

the realities of the situation, to stir up trouble between the members of the University, is deplorable.

Mr. Speaker: I have already expressed the hope that out of all this trouble good will come. One or two other things I think I ought to express to the citizens of Jamaica who have suffered loss or personal hurt or damage, the regrets of all Jamaica over an incident of this sort (Hear, hear). And I ought to say to them that they must rise to the highest level of good citizenship; stand by what they think to be just and right and proper, and care for their country the best way they can.

And I would like to say all those in Jamaica who feel downtrodden and outcast; to all those who are poised precariously on the boundaries of decency and Law and Order, I would like to say that those who care for this country deeply care for their position. We are not prepared to dismiss them from our minds as irrelevant to everything that matters in this country. We realise that we have to try and make a better country for these people and a country less susceptible to those aspects of propaganda that may endanger security. And we trust that out of this evil real good will come. I now move the Amendment to this Motion which I have already named: that the motion be amended by adding the following sentence:-

"Nevertheless this House regrets the failure of the Government to take more appropriate action at an earlier stage and deplores the inept and provocative manner in which action was taken."

(Applause from Opposition Benches.)

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Motion that has been moved by the Leader of the House. Mr. Speaker, what is the motto of this country? What is the Motto over your head? What is the Motto printed on every Gazette? What is the Motto in the Supreme Court? What is the Motto in every school in this country? — "Out of many — one people."

In this country there is neither black nor white nor pink. What we are interested in in this country is the quality of the individual; not the colour of his skin. That is the Motto which keeps us, and that is the Motto which we strive for.

Now, Sir, before I go on further, I would just like to refer to one or two points made by the Leader of the Opposition. He referred to the arrogance of Government.

Mr. Glasspole: That is a statement of fact.

Mr. Grant: And he said we had never before explained our reasons for taking action as we now do in the case of Mr. Rodney.

I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition out of the more than a hundred expulsions and bans that took place in his time, when did he ever explain to the country his reason. Let him tell us of one case.

Mr. Glasspole: I can tell you of one case right off . . .

The Speaker: Order.

Mr. Grant: The Leader of the Opposition said that a wise government will anticipate what the public will think and what the public will do, referring to the reaction of violence and looting and arson and so on. That is correct. But what a wise Government could not anticipate is that the Leader of the Opposition would make such a deplorable statement concerning the security of the country. What a wise Government could not anticipate is that the Vice-Chancellor of the University would break a confidential disclosure in Cabinet . . .

Opposition Member: Who first leaked the Cabinet? Where did the Gleaner get the news before the Vice Chancellor opened his mouth?

Mr. Grant: If they want to know who leaked the Cabinet let them ask the Gleaner, but I am confident that no Government Minister leaked any reports.

Opposition Member: Speak for yourself. The Cabinet sent for them.

Mr. Grant: That is a shocking statement for you to make.

The Speaker: We are not enquiring into who leaked what. Please let us keep the debate on a high level.

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to refer briefly again to what took place in Cabinet. At the time when we were considering the matter, we did not know all the facts about Mr. Rodney's movements at that time.

Opposition Member: Where was the Security then? Is this a revised version?

Mr. Grant: We understood that he came here about 1960 when we were initially dealing with the matter, and that he is here in 1968. That is six years. We know he was a British subject, came from what was then British Guiana. It was because of that that Sir Philip Sherlock was called to ask him if because of what he was told he could get rid of Mr. Rodney, and he said Mr. Rodney had not broken any of the terms of his contract. And then it was the Vice Chancellor who suggested to us at the time — and I have no doubt about this in my mind — the Vice Chancellor said that Government could declare him *Persona non grata* . . .

Opposition Member: You didn't know that?

The Speaker: What they do not understand is that under the Constitution if he was here for 8 years as a British subject — under the British Subjects Immigration Law that action could not be taken. That is what I am trying to explain and they won't listen.

Opposition Members: Security should know that.

Mr. Grant: I am talking of the initial stages; and it was the Vice Chancellor who said he could be declared . . .

Opposition Members: Nonsense; you must know that.

The Speaker: Any Member who wants to refute what the Member has said can, when he gets on his feet, give the facts. But don't keep shouting across the floor. It is most improper; unparliamentary. It detracts from the debate and the dignity of the House.

Mr. Grant: Having related these facts briefly, I would like to go on and say something else.

Mr. Munn: You are sure you now have the facts?

The Speaker: You tell him the facts when you get up. (Laughter).

Mr. Grant: I am going to address you as Attorney General as the Head of the Bar in Jamaica.

Mr. Winston Jones: As a Member of the House.

Mr. Grant: I always address you as a Member of the House.

Mr. Winston Jones: On a point of Order, as a Member of the House.

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, when the trouble started yesterday morning at the University, the pressure was on the University, and the Vice Chancellor made a most deplorable statement, and in making that statement, Mr. Speaker, in disclosing what took place in Cabinet without authority . . .

The Speaker: May I interrupt to say that the Vice Chancellor is a person who holds a very prominent position in this country and I would ask that any comments you see fit to make to be extremely careful. He is not here to defend himself.

Mr. Grant: He has attacked us in the Press.

The Speaker: I don't think he should be criticised unduly.

Mr. Grant: I do not intend to criticise him unduly, but I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that he has attacked the Government in the Press by two separate statements and I would like to tell both the Vice Chancellor and the country that in disclosing what took place in Cabinet, it was a breach of the Official Secrets Act, it was a criminal

breach of the Official Secrets Act. I would like everybody in the whole country to know that when anybody is called to Cabinet and a confidential discussion takes place there, to go outside and disclose it is a criminal breach of the Official Secrets Act.

Mr. Glasspole: Tell us how the Gleaner got the story.

The Speaker: I rely on your discretion in this matter.

Mr. Glasspole: Will the Honourable Minister . . .

The Speaker: Are you addressing me?

Mr. Glasspole: Tell us how the Honourable Minister advise this House how did the Gleaner get the news report that the Vice Chancellor had attended on the Cabinet and had discussed this matter with the Cabinet before the Vice Chancellor spoke. Tell the House that.

Mr. Seaga: May I answer that? The answer is . . .

Mr. Glasspole: I am speaking to the Honourable Attorney General.

The Speaker: Let the Honourable Attorney General speak.

