedicated, illumined and illuminated teachers, it might be said, as of Goldsmith's Village Preacher:

“For other aims their hearts had learned
to prize,
More skilled to raise the wretched than
to rise.”

I myself have been a product of the Church. I have been a product of two denominations. The impact of that venerable clergyman, Canon Boodle, of the Anglican Church, in my early years, and of the Rev. Dr. Macdonald, the Rev. Dr. Scrimgeour, the Rev. Dr. Walls, and the Rev. Dr. Swann, keeps resounding in my memory and keeps haunting it. Of each of them I am tempted to say, like Plato said of Pythagoras: “And in my ear so charming left his voice, that, I all the while,

thought him still speaking”. To me, as though I could still hear the voices of these men as Plato had heard the voice of Pythagoras.

We, all of us in Trinidad, will remain forever indebted to these people, and when future historians chronicle the deeds of people who have done great work for the development of a country, the names of these people—I should say these martyrs in Holy Orders—should go down in immortal letters of gold, emblazoned in letters of gold, which neither time nor the lapse of seasons can destroy. All of that we are fully cognizant of, but times have changed. The old order changeth giving place to the new. That is what the poet said. And change is inevitable in any society, and in the field of education a revolution has taken place all over the world in technology and in science, and has so changed the whole structure of education that the hon. Member for Nariva, Dr. Forrester, would not be able at all from the days when he won the Jerningham Medal to recognize what has happened today.

Educational reformers have been active all over the world. Men like Froebel, Pestalozzi, Rousseau, names like Montessori—everybody knows the work of Dr. Montessori in infant methods at school—men like Dewey and Thorndyke have taught that education is not a preparation for life, it is life itself. They found out that the school system, which continually looks backward, is incapable of preparing young people to make adjustments to a constantly changing society. Will the hon. Member for Nariva also put these illustrious reformers in education in the Rogues' Gallery? If he would, then the Prime Minister is in illustrious company, and I wish I would have my own portrait hanging in the Rogues' Gallery, because he

would have to put a number of people there, and I should like to share the company of anyone, or all of these, because they are the greatest reformers in education alive today.

Nations go on changing, evolving systems, because nations, not content that former words stand fast, look forward, persevering from well to better, daily self-surpassing. Nobody who is content can get any place.

It is not difficult to understand the indignation and ire of the church. Liecester Webb has put it very nicely:

“To change educational systems is to incur inconvenience and arouse the antagonism which comes of habits disturbed.”

That is the reason why the ire and indignation of the church has been aroused.

The question being asked all over the world is whether the organization and institution of education shall be private or public; Trinidad is not the only country in which it is being asked. Who shall be educated? All or some? If educational opportunity is to be equal for all, must the same kind as well as the same quantity of education be offered to all? To what end shall the state direct the education of its members? To its own welfare and security? Or to the greater glory of God? To what end must the state educate people? And the answer is the same in every country. John Stuart Mill holds it to be an almost self-evident axiom that the state shall require and compel the education up to a certain standard of every human being who is born its citizen. Montesquieu advocates that laws of education ought to be in relation to the principles of Government. “The laws of education are the first impressions we receive”, says he, “and as they prepare us for civil life, every private family ought to be governed by the plan of that great house-

hold (the State) which comprehends them all”. Rousseau calls for a system of public education run by the state. “Its object” says Rousseau, “is to assure that the citizens are early accustomed to regard the individual only in relation to the body of the state, and to be aware, so to speak, of their own existence merely as part of the state.” “Taught in this way the citizens,” Rousseau claims, “might at length come to identify themselves in some degree with this greater whole, to feel themselves members of their country and to love it with that exquisite feeling which no isolated person has for himself.”

This is Rousseau, and he gives you the reason why the citizens must subscribe to the education of the state: to love the state. “Of all things,” Aristotle says, “that which contributes most to the permanence of constitutions is the adaptation of education to the form of government”. “The best laws,” he continues, “though sanctioned by every citizen of the state, will be of no avail unless the young are trained by habit and education in the spirit of the constitution”.

7.55 p.m.

In Plato's *Republic* we find him drawing up a curriculum for education and for the first time divisions are clearly made between liberal education, physical education and moral education—the training of the body as distinct from the training of the soul. The aims in Plato's *Republic* are to develop in the body and the soul all the beauty and all the perfection of which they are capable. And Augustine, a product of the church said of the liberal education he received that it served not to his use but to his perdition. While the liberal arts served so well in the study of scriptures it did not serve in the reclamation of his soul, for said he, “I had

[MR. L. F. SEUKERAN]

my back to the light and my face to the things enlightened; whence my face with which I discerned the things enlightened, was not itself enlightened”.

And Bacon declares that men should enter upon learning in order to give a true account of their gift of reason to the benefit and use of men—that is for the state. And Montesquieu laments the pedantic education of the church for aiming at nothing but to furnish our heads with knowledge and not a word of judgment. These are classical references drawn from some of the most eminent people who have ever lived. That has been their experience that I have brought you in a nutshell, the sum total of their thinking.

It is not that this Bill is so bad; it is not that the Bill has anything evil in it. But it is the refusal of the denominations out of long habit and custom to accept the change that is so necessary to a developing country. It is their blunt refusal to accept the change.

Now England affords a classical example of this antagonism of the church to any progressive change. Perhaps in no other part of the world has the church been more entrenched than in England itself where it has resisted every attempt of the state to streamline the education to its national aspirations. To the advocates of the church I want to say that when in the reign of Charles II an attempt was made to broaden the old style curriculum it was found that the powers of the ecclesiastical authorities were so great that the laws barred the introduction of new courses into the schools or the hiring of teachers to teach them, a law due to the influence of the church barring educated people from getting a job to teach.

So important was the religious qualification for teaching that a law in 1662 required every teacher public or private, in home or school to subscribe to the declaration that he would conform to the liturgy by law established and obtain a licence from the Archbishop in order that he could teach. Non-conformists were almost completely deprived of education. In 1665 the Five Mile Act was passed and a fine of £40 or six months imprisonment was imposed on any non-conformist who came within five miles of a town. That was the force of the church. We in Trinidad have no desire to go back to the seventeenth century. Times have changed and even in the United Kingdom education is today controlled by and is the responsibility of the Minister of Education appointed by the Prime Minister and answerable to Parliament. And his duty is defined in the Education Act of 1944 as follows:

“To provide the education of the people of England and Wales and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose and to secure the effective execution by local authorities under his control and direction, of the national policy for providing a varied and comprehensive educational service in every area.”

The Minister issues his main requirements in the form of statutory regulations in circulars addressed to local education authorities and other bodies.

Now let us see what happens in America. In America education is streamlined with a sentiment of nationalism. For instance, Henry Steele Commager in 1950 summed up the American education thus:

“The nation could not absorb ten millions of immigrants from all parts of the globe without rapid and effective Americanization. To our schools went

the momentous responsibility of inspiring a people to pledge and to hold allegiance to those historic principles of democracy, nationalism, Americanism and egalitarianism."

So you see what type of education we have in the United States where the church runs schools, but they are completely controlled in order that the child and the immigrant should be dedicated to those historic principles of democracy, nationalism, Americanism, and egalitarianism.

In France the principle of centralization dates back to Louis XIV. I am talking about the 17th century, as far back as that. The Bourbon Monarchs insisted that the state personified by the King, was the source of all power and of all benefits to the citizen. And despite the various changes that have taken place in the Government and despite the fall of the French people the system remains unchanged to the present date. After the defeat of the French by the Germans in 1940—I am coming right up to the modern times—a commission was set up by the Free French Government which was then stationed in, Algiers to consider drastic educational reform with a view to strengthening the weaknesses of an over-intellectualized cultural education. The Commission blamed the defeat of the French on the educational system. It said in part:

"The defeat and the tyranny would not have been what they have been but for the faint heartedness, the default, and the treason of the controlling groups in the navy and army, in politics, in finance, in industry and commerce. Those who could claim to have come from the summit of our educational system are those whose cowardice has been most scandalous."

It also found that the education in the free secondary schools of France had been deficient in scientific and technological content and the very existence of a nation in a scientific age depended upon strengthening this weakness. Although France is a leading democracy—it is one of the most powerful democracies—its educational system is as centralized as that of any totalitarian state. To the Frenchman it is France, one and indivisible. The system is free, public and under the control and supervision of the Ministry of National Education headed by a Cabinet Minister appointed by the Prime Minister and approved by the President of France and responsible to Parliament. That is the educational system in France. Trinidad and Tobago is doing nothing more and nothing less than what these democratic countries have already done. As a matter of fact I think we could have done far better, but the Government have given way on many points and I am very happy about it.

8.05 p.m.

What is the position elsewhere? I want this myth to be exploded, eroded and destroyed once and for all. I am concerned about the thousands of people in Trinidad and Tobago who will be listening to this debate and I am concerned about their getting a true picture of what happens in other parts of the world. That is my concern and that is why I am anxious to write this into the record. What is the position elsewhere? In Indonesia the Minister of Education and Culture in Djakarta, the capital city, is made responsible for the organization of education throughout the entire archipelago. Secondary and technical teachers are all appointed, supervised and schools controlled by the Minister of Education.

[MR. L. F. SEUKERAN]

In Pakistan, the central Ministry of Education directly administers the educational systems in Karachi the national capital. In desert Baluchistan and in the North West Frontier provinces local government is under the control of the Minister of Education who subscribes to conditions laid down by the central government.

In the Philippines, the system of administration is centralized with policy, finance and control in the hands of a central department of education.

In Thailand, the system is centralized, under ministerial control in spite of the fact—and this is interesting, Mr. Speaker—that there are 1,500 private schools enrolling 233,000 pupils of which 300 are Chinese and 1,000 organized by various Christian missions. Not a Christian missionary in that country raises his voice to say one word about government controlling the system.

In Turkey the system is highly centralized, controlled by a Minister of Education advised by a general council whose advice the Minister *may* accept, not *must*.

Australia provides a system in which the component parts of the state each has highly centralized systems of education. They have no local participation of parents, of citizens or of the denominations. The world wonders why a leading democracy like Australia has adopted a system which seems more suited to a totalitarian regime and not a church raises its voice in the countryside or in the metropolis.

In New Zealand education is state controlled, and according to Kendall it is education for efficiency of all its people.

In India the educational system, according to Raja Rajsingh and as written into their Third Five-Year Plan, aims at efforts to forge the bonds of common citizenship, to

harness the energies of the people and to develop the natural and human resources of every part of the country. It is dedicated to developing secondary education along lines which would conform to the diversified needs of the individuals and of the society. With this end in view it is reorganizing its curriculum, rewriting its text books, retraining its teachers and readopting a different type of examination system and no church raises its voice in India. At university level, the shift is towards scientific and technical education. In short the aspiration, and endeavour of the Indian Government are to realize within the shortest possible time a well-balanced, integrated and adequate system of national education capable of making a powerful contribution to all spheres of national life. That is the pattern we must follow, a pattern capable of making a contribution to all spheres of national life, of social life and to development of the country; a pattern for the building of a democratic society, for the promotion of national integration and unity and, above all, for the transformation of the individual in the endless pursuit of excellence—excellence in any field, be it science, technology, agriculture, vocational schools, grammar schools, commercial schools or classical schools; whatever school is involved the Indian Government are gearing up people in the shortest possible time to meet the exigencies of a developing nation that wants to find a place in polite society. That is what the aim of education is.

