

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

(Constituted under the British Guiana (Constitution) (Temporary Provisions) Orders in Council, 1953 and 1956).

Friday, 16th December, 1960

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary, Hon. Major I. O. Smith, O.B.E. (Acting)

Attorney-General, Hon. A. M. I. Austin, Q.C.

ex officio

Financial Secretary, Hon. W. P. D'Andrade.

The Honourable **B. H. Benn**

—Member for *Essequibo River*
(Minister of Natural Resources)

Janet Jagan

—Member for *Western Essequibo*
(Minister of Labour, Health and Housing)

Ram Karran

—Member for *Demerara-Essequibo*
(Minister of Communications and Works)

„ **B. S. Rai**

—Member for *Central Demerara*
(Minister of Community Development and Education).

Mr. **R. B. Gajraj**

—Nominated Member

„ **W. O. R. Kendall**

—Member for *New Amsterdam*

„ **R. C. Tello**

—Nominated Member

„ **F. Bowman**

—Member for *Demerara River*

„ **L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.**

—Member for *Georgetown Central*

„ **S. Campbell**

—Member for *North Western District*

„ **A. L. Jackson**

—Member for *Georgetown North*

„ **E. B. Beharry**

—Member for *Eastern Demerara*

„ **S. M. Saffee**

—Member for *Western Berbice*

„ **Ajodha Singh**

—Member for *Berbice River*

„ **Jai Narine Singh**

—Member for *Georgetown South*

„ **R. E. Davis**

—Nominated Member

„ **A. M. Fredericks**

—Nominated Member

„ **H. J. M. Hubbard**

—Nominated Member.

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

Mr. E. V. Viapree — Assistant Clerk of the Legislature.

ABSENT :

The hon. Dr. C. B. Jagan — Minister of Trade and Industry — on leave

Mr. A. G. Tasker, O.B.E. — Nominated Member — on leave.

The Clerk read prayers.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 15th December, 1960, as printed and circulated, were confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I wish to announce the composition of the Standing Committees for the new session:

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. W. O. R. Kendall, Mr. F. Bowman, Mr. A. L. Jackson, Mr. H. J. M. Hubbard, Mr. A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE

The hon. B. S. Rai, Minister of Community Development and Education; Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.; Mr. R. C. Tello, Mr. Ajodha Singh, Mr. Jai Narine Singh.

HOUSE COMMITTEE

The hon. Ram Karran, Minister of Communications and Works; hon. B. S. Rai, Minister of Community Development and Education; Mr. R. E. Davis.

ORAL ASKING AND ANSWERING OF QUESTIONS

DISMISSALS AND RESIGNATIONS OF PRISON OFFICERS

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard, is to ask Question No. 4 standing in his name on the Order Paper.

Mr. Hubbard: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the hon. Chief Secretary to state: (a) the number of dismissals which have occurred in each grade of prison officer over the past five years; (b) the number of resignations which have been received

from each grade of prison officer over that period; and (c) the names of the Superintendents or Directors of Prisons during that period?

The Chief Secretary: (a) During the past five years six Prison Officers on the permanent establishment were dismissed; 11 Prison Officers on probation were dismissed; and the services of 17 Prison Officers on probation were terminated; (b) 12 Prison Officers on probation and eight on the permanent establishment resigned during the period under reference; (c) Mr. R. Aitken was appointed Superintendent of Prisons with effect from 2nd November, 1955, and the post was redesignated Director of Prisons with effect from 8th August, 1959. He was granted vacation leave during the period December, 1957 to August, 1958, and Major L. F. Candy, at the time Deputy Superintendent of Prison, acted as Superintendent.

Mr. Burnham: As a Supplementary Question, would the Chief Secretary tell us whether Government is not concerned about this inordinate number of dismissals and termination of services?

The Chief Secretary: In the circumstances of the Prisons Service, the answer is in the negative.

Mr. Burnham: As a further Supplementary Question, would the Chief Secretary tell us whether ever before, in the history of the Prisons Service, there had been so many dismissals and termination of services?

The Chief Secretary: I would require to be given notice of such a question, as I cannot answer it now.

Mr. Burnham: As a further Supplementary Question, can the Chief Secretary tell us whether he has not had further complaints about the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Prisons who are supposed to be dictators?

The Chief Secretary : I have not had any, and would point out that the Deputy Superintendent of Prisons referred to is no longer with us.

Mr. Speaker : I wish, further, to attract the attention of Members to Rule 19 (1) of the Standing Orders because today is the second occasion I have noticed that questions have been read out by the Member in whose name the questions stand. The Rule says:

"19. (1) At the time appointed for the oral asking and answering of questions under Standing Order 11, the Speaker shall call in turn upon each Member in whose name a question stands upon the Order Paper, in the order in which the questions are printed."

Now comes the effective part:

"Each Member so called shall rise in his place and ask the question by reference to its number on the Order Paper, and the Member questioned shall give his reply."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

The Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai): I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the

Georgetown (Valuation and Rating) (Special Provisions) Bill, 1960.

I wish Your Honour's permission to give notice that I propose to move the Second Reading of this Bill on Wednesday next.

ORDER OF THE DAY

BILL—FIRST READING

The following Bill was read the First time :

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to authorise the Georgetown Town Council to prepare the valuation list to come into force in 1961 and for other purposes incidental thereto or concerned therewith."

EDUCATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Council resumed consideration of the Second Reading of a Bill intituled

"An Ordinance to amend the Education Ordinance".

Mr. Speaker : We will resume the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill. On the adjournment the Member for East Demerara, Mr. Beharry, had exhausted his time but, on a Motion, had been allowed fifteen minutes more. He may continue.

Mr. Beharry: I have dealt very extensively with the various points yesterday, to show why the Minister of Community Development and Education should withdraw this Bill. I am appealing to his better judgment today, and I ask him to discuss this matter again with the Members of his Party and the Government. This Bill has far reaching consequences which I will endeavour to point out to the Minister.

In introducing this Bill, the hon. Minister said that "thirty-five years ago a Commission recommended the abolition of dual control of schools". He spoke at length and cited several recommendations by various Commissions on this matter. He quoted the Royal Commission headed by Lord Moyne in 1930. He also quoted Mr. Hammond's recommendation in 1941 as well as Mr. Burnham's in 1953. But what the Minister has failed to do is to appoint a Commission to go into the whole matter of dual control of schools today. Why do I say this? When the recommendations were made, it was not envisaged that this country would have been saddled with a Communist Government!

Mr. Speaker: I am not aware of that. When you speak in this Council on such matters you must speak of facts. I do not know that any such Government was returned; in that regard you should only refer to things that are mat-

[MR. SPEAKER]

ters of common or certain knowledge, in order that I may appreciate what you are referring to.

Mr. Beharry: I can only judge men by their actions and utterances. From the utterances I have heard in this Council from time to time, I can come to no other conclusion. I am very sorry, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: That is entirely different. Your conclusion may be right or wrong.

Mr. Beharry: I feel sure if the various Commissions were asked to sit today, and view the matter in the light of present conditions, they would not have recommended the abolition of dual control of schools. They had recommended that, because they did not know that today we would have been living in a different age with people trying to change the pattern of our lives. I would really like to see what an impartial committee would recommend today. It must be remembered that the recommendations of the Commissions were made twenty years ago.