Mr. Grant: The Cabinet meeting, Mr. Speaker, was in broad daylight and the Vice Chancellor came and left in ordinary garb; he did not come under disguise, and I understand from reliable sources that the Gleaner did not say he attended the Cabinet meeting, it said he attended on the Government.

The Speaker: Let us discuss this matter dispassionately. We do not want any emotionalism here.

Mr. Grant: Another thing I would like to tell the Government and the country is that when the Vice Chancellor said this thing was done to Rodney's wife and children in my hearing yesterday morning, the Prime Minister told the Vice Chancellor then and there, yesterday morning, in the Prime Minister's Office, when the Vice Chancellor mentioned Dr. Rodney's wife and children, that the Government would do everything to see that they were attended to.

Mr. Allan Isaacs: Where was Rodney at that time?

The Speaker: Would Members like a few minutes to sort of get themselves back in form, are you getting hungry?

Members: No.

The Speaker: Will you listen to the Member on the floor?

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, some people seem to forget that under the Constitution, the Government is the supreme authority in this country; some peo-

ple do not seem to understand that.

The Speaker: May I remind the Members of this House of Standing Order 40 by which you are governed. It is in these terms—

"A Member present in the House during debate... —that is what is going on now—

"...shall maintain silence while another Member is speaking and shall not interrupt except in accordance with these Standing Orders and he shall otherwise conduct himself in a fit and proper manner."

I commend that to you. Please proceed.

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, the last thing I would like to say about the Vice Chancellor's disclosure—it is a very serious matter—the last thing I would like to say about that is this: in disclosing a part of what took place in Cabinet, I regret to say that it ended up as a gross misrepresentation of what took place.

Mr. Speaker: I now go on to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition on the front page of today's *Gleaner*, Thursday, October 17, and it says—

"Manley: Arbitrary Use of Power"

Now, Sir, he has used the words 'arbitrary use of power'. I suppose that the Leader of the Opposition forgets that the Government in this country is advised by a person who was once a Civil Service Attorney General and who was trained in the highest principles of Constitutional Law. I suppose the Leader of the Opposition has also forgotten that in the Attorney General's Office we have the highest qualified people in this country and they are all available to advise the Government, and those people were trained in the finest Universities where British Constitution, English Constitutional principles are taught and to suggest that the Government, which is advised by these people, is going to be exercising 'arbitrary use of power', I regret to say it is an excessive use of language.

Now, Sir, in the statement itself, he says, 'this arbitrary use of power is a plain denial of the Rule of Law'. Now, we are all familiar with the principles of the Rule of Law. This evening, to make sure, I again consulted Professor Dyces who, I think, was one of the founders of modern Constitutional Law.

Mr. Winston Jones: Where did you see him?

Mr. Grant: The Speaker knows, you would not know. In the Rule of Law there are three main principles set out

in Professor Dyces. It says, 'One of the principles of the Rule of Law is equality under the Rule of Law', that is, every man must be treated the same by Law. He is suggesting that we should treat Mr. Rodney differently because he happens to be a member of the Faculty of the University. That is not the Rule of Law. We are going to treat everybody the same way whether he is white, brown, black or pink.

This is part of the Rule of Law.

Mr. Allan Isaacs: Including Ministers?

Mr. Grant: The Leader of the Opposition will understand that.

The Speaker: I think I would advise some Members to take a course in memory-training.

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, another principle of the Rule of Law is that every action of the Executive, or the Government, must be done according to Law, that is another well-known principle of the Rule of Law. Another principle of the Rule of Law is that the ordinary Courts of the country must be able to try everybody for any offence.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition, who is or was a distinguished Lawyer, has suggested that the Government has broken the Rule of Law. Mr. Speaker, the Government acted under the Immigration British Subjects Restriction Law which is one of the Laws in the Statute Book, so I do not know how it can be suggested that we have broken the Rule of Law when we have acted according to Law.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition, who is or was a distinguished Lawyer, has suggested that the Government has broken a Rule of Law.

Mr. Speaker: the Government acted under the Immigration British Subjects Restriction Law, which is one of the Laws in the Statute Book; so I do not know how we could be accused of breaking the Law, when we are acting within the Law.

I will go further. Under the Fundamental Rights Provision in the Constitution, Section 15 of the Fundamental Rights and Freedoms state that:

"No person shall be deprived of his personal liberty save as may in any of the following cases be authorized by Law..."

So that the actual Fundamental Rights Provision of the Constitution recognises the right of Government to exclude from Jamaica anyone who is not a citizen of Jamaica, who is acting contrary to the safety of the country.

The Leader of the Opposition should also note that under the Fundamental Rights Provision, it says that 'nothing should be regarded as contrary to any of the provisions of this Section which is done for defence or in the public safety. And I emphasize these words, 'public safety.'

Mr. Speaker: the Leader of the Opposition, apart from saying that we broke a Rule of Law, when we acted under the Law, when we are supported by the Constitution; he has also suggested that "it is a monstrous breach of human rights."

Now, I challenge the Leader of the Opposition or anyone over there, to tell me of one of the Conventions of Human Rights that this Government has broken.

I have studied the Conventions, and if you look closely at them, you will notice that no one can challenge a Government's right to exclude a person from the country in the interest of public security. After all, the Human Rights Convention was drawn up by some of the best Lawyers in the world, and everyone will understand that one of the principal functions of the Government is to ensure the security of the State; and when Government is ensuring the security of the State it cannot indulge in the niceties that the Leader of the Opposition spoke about.

What the Opposition should do is congratulate the Government for having nipped in the bud this notorious, conspiratorial act to overthrow the Government of the country and to destroy property in this country.

Mr. Speaker: the happenings of yesterday is a mere joke to what would have happened if we had allowed Dr. Rodney to re-enter the country. It is a mere little incident in comparison to the massive acts of destruction which were contemplated by the movement.

What the Leader of the Opposition should have done is congratulate us for having nipped this in the bud.

What should we have done? Allow him to come back here, refreshed with new ideas, and allow him to lead dissident forces in destructive enterprises and cause great loss of life and wanton destruction?

I repeat that the Government has broken no Rule of Law; that the Government has breached none of the Conventions on Human Rights. I say this because the Leader of the Opposition is a foremost Lawyer in this country, and anything he says, people will tend to believe him. And it is not correct to say that the Gov-

ernment breached any of the principles of the Human Rights Convention or that the Government acted contrary to the Rule of Law.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to deal briefly with the behaviour of the students. It was deplorable. It was shocking.