What has the church to say about other countries where we have education controlled by political parties with the sole object of fostering and inculcating the cult of the party? Did not the Fascists in the very heart of the Vatican City regiment the educational system of Italy? What did the church say about it? How about the

Nazis in Germany and Japan about two decades ago? How about Soviet Russia where the entire system is fully controlled by the Communist Party? People who talk this arrant nonsense that the Trinidad Government want to uproot and destroy the schools of the denominations ought to make a study of comparative education in the rest of the world. If they have the aptitude I desire to commend the work of Cramer and Browne, two eminent scholars who have done most recent research of a comparative study of national systems as contained in their book, *Contemporary Education*, published by Harcourt, Brace and World, New York. The edition is as recent as 1964. If, instead of reading trash into the records of Parliament and if, instead of quoting a lot of what certain people have said in the newspapers and putting that down in the records of Parliament, people would take the worry to devote some time to studying the educational systems which obtain in the rest of the world on which we must pattern our lives, perhaps they could do to the country and to posterity a great deal of good. That is why I have insisted on making this speech even at this late hour; because I want it to go down in history in proper perspective.

To all those who see in this Bill the uprooting of the Christian church and the condemnation of its adherents to Valhalla I offer my sincerest condolences. As to the rest of the population, I want to commend the words of Adam Smith on page 348 of his *Wealth of Nations* where he summarizes the reasons for the wrath of the church. Let us study Adam Smith:

"The interest of the clergy is never the same as that of the sovereign and is sometimes diametrically opposed to it. Their great interest is to maintain their authority with the people and this authority depends

upon the supposed certainty and importance of the whole doctrine which they inculcate and upon the supposed necessity of adopting every part of it with the most implicit faith in order to avoid eternal misery. Should the sovereign have the impudence to appear either to deride or doubt himself of the most trifling part of their doctrine, or from humanity to protect those who did either one or the other, the punctilious honour of a clergy who have no sort of dependency upon him is immediately provoked to proscribe him as a profane person and to employ all the terrors of religion in order to oblige the people to transfer their allegiance to some more orthodox and obedient prince."

Mr. Speaker, I have summed up this thing in as short a way as I possibly could.

8.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The time of the hon. Member has expired.

Motion made and Question proposed, That the time of the hon. Member be extended by 30 minutes—[Dr. R. Capildeo].

Question put and agreed to.

Hon. Member's time extended accordingly.

Mr. Seukeran: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from the author. On page 345 he says:

"Religious instruction is not so much to render the people good citizens in this world, as to prepare them for another and a better world in life to come."

Surely, the church must incline to the charitable view that Government also have a duty to prepare those who inhabit this planet for a richer and a fuller life, both for themselves and for their country.

[MR. L. F. SEUKERAN]

Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* quotes Emperor Julian as observing that the men who exalt the merit of implicit faith are unfit to claim or to enjoy the advantages of science, and he contends, that if they refuse to adore the gods of Homer and Demosthenes, they ought to content themselves with expounding Luke and Matthew in the churches of the Galileans.

It has been contended that the present Bill gives to the Minister the powers of a dictator and that such powers of the Director of Education in the existing Ordinance are much more limited.

The Education Ordinance No. 28 of December 14, 1933, section 6, states that there shall be established an Education Board to advise the Governor in regard to education policy and principles, and to submit its views on matters educational which the Government may refer to it; to advise on administrative questions which he may submit and to undertake duties which the Governor may impose. Under the existing Ordinance the Board is primarily consultative. Nowhere is it mandatory for the Governor to act on its advice.

In discussing the function of such a Board, the Marriot-Mayhew Commission 1931-32 said:

"We think that the Government should not delegate executive responsibility covering a wide range of educational interests and institutions and the expenditure of public funds to a body consisting solely of nominated members over which neither the Government nor public opinion as represented in the Legislative Council has any effective control."

It goes on to say:

"It is difficult for a nominated Board to have the same responsibility as the Head of a Department directly controlled by the Government and sensitive to criticism in the Legislative Council and elsewhere."

And these observations are made on a Board who may have advice, not must advise. And this is the view of two Englishmen appointed from the United Kingdom to investigate a colonial type of education in a colonial regime where nobody had any right as to whether they wanted to be educated or not.

They go on:

"Division of responsibility leads either to friction, or to a weakening of the sense of responsibility in one or other of the parties concerned."

These were the findings of the Board in the era of colonial history. Division of responsibility, the Commission says, leads to friction and weakness and yet the Government have gone out and appointed a Board or advisory council on which you have teachers, denominational people and people of the public. They say this is a bad thing. Nobody had the temerity to get up and to refute and to repudiate these measures that were proposed by a Commission long ago. These were the findings of these people.

As far as denominational representation is concerned—and I hope the Prime Minister is taking cognizance of this because it is very important—the Commission said that there were no witnesses in any of the islands that asked for denominational representation. This was a Commission inquiring into all the West Indies. Some denominational representative spoke against it.

The Bishop and leaders in the churches in Barbados assured the Commission that there was neither demand nor a need for such representation. In Grenada where such representation is provided the relations between denominations and Government are far less helpful and friendly and inter-denominational feelings seem more bitter than in the rest of the islands.

On page 37 of that Report, paragraph 58, the Commission makes this startling revelation:

"Discussion of Educational Policy or in conferences, is animated by the individual desire of the members to establish or maintain their denominational positions rather than by a common wish to spend what is available in the most effective manner."

That is, when you have the denominations on the Board, they fight each other to see which can get more. They look for themselves rather than for the whole. And that is why Marriot-Mayhew said it was wrong to have them there.

"Those who participate are regarded as ambassadors representing conflicting interests rather than as delegates interested in a common cause."

This is very interesting. The Commission goes on to report in the same paragraph:

"We were given to understand by the representatives of the Wesleyan and the Moravian churches that they would prefer generally a Government system of education, provided that religious instruction is safeguarded, to the present dual system, but for obvious reasons they could not give up their schools unless it was part of a general policy."

On page 39, paragraph 62, the Commission made this further startling point:

"Some have even charged the denominations as regarding increased support from public funds as an excuse for reducing their present expenditure, or withholding from education, additional church funds that may become available."

Since the state provides money the churches are withholding theirs; they are doing anything else with it besides putting it to education.

8.25 p.m.

I am a bit detailed on this but it is the crux of the case today.

Paragraph 66 (40), the Commission reports:

"We were convinced by evidence put before us that the more thoughtful section of the public is at present being strongly influenced in some of the islands against church schools by the prolonged controversy to which they too often give rise.

"There is a genuine suspicion that the denominations in their dispute with the Government and with one another, are more interested in retarding the growth of other denominations than in advancing the cause of education,"

and the Commission says:

"This suspicion has been strengthened by the expressed readiness of some denominations to withdraw from particular areas, provided that their place is taken by Government schools and not by another denomination."

That is, one of them will withdraw gradually, gracefully, but so long as one denomination is pressing, it is pressing, not against the

Government but against the other denomination, and this rivalry and jealousy has been the very bane of the existence of the educational problem.

In Trinidad and Tobago, or in Britain, the Ministry of Education has its own research and intelligence branch. There are, in addition, a central advisory council, whose duty is to advise on matters of theory and practice and on any questions put by the Minister to them. There are a number of advisory councils. These include the secondary schools examinations council and the national advisory council on the training and supply of teachers. He may also appoint—not add, not must; listen to the words: He may also appoint *ad hoc* advisory councils; for instance, the curriculum study group to advise on special features of education, in which case the function and scope of these councils and committees are advisory and consultative, not mandatory. He may (not must) accept such advice.

Mr. Speaker, where then can Trinidad draw its inspiration? If it draws it from America it is on safe ground, from England it is on safe ground, from France it is on safe ground. I have quoted you one dozen and more of the most progressive countries in the world, and in every one of these I have given you a precedent to prove that the Trinidad Government have been more charitable and more lenient.

To say that the Act denies any one the right to give or receive religious instructions is not only vicious and immoral, it is wicked and it is a gross distortion of the truth. In fact the Act is an improvement on the religious education that obtains today and a great improvement on what obtains in Britain.

In the present Regulation No. 48, all teachers in Government schools may be required to give religious instructions according to their faith. No mention is made of anybody going in the Government schools today to give any religious instructions.

In schools wholly maintained by local educational authorities in Britain children receive religious instructions of an un-denominational character. That is to say, in accordance with an agreed syllabus by conference representing the religious denominations, teachers and local educational authorities. One syllabus of un-denominational Christian character—Catholic, Anglican, Presbyterian—all join to form something and that is the devotion. In aided schools religious instructions may be given subject to parents' approval. In controlled schools such instruction is for a limited period, a maximum of two periods in one week; it may be less. In some circumstances the clergy have a right of access to the schools to give denominational instructions for a limited period each week; maybe once a week.

Here in Trinidad, Regulation 75, if it is not now changed, empowers the Minister to appoint people of religious authorities—heads of religions or whoever they want (not to have to appoint) but to allow them to come to the school and to give religious instructions. As a matter of fact it was once a regulation. The Government have gone out of their way and entrenched it in the Bill. It is in the Bill under "Conscience." And what does it say? That in a Government school you can have the headteacher giving religious instructions, as a Catholic if he is one, and you can have Presbyterian, Baptist, the Hindu, the Muslim and divers

other religions, all bringing pandemonium within that hour, if they want to. The law provides for that. They can go and teach their religion.

Is not this a considerable improvement on what happened in the last regime, or what obtains in the existing regulations? Is not this an improvement on what happens in Britain, where the instruction has to be of an undenominational Christian character, and where it is for two days in the week as compared with Trinidad with five days in the week; and all the religious bodies can get down there and do what they like, teach what they like without let or hindrance. Does this in the present Act suggest a desire on the part of Government to uproot religious institutions, relegate the young to world horror and hell and to tyrannize the churches with all the tyranny of totalitarianism? Does this in the Act suggest that? I cannot see it for the life of me, and that is why I have taken time off at this late hour to correct this misrepresentation and this wicked distortion of what is contained in this Bill.

Some people have even read in the Act the denial of the inalienable rights of the parent to have his child taught in a school of his choice, or what he believes is best for such a child. I should like to let Dr. Johnson, in his famous classic, *The Great Conversation*, answer this question for me.

At a dinner at the home of Edward and Charles Glee, the Reverend Doctor Mayo, asked Dr. Johnson the following question, which is very pertinent to the issue: "But, Sir, is it not very hard that I should not be allowed to teach my child what I really believe to be the truth?" Dr. Johnson's scintillating brilliance shone

forth with luminous effulgence on such occasions, and he quipped immediately: "Why, Sir, you might contrive to teach your children extra scandalism, but, Sir, the magistrate, if he knows it, has a right to restrain you. Suppose you teach your children to be thieves!" Dr. Mayo: "This is making a joke of the subject, Sir." Dr. Johnson:

"No, Sir. Take it thus—that you teach them the community of goods, for which there are so many plausible arguments as for most erroneous doctrines. Suppose you teach them that all things were at first in common and that no man had a right to anything but that he laid his hands upon it, and that this is still and ought to be the rule amongst mankind. Here, Sir, you will stop a great principle of society—property—and don't you think the magistrate will have a right to prevent you? And suppose you should teach your children the notion of adamites and they should run naked in the streets, would not the magistrate have a right to flog them into their doublets?"

And he concluded this discussion by saying:

"The vulgar are the children of the state. If anyone attempts to teach them doctrine contrary to what the state approves, the magistrate may and ought to restrain him."

Mr. Speaker, I could not find a more classic quotation in all my reading to answer this. Because if people want to have the right to educate their children where they like they must not make them the burden of the state. They have no right to expect the state to employ half-baked, semi-educated people. If you give this right to educate your child to the state you can hold the state responsible for providing him with

gainful employment, because the state will, at an early age, sublimate a child in a direction for which he could be trained to become a useful citizen, and in consequence of that training he will be privileged to get employment. If the parent wants to train the child he must also be prepared to carry the necessary responsibility of finding work or employment suitable to that child when he grows big.

8.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I only have one more comment to make. As a matter of fact, I am in a desperate mood to deal with this Bill from page to page. And believe me, I have studied it and I know what I am talking about. I am not very happy about the introduction of the compulsory Ordinance and I am going to ask the Prime Minister to consider seriously that, while it may remain on our statute-book, because the time might well come when we might have use for it, no effort should be made at the present time to implement it. For it cannot be gainsaid that the need for the removal of defects with which the educational system abounds constitutes the first claim on such additional funds as are, or may be, available. Reforms are necessary to make compulsory education fruitful and a public boon. Extensive training to produce competent teachers; adequate building provision for manual training, medical inspection, devising a Register of children of school-going age, and methods of keeping it up-to-date, must be prepared well in hand before the introduction of compulsory education.