The hon. Minister has failed to get the recommendation of the Teachers' Association. He was unable to quote that the Teachers' Association—the people who are closely connected with teaching and schools—are in favour of the abolition of dual control. I want to sound a note of warning to the Indian community in this country, and I intend to do that now. This Government and this Party have a history of 'divide and rule'. In this country the Indians are divided against their African brothers and *vice versa*.

This country is divided on racial grounds, and no one can deny it. That is why I am appealing to the Minister to withdraw this Bill. Are we going to see a further division in this country? Are

Christians to be divided against non-Christians? Where will this Government stop? Divide and rule is the order of the day; it is the culture and social pattern of things in our country. God help this country if we live to see Muslims turning against Hindus and so on! What a tragic day it will be; what tragic history this Government is writing for this country!

The Indians in this country think they can control this party because of the number of votes they have. I warn them that they may be able to control the party today. But when Independence comes there will be a dictatorial Government in this country, and the Indians will not be able to control the party.

I appeal to the Minister to stop this country from being divided further than it is divided today. The division is getting greater and greater because of the muddling of this Government in power. I know very well that Government will be able to pass this Bill with the assistance of a few lackeys and stooges.

Mr. Speaker: I have banned that word in this Council. "Stooge" is not a good word to be used here.

Mr. Beharry: When I referred to "lackeys", I meant blind supporters of the Government irrespective of where the country is going.

Mr. Speaker: "Stooge" is the word I am concerned about.

Mr. Beharry: I know that this Bill will be passed in this Legislature. However, I want to appeal to the Christian Social Council just as I have appealed to the Indian community in this country from whom this party draws its support. I want to tell the Christian Social Council that although this Bill will be passed, they should call a meeting of the other religious groups—group—immediately and prevent it from being implemented.

Yesterday I recalled that some time ago this Government introduced a Bill with a view to allocating the rice mills in the various districts in British Guiana. Not very long ago the Government had to withdraw it, because they found that they were losing support. In order to prevent the implementation of this Bill, I appeal to the Christian Social Council to summon a meeting of representatives of religious societies such as the Vedic Missionary Society, the Sad'r Anjuman Islam, Sanatan Dharma Maha Sabha, the Hindu Pundits Council and the religious leaders of the Muslim groups. If you can reason with them and show them the difficulties in this Bill; if you can get them to agree with you, I am certain that this Government will not implement the Bill.

This Bill has been brought here because the schools are neither Hindu nor Muslim schools. Those are the people from whom this party draws its support, and that is why the Government would withdraw the Bill. If tomorrow the Hindus and Muslims were to say that this Bill is an injustice to a religious sect in this country that has made a useful contribution to education, I am sure the Government would withdraw the Bill.

Every person who is in this Chamber listening to the debate on this Bill is the product of a Christian education from some Christian school, and we should be grateful for the contribution they have made. Certain organizations have built schools to educate the Christians and non-Christians. It is not that the Christians are demanding that only Christians should be educated in these schools. Whether you are a Christian or non-Christian there is no discrimination in these schools, and I do not see why these schools should be confiscated. The answer to the school problem in this country is to build more schools—not to take away the schools from these organizations. You are preventing one set of people from running these schools, and

handing them over to another set of people.

I said yesterday that the Minister mentioned that Anglicans cannot get promotion in a Catholic school. But I am warning the teachers that they will not be able to get promotion unless they are P.P.P. members, or communist sympathisers! When the Government takes over the schools it will be worse for the teachers.

I hope that the Christian Social Council will see the wisdom for marshalling support where it would be most effective, because I am certain that the issues have not been properly put to Hindu and Muslim leaders. The other day I read in the newspapers that the Minister of Community Development and Education had delivered a lecture on dual control of schools. I wish he had explained where this lecture took place. It took place in a Hindu Churchyard at Grove on the East Bank.

Government has never honestly put the issue of dual control of schools to the non-Christian organizations and its non-Christian supporters. That is why I am appealing to the Christian Social Council to put the other side of the argument to the Hindus and Muslims. If they do so there will be no implementation of this Bill. I am certain of that. Together they can demand from the Government the withdrawal of this iniquitous Bill.

The chief argument in favour of this Bill is that the schools to be taken over are aided schools, and that the Government pays the teachers. I would like the Christian Social Council to impress upon the non-Christian religious leaders the point that the fact that Government assists these schools does not give Government the right to take them over from the denominations. Government has assisted other organizations. It subsidizes villages in the matter of drainage and irrigation, but that does not give Government the right to take over those villages.

[MR. BEHARRY]

This Government appears to have a burning desire to find employment for its followers. Why find it in the Christian schools? Economic development is the answer to the unemployment situation. In its attempt to take over certain schools Government is only exposing its inability to run this country. It is shameful that it has to try to find employment for a few people by taking over schools. The country is being divided now on religious lines. We shall soon see Christians fighting against non-Christians in this country if this Government remains longer in office. I hope that the Hindus and Muslims will realize that this is not merely an attack on Christians, but that their turn will come later. If they feel that they control the votes of the Members of the present Government and they can throw them out whenever they wish to do so, I wish to warn them that it is very difficult to throw a dictator out. He has to be thrown out with guns—not votes. That is how they have elections in Cuba, and if we do not control them now, that is how elections are going to take place in this country.

Mr. Speaker: Your time is up.

Mr. Beharry: I am asking the Christian Social Council to approach this matter in such a manner as to prevent the implementation of this Bill.

Mr. Tello: Unlike my friend, the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard, who has never impressed me as being either emotional or reasonable, I propose to be both emotional and reasonable in my opposition to this Bill. I am satisfied that Government fully understood and is quite aware of the undertaking given to the Christian denominations with regard to the future of denominational schools rebuilt by Imperial and/or local Government funds.

The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, quoted from certain correspondence to support his contention. For-

tunately those records are there and cannot be easily refuted. With your permission, Sir, I wish to quote from a statement on dual control released by the Christian Social Council in July, 1960. It states:

"The Minister asserts that the Dual Control Agreement of 1946 implied that schools rebuilt by Government on land leased by the Denominations should be under Government control.

We completely reject the Minister's interpretation and none of those who made the Agreement could accept it. For fourteen years it has been held and has been the practice that such schools should be under Dual Control".

The hon. Member has quoted this correspondence, and I doubt whether Government will attempt to question the authenticity of those letters. But there is farther evidence of goodwill and acceptance on both sides, because I happen to know that when those schools were completed the Government, anxious that the entire community should be witnesses to the fact that it was entrusting the control of those schools to the respective denominations, held formal handing-over ceremonies. One is therefore left in a quandary to understand the Minister's present interpretation, because most of those ceremonies were performed during the regime of this Government, so that there can be no misunderstanding, lack of knowledge or lapse of memory on the part of Members of this Government. The facts are on record, and Government can refresh its memory.

I would like to say that the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, has done a tremendous lot of research work on this question—I have done a little myself—but in his anxiety to present his case yesterday he omitted to quote from a certain document which, unfortunately, got mixed up with other papers. As I happen to have a copy of the reference he intended to quote, I have obtained his permission to use it. With Your Hon-

our's permission, therefore, I would like to read a copy of telegram, No 581, from the Secretary of State:

"581. Your telegram Dual Control of Schools

I must regret having overlooked your request commenting upon that proposal in your despatch 37. Generally, I agree throughout and congratulate all concerned on the large measure of agreement reached. I hope that you will proceed with legislation on the lines of the agreement already reached and I shall be glad to see the draft when ready.