They committed many criminal offences. But apart from that, I would like to deal with this document, entitled "Tactics; Tactics; Tactics," which was drawn up by the students and circulated among students at the University.

They talked about 'provoking the Police.' Then they go on to say, 'insult them.'

I would like to say that that, in itself, is an offence under the Constabulary Forces Law for which you can be arrested, fined or sentenced. So that when they are telling each other to 'insult the Police', they are committing a criminal breach under the Law and conspiracy to break the Law, for which offence they can be sent to goal, to prison.

So that I would like the students to know that in that first paragraph they have committed a criminal offence in this country.

Later on in the document, they go on to say, 'You know how to make a kerosene bomb — Paper wick, bottle, oil. Mix ... Don't read this. Make one.'

I would like to tell the students that it is seditious for a person to commit treason felony. And I would like to say it is seditious, and it is cheap conspiracy to commit treason felony.

The Speaker: The Member's time is up.

Mr. McNeill: Sir, I beg to move that the Member be given half an hour more.

Seconded by **Mr. Lynch** and agreed to.

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, coming down to the end of the circular which reads 'Burn U.W.I. Burn U.W.I. Burn U.W.I.', I would like to tell the students at the University that this is an incitement to commit arson — another criminal offence.

I would like to tell the country that, apart from inciting to commit arson, it is also a conspiracy to commit arson when it is circulated among students. So that this document discloses not less than about five or six offences against the Criminal Laws of this country.

Mr. Speaker: that is what this Government is supposed to

tolerate — students conspiring to commit treason felony, to commit arson! And who is at the head of all this? Mr. Rodney. And we are supposed to permit him to come back here calmly when we know the facts and have the authority to act — and act promptly.

Mr. Speaker, having heard the Prime Minister's disclosures and having heard of the criminal offences committed by these students, how can anyone say that the Government has committed a breach of the Human Rights Convention and broken the principles of the Rule of Law by banning Dr. Rodney?

I think that having heard the Prime Minister's disclosure and having heard the criminal offences disclosed, I believe the other organizations—I heard that some of the organizations like the Jamaica Teachers' Association say that they didn't agree with the action of the Government, how the Government did it; I heard some of the University Professors say they didn't agree, it shows the danger of making statements before checking the facts; I heard the Academic Staff at the College of Arts, Science and Technology didn't agree with it—I suppose that having now heard the Prime Minister's statement they will realize, I hope that they will realize the seriousness of the situation. I hope that they will realize that this gentleman was sitting on the pinnacle of lawlessness, sitting on the top of a mountain that would explode like a volcano at any moment, because they were planning to explode at a certain time, and that what the Government did was in the best interest of the country.

It would be very, very lamentable, Mr. Speaker, that the Government having got all the facts should allow this person who is from abroad to come here and overturn our peaceful country, a country built upon firm constitutional principles, a country built upon tolerance. Many of our fathers and forefathers over the long years have slaved and worked to bring this country as it is to make it one of the most wonderful countries in the world. It is one of the most tolerant countries in the world, and I challenge anybody over the Opposition—I have travelled all over the world—to tell me any part of the world that is as tolerant as this country.

Opposition Members: None, none, we agree with you.

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, this country, the very Constitution of this country, the very Constitution enshrines the principles, the highest principles of democracy by referring time and time again to consultations

with the Leader of the Opposition in certain important matters.

In the Constitution is enshrined the highest tenets of democracy. Anybody in this country can write any letter to the Press, they can say anything, the Government is not concerned with what people say, the Government is not concerned with what Mr. Rodney wants to tell people whether their minds must go this way or that way, the Government is not concerned with that, but when Mr. Rodney or anybody else is telling the students or the Rastafarians or the lawless elements that they should use violence, that they should use arson, that they should use looting to attain their deplorable ends, their revolutionary ends, then the Government will not be tolerant at that point.

Tolerance ceases where lawlessness begins. (Applause). Tolerance ceases where a foreigner is preaching violence to overthrow the Government of this country. We will not be tolerant, and let everybody who is from abroad know now that this Government of which I am a part will not tolerate, whether you come from Guyana or Trinidad or wherever it is, let them take it back to Guyana or Trinidad, or take it to where they come from, let them take it back to England, this Government will not tolerate violence to overthrow the Government and bring destruction to the lives of people in this country by foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in ending that all the students of the University of the West Indies, they stand condemned for their behaviour. Mr. Speaker, when you look at them some of them are so ugly...

A Member: Withdraw that. Take a look in the mirror.

Mr. Grant: Mr. Speaker, the ugliness is in their deplorable conduct, I saw it with my own two eyes, their ugly behaviour, their lack of gentlemanliness, their lack of proper deportment, I saw them with my own two eyes taking off their gowns and handing them to others.

A Member: Just take a look in the mirror.

The Speaker: He doesn't need to look in the mirror, he didn't mean what you thought he meant.

Mr. Grant: The students of the University, they stand condemned for the lawlessness, for marching from the University contrary to the provisions of the Public Order Law, they stand condemned for that. The police were gentle in treating them in the way they did because they were breaking the

Law and the police did not even arrest one of them. They were breaking the Public Order Law and the police were extremely tolerant with them to allow them to march down.

That was an example of the tolerance and they stand condemned for breaking that Law. They stand condemned for their lawlessness and for breaking that Law; they stand condemned for looting and beating up people on the various streets. The students of the University were the ones who sparked it off, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that the Vice Chancellor stands condemned for a breach of confidential happenings in Cabinet. He stands condemned for a breach of the Official Secrets Act.

I regret also to say that the Leader of the Opposition stands condemned for misleading the country by suggesting that it is a breach of human rights, and all of those elements who have united together, those who rushed into printing things before knowing the whole circumstances, instead of enquiring what are the reasons or waiting until the Government comes to Parliament, they rushed and caused loss of lives, Mr. Speaker, they all stand condemned for their actions. Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

Mr. Blake: Mr. Speaker, it cannot be disputed, Sir, that the activities of Dr. Rodney as reported upon by the Prime Minister in his statement this afternoon warranted some action, but whether the Government was right in postponing such action in the face of what is said in this paper the gentleman said, or whether the Government acted wisely are debatable questions. I have listened with great interest to the last speech, and I am gracious in using that phrase, which has just been delivered by the Minister of Legal Affairs, and I have listened to him condemn the Leader of the Opposition, condemn the Vice Chancellor, and condemn the students.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister a few serious questions. I read in the statement issued by the Prime Minister that Dr. Rodney first came to the notice of Security in 1961, and I read, Sir, that in 1963 Security were paying serious attention to the activities of Dr. Rodney. I read further, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Rodney returned to Jamaica in January 1968, and I read that very recently—and I infer that that is some time after January—Dr. Rodney said amongst other things at the meeting of the University:

"Revolution must come. We must be prepared to see it through. We must stop talking and indulging in aca-

demic exercises and act. Who will be the first to come with me downtown and take up a machine gun"

The Minister of Legal Affairs never speaks in this House Sir, without blowing his own trumpet. We have heard for the umpteenth time tonight of his legal acumen, of the vast depth of his legal talent, we have heard of the plethora that surrounds him. If what is said in this Paper is true, he stands condemned and he stands condemned for failing to advise his Government long ago that action should be taken.