The additional cost of compulsion for children six to twelve years old was carefully worked out in Barbados some years ago. As a result of this survey, the amount

of money to be spent on compulsion and on initial costs amounted to £12,000 in Barbados, and \$4,682 recurring expenditure, an increase of some 12 per cent. of the annual recurrent expenditure. And the Barbados Government merely took into account the provision of homes and salaries for attendance officers. It took no cognizance of the training of teachers, the provision of residential orphanages for the poorer classes, of free clothing, free meals, free books for children of respectable but poor families. All these would have to be taken into account in any system of compulsory education.

It is with that fond hope that I am asking the Government to give very serious consideration to leaving this particular regulation, or rather the section in the Bill, so that when the time comes we may be able to make great use of it. But until we can set all these things that are prerequisite to a compulsory educational system in order, I do not think it would be wise and proper for us to implement it.

Perhaps you will permit me to register this last note. The Trinidad Government pay nearly all the cost of secondary education. I have some vital statistics in my possession and I should like to read these into the record.

Take for instance in 1965 the Trinidad Government will have paid the salaries of teachers in denominational primary schools alone amounting to \$12,263,864. Those of assisted secondary schools will run up to \$2,544,196.

School Equipment and Maintenance of Premises (Assisted Primary Schools) \$285,000
Maintenance Grants for Practical Subjects (Assisted Secondary Schools) \$ 78,300

Fees of Pupils (Assisted Primary Schools)	\$ 85,000
Fees of Pupils (Assisted Secondary Schools)	\$550,000

In other words, all Trinidad should know that most of the expenses of these schools are met by the Government.

Text Books (Assisted Secondary Schools)	\$72,400
--	----------

You have grants for libraries, games equipment, water rates, travelling and transfer expenses. But I want to deal for one moment with grants for school fees \$550,000 of Trinidad's money for school children. The Trinidad Government did not discriminate whether that child was the child of Messrs. Gordon, Grant & Co.; whether it was Huggins' child, or whether it was the rich man's child in Trinidad. It did not take cognizance of whether the child was born in Woodford Square and grew up in an orphanage. All the Trinidad Government had was a criterion, a merit system. You pass this examination; you come among the first 500 and they pay your way. All these children's fees were paid. What is the fee? \$48.00 per pupil. If the schools had 1,000 pupils, that would be \$48,000 for the pupils every year for them to be taught. They are receiving teachers' salaries; they are receiving library grants; they are receiving maintenance; they are receiving structural repairs; and if the schools are being built, they receive two-thirds of the grant.

Are they serious, Mr. Speaker, when they suggest in this House that in the age of independence with a Cabinet system, where we have a two-party system with an executive in control, with a Prime Minister and a Minister of Education and

a Government putting out all this amount of money, the Government have not got the right to say what type of education should be given for the benefit of the overall population?

It is a small concession that the Trinidad Government, like all other Governments in every developing country and any democratic country, can ask for. If it were a totalitarian country, none of them would have opened their mouths tonight. Nobody would have said anything. But in a democracy where people are making such yeoman contributions like other countries are doing, why cannot we take a page from India. India is a lovely country to take an example from. They have a third five-year plan in progress now. We are having a third within a short time. And India within this short time has reorientated its whole educational system to meet the exigencies and the needs of a developing country.

8.45 p.m.

If you want a mason you cannot find him; you want a plumber, you cannot find him; you want an electrical engineer, you cannot find him; you want a good painter to paint the Red House, you cannot find him, and now you are talking about un-employment. Unemployment...

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is given two minutes to wind up.

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: With the two minutes I would say that we could avoid all these unemployment situations which I admit we have, if you would allow the Government to sublimate the educational steam into a direction suited to create jobs for the needs

of a developing country and here I want to ask the church to go slow and not to impede the work of a progressive nation in the era of independence.

Mr. T. Hosein: Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a very bold, short and objective speech on this Bill as it stands. I am not going to make any general comment on it, but there are about six points that I should like to raise, not that I think that any useful purpose will be served by raising the points, but I think nevertheless I should like to make them for the purposes of the record.

First of all I should like to make some comment on the provisions on the Board of Management of assisted schools managers, clause 15, &c. It seems to me that the administrative machinery which is created by these clauses for the management of assisted public schools is farcical. There is no proper co-ordination of the administrative machinery, and by way of illustration may I just make these observations.

First of all, clause 15 establishes boards of management of public schools and assisted schools. Then clause 16 provides that these boards must act in accordance with any special or general directives of the Minister concerning the exercise and performance of their powers and duties conferred or imposed on them by this Act and the Regulations.

It follows therefore that the Minister can issue to these boards any directives on any particular matter that he may wish, because he has the power to make regulations and therefore the character of his directives may change from time to time and it is mandatory for this board to obey this directive.

In clause 17 certain general powers and duties are set out. It means that these powers and duties are completely loose in the sense that they are liable to be varied and the board must, in the exercise of these powers and duties, obey the directive of the Minister, which are completely general. That is not all. The board is specifically empowered by paragraph (e) to appoint managers and to dismiss them. When you look at clause 21 you find that the manager shall be responsible for the efficient performance of such duties as may be delegated to him by the board of management and such duties that are delegated to him by the Minister including three specific things.

It follows that if these managers, who would be appointed and be dismissed by the board, could be assigned duties by the Minister; naturally the Minister would be able to control the managers as well. One would expect that if managers were appointed by boards they would be responsible to the board, and that if the managers were to be given any particular direction by the Minister, those directions should go through the board. It is the board that should control the managers, and the Minister, if he wishes to direct the managers to do anything, should go through the board. But no, that is not what happens. The Minister has a right to direct the managers to perform any particular duty which he may wish to assign to them.

The situation is even worse than that; the supervisor whose duties are defined in clause 26 is also given by sub-paragraph (1) the duty of supervising the due performance of the functions of managers. So managers are appointed by the board and they must be supervised by the supervisor and they can be directed by the Minister.

It seems to me that if you are going to have such administrative machinery set up for the control of public assisted schools you ought to have some authority at the top, and if some order is to be given to a subordinate authority that order ought to go through the authority at the top.

When you look at this Bill you will find that provisions are being made in it for all sorts of returns to be submitted by all sorts of people. The Minister must be entitled to require returns to be made if he is to exercise proper control, but what I do object to is that he can require a principal of a school to submit returns, the manager of a school to submit certain specified returns, he can require the Board to specify certain returns if he wants returns. The managing authority is the board and the proper thing to do is to require the board to submit any return and if the board must comply when directed to submit these returns then the board can obtain the information from its manager or principal and submit the return to the Minister. But the Minister should not be entitled to go behind the back of the board and require its manager to submit a return when the manager is subject to the jurisdiction of the board and the manager is appointed by the board and can be dismissed by the board. The same argument can be used with respect to the principal. I find, therefore, that the administrative provisions have not been properly conceived and the administrative machinery which has been created by these provisions is not properly co-ordinated.

Let me then pass to my second point; and this is a constitutional one (which I know is viewed with a certain degree of abhorrence in this House), but I think, nevertheless, it is my duty to make it for purposes of the record. The point I am making is that the

conjoint effect of clauses 16 and 17 of the Bill may on their proper interpretation constitute an infringement of the right to enjoy property which is vested in the owners of assisted schools. I merely state that point and do not intend to argue it.

The third point I should like to make is on clause 71 and the following sections relating to the associations which are to be established for the purpose of representing teachers. On this point I should merely like to repeat the comments I made two days ago on similar provisions which are contained in the Civil Service Bill.

The fourth point is that notwithstanding the assurances by the Prime Minister that the Public Service Commission would be enlarged to cope with the additional functions which will devolve upon them by reason of the bringing of teachers under their control, I myself have no doubt that (notwithstanding the enlargement of the Commission) they will not be able to cope with their additional duties. I speak from experience because I have had to deal with many cases which have come before the Public Service Commission, particularly disciplinary cases.

8.55 p.m.

I know of certain civil servants who are under suspension by the Public Service Commission for two to three years, and it takes that long to formulate disciplinary charges against them. I know of certain people in Tobago, I know of certain civil servants in Trinidad. It is something which, I think, is quite unjust: that a civil servant of this country should be suspended and should not be charged and dealt with if his dismissal is contemplated; and this sort of thing is bound to occur where you find so many people being brought within the control of the Public Service Commission.

[MR. T. HOSEIN]

The fifth point I should like to make is that the regulation-making power of the Minister is extremely wide. I concede that the Minister should be granted the power to make regulations in order to give effect to the Act, but having regard to the wide powers which are being conferred upon him, I should like to make the same point that I made on the last Bill to the effect that these powers, when exercised, should be subjected to the scrutiny of Parliament before they come into force.

And the final point I should like to make is this: that many of the enabling provisions of this Bill have long been part of the statute law of this country. Many of these provisions are not new, and many of the provisions which have been inserted here and which have been in existence before have never been used. I do not know why. There were lots of provisions on the statute-book in relation to private schools. They were never used. I am not sure whether, by merely re-enacting these provisions, more use would be made of them.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me what we need in this country is not more legislation but much more action.

Mr. S. Capildeo: Mr. Speaker, since this is a debate on education I should like to refer to a matter, just between the Prime Minister and myself, merely to put the record straight. When I referred to the Prime Minister of Barbados in this Assembly, the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister told me I should be careful how I confuse Plato with Aristotle. I know that the Prime Minister, far beyond any other person in this territory, would be the authority on these subjects, but I also know that the Prime Minister is burdened with considerable duties of state and that his excursions into Plato and

Aristotle have been of long but distant standing. Therefore it is necessary for me to remind him that I believe—I do not want to say that I was right and he was wrong—that this book says that the quotation comes from Plato; it is contained in the Fifth and Sixth Books of *The Republic*, and the words I am using are the English translation by Jowett of Balliol College, Oxford, and this is what he says in the Fifth Book:

“Until philosophers are kings or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy and political greatness in wisdom...and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils, nor the human race, as I believe. And then only will this our state have a possibility of life and behold the light of day.”

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this would end the dialogue between us which has gone on since 1956, that it was Plato and not Aristotle who made use of this phrase.

In the Bill before us there are many many matters of complaint, but I seek your permission to refer you to page 44, the Offences and Penalties sections—86, 87, and 88. This Bill provides for fines to be imposed from \$25 to \$250, and then for a further fine of \$25 for each day, and all these for obstructing any person acting in the execution of this Act or of any regulation, order or warrant made or issued thereunder. In sections 86, 87 and 88, I want to repeat, citizens of Trinidad and Tobago are going to be put under penalty of fines and imprisonment for perhaps disobeying or not observing a regulation or order or warrant.

Because of these very severe penalties provided in this Bill, it becomes necessary for me to refer to another dialogue between

us, a dialogue about the rights of Ministers to make regulations under a Bill, under an Act, under an Ordinance, to provide penalties for non-observance without bringing those regulations or orders or warrants to Parliament. It is my respectful submission to you Mr. Speaker, that the present state of the law of England, which has been arrived at after many many years of close observation, ought to be the position in Trinidad, and that the Minister ought not to be permitted to make all these regulations that he is permitted to make under this Bill unless these regulations came before Parliament. In this Bill, from pages 40 to 44, the Minister is given the power to make regulations on almost every imaginable subject. Section 84 (2) says:

“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.”

It goes on, Mr. Speaker—I will not burden you with all the words—but again in subsection (4):—

“The Minister may make regulations providing for the general control, management, organization and conduct of intermediate schools....”

In subsection (5) “The Minister may make regulations in that behalf for private schools. Subsection (6):

“The Minister may make regulations for the control and management of private schools....”