Secretary of State."

Mr. Speaker: To whom was the telegram sent?

Mr. Tello: A copy of the telegram from the Secretary of State was sent by the Director of Education to the Governing Body concerned, and I have quoted the number of the telegram so that it could be checked. I would also like to read a letter from the Education Department dated 4th March, 1954, also addressed to the Governing Body. It reads:

"Rev. E. S. M. Pilgrim, M.A.
Dear Sir,

With reference to previous correspondence ending with my letter dated 17th February, 1954, I desire to inform you that the said Kingston Methodist School has now been handed over to your Governing Body according to the terms mentioned in my letter of 4th February 1953.

2. At the Opening Ceremony of the new school the Building Officer in the name of the Education Department publicly handed over the building to you.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) A. A. BANNISTER,
Director of Education."

I have quoted this letter and the telegram, because I am impressed by the fact that the Government accepted the agreement. Whether it was formally ratified by legislation or not, the fact is that Government accepted the spirit of the agreement and

took steps to implement it. Government agreed to rebuild the schools on lands belonging to the denominations and to permit the continuance of denominational control.

Of course, lawyers are more qualified to interpret things than I, but my commonsense will permit me to be guided by those who are not legally trained but are also intelligent. What I want to say is: We have had evidence of the acceptance and implementation, and I would say, between the acceptance and the implementation, there is valuable goodwill. That is an important thing.

There is anxiety in the Christian community for the continuation of dual control, because the Christian community feels that it is the responsibility of the parents to see that their children are brought up in the correct school environment. That is a fact, and history supports it. It was their responsibility to see that their children had proper scholastic education that was associated with the protection of their spiritual outlook and values, and that is the firmest evidence we have as the reason for the early Christians investing their money on education.

Probably, Government has forgotten that it is its responsibility to provide schools. It had been relieved for about a century, and in some cases more than a century, of providing schools for a certain community. We have no evidence that these schools have not benefited the community. When we look around this Council Table we see tremendous evidence of the services rendered by the denominational schools of the Colony as a whole.

Who are really opposed to denominational schools? I would categorize them. There are three main sources of opposition. One is that which we will never defeat or convince—the one which opposes it for ideological reasons—people

[MR. TELLO]

of a certain strong view who refuse to accept religious influence in schools. I do not propose to elaborate on that because we have tremendous evidence of it the world over that one of the ways to change the entire ideological outlook of a nation is to start with the children. This is a wonderful hunting ground and a most fruitful field to work in. Take control of the youth and you take control of the nation! I say, there are a small, impressive, hard-working few, as compared with the large majority of people who are opposed to dual control of denominational schools.

Unfortunately, the average Guianese parents do not belong to that demonstrative lot. Perhaps, in their own quiet way they strongly resent the Bill, and they came to the Council to give moral support to those who oppose it. They are not the demonstrative type to go picketing and making trouble for the Police, but we must not interpret this as 'all is well'. I can assure this Council that the whole religious community of Guiana is very watchful of the proceedings here today.

As I said, there are three main factions of opposition. There are those who oppose religious influence in schools for ideological reasons. Secondly, there are non-Christian teachers. They, certainly, have my sympathy, but history will prove that there has always been goodwill and there has never been discrimination among the Christian denominations with regard to educating or admitting non-Christians to their schools.

What is the schools alive in British Guiana is the willingness to sacrifice. In the by the salaries of elementary schools teachers were unattractive. The profession was not attractive and who wanted to make a tremendous sacrifice in the interest of a future Guiana stuck to the

them Christians. I am sure to pass on information and to state members of the non-Christian community. I, myself, was educated in those days at the Port Mourant Roman Catholic School. In that school more than 80 per cent. of the attendance were non-Christians, and I believe it carried a staff of Christian teachers. As I grew up, I saw the structure changed. I saw East Indians appointed; I saw Christian teachers take more interest in non-Christian whom they taught.

I would like to point out a few cases that come to mind. I remember Mr. C. B. Giddings, a follower of the boy. All interest was taken in him, and later on we had the honour of seeing him headmaster of one of the largest schools in the Colony. I remember Mr. Walter Sabsok, an East Indian but a Christian. In him, too, a great deal of interest was taken. I recall Seecharran, a wholehearted Hindu boy, who would argue day and about the correctness of the Hindu religion. Seecharran sat the Entrance Examination to the Teachers' Training Centre and won first in the examination for entry to the Centre. He had no use for the Christian or Catholic faith, but it did not prevent the Christian teachers from taking an interest in him. I remember Mohammed Haniff, a very zealous Muslim. Unfortunately, when he was just his name in British Guiana as a teacher, he died suddenly but all his elementary school life he enjoyed the fullest co-operation of Christian teachers.

The fact remains that these boys and girls—those non-Christians—had an equal opportunity with those Christians who attended those schools. I admit that I have come across the appointment of a non-Christian to a Christian school. I would be shocked to see the

leader of the P.N.C. appointed Prime Minister if his Party is not elected in Office. *Vice versa*, next year when the democratic forces come into power I would be shocked to see the hon. Dr. Jagan becoming Prime Minister. [Laughter from Members of the Majority Party.] It is just the people in whom you have implicit faith to lead your schools. After all, the morals of the children are involved and you must be assured that the teacher has accepted the moral standards of the denomination.

The solution to this problem is not to take away the existing denominational schools. The solution, I believe, and will speak more extensively on it later, is to provide the non-Christians with schools. I am sure that if the Government should give some indication of its willingness to assist the Hindu and Muslim communities to build their own schools, the response would be encouraging. I doubt very much that the Christians who, from their own resources, have built their own schools, would have any objection to Government using money from the Treasury to build schools for the non-Christians. For, after all, who are the taxpayers?—the Hindus, Muslims and Christians. But I say, if this were intended to satisfy the non-Christians, then you are going about it in the wrong way.

There is also another faction opposed to denominational schools and that is the belief that the only qualification that is necessary for the appointment of teachers, and especially head-teachers, is academic qualification. That school of thought should be objected to and resisted, for they would not accept the rigid moral discipline of denominational administration.

One must remember that at the scholastic age—the moulding age of the children—parents would like to be satisfied that the moral safety of their boys and girls are in good hands. Today there is a different school of thought on that: children are to attend school, learn

the three “Rs”, be brilliant scientists, but the moral aspect is not really important! That is one of the sources of opposition to dual control. They are not willing to co-operate with the rigid moral standards set by denominational bodies.

I would like to state that I think the denominations are perfectly correct, and the parents who support them are doing a good job in supporting the retention of dual control so that the administration will have that moral fibre which will be good for the children. I should like to quote from the Norwood Report. The Norwood Committee was a Royal Commission appointed to investigate and make recommendations on schools and the educational system in Great Britain. I would like to quote an extract from the Report which was published by His Majesty's Stationery Office in London. It states:

“The outlook and the behaviour of the pupil,” it runs, “his standards and habits of judgment, whether as an individual, as a member of the school community and later as a citizen, depend to a great extent upon the nature of the influences which bear upon him at school: such influences are often most powerful when least consciously exerted. Growth in ideals takes place best in an environment in which those ideals find embodiment in everyday life, and to that spiritual environment every teacher can make his contribution... The point which we wish to make at this stage is that an environment which will foster the growth of ideals, spiritual, moral, aesthetic and intellectual... cannot be fully created without the contribution of each teacher who shares the daily life of the school community”.