(Applause by Opposition Members.)

Dr. Duhaney: Is it possible to have this applause going on in the gallery stopped, Sir?

The Speaker: Members of the Gallery are only permitted to listen.

Dr. Duhaney: I am sorry...

Mr. Blake: Let it be granted that under the Constitution the Minister of Legal Affairs is not the proper person, he has a responsibility to put the matter before the Government for the Director of Public Prosecutions to take action. Further, Dr. Rodney at a meeting of the Black Power Movement when asked what is Black Power, his answer was 'Castro Revolution'.

It is easy for the Minister of Legal Affairs to come here and condemn and talk about people who have not read the Constitution for a long time, and easy to boast about his knowledge of this Law and that Law, but I am entitled to ask him this—is it only recently that he has read the Law of Sedition, has he forgotten about Treason Felony? Did he not know that he has a duty to advise the Cabinet to get the Director of Public Prosecutions to take action against this man?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to come now to another aspect of this matter. Up to now, Sir, most Jamaicans and certainly both sides of the House are united in the belief that the Rule of Law, the two-party system and the sanctity of the ballot box ought to be the foundations of our society. But the events of the last 48 hours suggest that there are many persons in the community who do not accept these principles and in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I submit that those events should be a warning to all of us. To the Government, to the Opposition, and to the community at large, that the sands of time may be running out.

Mr. Speaker, it would be an act of folly, it would be an act of the grossest stupidity and a betrayal of Jamaica if we should allow this debate to pass without addressing our minds to the situation, the problems and the frustrations in our community which pro-

vide a happy hunting ground for extreme elements and revolutionists.

I listen *ad nauseam* to those who talk about the evils of Communism, apart from those who belong to the Communist movement. The greatest purveyors of Communism are those who have the powers to heal the social events, fail to act and allow this to grow up in our society.

What we need, Sir, much more urgently than Exclusion Orders against individuals, is the reduction of poverty, the exclusion of large scale unemployment; the minimisation of frustration and the elimination of social inequality in our land; but believe me, Sir, and unless all of us and — and in this respect the Government has a greater responsibility than any other element in the society — unless we all can dedicate ourselves anew in Human Rights Year to the solution of those problems, Government will be spending its time issuing Exclusion Orders. Today it is Dr. Rodney, tomorrow it will be someone else.

Mr. Speaker, no one in his right senses could believe seriously that yesterday's events were exclusively the action of groups or organizations organized by this man. I say that for this reason . . . the Paper, the statement which has been issued by the Prime Minister, makes it clear that that Government had thought seriously at one stage of solving the problem of Dr. Rodney by getting the University to act by terminating his contract.

Now, if it were the fact that the groups which we are told were organized and sprang into action really did exist, I cannot imagine that the Government would have been content to leave the control of Dr. Rodney to the leisurely processes of a termination of his contract, and therefore say . . . and therefore I say that what happened in the march yesterday is no evidence of the fact that the groups that joined it had been organized by him . . . maybe some of them possibly.

But anybody with experience knows that in this country there are so many dissident elements wishing to take advantage . . . so many subversive elements wishing to take advantage of a situation, that it is quite evident that what happened yesterday after a certain stage is that those elements took charge of a situation.

I am not defending Dr. Rodney, I am merely trying to point out that it is very easy to come here and make sweeping statements, but we are fooling ourselves if we do not appreciate that a great deal of what took place yesterday took place because there are disaffected elements in our community. They were there long before Dr. Rodney started his activities and enough has not

been done by this country in order to contain them and give them a chance to be otherwise.

So, Mr. Speaker, I venture to suggest, Sir, that in deciding that Dr. Rodney is to be banned, we do not allow ourselves to be carried away by extravagant language, by intemperate statements . . . after all we have had problems such as looting and lawlessness before Dr. Rodney's time. When in 1967 we had problems in West Kingston Dr. Rodney was not here; when before that time we had similar looting Dr. Rodney was not here. By all means let us contain our subversive elements, but not delude ourselves by adopting repressive measures that are no solution to our problems.

May I conclude these remarks of mine by pointing out, Sir, that we have these problems because there is a growing belief in our society that our democratic processes have failed to come to grips with our social and economic problems. Let us ban Rodneys, but let us have an end to hypocrisy, an end to repression; an end to a system which doesn't allow every person to have a chance to exercise his right in an election. (Applause by Opposition Members). . . and I will wager that if we can learn a lesson from these things and pay attention to those problems, I will wager Jamaica will then be the sort of country that all of us would like to see.

Mr. Hill: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the line of Her Majesty's Opposition, Her loyal Opposition, the line which they have taken.

A great deal of attention has been focussed upon the history of the Government in relation to this episode, and I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, to direct my attention largely to the issues of the Opposition in relation to this episode.

The first significant act that we know of in which the Opposition related itself to this problem — if we can call it a problem — is the statement by the Leader of the Opposition clearly and unambiguously condemning the Government for excluding Mr. Rodney from Jamaica.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a report of the statement issued by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition puts forward the postulation that the Prime Minister should seek his advice on matters of importance. It is not within the purview of my office to give advice to the Prime Minister in public, but I would like to crave your permission and the Prime Minister's permission to give him a little advice tonight and that is: 'Never accept the advice of a man who is incapable of advising himself'.