Subsection (7):

“The Minister may, from time to time, make regulations for all or any of the following purposes—”

And we proceed to have about 16 lines enumerating matters and things on which the Minister may make regulations under subsection (7). Under subsection (8):

“The Minister may from time to time make regulations for all or any of the following purposes:—”

“(a) Defining the categories of children requiring special education....” and so on for the whole of page 42. Under subsection (9):

“The Minister may from time to time make regulations for all or any of the following purposes—”

And this gives him powers over teachers' colleges and what not, and going on to page 43 on a number of matters and things. On page 43, subsection (11), for some reason, unknown to me, but I hope the Prime Minister will, in his reply, give me the necessary elucidation, the power of making regulations is taken from the Minister and put in the hands of the Governor-General under subsection (11).

Under 85, page 44—and this is the one which I believe I find most necessary to emphasize—

“The Minister may make regulations generally for the purpose of carrying this Act into effect....”

That is to say that is a positive power of making regulations to carry the Act into effect. But it also gives him the power, and in particular, for prescribing anything that is by this Act required to be prescribed. In other words, it appears to me quite clear that by this Act it is intended to give the Minister the power to legislate over every matter and thing which this Act could possibly have envisaged or dealt with or mentioned or be concerned with, either explicitly or impliedly.

9.05 p.m.

Against that background I, therefore, crave your indulgence to point out the existing position in England, and to say that if

[MR. S. CAPILDEO]

these provisions were present in our Parliament, if we were given the same privileges in our Parliament, then perhaps I may not be as loud in my denunciation of these powers. But in the absence of the safeguards which obtain in England I find it necessary to point out that these powers are too great.

In the Second Edition of *Parliamentary Dictionary* we have the definition of delegated legislation.

"Under many Acts of Parliament the Queen in Council, Ministers and certain statutory bodies have power to make orders, regulations, rules and similar instruments having the force of laws, the power to legislate or make law being thus delegated by Parliament to the authorities or persons making the instruments."

Under the head "Statutory Instruments" we see:

"A statutory instrument may be defined, broadly speaking, as an order or regulation made by the Queen in Council or one of her Ministers, as the case may be, under an Act of Parliament and either having the force of law or acquiring such force on being approved by either or both Houses of Parliament. The Statutory Instruments Act, 1946, laid down a uniform procedure for the parliamentary control of such delegated legislation."

We have not got any Statutory Instruments Act, 1946, and there is no procedure for laying down, for bringing under parliamentary control this delegated legislation. Under Statutory Instruments, Select Committee on, we find the following:

"A Select Committee is appointed by the House of Commons at the beginning of each Session. Its function is to consider all statutory instruments laid or laid in draft before the House which either must be approved by resolution of the

House or of both Houses before they acquire the force of law or are annulled if either House passes a resolution or votes an address to that effect and to draw the special attention of the House to any instrument or draft—

- (1) which involves the expenditure of public moneys or imposes or fixes fees for licences or for services;
- (2) which cannot be challenged in the courts on the ground that it is *ultra vires* or is only temporarily so challengeable;
- (3) the making of which appears to constitute an unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the Act under which it was made;
- (4) which purports to have retrospective effect although the Act under which it was made does not in terms give the minister power to make such orders;
- (5) the publication or the laying before Parliament of which appears to have been unduly delayed;
- (6) in the case of which there has been unjustifiable delay in notifying the Speaker that the instrument had come into operation before it was laid before Parliament; or
- (7) the purport or form of which appears to require elucidation.

Mr. Speaker: May I draw the attention of the hon. Member to Standing Order No. 76. Have you got your Standing Orders?

Mr. S. Capildeo: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I am just trying to help.

Mr. S. Capildeo: I welcome your help, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful to you for sending me your Standing Orders and referring me to section 76 (1).

“76. (1) The Regulations Committee shall have the duty of considering all such regulations (as defined by the Interpretation Ordinance for the time being in force) as under the authority of any law are to be laid before the House, and to bring to the special attention of the House any regulation.”

and we have copied here almost verbatim the words I have read. And I am grateful to you for drawing my attention to this existing order. But I should like you to help me further and to tell me whether a Regulations Committee has been appointed and how many times since 1961 up to this date has that Regulations Committee met, if it has met, whether it has ever considered any regulations; and if it has considered the the regulations whether it has brought anything to the attention of this House. I venture...

Mr. Speaker: May I inform the hon. Member that I am the Chairman of the Regulations Committee and that it has met within the last Session, and under the conditions laid down by the Standing Orders.

Mr. S. Capildeo: Thank you. But, Mr. Speaker, the last question I asked was whether at any time at all this Regulations Committee of which you are the Chairman has brought to the notice of this House any regulations as laid out under (a) to (g) of section 76 (1) of the Standing Orders.

Mr. Speaker: I said the Regulations Committee met under the conditions stated in the Standing Orders. They are not bound to report. They report only when the

regulations contravene certain sections that you have read. That is all. I suppose you know. I do not know if you are on the committee.

Mr. S. Capildeo: Am I on the Committee, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: I do not remember the personnel of the Committee. But I am very serious about the matter and I have drawn your attention to Standing Order 76 (1). When you read those regulations from the *Parliamentary Dictionary* I was reminded that those Standing Orders had them. And I am very serious in submitting it to you as a Standing Order that governs the Regulations Committee.

Mr. S. Capildeo: Mr. Speaker, my question is limited to the Bill before the House, and since you have been so kind to intervene and to elucidate these matters and things for me, I think that I am entitled to ask you to tell me whether it is the intention of this Bill that all the regulations which will be made by the Minister will come under the scrutiny of the Regulations Committee.

Mr. Speaker: I am not dealing with the intentions of the Minister. I drew your attention to a Standing Order that exists. The Committee appointed under that Standing Order takes into account the regulations that are laid on the Table in this House. And I am very seriously trying to help you in this matter. I am very serious about it. But I cannot deal with the intentions of the Minister, whether he is bringing regulations here or not. The very Standing Orders say what to do when a Minister does not bring the regulations to this House. The Speaker has authority to do something.

Mr. S. Capildeo: Mr. Speaker, you said twice that you are very serious.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I am trying to help you.

Mr. S. Capildeo: I wonder if you believe that I am less serious than you, having taken the time to read all of these things and to come before the House. I am not less serious than you at all and let us not quarrel about this because you see I have studied the Bill and I know what I have to say. And I am going now to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look at clause 75 (2) of this Bill. It says:

“(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), the Minister, if he is satisfied that it has become necessary or expedient to raise or lower the upper limit of the compulsory school age, may by Order...”

And these are the words I wish to underline to you, Mr. Speaker, the custodian of the rules of this House. If the Minister is satisfied that it becomes necessary or expedient to raise or lower the upper limit of the compulsory school age he may do so by order, but is subject to affirmative resolution of Parliament within 60 days of the making of the order, and that is the section which I am drawing to your attention that is absent throughout the rest of every other power enabling the Minister to make regulations.

9.15 p.m.

If this provision requiring the Minister to come before the House for affirmative resolution within 60 days of the making of an order has been inserted throughout the relevant parts of this Bill, if any Member opposite can tell me that according to this Bill the Minister has not got power to make regulations to get people arrested, to have them fined, to have them incarcerated, if hon. Members opposite can tell me that

throughout this Bill there is an obligation on the Minister to get the approval of Parliament whenever he makes regulations, I will take my seat, and I will not come to the debates of this House for the next three months because I would then consider myself a fool and a person incapable of understanding the English language, incapable of appreciating the laws of the land to which I subject myself and incapable of contributing to the debates which I take so seriously.

The point I am making is implied in this Bill. In Clause 75 a particular provision, under which the Minister may make a regulation, compels the Minister to come to this House within 60 days and get an affirmative resolution. But in no other part of this Bill, on no other page and in no other clause dealing with the power of the Minister to make regulations will you find the provision that he must come before this House within 60 days of the making of the regulation for affirmative resolution. This is a matter over which I feel very strongly.

With the greatest respect to you, Sir, I am going to read into the record what happens in England. I am referring to *May's Parliamentary Practice*, 17th Edition, page 606:

“In certain cases where the Crown is empowered to act by Order in Council, the statute requires that the draft Order in Council shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament and that the Order in Council shall not be made unless both Houses present addresses to the Crown praying for the Order to be made...”

That is the affirmative procedure.

It goes on:

“The negative procedure. As already mentioned, the commonest type of parliamentary control is a provision in the

parent Act that the instruments made thereunder, though taking effect forthwith or on some named future date, shall be subject to annulment in pursuance of a resolution of either House of Parliament adopted within a named time limit. . . .”

On page 610 is stated:

“In 1924 the House of Lords, conscious that at any rate those rules and orders which require affirmative resolution ought not to be passed as a mere formality, set up a ‘Special Orders Procedure’, so that a sessional committee of the House examine them and report, in effect, whether the provisions raise important questions of policy or principle, how far they are founded on precedent, and whether there should be any further inquiry before the resolution is moved.”

Since 1924 the House of Lords made it clear that they would not leave it for the Minister to decide whether he should bring it for scrutiny; the House made a law saying that once the Minister makes a regulation, that regulation must come for scrutiny within a certain time.

“In the session of 1943–1944 the House of Commons constituted a Select Committee to scrutinize all Statutory Rules and Orders (and drafts intended to become Statutory Rules and Orders). . . .”

The point I am making is very simple. The people of England in their wisdom made it clear because, you see, there were judges in England who were careful about the rights of the citizen. I am making no excuse tonight for putting into the record the words of one of the eminent judges of England in this very matter. Lest we forget what I am talking about, I am saying that this Education Bill is giving the Minister power, in all ten pages, to make rules. Lest we forget

what I am talking about, I am saying that in England when a Minister gets this power he is compelled to bring the regulations before Parliament to get parliamentary sanction before the regulations become law. Lest we forget what I have in mind, it is the protection of the citizen, it is the protection against the arbitrary exercise of power by any Minister, no matter who he is.

The question I asked a friend outside I ask you today: “You will give this power to Dr. Eric Williams, yes; you are prepared to give this power to Dr. Williams as Prime Minister or the Minister responsible for Education. Look me squarely in the eye and tell me, will you give me that power to make regulations, to fine you and to send you in jail without bringing those regulations to Parliament? Will you give me those powers? And by “me” I mean any citizen of our country because I stand on the principle that in this era of independence no matter who is who or what is what he has the right to aspire to become the Prime Minister of our country. The question is, you will give him that power but will you give me the power to make rules, ten pages, without coming to Parliament? Will you give me that power?”

The people in England did not leave these things to guessing. Lord Justice Scott in the case of *Blackpool Corporation versus Locker*, reported in the All England Law Reports, 1948 at page 87, says:

“This appeal raises several important questions about the delegated legislation . . . There is one quite general question affecting all such sub-delegated legislation and of supreme importance to the continuance of the rule of law under the British Constitution, namely, the right of the public affected to know what that law is.

That right was denied the defendant in the present case. The maxim that ignorance of the law does not excuse any subject represents the working hypothesis on which the rule of law rests in British democracy. That maxim applies in legal theory just as much to written as to unwritten law, i.e., to statute law as much as to common law or equity, but the very justification for that basic maxim is that the whole of our law, written or unwritten is accessible to the public—in the sense, of course, that, at any rate its legal advisers have access to it at any moment as of right. When a government Bill is brought before Parliament in a form which, even in regard to merely executive or administrative matters, gives a wide and unlimited discretion to a Minister and objection is made, the answer is sometimes given that the Minister may be trusted by the House to use his powers with a wise and reasonable discretion. The answer may be perfectly bona fide but *tempora mutantur* and another Minister or another government may use the unlimited powers indiscreetly or oppressively. If that happens, the only remedy practically open to the aggrieved citizen is action in Parliament to which alone the Minister is responsible. The Act, when passed, may contain delegated powers to a Minister of the Crown to legislate, and the Minister may within his powers make rules or orders which constitute binding legislation. Again, the aggrieved citizen has no legal remedy against the legislative act of the Minister. He is bound again by the terms of the delegated legislation, but in both types of legislation, Parliamentary and delegated, the aggrieved citizen at least knows or his lawyers can tell him just what his rights and duties and restrictions are under the

new law because each kind of statutory law is at once published by the King's printer, whether as Acts of Parliament or as statutory instruments."