So you can see why denominational authorities are so anxious to keep the influence of the Church in the schools in order to maintain and sustain their teachings. They are anxious that dual control of schools should continue. This is supported by some of the greatest authorities on the subject.

Unfortunately, I did not hear the hon. Minister of Community Development and Education when he was moving the introduction of this Bill. I tried to

[Mr. TELLO]

read what little there was in the Press on the matter, in order to glean from the printed word what actually took place in this Council. I wanted to know what we would achieve; in what manner British Guiana would benefit from the taking over of 50 schools by this Government, and so on. I think the hon. Minister would be the first person to agree with me that what is urgently needed is more schools and more school space. I would like him in his reply to explain to me how this would be fulfilled by taking over these 50 schools. What advantage would be gained by taking over these schools?

I am sure the efficient standards of these schools will not go up, because the records will not support him. I wanted to get exact figures from the Department of Education, but my source of information is sufficiently authoritative. The difference between the reports on denominational schools and Government schools is so negligible that it is unrecognizable.

I am sure the Government has no other source to draw its teachers from than the same source the teachers are drawn from today. Does the hon. Minister believe that the mere shifting of a teacher from a denominational administration to a Government administration would make him a better teacher? Would it give them better team spirit, or reduce the *per capita* cost of educating the children? I do not know in what manner he hopes to achieve improvements in the educational system. The whole exercise is a fruitless one; it is merely an exercise of the demonstration of power; it is merely another means of choking

He is merely telling the denominations: "If you do not want to give up dual control, I have the power to introduce legislation to relieve you of your control by the force of law". This is all I can get out of what he has said.

I doubt very much that the Education Department can afford to run and manage these schools at the cost the Christian Social Council is running them. This is what the Christian Social Council said in a release in July, 1960:

"Further to the Minister's own proposals could not but cost the country hundreds of thousands of dollars of extra expenditure which could be used to provide school places. At present our Denominations are saving the taxpayer a considerable sum every year not only through providing denominational school buildings but also through the immense amount of work we undertake, without charge, in managing these schools."

Mr. Speaker: Time!

Mr. Beharry: I beg to move that the hon. Member be given half an hour more.

Mr. Bowman: beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Please continue.

Mr. Tello: I doubt that one could put this Bill under the most powerful microscope and discover any true value that would accrue to British Guiana from the change over, other than that 50 more schools would become Government schools and listed in the records as indicating greater responsibility for education. As far as the philanthropic work done by the denominational bodies are concerned, I doubt that the Education Department can find people to manage these schools as efficiently and at such low cost.

I have obtained my information from the Press, and I have no reason to believe that it is not correct. I was not here at the beginning of the debate, but I have discussed the matter with my colleagues who confirmed that certain things were said. The hon. Minister quoted certain countries in which no dual control exists. I am not prepared to

challenge his references. I believe the Minister sincerely wanted to offer information to this Council, but one is not at all times fully informed on certain matters. While the hon. Minister has quoted several countries where dual control does not exist, I want to remind him that there are many powerful influential countries near and far from us who still maintain dual control. As recent as this year they have offered the denominations greater financial assistance. I refer to the Dutch countries, the Netherlands, Aruba and Curacao. In those countries equal treatment is given to government and denominational schools. The Government builds and maintains the schools for the denominations, but the denominations appoint all teachers while the Government pays the salaries. That is the position in Aruba and Curacao. I am not quite sure whether the Government of Surinam builds schools as well. I know that the denominations appoint teachers in Surinam and their salaries are paid by the Government, despite the fact that the denominations have full control of the school buildings.

In the United Kingdom Government pays the salaries of teachers in denominational schools, and that is provided for in the 1944 Education Act. As a result of a subsequent amendment to Education Act, this year the amount given to denominational bodies for the rebuilding of schools has increased from 50 per cent. to 75 per cent. I think if we are looking around for examples, we can take Surinam or the United Kingdom and see what they are doing. As we are an English-speaking Colony, even when we become independent we will remain in the Commonwealth. I think we can follow the practice in the United Kingdom in this matter.

In accordance with the Scottish Education Act of 1918, Government pays everything in both State and denominational schools — buildings, main-

tenance and teachers' salaries, as is the case in the Dutch system. That has been observed all through the years. The administration of the system has been changed from a Government (Country-wide) Board to the Local Authorities (Cities, counties). Teachers are appointed by these Local Boards from approved lists, which must be maintained by the denominations. No teacher may be appointed to a denominational school without the approval as given on the denominational list concerned.

In Ireland the system of national education is denominational. By an Act of 1934 it is provided, in a Roman Catholic country, that if there is a demand from parents for a minimum of ten children of another faith, Government will provide a school of the denomination required. If there is a minimum of seven children, Government will provide transport to the denominational school required.

France has this year adopted the dual control system. Legislation providing for financial aid to "private" schools was passed on December 31, 1959, and became effective in this academic year. The National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service Report of November, 1960, published in today's "Catholic Standard", states:

"The Ministry of Education said that at least 10,400 schools had applied for contracts that would enable them to receive financial assistance from Government. Almost all the 11,400 private schools in France are Catholic. The rest are Jewish, Protestant and secular".

In Canada different systems operate whereby special taxes are directed towards assisting the payment of teachers in denominational schools. Taxpayers are asked to register the denomination to which they belong. Grants are also allowed for buildings like laboratories, etc

[MR. TELLO]

In the West Indies there has been through the years, and still is, a form of dual control of schools and aid to denominational schools in Trinidad, Grenada, St. Lucia, Dominica and Jamaica. In British Honduras there is very substantial Government aid in the building of denominational schools as well as the payment of teachers' salaries.

In India considerable subsidies are given by Government to Christian schools. The recent overthrow of the communist Government in Kerala was the result of the resistance of the Indian people to the communist attempt to take over and secularize the religious schools. Christians, Hindus and Muslims combined to defend them.

In Ghana the schools fall into three categories—Government, Denominational and Trust Schools. Substantial help is given by the Government of Ghana to the denominational schools. The denominational schools in the Volta region were taken over by the Government, but were subsequently restored to denominational control.

I hope the Minister will give serious consideration to these facts. He made reference to Ceylon but I would give the Government of that country another two years when they will do like India and adopt the policy of Ghana by returning to dual control of schools, if they have not done so already. Why is this Government making this experiment and groping in the dark? There are good examples which it can follow.

With regard to the system in the U.S.A. the Minister knows the reason for it; the Americans wanted to demonstrate their independence. They wanted to show that the people had freedom in every respect, and it is a fact that the American national schools receive no Government aid but tremendous financial aid from persons who prefer to con-

tribute to the upkeep of denominational schools rather than pay higher income tax. It is therefore an indirect subsidy to the denominational schools by the Government which grants income tax relief in such circumstances.