I see the Leader of the Op-

position has rightly and correctly said that it is today for the first time that he has come to know the facts which surround the Government's action in excluding Dr. Rodney from Jamaica. Now if I regard the Leader of the Opposition as a fit and proper person to advise my Prime Minister I would expect the Leader of the Opposition in making any statement to tell the whole public of Jamaica: 'I did not know the facts.' And I am wondering why this man who claims the right to advise my Leader should get up and make what I regard as a most provocative and inciting statement, without disclosing to the Nation — they tell us about the things we have not disclosed to his followers, to the people whose mental processes he claims to influence — why didn't he tell them he did not know the facts. Why didn't he disclose that to the people of Jamaica. The Leader of the Opposition is not an inexperienced man. He claims to be an adviser. The Leader of the Opposition is not an inexperienced man. He claims to have handled the affairs of this country well. He is always exactly right and after listening to his profound utterance tonight, I am satisfied that he is sitting in the exactly right place — over there on that side (Laughter from Government Members).

Now, Sir, when I hear the Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition stand up in this House and talk about the Government provoking trouble, though it is purely hypothetical, I ask the Leader of the Opposition for his advice. Which is worse, provocation or inciting? Which is worse, to do something which one has done in good faith that might turn out to be provocative, or to make statements not knowing any facts which could only be calculated to incite people to commit breaches of the peace?

You know, Sir, I saw the Member for Eastern Kingston, and I observed his face very carefully. I observed his countenance when he said with glee and pleasure that Her Majesty's Minister of Home Affairs had to be protected by the Police as he moved about the city.

It was a pleasure to him. No pleasure to me. You criticize what we do and don't do over here. They don't keep their inciting outside. The Leader of the Opposition — and I wrote down his words because they impressed me very much — he said: Jamaica is fortunate that students do not take enough interest in Jamaican affairs. Now, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition went on to relate that student interest to violence. He went on to relate that interest to uprising by students.

Well, we have people who are trained at the University in the art of creating implements of violence, so if you have supposedly responsible citizens telling people that when students take an interest in affairs they revolt and then at the same time telling them that in Jamaica they don't take enough interest, what inference can the intelligentsia at the University draw from that profound statement?

He went on to make grave allegations against members of the Cabinet. He went on to say that some member of the Cabinet had leaked some information to the *Gleaner*. I don't trust, I don't hope, I believe that if the Leader of the Opposition were to discover the facts he would have to say again: I made a statement without knowing the facts. I am not here to attack anybody, but if in the process of defending my country, if in the process of playing my part in the effective administration of good Government in Jamaica it is necessary for me to say things about people that are unpleasant — I don't do it with pleasure, I don't do it with a smirk, I do so in great seriousness and great responsibility. And I ask the Leader of the Opposition in whatever criticism I have to make of him, I ask him to accept it as being constructive criticism. I ask him in the twilight of his political career to learn to adopt the same forms of responsibility that he has been standing up over there and asking Government to adopt tonight. You know, Sir, there is an old Jamaican adage that when you accuse, you have one finger pointing over there and three fingers pointing behind. I advise the Opposition to pay attention to the three fingers pointing behind.

I am not making any accusations but I say that the Vice Chancellor of the University made one statement in public. We have evidence that he made one statement in public, so if there was a leak of what happened in the Cabinet, why should the Leader of the Opposition try to place that leak and place responsibility for that in a field concerning which he has no evidence at all and leave completely untouched the field in which he has evidence?

The Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Honourable Member, but I must at this point enquire from the Leader of the House how late he proposes to sit?

Mr. McNeill: I beg to move suspension of the Standing Orders in order to complete and conclude this debate.

Mr. Glaspole: I would like to point out Mr. Speaker, that it is a well established convention that when the Leader of the House proposes to ask the

House to sit beyond 10:20, he invariably gives the House due notice and advise the Opposition accordingly. The first time I knew he proposed to sit after 10:20 was half an hour ago. That is not how the House is run.

The Speaker: Not 10:20, 10:30?

Mr. Glasspole: Yes.

Mr. McNeill: Let me remind my Opposition Member that this matter for debate, this Resolution was brought forward today out of a situation that only arose yesterday. We, of the Government, feel that it is urgently necessary to thrash this matter out tonight and have the Government rid of this situation once and for all.

Mr. Glasspole: I appreciate your anxiety to rid yourself of the situation, I quite appreciate that.

The Speaker: The Question before the House is the suspension of the Standing Order to enable the Leader of the House to move for continuation of the debate until its conclusion.

(Put to the House and agreed to.)

Mr. McNeill: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the debate continues until the subject of the Resolution is concluded.

The Speaker: This debate continues. When a question is put, I would like Members to have the courtesy to stop talking. The Question is whether this debate should continue until its completion and that would take us, perhaps into the wee hours of the morning.

(Agreed to.)

The Speaker: The Honourable Minister may continue.

Mr. Hill: Mr. Speaker, I was dealing, Sir, with the question of this vicious and unwarranted attack upon the Honourable Members of this Government in relation to this alleged statement and I say, Sir, it is public knowledge that the Vice Chancellor of the University paid—I do not know if he paid out of University funds—but I know he paid for a broadcast on the radio in Jamaica in which he made a statement committing what the Prime Minister called, and rightly, a gross breach of privilege. If a man will spend his money to go on the radio and commit a breach of privilege, wouldn't he be more likely to commit it free, when it does not cost him anything? I am not saying that he has done it, but those people over there, on that side, are he intellectuals and I am trying, Sir, to reason with them. It is a difficult task, but I am trying to reason with them.

Now, Sir, we are in a very happy position where now that the Opposition group knows the facts, it is a most revealing situation that up until now not one of them over there has made any serious challenge as to the accuracy of the facts. One

of them has attempted to besmear a Civil Servant, the Secretary of the Cabinet, and that is a gross act of irresponsibility, and that is in my view, a breach of the privilege of this House.

Sometimes in the course of debate, it is necessary for us to mention people; sometimes in the course of debate it is necessary for us to speak ill of people in the public interest, but when somebody seeks to impart somebody into a debate concerning whom there is no relevance whatsoever and to seek to besmear that person's character in a place where he is privileged, Mr. Speaker, this is something that I deplore so much that it beggars of description.

Now, Sir, if at some time in the future some young person who is interested in appreciating the ramifications of the English language ever came and asked me to describe for him or to interpret for him or to define for him the word 'paradox', I would advise him to obtain a copy of Hansard debate of tonight and read the speeches made by the Opposition, because that would describe the term far more accurately and far more effectively and with much greater force than I could even do.