9.25 p.m.

"On the other hand, if the power delegated to the Minister is to make sub-delegated legislation and he exercises it, there is no duty on him, either by statute or at common law, to publish his sub-delegated legislation, and John Citizen may remain in complete ignorance of what rights over him and his property have been secretly conferred by the Minister on some authority or other and what residual rights have been left to himself. For practical purposes the rule of law, of which the nation is so greatly proud, breaks down because the aggrieved subject's legal remedy is gravely impaired. When executive or administrative direction falling short of legislation, accompany the sub-delegated legislation, as they may often do, the omission to publish such directions raises no legal issue, or, at any rate, none relevant to the present appeal, but such cases as the present do appear to me *ex debito justitiae* to demonstrate the crying need of immediate publication of all matter that is truly legislative. That might mean, I think, an amendment of the Statutory Instruments Act, 1946, but I will revert to this aspect later when I have illustrated its urgency by the fact of this appeal."

Mr. Speaker, I intended to read further into the record, but I am going to say one sentence more.

"It is just in that protection for the liberty of the subject that sub-delegated legislation such as that authorized by regulation 51 (5) is so dangerously lacking.

Paragraph 1 of the regulation had, subject to certain limitations, in paragraph (3), given to the Ministers powers which are as unlimited as they are undefined."

I am grateful to you Sir, for allowing me the opportunity to air this point. I recognize that we have clause 76 (1) which talks about a regulations committee, but without bandying words with you and without attempting to score any point over you, Mr. Speaker, you and I know that you really have not got what Lord Justice Scott has been talking about—the right of John Citizen to know what the Minister is going to do, how it is going to affect his liberty, how it is going to affect his life, how it is going to affect his pocket. And so the one point that I am making against this Bill, and very strongly, is that it is giving the Governor-General in some respect and giving the Minister in some respect the power to make law without scrutiny, except as I have pointed out to you in clause 75 (2). It is passing strange to me that the Government of the territory as at the present time constituted will give power to the Minister to do any and everything he cares to do under this Bill but will confine him to bring within 60 days to this House for an affirmative resolution of Parliament, whether it is time to change the school age. If there was ever a confusion of thought in the minds of the draftsmen of this regulation I believe it was at that point.

The second point which I wish to make is, I think, that clause 75 (2) is a mistake. This is copied wholesale from some English section and what is in the English law is followed in the Trinidad law. I believe this is a mistake. Perhaps the Minister may want to expunge this if he is going to be rational and logical. If he will pay

heed to some of the respectful contentions which have come down from the Mother of Parliaments that legislation of this nature affects the very education of the citizens of this territory and it should come for scrutiny before Parliament as clause 75 (2) provides—that this should be a general provision throughout the whole Bill, I would then with as much a grace I could command, withdraw that objection to this particular Bill. But the point I want to make is, what I would call, with great respect, the patent dishonesty in the pretence that the denominational system of education may continue.

In my respectful view, this Bill when it is passed tonight puts an end now and forever to the denominational system completely, unreservedly, unmitigatedly, without any question and without any doubt. So far as the word "denomination" or "denominational Board" is concerned it is an anathema to the draftsmen of this Bill, that even in the definition section I cannot find those words. I have tried to read this over and over and I cannot find those words in one single place. So I would hesitate to use my poor vocabulary to describe anybody who sits down and utters words, such as we are privileged to hear sometime in this House, about the church and their rights and so on.

Let us look at this thing with the eyes of objectivity. The only power that the Board has is contained in clause 15. The Board of Management occurs in clause 15, and I believe there is a slight typographical error in 15 (1), that the word "the" is being used instead of "be". The clause in part reads:

"... a board of management consisting of persons appointed by the authority which established the school, save that

[MR. S. CAPILDEO]

the Minister may require the school to the controlled jointly . . ."

I think it means "the school to be controlled . . ." I do not want to make anything of that.

This Bill spells execution, final decapitation, irrevocable to the denominational system. Clause 15 (1) says:

"Where, in accordance with subsection (1) of section 14, at the commencement of this Act any school is deemed to have been established as an assisted school, there shall be established, for the purpose of exercising the control of the school, a Board of Management consisting of persons appointed by the authority which established the school, save that the Minister may require the school to be controlled jointly with any other assisted school operated by the same authority.

(2) Every assisted school established after the commencement of this Act shall be controlled by a Board.

(3) The Board shall consist of not less than three members, except that there may be more than three members of any such Board if that Board controls more than one school or there are special reasons which render it desirable to have more than three members on that Board."

Clause 16, however, is a complete change from clause 15. Clause 16 reads:

"Subject to this Act a Board shall act in accordance with any special or general directives of the Minister concerning the exercise and performance of its powers and duties conferred or imposed on it by this Act and the regulations."

9.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I have to parade my ignorance before this hon. House so very often. I am an unlettered man, but I am afraid that when I read something like section 16 without any parentheses, without any marks of differentiation—I read that "the Board shall", and "shall" here cannot mean "may"; "shall" here must mean "must"—the Board must act in accordance with the special or general directives. If this is a law that a Board must act in accordance with the special or general directive of the Minister, I say that this section 16 puts an end completely to any system of church schools which may have been in existence from time immemorial in our territory.

As a product, myself, in the primary stages of a church school, let me, on the passing of this dearly beloved system, utter some words of praise, some words of consolation before dust goes to dust and ashes to ashes.

Most of us, in and out of this hon. House, have at some time or other, benefited from the denominational system. Most of us, in and out of this hon. House, in high and low offices of this country, both at home and abroad, have received church instructions in church schools, and I want to say publicly, with great regret, that I cannot associate myself with a single remark made by the hon. Member for Naparima, when he dealt with this particular aspect in the debate. I cannot for the slightest moment of time envisage that this Bill should provide the excuse for a vitriolic and virulent attack on the churches of this country and the work they have done in education; and I think that the parade of legal and ecclesiastical history to which we were subjected earlier

this night comes ill at a time when we are burying the denominational system. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*, is a good rule, and I would recommend that to my Friend the hon. Member for Naparima without saying anymore. I am quite sure that he knows I mean nothing personal to him, but I feel that the church did not put itself in issue in this debate; the church is not here. I do not think that anybody in this hon. House is prepared to say that they have come here to represent any particular church or denomination. I believe each person has come here to contribute to the best of his ability to this debate, and for this unwarranted, uncalled for and unjustifiable attack on the church, the least I can say is that I disassociate myself from the remarks made by the hon. Member who spoke last. I do not think that, in this year and grace, it was right for my Friend the hon. Member for Naparima to say that the churches are interfering . . .

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: On a point of order. Lest the country subscribes to this distortion, let me say that I have spoken and that I am fully aware of what I have said. I have taken time off to quote all the leading authorities of the world, and if their views are an attack on the church and my reciting their views makes me attack the church tonight, then I am very sorry for the unfavourable construction that the hon. Member is putting on my very humble attempt to prove to the country what I think should be the duty of the state. At no stage did I make any attack on the church. If the hon. Member wants to make some appeal to the church to secure some measure of support from them, let him do so honestly, but nobody who has heard me tonight can say that I have attacked any church. I have merely put the state

in its proper perspective as regards its duty and as against the church's duty: One, the saving of souls, the other, the preparation of man for his proper role in society. This may end bad tonight, yes.

Mr. S. Capildeo: I do not want it to end bad, Mr. Seukeran. I am appealing to you that we should not end it bad. When you said that you wanted to hang your portrait in the rogues' gallery, I said, "Well use another word; do not use the word 'rogue', it might sound bad", and I still mean it. I do not think you should hang your portrait in any rogues' gallery. I think you deserve better from this country. So let us leave it at that. I would just remind you of that one word that you used, when you said you would like . . .

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This hon. Member has a great facility for distorting speeches made that the country will be listening to. I never said that. What I said is that the hon. Member for Nariva had made certain statements that the Prime Minister, who is such an eminent scholar, and who should have found a place among the leading teachers of the world, has now qualified to have his portrait hung in the rogues' gallery, and I said that people like Froebel and all the other leading people who are educational reformers have gone far beyond what the Prime Minister has done, so, the hon. Member for Nariva will have their portraits in the rogues' gallery, and if so then I would be in excellent company if he would also consign me to the rogues' gallery. It is in the illustrious company of these illustrious masters, who are the reformers of the educational principles of the world that I should like to be. I do

not think that I want to be in the category of the rogues that the hon. Member for Couva is thinking of; that type of roguishness I am not capable of, but certainly I should like to be in the same gallery with the great reformers of the educational system who have done so much for modern education.

Mr. Speaker: All right. I thank you, Mr. Seukeran.

Mr. Seukeran: Now, let him put that to the country.

Mr. S. Capildeo: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in your wisdom and in your exercise of patience you would know—and I will not say any more—that my hon. Friend is rather unfortunate in the choice of his language and the choice of his examples. If he says that he does not want to hang his picture in the rogues' gallery, I agree with him, but when he says he wants to be in the company of President Sukarno of Indonesia, when he says he wants to be in the company of President Mohammed Ayub Khan of Pakistan, when he says he wants to be in the company of the Philippines—then I wonder whether he would like me to tell him about the Philippines.

Mr. Seukeran: On a point of order. I cannot allow the country to be carried away by this kind of distortion; at least not while I sit here. I was not in the company of any of those men, but even then I would prefer to be in the company of Mr. Ayub Khan of Pakistan than in the company of some of these people in this hon. House. I am sure about that. I was quoting them as examples of people who have adopted a system that no one has questioned and I was comparing them with the Trinidad Government which have gone so far to

meet the churches, and in spite of that they are becoming the butt of sundry ridicule at the hands of people who should know better. The churches have accepted this decision by the Government. They have agreed; they are quite quiet about it, but it is the mischief-makers who are distorting the facts. That is what I was trying to do—to quote examples. So that every time he quotes me wrongly this debate will be prolonged for hours.

Mr. S. Capildeo: And so, in this pleasant evening that we have he will get up and I will get up, and he will get up and I will get up. You will have to get up again, my Friend, because you see, you say you like to be in the company of Ayub Khan, the Prime Minister of Pakistan . . .

Hon. Member: The President of Pakistan . . .

Mr. S. Capildeo: The President of Pakistan, and if it was him nobody will get up and say a word. That is true! They cannot answer in Pakistan. They does get kill, you know. Pakistan is a dictatorship. He do not have no election there. It ain't have no Government; it ain't have no Parliament and thing, you know. Is kill, is hang! So if you want to be like Ayub Khan, you take this whole House, I go leave it for all you and go, because I don't want to be nowhere you go hang people without giving them a chance to defend theyselves.

9.45 p.m.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not think he will get up again. So let us continue with the serious matter before the House, that is to say, in this evening when we are witnessing . . .

Mr. Speaker: Ask for an extension of your time please: if you are going to be long. Will you take ten minutes more?

Mr. S. Capildeo: I have not opened the Bill yet.

Mr. Speaker: Well, all right, you will have to get an extension of time.

Motion made and Question proposed, That the hon. Member's time be extended by 30 minutes—[Mr. L. F. Seukeran].

Question put and agreed to.

Hon. Member's time extended accordingly.

Mr. S. Capildeo: Mr. Speaker, witnessing the death of a very cherished institution, I should like for a moment to be slightly solemn, if I may, and to say that I cannot possibly support this Bill in its present form because it really does put an end completely and irrevocably to a system which has benefited most of us.

I am not going to say what is right or what is wrong. I should like to read into the record just a few words as regards the educational system now obtaining in Russia:

"In Russia one of the most prominent pieces of Soviet Education which highlights its differences from other large-scale systems of mass education is the extent of price control exercised by the Central Authority."