I want to suggest to the Minister and to this Council that rather than gamble and grope in the dark with something we are not sure about, we should follow good example. Knowing the Minister as I do, I feel sure that, given a free hand in this matter, he would join with me in proposing the establishment of denominational schools, Government schools, and Hindu and Muslim schools in this country. But I appreciate that the Minister is carrying out party policy. I would like to make a quotation for his benefit with reference to the educational system in the Netherlands, as I am sure that if he could allow himself to give serious thought to the suggestion that he should withdraw this unfortunate Bill which is intended to satisfy a few persons and offend the majority, he would agree that I am offering him a good example. I quote from "The Case For Catholic Schools" published by the Catholic Education Council for England and Wales:

"In 1909 the Liberal premier, Cort van der Linden, set up a Commission under the Chairmanship of another Liberal, Dr. Bos, and composed of two members from each political party (including, of course, the Catholic party) to draft a Bill giving the Voluntary Schools financial equality with the State schools, and to consider whether the Constitution should be varied. The Commission reported in 1913 and it was under the same premier, in 1917, one year before the Scottish settlement was reached, that Art. 200 of the Dutch Constitution was amended to make this equality possible."

The article goes on to say:

"In order to establish a new Voluntary school it is necessary to submit, among other things, (1) a declaration, signed by the parents of a number of children to the effect that they wish their children to attend the new

school. The specified number of children varies with the total number of inhabitants in the municipality; (2) a declaration that the proposers are prepared to deposit with the Local Authority as security a sum equivalent to 15 per cent. of the cost of establishing and equipping the school. If at any time during the first twenty years of the school's existence the number of pupils in the school falls below two-thirds or one-half of the number for which it was built, the whole or a proportionate part of this deposit is liable to be forfeited. Otherwise it is returned with interest to the proposers at the end of that period. No deposit has yet been forfeited in respect of any Catholic school.

Once these conditions have been fulfilled the school can be built, and the cost of site and building will be borne by the Local Authority.

The Local Authority must pay exactly the same amount per pupil towards the maintenance expenses of such a school as it does for its own schools.

The teachers in a Voluntary School are appointed by the Managers, who are free to make their choice without obtaining the approval of the State or Local Authority, provided that the teacher is duly qualified and has a certificate of good moral behaviour from the Mayor of his or her place of residence. The State reimburses the Managers for the cost of paying the salaries of the teachers up to the number fixed by law for both State and Voluntary schools of that size, and the State is also responsible for the teachers' pensions."

This is what I am offering to the Minister, and this is what I am certain the Christians, Muslims, Hindus and the Government can accept with dignity and without any loss of face, and thus win the goodwill which is so necessary to harmonize the Guianese nation. I am putting it to this Council that this attempt at satisfying the non-Christian community by introducing this politically inspired Bill is creating a grievous harm. If the reasons are not political and this legislation is genuinely intended to serve the community as a whole, I offer to the Minister the Dutch system. I am suggesting to the Minister that if he could advertize the fact tomorrow that any community which could establish by

the signatures of parents that it needs a new school and is willing to contribute 15 per cent. of the cost, he would get a quick response from sections of the community who sincerely desire to have their own schools. Government would have requests from the Hindu and Muslim communities and also from the Christian community. There would also be Government schools, and such an arrangement would give satisfaction to the majority of the people of the country.

I am asking the Minister to withdraw this Bill and to give consideration to the suggestion I have made. I suggest that he considers either the Scottish or the Dutch system, and he might also inquire from the United Kingdom why it was found necessary in 1960 to increase the financial assistance to private schools. I suggest that it was because they recognized once more the invaluable service rendered by the denominational system.

I regret very much to say that the Minister, either in his haste to bring this Bill or his anxiety to satisfy others, has made several mistakes. I have with me a copy of a letter which was addressed to teachers; and I am really disappointed in the hon. Minister himself for not embarking on this part of his programme with some regard for industrial relations' practice. I remember the hon. Minister himself was a very active and militant trade unionist, and he could not have been so long in the 'Ministerial harness' as to forget. I know the Minister knows that the British Guiana Teachers' Association is the official bargaining agent for the teachers; and I know that he understands that there are certain cardinal principles that must not be violated. I am not charging him with being dishonourable, but he is certainly subjected to such a charge. [*Addressing the Minister.*] This is the letter which you have written to the teachers, who make up the membership of the British

[**MR. TELLO**]

Guiana Teachers' Association, to reply to at such short notice. It is unfair and improper behaviour. You have no excuse. This is the letter:—

"Dear Teachers,

The school in which you now serve will soon be a Government School. The Honourable Minister of Community Development and Education would like to assure you that all members of the staff would be retained in their present capacities if they so desire. I should be grateful if members of the staff would signify immediately their willingness or otherwise to be retained on the staff. Headteachers should bring this letter to the attention of all teachers in their schools. An entry to this effect should be made in the Log Book of the school and should be by all the teachers. Decisions incorporated in a single reply to which each member of staff must affix his signature. You will be notified in due course of the date of the change over."

Mr. Speaker : From whom to whom?

Mr. Tello: It is from the Education Department, dated 6th December, and sent to the headteachers and staffs of the Roman Catholic Schools listed among those to be taken over. It was signed by someone for the Director of Education. In the trade union language you call it "intimidation". You walk into a man's office and say: "I want to hire it from you, are you prepared to accept the new management?" The whole exercise is wrong; the whole thing is unfair. I know that the school teachers have no alternative. The officers of the Department of Education and the Minister know that the proper course was to invite the Teachers' Association in, inform them of the new project and obtain from them their approval on behalf of their members. Such things are not done at short notice. It is intimidation to its height.

Once more, I would ask the hon. Minister not to think too hard, of anything we have said here in good faith,

but to accept it, not with prejudice, and do not continue what has been the practice here of refusing to listen to this side of the Table and simply believe in the decision reached in Executive Council. I would ask the hon. Minister to act in an honourable manner, give serious consideration to withdrawing this Bill and get further information from the United Kingdom and Dutch Guiana of their system that has brought so much satisfaction. We know that even in Surinam, the system has received a good response from the community.

I would like to say that in 1953, British Guiana was granted a Constitution that provided for individual Ministerial responsibility. I would further like to say to the three *ex officio* Members who sit here, that this question we are discussing today involves the Christian administration of schools. I am sure that they are Christians. I know two of them are Guianese, and this is a Guianese question. In 1953, there was a Constitution which gave Ministerial responsibility to individuals; in 1954, it went through a retrograde step; and in 1957, we received what is commonly known as the Renison Constitution—a Constitution that gave the then Governor more powers than any of his predecessors. Today, we are debating a question that is solely and properly a Guianese question—a question that affects Christian principles. I am asking, under the provisions of the Constitution, these three honourable Gentlemen to inquire of His Excellency the Governor—and I can offer a great deal of evidence to show that on several occasions, with matters of this sort, *ex officio* Members were granted permission to vote in accordance with their consciences or abstain from voting—whether permission could be granted in this matter.

In conclusion, I would ask the hon. Minister to give consideration to my and withdraw this Bill in the interest of the goodwill he will need in the future.

Mr. Campbell: rise to register my objection to the Bill which is being debated, for I see in it a direct attack on religion. I will deviate a while. From the point of view of wise spending of the Colony's funds, if this Bill goes through, it will be bad economy. At the present moment and for a long number of years this country has had what we know as the system of denominational schools. The managers of these schools had been carrying out such duties free, gratis and for nothing—for the love of God—and by so doing have been saving hundreds of thousands of dollars for this country. But the take over of these schools by Government would mean that it has to get 50 managers who have to be well paid—around \$300 per month. If you multiply \$300 by 50 for 12 months, it would mean that \$180,000 would have to be paid out in salaries alone, annually. What about the boats to take the managers about the rivers and housing? In a little while it will be paying out millions of dollars annually to manage schools. That would be wonderful! I suppose that is the logic of this Government which has brought this Bill here today.