I have had the sickening experience of listening to responsible men getting up and in one breath saying, 'The Government has had this information before them for nine long months and they have done nothing about it', and before they have an opportunity to take another breath, they say, 'You have acted too late'. Mr. Speaker, I am the junior Member in this House, I am 'the baby' of the House, but I have never experienced anything like this in my short stay.

Sir, the Opposition by their remarks have expressed their complete inability and their complete instability ever to have vested in them the responsibility of government in Jamaica. Mr. Speaker, if they don't know anything about the science of Government, if they don't know how a Government works, if they don't know how the Ministerial System operates, if they have no knowledge of Public Administration, I beg them not to come here and display their ignorance, because it makes me feel ashamed. Even if they have read some good detective stories, Mr. Speaker, they ought to know that when matters of security are involved, timing is the necessary thing.

Mr. Munn: That is true, your timing was bad.

Mr. Hill: If you take an action before the time is ripe, you divest yourself of maybe a wealth of information that you would not have been able to get had you waited. Of course, they would not know about that, it would never occur to them. Imagine, a responsible man gets up

here and accuses the Attorney General of not advising the Government! Of course, it had never occurred to him that Her Majesty's Honourable and Learned Attorney General only gives advice on a file passed to him, and if the Security Officers in this country never send a file to the Attorney General, the Attorney General never gives his advice for it is not the job of the Attorney General to go and seek out files.

Mr. Munn: You would never believe that from what he says.

Mr. Hill: There is nothing I appreciate more than their laughter because I have never come across any laughter so completely associated with ignorance as their laughter. I am satisfied, Sir, that I have more knowledge of the facts of this case than those over there.

I am satisfied that the Government happens to borrow a phrase from the Leader of the Opposition at exactly the right time.

They make a lot of noise about not allowing the man to see his children.

You see, Sir, if they had to take a decision between endangering the lives of the citizens of Jamaica—if they had to take a decision between allowing a dangerous character to come in here and organize a revolution and a man seeing his wife and child, they would opt for the alternative of the man seeing his wife. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they sit over there!

Now, Sir, one of the most remarkable statements by the Leader of the Opposition is one in which he says that the Prime Minister is seeking to set one set of students at the University against another.

On behalf of the Prime Minister, I defend this; and the Prime Minister would be lacking in his duty to this Nation if he did not seek to set those persons who are interested in the security and the welfare of Jamaica—those persons who are interested in the protection of life and property in Jamaica against those persons who seek to destroy life and property.

Now, we make no apology for it; and it will always be the policy of this Government to divide the good from the bad.

You know, Sir, the University is a most remarkable place. We, in our society, do not believe in cleavages, we do not believe in hard and fast division of classes or social sectors; but we feel that when people of a fortunate background come into contact with people of a less fortunate background, their function is to lift that unfortunate man up to their level.

But at the University, we find the very opposite: the people of fortune come into contact with the unfortunate, but instead of lifting them up, they descend to the level of the unfortunate.

Sir I wish I could, in the interest of Security, reveal the facts that I have at my disposal tonight. But I am bound by the Order of the Prime Minister not to reveal them, so I cannot and I will not. But it is a most serious thing, Mr. Speaker.

I expected, having regard to the statements made, to come here and hear the Opposition tell us tonight what a wrong thing we have done in banning Rodney, because that is what the Leader of the Opposition said in the first instance. They are here, but they don't contradict me.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would quote what the Leader of the Opposition said:

"As Leader of the People's National Party I protest on behalf of the Party against the outrageous conduct of Government in banning Dr. Walter Rodney from entering Jamaica, he being a lecturer at the University of the West Indies, still employed to them and sending him back to Canada, leaving his wife and child and job behind."

Nothing is said here about the way that it is done. That is an afterthought.

The Opposition Leader's statement continued:

"This arbitrary use of power is a plain denial of the Rule of Law and is a monstrous breach of human rights. It has all the elements of a Police State and all the stigma of the things we are supposed to be fighting against."

Now, this is the same man who comes here and agrees. I won't even bother to read any more.

So, Sir, my learned Friend on the other side gets up and he put forward a very excellent proposition. He says that 'the real people who are preparing revolution are those who create the conditions which lead to this type of conduct that has a tendency to revolution; and, he says, the necessity for the Government to ban people arises only out of the fact that the well-fed students of the University who cost Government several million pounds a year, go around in the Corporate Area, marching through the streets of Kingston, looting and burning, but also to the....

The Speaker: The Member's time is up.

Mr. McNeill: Sir, I beg to move that the Member be given fifteen minutes more.

Seconded by Mr. Grant and agreed to.

Mr. Hill: I think the Member was trying to say, 'It seems, if I reason correctly, that when the situation in the society improves, then there will be less

necessity for violence, less necessity for subversion and less necessity to ban people.'

It follows, therefore, that if you improve the society, there will be no incidents of the kind. On the other hand, I must here make the point that although the P.N.P. has had a shorter time in the Government than has the J.L.P., it found it necessary to make arbitrary use of the Laws for Security reasons 113 times. And although we have had a much longer term in office, we have found it necessary to ban persons only 33 times.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the thing that really hurts me is that I was backing his position, but after consideration I have had to withdraw.

And it has turned out that in the course of this debate, the real issue in the matter has not come into dispute. And the issue is a simple one: we have a man who is dangerous to the society. Should we ban him or should we not?

You know, Sir, I would not be a party to having Dr. Rodney here visiting his wife and child for a week, knowing what I know. I would not look forward to letting Dr. Rodney in for one or two days.

One Member over there said we sent him back to Montreal!

Mr. Speaker, some smart man over there says 'to Montreal' and he chuckles to himself with satisfaction, that seems to be the most brilliant thing he has said so far. What does it matter where we send him, whether it is to Montreal or Timbuktu or to where he properly belongs — to hell — so long as the people of Jamaica are safe and secure? What does it matter? Perhaps if my Friend would be glad, because I must confess I don't know.

Nobody has challenged the validity of this Order; nobody has even seriously challenged the way in which this Order has been carried out. I gave Mr. Manley the assurance, or rather, the Member for St. Andrew — I beg you to excuse me. I am young in this — I gave the Leader of the Opposition the assurance that whatever slight criticism he has been able to make if he hears the full facts, which the Government is not prepared to give him, he again would have to face the public and confess, "This is the first time I am knowing the facts."