And the book is *Soviet Education*—by Nigel Grant. It is a recent work and it goes on to say:

"From one corner of Russia to the other the authorities in Moscow keep a firm grip on what happens in schools and colleges from Libya to Vladivostok."

When my Friend was using Indonesia and Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand and Turkey as examples, he should really have used the example of Russia, because I feel that the Russian system of education at the present time is far superior to any other system that we have. That is my personal feeling, but whether, if I were the head of the Government, I would introduce the Russian system at the present time is another matter altogether. The issue here is not whether the Russian system is good or bad. I should like to go on record as saying that I admire the system which has taken people who were illiterate in 1919 to the stage where they are attempting in 1965 to put a man on the moon. I admire the system; but that does not derogate from the fact that the powers contained in this Bill, are similar to, if not less than, the powers contained in the Ordinances which give the Soviet educational system the right to control education.

Even their major decisions on policy are made by the central organs of the party often after trying out the ideas first by flying kites in the form of debates in the press or discussions at meetings thereby gaining some idea of the state of opinion on the matter in hand. And I must congratulate the Government for inadvertently and without any choice at all doing in Trinidad exactly what is usually done in Russia on these matters. Mind you, Sir, I am not condemning; I am not supporting. All I am saying is that this is the fact.

My hon. Friend was very anxious to read into the record his incursions into a work on comparative education. Well I do not know which book is better than the next. That is Dr. Williams' job. All I can say is that the matter appears to

Education Bill
[MR. S. CAPILDEO]

Wednesday, 8th December, 1965

Education Bill

me in this book to be slightly different from what it appears to him. And, Sir, here I must address my remarks to my Prime Minister through you. As you and I know, all these texts written abroad on these matters are dangerous precedents to follow because in a book which is otherwise apparently authoritative there occurs the sentence:

"The best we can say is that the most important factor making for a national outlook today is a common tradition and culture, this entailing common history and cultural ideal, the latter often based on a religion introduced at some period in the history of that nation though it must be remembered that in the Christian Church today there are a great number of sects and denominations and that it is now possible for many divergent religious beliefs to form part of the general epoch of a given nation."

Our country is unique. There is no other such country. Our systems are unique. They have evolved because of the pressures of population, the pressures of the cultural patterns and the changes in our history from time to time, and not one of these books on education from abroad can do anything to assist us in telling us what is right and what is wrong for our country. But we can take guideposts from them.

And if I may again refer to Soviet Russia—in that country they do not leave it to chance as to what should be done. They lay down the duty of every school child to study diligently, to be punctual in attendance and not to arrive late for classes and they go on making rules in every detail. These rules go far beyond the need of discipline in the narrower sense. Some of them certainly seem dictated by pure administrative convenience; others are con-

cerned more with formal etiquette than with anything more fundamental. The Soviet school takes moral education very seriously indeed, no less seriously than in sections like the basic skills and the sciences. My point is that we in Trinidad have an opportunity because of our history, and because of our background, to make contributions which would lay the foundations for people who are studying comparative education to follow us. But we cannot do it by kicking over the traces. We cannot do it by making a complete break. We cannot do it by disregarding all that has gone and the experiences of the whole world.

May I just point out very quickly a few words from a book—*A Hundred Years of Education*—by a man called Peterson. He is the Headmaster of a grammar school in England and it is presumed that he knows something about what he has written

He says:

"By the very nature of public control it places more and more reliance on paper qualifications. Public administration has not been blind to the importance of getting good teachers in schools; but whereas an individual or Parish Board can appoint a teacher because they know his virtue as a teacher, the impersonal public administrator can only go on certificates and training courses."

I repeat: "the impersonal public administrator can only go on certificates and training courses."

There is a long paragraph here but I should like just to get into the record the one conclusion:

"Looking back over the last hundred years, then we can surely see that the intervention of the state to promote and control education has brought about

a change of immense value. But in bringing about this change the state has inevitably increased the strength of those tendencies in bureaucracies which are dangerous to education. Up to now the result of this blindness has been nothing more serious than a wrong balance in the distribution of our resources. Whether things get better or worse must depend on the view that administrators take of their own function and capacities.

9.55 p.m.

I am only reading that into the record to point out that it is the experience in England, with almost 100 years of state control, that it has not worked properly. It is the experience there that this system of central control with the Minister having absolute power as is being given by this Bill, carries with it a dangerous incubus. In England, as against America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the system of education which the state sought to impose as against the church all along the years has lowered the standards, and that has permitted both the United States and Soviet Russia to exceed England in the capacity to instruct their citizens and produce citizens and results which we are now seeing world-wide.

Before I sit down I should like to make one last point, and I say it again with due deference to my hon. friend for Naparima. He kept on saying that Government are putting out the money, Government are spending the money, Government are giving this amount of money and Government are giving that amount of money. To me, there is no such thing as the "abstract Government money".

I would suggest to him that if he would not have me to get up and say these things he should say Government utilizing the taxpayers' money; taxpayers who belong to various faiths or who have no faith at all. So there is nothing called "Government money" it is really taxpayers' money and if taxpayers' money is being spent for taxpayers' education it does not confer on Government any particular right that will give the Minister the authority to talk about Government putting out all the money.

Tonight is a very sad night for me. I had hoped that the dialogue which has taken place throughout this country over this Bill would have resulted in some form of meeting with the authority and that we would have sat down and introduced a system of education which would have been the envy of all emerging territories.

I believed when this debate began in the Press that the Prime Minister had conscientiously and deliberately thrown a small grain of sand in the oyster of Trinidad to produce a pearl of education which we could have held up as the manifestation of the intellectual achievements of our country.

I had hoped that this Bill, put forward by him, would have brought out the John Dewey, the Bertrand Russell and—I am sorry, I would not irritate my hon. Friend the Member for Naparima—would have brought out the Frenchmen, the Russians, the Americans, the British people, the Jeffreys...

Mr. L. F. Seukeran: I am the theme of your education.

Mr. S. Capildeo: I am sorry, I do not mean to say anything to irritate you. What I am saying is this: here was an opportunity given to my country by the Prime Minister

[MR. S. CAPILDEO]

in this Bill to provoke a dialogue and a debate in which a group of people would have envisaged what they required our citizens to be in the future, as a result of which we should have had in this Bill a blueprint for the future of our citizens. But in place of that, I note, with considerable pain and regret, that the purpose of this Bill is to give effect to the execution of the education policy of Government.

If page 7, clause 3, subclause (c) had pointed out what the education policy of Government was, if we had some means of discovering what the draftsmen of this Bill meant by the education policy of Government, then it would be possible for me, even at this last moment, to say that I support it. But in the absence of any criterion put down in this Bill, I must repeat with sadness and regret that here was something which promised great things but which has resulted in a nothingness, a sameness, and a reversion to a system which looks like the Russian system without the effectiveness of it, which looks like a totalitarian act without the benefits, which looks like a system to destroy the church but which supplants it with nothing else.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, there are two major points that have arisen out of what has been said on the other side that I should like to deal with.

The first relates to the question of the Public Service Commission and the control of teachers. On the 11th December, 1964, the Secondary School Teachers' Association sent to the Minister of Education a protest on behalf of the Presbyterian School Teachers against the appointment of Principals at Naparima and Iere Colleges.

In the light of what has been said on the other side about the Public Service Commission, I wish to put part of this statement into the records. It was sent to the Ministry of Education and it was sent to the Secretary of the Board of World Mission United Churches of Canada; so that the issue has gone outside of Trinidad and Tobago.

The Secretary of the Secondary School Teachers' Association, rather strangely in the context of what you have heard on the other side about the teachers, wrote as follows:

"The staff of Naparima College is entirely dissatisfied, frustrated and feel victimized because of the stand they have taken. The students of the school are the ones ultimately harmed."

"The staff at Naparima is frustrated and confused by frequent examples of mal-administration obviously due to lack of experience of intricacies involved in running a good secondary school."

"Members of the staff at Naparima complain of being constantly provoked to do things that could result in the loss of their jobs."

The teachers themselves sent a copy of a communication which they addressed to the Principal of Naparima College on the 26th March, 1964, to the Minister, and therefore it becomes part of the public issue involved. The protest stated among other things:

"...the apparent lack of policy on various aspects of education...."

This is one of the principal matters that disturbed them.

"... in the school and where a stated policy exists, the failure to carry it out."

"For example, the type of curriculum to be offered at different levels, the special needs of Form I, the choice of subjects, specialization training, promotions, admission to Sixth Forms &c."

"Since there is seemingly no educational policy there is no attempt by the administration to keep up-to-date with developments in education or to institute change. It is left to the staff to take the initiative in such matters."

May I emphasize that this is a protest, not against the Minister or the Ministry, but against the Principal and authorities of Naparima College. They continue to criticize the lack of unity, of consistency of common objectives of agreement among members of the administration. The apparent lack of consultation among them before important decisions are made. The vagueness as to varying functions and spheres of responsibility of the officers of the administration; a vagueness which exists not only in the minds of the staff but even in the minds of the Principal and other administrative officers. They condemned the low standards accepted and therefore encouraged in all aspects of school life, especially academic work, sports and discipline, the assumption that concern for character building compensates for low standards, the failure to realize that Christianity and character building demand the striving for high standards.

10.05 p.m.

And on the 25th June, 1964, the staffs of the Presbyterian Secondary Schools addressed a memorandum to the Synod of the Presbyterian Church protesting specifically and by name against the person who had been appointed principal of Iere, and the person who had been appointed principal of Naparima. They said the man appointed at Iere had been specifically trained for the ministry and has had no professional training for teaching. In addition he has not had any experience in teaching in a secondary

school nor in the administering of such schools. He therefore does not qualify for the post to which he has been appointed. In the case of Iere, a comparatively young school where he would be expected particularly to provide some guidance, he would have to be seeking it. And in respect of the Naparima they stated that the disabilities applied also to the man who had been appointed, that whilst he had had some experience of a secondary school, he had not absorbed very much from it. They continued—these staff members protesting to the Synod of the Presbyterian Church:

"It is an act of injustice to the staffs, students and parents of these schools to thrust on them as principals, men who are so lacking in the necessary training and experience when there are available candidates who are suitably qualified professionally to perform such tasks. The administration of a school at this level must not be considered to be an amateur process that can be accomplished by trial and error or by on-the-job training. Our society demands much from our secondary schools. Inept leadership at this stage is inexcusable and dangerous."

These are the men on the spot themselves protesting against conditions to which they are subjected, people who have sent private message after private message of this sort to the Government to say: "Go ahead with the Bill, we want to be under the Public Service Commission, all the secondary school teachers are behind you." The staff of Naparima protested to the Synod, and continued:

"In addition we find it necessary to point out that both of these gentlemen (the persons appointed to the schools) were specifically trained for the ministry . . ."

Education Bill

Wednesday, 8th December, 1965

Education Bill

[DR. THE RT. HON. E. E. WILLIAMS]

Not the Ministry of Education, the Church ministry.

“... and that the pastoral work of the Church is in dire need of persons trained in this field. We are certain that the members of the Synod are only too well aware of the fact, and it is disappointing to know that the Synod, in the face of this lamentable shortage of ministers, has been so ready to remove pastors from the Church.”

In the circumstances they suggested that Synod choose the best qualified laymen to be principals of secondary schools under its charge, raising a point of great importance in a number of the assisted schools, and that is—hon. Members over there spoke as if it is a crime—that the Government take a junior in an assisted secondary school and give him promotion. It is the first I heard that anybody was to be criticized because somebody is taken from a junior position—possibly his talents are recognized—and he is put in charge of a school, whether he is taken from Queen’s Royal College or from an assisted secondary school. The great problem in the assisted secondary schools is that the tendency to put clergymen as principals, whether of boys’ or girls’ schools, effectively blocks the avenue of promotion for the laymen on the staff, when the clergyman is an expatriate and the local man is a subordinate on the staff. It means that you immediately raise a case of expatriate versus local. That is why I raised the point.