One hon. Member said here yesterday that the history of this country has been a Christian history—it has been bound up with Christianity. This is true. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard, quoted the name of the Reverend John Smith to support his argument in favour of this Bill. That was funny! It tickled my sense of humour. Who was the Reverend John Smith? He died a martyr's death for being true to his Christianity. He stood a champion of the slaves. He fought for the slaves because of his Christian principles. What is the point of bringing in the Reverend John Smith as past history to strengthen the argument for this Bill?

I heard a definition of religion given by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard. He said: "Religion is a political manifestation of the Churches". If I

am wrong, he can correct me. I feel that religion is a relation between man and God. Man is a religious being, and he has to believe in something mysterious. If he does not believe in Christianity, he will believe in obeah and so on. You cannot alter human nature.

Religion is a myth, but what do we find today? This wide world is divided into two philosophies: those for God, and those against. I am wondering whose side the Government is on. I am on the side of God, and I will battle to my last breath if anything or anyone dares to challenge that there is a God. The Leaders of the Government are well-known for their beliefs. They have said here and elsewhere that they are Marxists, and they believe in the doctrine of Karl Marx. Of course we have had a declaration here that has become a household word: "You cannot stop Communism; it is easier to stop tomorrow". That is telling us that Communism is the best thing for British Guiana. If that is so, then this Bill goes against because religion is an obstruction to certain doctrines. Since it is an obstruction, it must be got rid of somehow.

This Bill to take over 50 schools from the Christians is the thin edge of the wedge to bring about religious intolerance in this country. Today is for the Christians; tomorrow for the Muslims and Hindus, because they are highly religious people and they believe in God. The religion of materialism is a negative one—these people believe in that; they believe in matter alone. They say they will take away the schools, because they are not run efficiently under the management of Christian clergymen. They are going to take over the schools and produce supermen. They are going to produce clever crooks instead. Without religion and morality, what do we have? We will have the cleverest villains in the world who have no morals, but are educated in materialism alone to the detriment of that which is highest in man.

[MR. CAMPBELL]

I am a product of the denominational schools. My schooling has just been for five years in an Amerindian village, but those Christian Managers have my everlasting gratitude for educating me and giving me the three "R's" plus a fourth "R", religion. I have not regretted it since I left school. I daresay that even the Mover of this Bill has gone through denominational schools.

The history of British Guiana has been made all along by the Christian Leaders, Priests and teachers. They realize that man is made of two elements: the material side of him is like a beast, and the spiritual side may be referred to as the Angel part of him. Man is half beast, and half Angel. I know that Christianity caters for both sides. Government should look after the material side of the people of any country; Government should look after the building of houses, providing jobs and so on, but the other side should be handled by men who are spiritually and morally trained. The best police is a trained conscience. When a man is trained to give what is due to his fellowmen and his God, you are safe with him. God will tell him what is right or wrong, and he will abide with it. But when you merely have clever mathematicians with no belief in God, beware of such people.

I am sorry to remind this Council again that the Leaders of this Government are pledged to bring about a new experimentation with a new thought. That thought is generated by Karl Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Krushchev and others. A little over a month ago Krushchev declared at the United Nations' Conference that there is no God, and that God and religion are the inventions of man. If I believed in that, I would certainly agree with this Bill. I would believe that the Clergymen are fooling the people; that they teach them from text-books, get control of their minds and fool them. Naturally they should be got rid of, if

that were so. The Government are saying "Follow us and get heaven and earth".

In introducing this Bill, the Minister referred to the United States of America as a country where Church and State are separate. If I were a citizen of the United States of America, I would also believe in that arrangement. The U.S.A. happens to be the richest country in the world today and it can afford to have its own schools. The Roman Catholics and others there have millions of dollars invested in Universities and schools. If that practice were followed in a poverty-stricken country like British Guiana, Christians would be penalized, for they are not rich. They are taxpayers, too, who contribute to the general revenue of the Colony.

The Minister also mentioned Mexico. In the 1920's some Godless people in Mexico took over the Government, and made Rules and Regulations to abolish religion. I recall one name—that of Fr. Pro—who was shot preaching about Christ. Since then there has been terrible persecution of the Christians, the aftermath of which is still to be seen, but the best arrangement arrived at between the Christians and the Government was that they be separated.

The Minister also referred to Puerto Rico which has followed the U.S. pattern. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, gave a list of countries in which dual control of schools is the order of the day — England, Scotland, the Netherlands and other happy and enlightened countries. I think we would do well to follow the British arrangement and not the Mexican system.

I wish to make it very plain that I am not happy about this Bill. Past experience has taught us that once the Government has made up its mind to pass a measure it is going to be passed. It is a matter of simple mathematics—15 against 5, etc. — but I warn the Government that it will pass this Bill at its peril. The thinking people of

British Guiana are thinking deeply. The whole Western world will know about this, and we will know exactly where we are. Santa Rosa is one of the schools to be taken over by the Government and run by secular officials. The religious denominations have been in control of the schools for over one hundred years, and famous men of Guiana have passed through the denominational schools.

I say that the object of this Government is to create disharmony in this country. There are 20,000 children for whom places have to be found in the schools, and the denominations are only too willing to help. By taking control of these schools, will Government be able to find places for those children? The Government's philosophy is "We cannot afford." Government has no use for religion and it will not allow others to pursue it — a sort of dog-in-the-manger policy. I cannot support this Bill.

Mr. Bowman: As I see it, this Bill strikes at the very foundation of Christendom in this country. Those of us who are acquainted with history will remember that in the twelfth century when Christendom was threatened in the Holy Land during the reign of Richard of England, Europe took up arms in defence of Christendom. I support 100 per cent. the appeal made by my friend on my right (Mr. Beharry) to the heads of the various religious organizations, including the Hindus and Muslims, to get together and decide upon a plan to defeat this monstrous scheme by the Government.

The proposal of the Government is to take over 50 denominational schools. It is a clear indication of the future intention of this Government. This is only the beginning. It is Government's intention to re-orientate the entire educational system in this country. Today it is moving against some of the denominational schools which are entirely Christian. If the decision of the people of this country at

the next elections happens to be in favour of the People's Progressive Party I can assure the public that all denominational schools will be taken over by the Government. But when Government is finished with the schools of the Christian bodies its next move will be against the other religious organizations, the Hindus and Muslims.

What hurts me more than anything else is the fact that this group of people who have produced this hideous Bill are ingrates who received their early education in denominational schools. Can there be any more evidence of ingratitude than the introduction of this measure? I heard only a part of the speech of the hon. Minister of Community Development and Education, and with your permission, Sir, I would like to quote a paragraph or two from the statement issued by the Christian Social Council. I quote:

"In his statement the Minister cites the Hammond Report of 1941. The Hammond proposals were referred to a Committee consisting of representatives of all the interested parties: (Government and Teachers as well as the Denominations) and unanimously rejected. Instead, all parties agreed in the Report that a School Control Committee should be set up for each denomination. The principle adopted was that Government should be represented on each of the Governing Bodies and each Committee was to consist of three members of the Denomination and two members appointed by Government. This scheme was unanimously approved in principle by the Legislature on the 28th February, 1946. It is no fault of ours that the requisite legislation has never been enacted.