Mr. Speaker, the people of this nation trust the Government (Applause); the people who sent me here rely upon my integrity and my actions and upon my wisdom in taking decisions which effect them and the safety of the nation. They appreciate it even if the people on that side do not appreciate it: that it is not every time we

act in the interest of the nation we can disclose facts upon which decisions are based. So they can stand up over there and crow about the facts, that is what we will hear on the political platforms next week that they had to force Government to give them the reasons.

Mr. Speaker, the day when they could force the Government to do anything is long passed. Of course, it will be difficult for them to appreciate the different circumstances under which the Government can and cannot be led, and I am giving a Jamaican example. I am just bringing my own thinking on this matter, I am not committing the Government but I am trying to argue reasonably and logically. You know, Sir, there is an old question that many of us always ask from time to time.

I remember when I was a youngster asking my father why is it that the Government passed a Law — in those days we had the tramcars — why the Government passed a Law forbidding anyone to ride on the tramcar steps, and he said 'Because you may fall off and get injured' and I turned my young mind, 'What does it matter whether the man falls off or not, why is the Government worried' and he gave me an answer which I will never forget. He said, 'It is the duty of the Government to protect people against themselves'.

Now, Sir, in a case where it is the duty of the Jamaican Government to protect a man against himself, in my view the Government will never give the reason. For example, I don't think the Government would give this information about a man who was going to remain here. I don't think the Government would give information about a man who is a citizen of Jamaica because it is our duty to reveal such facts about an individual that will subject him to attacks if he walks on the street. It is not our duty to reveal such facts against an individual because people are susceptible to change, people who are doing wrong today, people who are criminals today may become decent citizens tomorrow if they wish to reform, and it is never the function of this Government to attach a man with a stigma for the rest of his life in the nation.

Quite separately and apart is the fact that in the interest of Security we cannot reveal information. Sometimes to give information might endanger the life of one of the Security men, but they don't care, let the man go and kiss his wife and let the Security man die. So that is an instance, Sir, which after due consideration the Government had decided to give certain reasons. Let nobody believe that this is a precedence. Let nobody believe that as a result of the reasons that the Government has given

this time they will be entitled to it if and when the Government has to act. Whether reasons are given or not given is the sole discretion of the Government and we will exercise that discretion in such a manner as seems necessary to the interest of the nation.

Mr. Speaker, we will exercise that discretion because we know that the vast majority of the people of Jamaica, the well-thinking people of Jamaica have confidence in us and when we are exercising our discretion we exercise it truly, we exercise it well, we exercise it properly. When people accuse us of not doing this or that, I regret to say that I am of the firm opinion they are measuring us by their own yardsticks. (Applause).

Mr. Coore: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Housing, apart from providing the comic relief which he does so effortlessly and naturally appears to be under the impression that this Resolution that we are debating concerns the conduct of the Opposition, because when he was not indulging in cockney verbalism he spends his time attacking the Leader of the Opposition, the Vice Chancellor of the University and anybody else that came to his mind at the time. But I must remind him that the Resolution is concerned — the Resolution we are supposed to be debating is concerned not with the conduct of the Opposition or the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition but is concerned with the conduct of the Government in this particular matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one would think that Members of the Government when debating a Resolution of this sort would have concerned themselves with dealing with the justifications for their action and would have had sufficient public spirit to appreciate that this is not a time in Jamaica's history for exacerbating feelings, but it is a time for dealing and for statesmanship. Instead of that they have without exception, so far confined themselves in so far as they have dealt with the subject of the Resolution at all, merely to repeating what the Prime Minister said in his statement this afternoon, and to attacking the Opposition. Many people, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, must be a bit surprised at the vigour and viciousness with which they have attacked the Opposition, the Vice Chancellor of the University and the students of the University.

Now why have they done this? I believe they have done this for a number of reasons. First of all to divert the attention in the hope that in attacking these people they might divert the attention of the public from their own ineptitude, and also divert the attention of their own followers, many of whom do not approve or agree with the way in which they have approached

this matter. . . And more particularly they have gone out of their way to vilify the Vice Chancellor of the University, to attack the students because basically they don't believe the University should exist at all, they don't believe in education, in educating the people of this country; their own followers have said that saltfish was better than an education and their Minister of Education has now taught some of them at least to appreciate the necessity for an education up to shall we say the Junior Secondary level, but has not been able to persuade them that education also goes as far as University level, and you cannot have a society in this world that is efficient, and give the people what they want unless you have people skilled and trained up to University level, and they are using this episode as an excuse to see if they can destroy the University. I am firmly convinced that is at the back of their minds.

As to the attack on the Vice Chancellor, it is one of the most scandalous things that has ever happened and why? Why they have attacked him so viciously? I think I know the reason. When the report of this matter first came out it was reported in the *Gleaner* that Government had consulted the Vice Chancellor on the matter.

What was the object of that sentence appearing in the report but to give the public the impression that the Vice Chancellor of the University was party to what they were doing?

Why did they want to give the public that impression? Because they knew that they would be criticised. They were not sure of the validity of the way they were doing what they had decided to do and they hoped to disarm the criticism by being able to let the public believe that the Vice Chancellor agreed. Why they are angry with the Vice Chancellor is because he would not allow himself to be used as a pawn.

And so they have decided to smear and vilify the character of a man who was a public servant and a patriot long before the Prime Minister came into public life.

Mr. Speaker, Sir Philip Sherlock does not need to be defended as a man of decency and honesty before the people of Jamaica. What needs to be defended is the conduct of a Government that fortuitously and for no reason through the Prime Minister to go on television and abuse the character of the Head of the University.

As to the attack on the students of the University, it has already been pointed out that the line of attack has been to suggest that it is non-Jamaican students who are behind the whole thing and the Jamaican students there are apparently

just being led like sheep. First of all it is a gross insult to the students of Jamaica for anyone to believe they are not capable of thinking for themselves; and it is a deplorable thing for the Government of this country to use an opportunity like this to set the students at the University who are from Jamaica against the students who come from other islands.

Mrs. Grant: Absolutely necessary

The Speaker: May I ask the Members on this side to allow the Member to proceed without interruption.

Mr. Coore: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but when I hear them squealing I know I have touched them . . . I don't mind. It is a deplorable thing for the Government of a country to use this as an opportunity to set the students at the University who are from Jamaica against the students who come from the other islands. We have been told and it has been read out that this year it so happens that the officers of the Guild of Undergraduates, most of them, come from the other islands from time to time the composition of that Guild changes. They have elections every year. If you look at last year or the year before you might very well find that the majority came from Jamaica, and next year it might be different. The composition of the Guild of Undergraduates at any particular moment is totally irrelevant to the issue.