One way to settle this question is to have a national clergy. From the top down in every denomination ought to be a West Indian, a national of Trinidad and Tobago, and then if they are properly trained for educational purposes there is no problem at all. Until you have that you have a

colonial relationship of a man at the top who comes from abroad and qualified nationals down below who cannot get promotion. It is not my fault if that is colonialism. We managed to break that in politics, it remains in the church today. One of the principal factors leading to a solution of this problem is a National Church. One of the factors that is going to affect this whole relationship between church and state is when those relationships have to be conducted through people who do not sympathize with the national aspirations of Trinidad and Tobago, and I make no apology whatsoever for my determination not to accept anything that is said to me by somebody from outside who does not belong here, who is a bird of passage and who sends impertinent letters to the Cabinet telling the Cabinet how it should conduct its business. This is nationalism as against colonialism. They could stay with all the colonialism as much as they like. This is Naparima—

Mr. Maharaj: A colonial puppet like you talking?

The Prime Minister: You would not know anyhow. [*Interruption*] I ignore you. I would have thought that instead of telling us about these parties—he has been in so many parties you never know what party he is going to tell us about tomorrow. I would have thought he would have explained to us why it was that at St. Stephen’s College in Princes Town, with which I believe he has some connexion, they should have taken in eight persons under the 20 per cent. intake in 1965, seven of them were below the cut-off point which the Ministry had indicated as the point below which no student should be admitted because they had not qualified.

Out of eight, seven fell below the cut-off point. They came from Penal, from San Fernando, from Cocoyea, from San Fernando, from St. Clement, from Princes Town—the one who was above the mark came from Princes Town—from Santa Flora, and another from Princes Town.

Mr. A. G. Montano: And he is the one who called the discrimination to our attention.

The Prime Minister: He raised the question of discrimination in this House.

Mr. Maharaj: What is the Leader of the House talking about? Why does he not keep quiet?

Mr. Montano: He is the one who raised discrimination, and look at discrimination in the school he has influence in.

Mr. Maharaj: Who must educate them?

The Prime Minister: I would have thought that as he is the only person here who is connected with a Board that he would have explained to us just what was the reason why a school which is not a particularly good school, if they had to take in people in their discretion, why did not the principal or the Board take somebody in their discretion who had passed the examination. Why must they take people who do not qualify? Why must they violate the prescription laid down by the Ministry of Education? Anyway, Sir, he prefers to tell us about the parties that he would be joining tomorrow and the one that he would be leaving tonight, or the one which would be leaving him. I do not know.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: That is the one he is afraid of.

The Prime Minister: Another point I wish to raise. At least I must give the hon. Member this: he makes his point and he stays, I must say that; he stays to keep on his agitation: not like the hon. Member for Caroni East, the self-constituted caretaker of the denominational schools. All he did was to read about the denominational schools memorandum. What he did was to quote almost word for word from the statement sent in by the principals of assisted secondary schools to the Prime Minister, dated the 6th July 1965. I know it because the letter was sent to me, the letter has been distributed all over the place. It included copies of communications sent to the Ministry of Education and of a memorandum sent in 1964 making a lot of complaints. What I do not understand is why the hon. Member for Caroni East—if he has to be a caretaker and has to clean up the place, at least clean up the place properly—did not bring everything out. If he is going to be a spokesman for people let him say everything. Why did he leave out certain things? What did he leave out? We did not hear in his complaints anything about the fact that the principals, through Fr. Valdez, had demanded parity with Government secondary schools in matters of salary—absolute parity. They go on:

“Parity. Is there any reason why similar provisions are not made on the basis of parity in the assisted schools?”

What is the parity? Long leave with pay for the principal. He wants to go to England for nine months. He wants parity with the Government. But when you give him parity with the Public Service Commission he says: “No, it is not that sort of parity I want and it is not that sort of parity the man over there wants either.”

A Member of Parliament gets up here in public and does nothing but to be a spokes-

[DR. THE RT. HON. E. E. WILLIAMS]

man for a vested interest in the country, criticizing the Government of the country for demanding an account for grants given to these people who, after all, are performing a public service.

10.15 p.m.

I am not saying that the schools should not say that; but a Member of Parliament criticizing the Government for insisting on certain conditions! We are giving parity; the parity means particularly the Public Service Commission which is what Naparima wants. Naparima wants the Public Service Commission that is not going to appoint an unqualified principal. I do not know if hon. Members know that Naparima College through this same question lost one of the most highly qualified men in Trinidad and Tobago a year ago. And the hon. Member for Siparia warned them three or four weeks ago that they are about to lose another highly qualified man. He cannot get promotion, a more highly qualified man than the clergyman who is put above him. To save the man in Trinidad and Tobago we are trying to see whether he could not be appointed to a Government school. We want to keep local talent in Trinidad and Tobago. But we did not raise this. Naparima College sent the protest through the Secondary School Teachers' Association to the Ministry. This is Naparima's problem. This is one of the worst cases of confusion and maladministration that you could find in any school. And the teachers have put it in our laps.

The Government must take some action on that. That is why Naparima has gone down and that is why Naparima will continue to go down and Iere will never get started on this particular basis. The objection is not to clergymen. There are

clergymen who go and get university degrees and are trained teachers as they are trained physicians and trained everything else. If you must put somebody as a principal in a secondary school and you insist on a clergyman all we are saying is two things: put a local clergyman—which does not arise in the case of Naparima or in the case of Iere—and secondly put one who is trained as a secondary school teacher. Do not put one who is not a teacher. Do not substitute a Christian gentleman for an educated gentleman. The first job of the man as principal of a school is to teach his students and administer his school. The hon. Member told us what were the points that they had asked. I wonder why he was so shy to mention this—long leave with pay:

“It is felt by the Association...”

And then this other point, Mr. Speaker. We attract teachers in training or teachers in service and give them scholarships and send them abroad to study. Every teacher, every person, who goes abroad on a Government scholarship has to sign a bond that he will work for five years with Government. At the end of his course of training he comes back to work for the Government. The principals of assisted secondary schools make the astonishing claim that, if we award a scholarship to somebody who happens to be teaching in a school probably on a month to month contract, we must give him a five-month scholarship and then let him come back to teach in the school. No suggestion that the man would not want to teach in the school! I have been told that many of them are on a month to month basis. They have no security of tenure. The principal can take anybody in there. The Ministry pays the Board and the Board pays the teacher. We are not always certain that we have the names of everybody involved. We

are not certain that in every respect all the income tax legislation is being satisfied and for the benefit of everybody I would say that the Minister of Finance has been looking for sometime into this whole question of income tax payment of teachers in assisted secondary schools, and he is looking into this whole question to see to what extent the assisted secondary schools are responsible for contributing to any problem of the balance of payments by sending money out of Trinidad and Tobago for missionary work without the knowledge of the Ministry of Finance. You can send money out of the country subject to certain exchange controls. These are purely secular matters which are being looked at quite objectively.

Why must the Government take a teacher, send him away for training—somebody who satisfies the Government's criteria for scholarships—and it must be on condition that he goes back to teach in an assisted school? You would not believe that the man has any choice in the matter. You would not believe that the Government have any choice in the matter. As we read this here, that the presumption is... Listen to this one, Mr. Speaker:

“Since all this section 5 of the Concordat is governed by the need for negotiations in changes...”

This is about financial relationship:

“...then any changes can take place only after negotiations as to the change in the manner of giving and form of grants-in-aid”.

Good Heavens! Even a grant in aid you cannot regulate now according to this. This is not a church speaking. When I read this I was away. It was sent to me. I said this was not a church. This is a state within a state. And one has to settle the questions of the proper channels of authority in the

country. There is no religious problem tied up in this. It is a principal who has a certain amount of power and he says, “I am not surrendering that power”. That is all there is to it. And as far as we are concerned that is all there will be to it. You will account for the grants and you will follow this procedure; you will do this and you will do that and you are not free to do something else, just as any principal in any government secondary school. I do not know what the fuss is about. Just one or two principals making a noise and their teachers are the ones who are most concerned about the conditions and most unhappy about it all.

The hon. Member for Couva raised the point that I thought he would have understood by now. The powers we give to the Governor-General are purely formal. He is exercising the executive authority of the Crown.

As regards section 75, we decide on affirmative resolution of Parliament because there are probably financial implications in this question of raising the compulsory school age. If you make it 15 and have to provide school places for the people Parliament must know about that. We are not all certain that a change in this school age would not interfere with the constitutional rights of the child. The other regulations that the Minister makes are purely administrative and procedural matters and they are not on all fours with section 75 at all. And I did not know that the hon. Member would have gone to all the trouble to find out about Plato. Every school boy knows that it was Plato who said that.

Mr. S. Capildeo: The Prime Minister said Aristotle.

The Prime Minister: What I had understood him to say was that I had been in some way involved in a controversy on Plato. And I corrected him by saying, No. The controversy was on Aristotle. That is what I understood him to say. That is why I intervened. Everybody knows that it was Plato who said that and Aristotle who sneered at him. I am glad the hon. Member knows it now. Better late than never.

Mr. S. Capildeo: Mr. Speaker, I think I can claim...

The Prime Minister: Is he on a point of order? If not, I am not going to allow him to interfere. I am very happy that he knows that. I misunderstood his reference. Now that we both agree that it was Plato who said it can we still remain friends?

Mr. S. Capildeo: We have always been good friends.

The Prime Minister: That is very good. Will he support the Bill, then?

Mr. S. Capildeo: I am his friend but not at that price!

The Prime Minister: We do not share the fears of the hon. Member for Chagnanas what he said about constitutional rights and the combination of sections 16 and 17. We are quite satisfied that it is a good and necessary Bill and we make all allowances for the speeches... I thought John Dewey had gone, and we would not have heard of John Dewey again. I hope the hon. Member for Nariva will admit that I am being very polite to him.

The other points do not merit any attention at this late hour.

Question put.

10.25 p.m.

The House divided, Ayes 12, Noes 6.

Ayes:

Montano, Hon. A. G.
Williams, Dr. the Rt. Hon. E. E.
Mohammed, Hon. K.
O'Halloran, Hon. J. H.
Wallace, Hon. R. E.
Teshea, Hon. Mrs. I.
Thompson, Hon. A. A.
Campbell, Hon. V. L.
Bermudez, A.
Johnson, C. K.
Pitt, B.
Seukeran, L. F.

Noes:

Maharaj, S. C.
Capildeo, S.
Forrester, M. A.
Jamadar, V.
Farquhar, P. G.
Hosein, T.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House 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.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 5 be amended by adding after paragraph (e) the following:

“In the case of assisted schools no books, apparatus or practices shall be imposed to which the denominational authority formally objects.”

I have not been able, due to the pressing need for time, to follow all the amendments that Government have been making, so if they have already made an amendment similar to this...

Mr. A. G. Montano: This is already provided in the regulations. It is regulation 72 (2) on page 15.

Mr. Maharaj: I should prefer that these things be put in the body of the Bill. These regulations are made by Cabinet and are not subject to the approval of Parliament and therefore they should be in the body of the Bill. This matter is very vital and I think Government have had enough warning on it.

I think it was the Teachers' Union which put the matter very nicely. I agree with them wholeheartedly. I also agree with the Prime Minister's statement about the protection of the various teachers and so on. There is need for integration and I agree with the Teachers' Union; I have accepted their suggestion with regard to clause 5 (e), which gives the Minister the authority to prescribe curricula, textbooks and practices in all public schools so as to ensure conformity with national standards of education. This suggestion appeals to me: in the case of assisted schools no books, apparatus or practices shall be imposed to which the denominational authority formally objects.

Mr. A. G. Montano: It is in the regulations.

Mr. Maharaj: Why not include it in the body of the Bill so that it would be subject to debate in Parliament if a change is sought? You must agree with the denominational authorities that if they have a school, say a Catholic school, the Minister should not be in a position to prescribe a book which is against their religious interest.