Like the B.G. Teacher's Association, we believe that the setting up of School Control Committees would provide the answer to whatever problem exists. It would give Government a share in the working of the Governing Bodies as well as safeguarding the rights of the Denominations and of the teachers.

The Denominations have available an adequate number of teachers well qualified for senior posts, and the chances of promotion in each denominational stream do not greatly differ. For

[MR. BOWMAN]

in each denominational stream of teachers the proportion of top-posts to the total number of teachers employed by the Denomination the same. To lump all the schools together would not increase the opportunities of promotion".

Sir, I would like to ask here and now—because the Minister did mention qualification, experience and efficiency; these are three important terms he employed in his argument yesterday—what is the record of the Dolphin Government School in comparison with the other schools? Did that Government school produce better results at the last examinations than the other schools? If it has not, it will prove that there should be greater efficiency. And as a result of that, it will prove that Government-controlled schools are not as fit and efficient as the denominational schools. This statement from the Christian Social Council goes on further. It says:

"But what of the Non-Christian Teachers who seem to be the Minister's main problem? A number of Government-controlled schools already exist and if Government pursues policy of building more Government schools this will provide them with opportunities for appointment and promotion, and Christian Teachers who prefer to teach in Government-controlled schools can seek employment there too.

In addition, Hindus and Muslim may wish to build schools of their own as we have done

What is wrong with that? I belong to a political party which shares the idea that because the Christian denominations have more established schools --- because they have been in the educational field before other religious bodies --- we would not object to Government contributing more towards the building of more Muslim and Hindu schools so that there would be no grouse at all, if there is a grouse. If there is grouse that Hindus and Muslims are not getting headteacher-ships in schools, let Government give

greater grants to the Muslim and Hindu religious bodies to build schools. I am sure the religious bodies would not take umbrage to that. But I want to say this: we have seen the pattern of things to come. This Government is a partisan Government. With the recent appointment to the Credit Corporation —

Mr. Speaker: Please do not discuss that.

Mr. Bowman: This debate concerns the Government and we must --

Mr. Speaker: rule, that is not the question.

Mr. Bowman: You have not heard what I have in mind. Almost all the people appointed to the present membership of the Credit Corporation are P.P.P. members. [Mr. Benn: "There is nothing wrong with that."] But what would be the impression in this country? And that is exactly what is going to happen in these schools. Every appointment made is going to be a P.P.P. member. It would be a sorry day; and I want to say further: if their plan succeeds, and if the people make the same mistake again next year and return this Government, God help us. For my part, I know what is going to happen; but I want this Council to know what is going to happen

I had the occasion, during the early part of this year when we were discussing the Cinematograph Bill, to say that this is a Christian country. My friends are determined to turn it into a communist country.

The hon. Nominated Member Mr. Hubbard, when referring to two previous speakers yesterday, said that they were representatives of denominational bodies. I want to ask that gentleman, who does he represent here? What religion? He

has none. He does not believe in God. He, too, would say that God is the invention of man. These people do not believe in God. They want to convert this country into a communist country, and that is the first step — get control of the schools, change the educational code and introduce communist education. Their intention is to change and mould the minds of youths. They want to bring in communist education which denies God, and this is only the beginning. I think the two Bishops should get all the Clergy together and carry out a colony-wide demonstration. This thing must be fought and fought by all means.

A lot of things have been said in this Council. With Your Honour's permission I would like to read a passage which I copied from a book called "Revolt of the Masses". Page 83 states:

"All democratic public authorities, in spite of their being all powerful, limit their attempts even at their own expense, to leave room in the State over which they rule for those to live in who neither feel nor think as they do; that is to say as the stronger, the majority. And it is well to remember, that the supreme form of generosity, is the right which the majority concedes to minorities."

That is true in essence. If, because they are in the majority, they are determined to push down the throats of other people things which they do not like, as have been done in other instances, then it will be seen what will happen in the years to come, if they are in office. I have been in that Party for a long time. I know how the members think. There was a time when I supported their ideas; but I am a thinking human being. They think, also, but there is a difference between their way of thinking and mine.

I have said it openly in this Council, time and again, that I had quarrelled with them often over certain things; and the other day when I said there are certain individuals here who do not

believe in God, you objected. I am not going to say that now. I would say that all of them do not believe in God, and they are playing a role. They cannot convince me to the contrary. I asked them to tell me who is responsible for the ———

Mr. Speaker: Are we to be burdened with your personal quarrels?

Mr. Bowman: This is not a quarrel.

Mr. Speaker: But you are referring to quarrels instead of dealing with the question before the Council. We do not want to be burdened with your personal quarrels. In this Council you have to debate according to the Rules.

Mr. Bowman: *rose* ———

Mr. Speaker: Will you take your seat! You have to debate according to the Rules. There are other places where you can burden individuals with the quarrels of the Party to which you once belonged. The debate does not relate to your personal quarrels with that Party. Your personal quarrels do not concern this debate.

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a subject which relates to religion. I am expressing the view, and the fact, that those who introduced this Bill do not believe in God, and this is an attempt to destroy religion in this country. It is the first attempt. You may say I am wrong.

Mr. Speaker: No, I spoke about your personal quarrels. As long as you are not on that, you can go on.

Mr. Bowman: I am trying to bring to the attention of this Council that I really do not believe that it is the Minister, himself, who has brought this Motion. He is doing what he is told to do, and that is a fact. If he

[MR. BOWMAN]

denies it, then he is toeing the line. Like everybody else he has to toe the line or get the boot. My friend here (Mr. Beharry) got the boot. [Laughter.] He got the boot because he refused to toe the line. I did not get the boot. [An hon. Member: "Is that so?"] I know that the Minister believes in God, but he has been forced to introduce this hideous thing in this Council. It is human nature for him to have some sort of weakness. The Minister has ambition, and he thinks of what will happen to him when we get independence. He has just been promoted as the Minister of Police, and he is thinking in terms of tomorrow. If I were in his position, I might also have thought about these things. These considerations have forced him to introduce this Bill, and I am in sympathy with him. Perhaps when he shall have reached my age — if he lives that long — he will think as I am thinking today.

I would like the Minister to think in terms of withdrawing this Bill in the same manner as Government withdrew the Rice Bill some time ago. This Bill will divide the people in this country. I have already tabled a Question, but I would like the Minister to tell me how much money this Government has spent from C.D. & W. funds for the building and repairing of schools from the time it has been receiving money from that source? I would also like to know how much money Government has spent from local revenue for the same purpose over the same period?

Who are the taxpayers? They want to take away the schools from the denominations because they claim that the taxpayers are paying the teachers, but they have forgotten that the parents of the children who attend these schools are also taxpayers. If you pay the teachers from taxpayers' money and the parents are also taxpayers, what is wrong with that? Is it the money of the so-called Ministers?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that you cannot avoid being rude and improper. You are getting more and more reprehensible.

Mr. Bowman: I can take anything from you, Sir; it makes no difference to me. As long as I say what I want to say it is all right. It is the taxpayers' money that is paying the teachers, and I would like to know why Government is so determined to take over these schools? Can't Government build the number of schools it promised to build? At the moment the taxpayers' money is running the business of the schools. I believe that most of the taxes are paid by Christians in this country, and I think I can say that with certainty. I do not see any harm in Government paying the salaries of teachers. I appeal to the Minister to withdraw this Bill, because it will have its repercussions. [Pause.]

Mr. Speaker: If no other Member wishes to speak, I shall ask the hon. Minister to reply.

Mr. Kendall: I, like a good many Members who have already spoken, am opposing this Bill because I think it is a very bad piece of legislation to be placed on the Statute Book at this time. Like all of us here, I am a product of a denominational school and I am not ashamed of it. I am yet to find that the Government schools in this country have produced a better type of citizen than the denominational schools.

I am worried about the indecent haste with which the Government is trying to force this bit of legislation through this Council. It is unfortunate that it should have come at this time of the year when all Christians are thinking of peace and goodwill.

I am sure the Minister will agree that it is somewhat dishonest to introduce this Bill at this time, because he knows that this matter of dual control is

under constant consideration by his Government and the heads of religious Bodies who share in these denominational schools. The Minister was told quite recently that no firm decision could be made by these denominational Bodies, because they have to put his suggestion to the parent Bodies either in the United Kingdom or in Canada.

I am not surprised that the Minister has done this today, because I can remember in 1958 when this Government tabled its first Budget in this Council — I think it was on the 3rd February, 1958 — I made my observation on this question of dual control. If you will permit me to read from page 700 of the *Hansard* Sir, hon. Members will recall that I said:

“Several members sitting here are the products of dual controlled schools. If they feel that what they have learnt in those schools was not sufficient and they want Government to control all schools in order to satisfy a few, I will say that they are ungrateful.”

On this very page the present Minister of Community Development and Education replied — he was not a Minister at the time; he was the Member for Central Demerara. This is what he said:

“I am a product of a denominational school, and I have had to unlearn much that I have learnt at the primary school. The policy of the denominational schools is working hardships on the people in this community.”

He then agreed with the hon. Member for Georgetown South, who, I presume, will speak on this matter at a later stage, that grants should be taken from denominational Bodies. The Member for Central Demerara also said:

“I was discriminated against when I sought employment as a school teacher.”

I am wondering whether he is taking the opportunity now he is a Minister to use his power to carry out a “vendetta” for what he, apparently, believes was a wrong done to him when he sought employment

as a school teacher. Perhaps it is good that he was not given employment as a school teacher, because he may not have been in the position which he occupies today as a Minister of the Government of British Guiana.

From the discussion I have heard on this Bill, I think it is dishonest to suggest that because the population of this country is made up of a large percentage of non-Christians, they do not derive enough benefit from education for the contribution they make. I think that was said in 1958 by certain Members. I think it is true to say that if the country had to depend on money from that source to build primary schools, the figure for illiteracy would have been higher than it is today.

I would like to remind the Minister that—speaking as a Congregationalist—I see on the Schedule to this Bill the No. 5 Congregational school which will be taken over by Government. The Minister should know from his Advisers that that school was built at a time when the villagers in that area contributed their self-help to one-third of the cost of the school, and the balance came from the grant of \$700,000 by the Imperial Government for education.

The denominations have done a lot to assist in the development of this country. I think it is very dishonest on the part of the Government to confiscate the No. 5 Congregational School. The Minister, if he visits the site, will find that the construction of that school is different from that of the other schools. It was not built by the Public Works Department, or by the contractor of the Education Department, but by a contractor engaged by the Manager of the denomination, which received a contribution from Government to assist the cost of rebuilding the school in that area. I do not know how the Government can with honesty deprive the denomination of control of that school in the circumstances. I hope the Minister will see

[MR. KENDALL]

wisdom in removing that school from the list of schools to be taken over.

As previous speakers have indicated, this is a political move, and although the Minister tried to justify his action by citing incidents dating back 35 years ago, I am certain that all of those incidents were not based on politics. Why try to deprive the religious bodies of control of these school buildings and to say that Government wants control so as to have right of entry? At present no one prevents Government officers from entering denominational schools, and I believe that when it was decided to build these schools on Church lands there was an agreement which gave the denominational bodies the right to control the school. I say again that it is dishonest to deprive the denominations of that right, simply because Government has a majority vote and would like to display its power in this direction.

Mr. Rai: I thought that no Member was allowed to impute dishonesty in another Member of the Council, or the Government. Several Members have imputed dishonesty to myself in this matter and I would ask—

Mr. Speaker: I stopped the Member. Perhaps you were outside. I do not hesitate to stop a Member the moment dishonesty is imputed.

Mr. Rai: The hon. Member has just imputed dishonesty to me and to the Government.

Mr. Jackson: Not to you as an individual.

Mr. Rai: He speaks of dishonesty.

Mr. Speaker: If he refers to the Government there is nothing wrong about it, but it is improper to impute dishonesty to individual Members.

Mr. Kendall: The Minister is a very good friend of mine and he knows that I would be the last person to impute dishonesty on his part, but he will appreciate that if this Bill is passed the Government as such will have committed a breach of faith. Previous Governments made certain arrangements and agreed to certain conditions, but instead of honouring the agreement this Government is using its voting strength to break it, which is dishonesty on the part of the Government.

Mr. Rai: I wish to say again that in my view it is not proper for any Member of this Council to impute dishonesty on the part of the Government of the country or a Minister, and the Member has imputed dishonesty to me.

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled already, and the Member has said that he is not imputing dishonesty to the Minister. I think he says that if Government had entered into a certain agreement and had broken that agreement, it is dishonest. If the hon. Member should impute dishonesty to any Member of this Council I would promptly stop him.

Mr. Rai: He says it is dishonest.

Mr. Kendall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I have said before, I am opposing this Bill, as I feel it is wrong that the Government should try to enact this bit of legislation at a time when the two parties concerned are considering ways and means of finding a solution to the problem of dual control of schools. I think it is wrong that the Minister of Education and the Government, knowing that at the moment there is no sign of a breakdown in the negotiations between the Government and the denominational bodies, should try to force legislation of this kind through the Council.

I also feel that it is wrong for the Government to take control of the No. 5 Congregational School in the building of which the members of the Congregational

Church contributed over one-third of the cost, the balance being provided by C.D. & W. grant. I agree with previous speakers who said that this legislation is merely the thin edge of the wedge, and that the control of education in the manner which this Government is seeking, and the type of training which it proposes to introduce will reduce the citizens of British Guiana from free people to slaves.

Mr. Saffee : I rise to support the Bill wholeheartedly. We have heard quite a lot of argument from the other side of the Table, but I do not share the opinions of many of the previous speakers who have ventured to distort Government's purpose in taking over control of certain schools which are now under the management of the Churches. As far as I can see there has been complete distortion of Government's intention, and that it has been done deliberately to create a bad impression among the people.

Discrimination is something which we should not tolerate far less try to foster. We have heard that the Church has done a tremendous lot for Guianese. I admit, and I think all rationally minded

Guianese will admit that that is a fact, but is it not also a fact that there is discrimination — that certain people who are capable of assuming responsibility have not been allowed an opportunity to do so because of their religious faith of which the Christian Church does not approve? We admit that the denominational bodies have done quite a lot in educating Guianese, but there comes a time when certain changes are necessary in the life of a community or a country. We agree that the Church has played its part, but is it not a fact that the Church has reached the point where it is not able to shoulder the financial burden of education in this growing community?

Mr. Speaker: I think you will be much longer.

Mr. Saffee : Yes, Sir.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chief Secretary : I beg to move that Council adjourn to Wednesday of next week.

Mr. Speaker: Council is adjourned to Wednesday next at two o'clock in the afternoon.

Council adjourned accordingly, at 5.03 p.m.