Mr. A. G. Montano: We agree with them and we put it here in the regulations; we believe that the regulations are the proper place for it.

The Prime Minister: The same words are there:

“In an Assisted School no books or apparatus to which the Board of Management of such school formally objects shall be introduced or imposed.

Dr. M. A. Forrester: What is wrong with putting that in the Bill?

Mr. Maharaj: That is why I have to agree that in all matters of such importance as this, where regulations are made by a Minister, these regulations should have the approval of Parliament. It would have been a different matter if these regulations were subject to an affirmative vote of Parliament. It is not so in this case.

Mr. A. G. Montano: What is the fear of having it in the regulations? Is it the fear that the Minister could arbitrarily change this and impose some condition on the denominational schools? If the Minister had the authority to do that, then with a majority in Parliament the Government could do the same thing. So that if it was the Government's intention to do that, whether by regulation or by parliamentary approval, it could still be done. It is because that is not the objective that we put it in the regulations.

Mr. V. Jamadar: That argument is not a valid one. They are two different things. With the regulation, a provision could be changed quietly because you do not have to bring it to Parliament.

Mr. S. G. Maharaj: Mr. Chairman, I think the Leader of the House will agree with me that it is almost an impossibility for Members to keep a trace and check on these regulations. In this case since I have got the Minister's assurances I shall say that this measure is meeting the case half way. I take it that the denominational boards would object because they would have some knowledge of the regulations. That is the only consoling feature. I reiterate my point, that the provision should be in the body of the Bill. Rather than prolonging the argument I will accept it with that reservation.

10.35 p.m.

Mr. A. G. Montano: He has accepted.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: I accept it.

Question put and agreed to, That clause 5 stand part of the Bill.

Clause 5 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 6 to 7 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 8

Question proposed, That clause 8 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: In the first line of clause 8 (1), the word "may" should be changed to "shall".

The Prime Minister: We put in 8 (2) the composition of the committee.

Mr. T. Hosein: "May" can only mean "must" where there is a duty imposed on the Minister and he has to carry out the duty, like in the "Telephone case", which you remember very well.

The Prime Minister: We saw that point and we tried to settle it by specifying the composition of the Committee. As a matter of fact the Chairman of the committee is already selected.

Mr. T. Hosein: You did not say how many members there are going to be on the Committee.

The Prime Minister: It depends on how many people we are going to get from the University of the West Indies and different organizations concerned. It would be a large committee.

Mr. T. Hosein: You could say not less than five, as in the case of the Civil Service Act.

The Prime Minister: It would be many more than five.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: What about having one person nominated by each religious denomination?

Mr. A. G. Montano: How many religious denominations are there?

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: I do not know. I think about ten or eleven. The Teachers' Union recommended an advisory body of twenty-one.

Mr. A. G. Montano: There are 18 denominational bodies.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: What about textbooks?

The Prime Minister: There is a text-books committee.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Even though there are 18 religious denominations there might be some objection from amongst the Hindus, the Muslims, the Christians. You have three sets of really religious denominations; but the Hindus are really split in two or three.

The Prime Minister: We thought of Christians and non-Christians; and let them make the selection. It would be about 20 to 25.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: You will agree with me that the objection to this Bill came from the religious denominations; they are the ones who, by custom and tradition in the old days, built the schools themselves. What about if you say, no less than five nominees from the religious denominations.

The Prime Minister: I did not say the number; I say 'Christian and non-Christian'.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Could you give a guarantee of the number?

The Prime Minister: We could not say.

10.45 p.m.

The Prime Minister: Look at sections 9 and 10.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: I am not debating that, I am putting the amendment. All I want here is a certain amount of confidence in the religious denominations.

The Prime Minister: We understand the point. But if you put them on the Textbook Committee; you put them on the Curriculum Committee, you put them on the Local Advisory Board and you put them on the National Committee; they are on everything. We thought it was much better to work at Boards of Management and to work at Christians and non-Christians. It would be balanced much better.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: In the same subsection we have the words "such other educational matters on which the Committee thinks it desirable to advise". If we compromise on that . . .

Mr. A. G. Montano: Read what is there now. That is precisely what you are saying—"The Advisory Committee may advise the Minister on any matter relating to the promotion of education." This is precisely what your objection is.

The Prime Minister: You are working on the first draft.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Okay, Mr. Chairman, go ahead.

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 8 ordered to stand part of the Bill

Clauses 9 to 11 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 12

Question proposed, That clause 12 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Mr. Chairman, in clause 12, subsection (2), in the third line, delete the words "as he considers desirable", and in the same line between the words "and" and "in" insert the word "approval".

You will notice, if you read this subsection, that it says:

"Having due regard to the educational requirements of the pupils residing in any locality and after such consultation as he considers desirable and in the case of an assisted school, with the Board of Management, the Minister may designate, redesignate, classify and reclassify public schools to fulfil the purposes of education deemed most expedient from time to time."

This to my mind is too far reaching. With the very introduction of this Bill, one of the chief complaints—if I went through all this memoranda carefully—was that there was not sufficient consultation.

The Prime Minister: You misunderstand it, because you do have consultation. What it means is this: After such consultation as he considers desirable. He must consult the Board of Management.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Yes, but I am saying that these schools, in the case of assisted schools, whether Government put two-thirds for the building of that school, nevertheless that school is the property of the denomination and there must be approval. That is my great complaint with the Board of Management. They are the owners of the school and they must consent. All I am saying is that these denominational bodies must approve of any change in their schools, because it is their property, and a man must have the right to convert

his property, even to close it down, to do what he likes with it. What I am saying is that there must be approval and not only consultation.

The Prime Minister: But you have consultation with the Board here and you do not object to it. Look at page 19, clause 28 (2).

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Page 19 ?

The Prime Minister: Yes, page 19, clause 28 (2). Have you got the third or the fourth session there? Which copy are you working on?

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: I have page 19 here. Clause 28.

The Prime Minister: Clause 28 (2), you will see the same remarks.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Yes, but you see this to my mind is more important, because the Minister may designate, redesignate, classify and reclassify public schools to fulfil the purpose of education deemed most expedient from time to time. I mean it is a complete change of a school. All I am saying is that the owner of the school must agree. I do not know if you mean that the changing from primary school to secondary school or what people may call comprehensive schools.

The Prime Minister: But there is no problem there. We will consult them and if they do not agree all we will do is reduce the grant. There is no problem.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Well, that is what I feel should not happen. They may have the argument that the primary school is not necessary.

The Prime Minister: But we have done this already. We have taken schools and converted them into community centres. They say, "any change" and we say we pay.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: I never suggested that under normal circumstances anybody should object to the extension of a school or the conversion to something better.

The Prime Minister: But consultation means approval. Approval is implied there.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: You will realize that consultation does not always mean approval. We have had several quarrels here on the question of the acquisition of lands, when we say that the people must be consulted, and when we do discover all the people can say is that they got a notice that their lands would be acquired without any negotiations. All I want to preserve is the spirit of negotiation.

The Prime Minister: Do you mean it should read like this in the second line: "After such consultation as he considers desirable, and in the case of assisted schools with the approval of the Board of Management". Is that what you mean?

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Yes.

The Prime Minister: All right. This is the important one. This is the classifying and reclassifying, the designating and redesignating.

Clause 12, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 13 and 14 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 15

Mr. A. G. Montano: At clause 15 there is a typographical error. In the eighth line of clause 15 (1) it reads, "to the controlled" and should read, "to be controlled".

Clauses 15 to 27 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

10.55 p.m.

Clause 28

Question proposed, That clause 28 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. V. A. Jamadar: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 28 be amended by substituting in subclause (2) thereof the words "with the approval of" for the words "after consultation".

In other words try and negotiate first and if you find it difficult then perhaps you can come back. It would be a lot better.

Mr. A. G. Montano: Mr. Chairman, we accept that.

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 28, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 29 to 53 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 54

Question proposed, That clause 54 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. A. G. Montano: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 54 be amended by deleting the word "employ" occurring in line 4 of subclause (2) thereof and substituting the words "was employed" therefor.

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 54, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 55

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

Mr. A. G. Montano: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 55 be amended, by deleting the reference to paragraph (a) of subsection (1) occurring in subclause (2) thereof and substituting therefor a reference to paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (1)

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 55 as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 56-61, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 62

Question proposed, That clause 62 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. S. G. Maharaj: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 62 be amended by deleting subclause (3) thereof.

It is the same point as regards the Industrial Stabilization Act that I have made on all the other Bills. I want to do the same for the teachers. I want to satisfy my conscience that when they get blows and they see nothing coming their way, they cannot say that I did not stand up for them and point out that this is a vicious and wicked piece of the Industrial Stabilization Act which is imported in all these Bills. I am warning them: I want to register my vote against it. I have promised to dedi-

cate my life to the removal of the Industrial Stabilization Act, and these Acts that are being passed here batter the workers and every segment of this country back to colonialism.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes 3, Noes 11.

Ayes:

Jamadar, V. A.
Maharaj, S. C.
Farquhar, P. G.

Noes:

Montano, Hon. A. G.
Williams, Dr. the Hon. Rt. E. E.
O'Halloran, Hon. J. H.
Wallace, Hon. R. E.
Teshea, Hon. Mrs. I. U.
Thompson, Hon. A. A.
Campbell, Hon. V. L.
Johnson, C. K.
Pitt, B.
Seukeran, L. F.
Bermudez, A.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. A. G. Montano: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 62 be amended as follows:

(a) by deleting the word "Department" occurring in line 1 of subclause (1) and substituting the words "Personnel Department" therefor.

(b) by deleting the words "classes and" occurring paragraph (b) of subclause (3).

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 62, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 63-64 ordered to stand part of of the Bill.

Clause 65

Question proposed, That clause 65 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. A. G. Montano: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, That clause 65 be amended by inserting after the word "negotiation" occurring in line 7, the words "or within such further period as may be agreed upon".

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 65, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 66-69, ordered to stand part of of the Bill.

Clause 70.

Question proposed, That clause 70 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. S. C. Maharaj: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, that clause 70 be amended as follows:

- (a) by deleting the word "less" in the penultimate line of subclause (1) thereof and substituting the word "more" therefor;
- (b) by deleting the word "five" in the last line of subclause (1) thereof and substituting the word "three" therefor;
- (c) by deleting the word "third" in the last line of subclause (2) and substituting the words "first and second" therefor.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 3 Noes 11.

Ayes:

Jamadar, V. A.
Maharaj, S. C.
Farquhar, P. G.

Noes:

Montano, Hon. A. G.
Williams, Dr. the Rt. Hon. E. E.
O'Halloran, Hon. J. H.
Wallace, Hon. R. E.
Teshea, Hon. Mrs. I. U.
Thompson, Hon. A. A.
Bermudez, A.
Campbell, Hon. V. L.
Johnson, C. K.
Pitt, B.
Seukeran, L. F.

Amendment negatived.

11.05 p.m.

Clause 7 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 72

Question proposed, That clause 72 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. A. G. Montano: In clause 72 I beg to delete the words "recognized as a Trade Union" occurring in subclause (5) and substitute the words "registered as a Trade Union".

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 72, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 73-74 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 75

Question proposed, That clause 75 stand part of the Bill.

Education Bill

Wednesday, 8th December, 1965

Education Bill

Mr. A. G. Montano: This is a typographical error, Mr. Chairman. Instead of the age of "fifteen" it should be the age of "twelve".

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 75, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Second Schedule

Question proposed, That the Second Schedule stand part of the Bill.

Hon. A. G. Montano: Delete the words "civil servant" occurring in paragraph 11 and substitute the words "member of the Teaching Service".

Question put and agreed to.

Second Schedule, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Question put and agreed to, That the Bill as amended be reported to the House.

House resumed.

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

Motion made and question proposed, That the House do now adjourn to Thursday, 9th December, at 1.30 p.m.

Question put and agreed to.

House adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 11.10 p.m.