I say that this attempt to set up the students from Jamaica against the other students and to pretend that there is some evil machination coming from the other islands of the Caribbean through their students against the Jamaican students, that attempt is designed to do nothing else but to destroy the University, and basically that is what they are doing. If that is not what they are doing, if that is not what they intend to do, let them change their line now because that in fact is what their attitude in this matter is calculated to achieve.

We have been told that a pamphlet has been produced which they say was produced by the students of the University. There is not a shred of evidence that any student of the University produced any such pamphlet, and the students at the University "ongly deny they produced any such pamphlet, it was handed to them on the march when they were marching. Lots of other things were handed around, some are ridiculous, some nonsense and some evil.

As far as the evidence goes, there is nothing to suggest that the people of the University produced this pamphlet. I am very suspicious of anonymous pamphlets. Think of it the Leader of the Opposition if he had been foreign born might have been excluded from this

country in 1962 on the basis of the notorious "spy letter." I am amazed to hear that the originator of that historic piece of irresponsibility dares to stand up before Jamaica and call other people irresponsible. . . .

(*Sotto voce*, remark and loud applause by Opposition and Government Members.)

The Speaker: Can I ask you Gentlemen on this side to allow the Member to continue without interruption. If you do not agree to what is being said that does not give you the right to interrupt. Please proceed.

Mr. Coore: If the Government of Jamaica can prove that any student produced that pamphlet then there is proper and salutary action that they can take; if they cannot prove it then I beg of them in the name of decency, in the name of the future of that Institution, in the name of the future of the country, do not make these wild and defamatory statements and blackguard the students. It is unfair, it is unworthy and a disgrace for a Government to do that.

I do not for one moment believe the allegation that students were personally involved in any acts of stone throwing or looting. I don't believe it. If there is evidence that any student was so involved, why didn't the Police arrest and charge them?

What I do know is that students who were marching peacefully, who started off marching peacefully and orderly

(Inaudible remarks by Government Members.)

The Speaker: If it is your wish I will suspend the Sitting for a short while

Members: No, no.

The Speaker: Well please keep quiet.

Mr. Coore: Students marching in a peaceful and orderly way, admittedly in technical breach of the Law, but in a peaceful orderly way. When they got in the vicinity of Mona Road and Wellington Avenue, they were tear-gassed. And they were tear-gassed several times. The fact is that many of those students were injured, some of them young girls; and if there was any riot and violence as far as the students were concerned, it was the violence to the students and not by the students.

It is of course perfectly true that hooligan elements attached themselves to the marchers and a lot of damage to innocent persons and property resulted. That is altogether deplorable and nobody in the world would ever support or condone any such thing. But let us not seize the opportunity while people's feelings are exacerbated and inflamed and try to make out that

our university students are nothing but a bunch of thugs, when in truth and in fact they are the very people on whom the future of this country depends.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said that in spite of all that happened he was optimistic. He said he believed the Government would learn a lesson and he said he believed that something good would come out of all this. Having heard the Members on the Government side so far, I am quite satisfied that they are incapable of learning any lessons no matter how it is hammered into them.

Mr. Speaker, they will be guilty of the same ineptness and unnecessary provocation next week if they get the opportunity again. He also said that he believed some better relationship would come about between the Government and the University. As far as I am concerned, I do not believe that as long as this Government is in power, there will ever be any proper relationship between the Government of the country and the University. They are not prepared to accept the University as an integral and necessary part of the Society.

There is one thing on which I agree with the Minister of Housing and that is when he said he did not wish his Leader to take advice from the Leader of the Opposition. I also would not wish my Leader to waste his time and brains to give advice to a Government that would be incapable of understanding it and would be incompetent to put it into execution; a Government moreover that would never have the decency to acknowledge where they got the advice from in the first place.

I would state quite shortly that the Government stands condemned, first of all because they say that all these months they had evidence, through their Security Forces, and the Security Forces must be in touch at least with the Minister of Home Affairs, had evidence of seditious conduct and they failed to prosecute the man guilty of such conduct in a Court of Law. They failed to have the charges proved in a court and discredit him and have him dealt with according to Law.

The way they have done it, people who want to believe or choose to believe that the allegations made by the Security Forces are not true will say it has never been proved. They stand condemned because having decided to take action, they took action in a way which was calculated to make Rodney a martyr and to make people who follow him have a Cause and get support from other people from whom they might not have otherwise got support if it had been handled in a proper way.

They stand condemned because through incompetence and ineptitude, having created an explosive situation, they have

proceeded to use that situation to abuse not just the Vice Chancellor as a person and as Head of the University, they have sought to vilify the students and create an atmosphere in which government's own followers are going to say that this University is something that should be thrown out of the country. There has been a development of tension between the Government of Jamaica and the University.

What is going to happen is a continuance of the uneasy relationship between two bodies which ought to be working together in one common cause. What is going to happen is instead of having an atmosphere in which the University can exist as an integral part of the Society making a contribution to Jamaican life, we shall have in the immediate future and perhaps for a long time to come, a state of tension and disharmony.

If Government thinks this is a result on which they congratulate themselves, then I say they ought to have their heads examined. They acted with incompetence; they created a bad situation and then proceeded to make it worse.

Mr. Speaker, there is one respect in which I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that there is cause for optimism and it is this: The people of Jamaica are more sensible than they think. This country cannot be destroyed by any Government, however inept it may be, because ultimately the people of Jamaica are too sensible to allow that to happen. And my optimism is that the way they have acted in this issue, in addition to the total incompetence they have shown over the past several months—the way in which practically every Essential Service has broken down, the way in which people every day are becoming more frustrated and dissatisfied, in that I see reason for optimism because sooner or later, and I think it will be sooner, the people will rise up and force this bunch of incompetents out of their position of power to put in a decent and able Government in their place.

Applause from Opposition Members.

Mr. Seaga: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition made a profound statement when he said that he saw cause for optimism. I am afraid that after hearing the speeches that have followed from his Side of the House, I cannot sincerely share his cause for optimism. The day's Session began with a ludicrous note in which a Member of his team in whom he reposes his confidence and optimism, took from its position of authority in the House, the Mace, and when I asked why he had taken the Mace from this position, his reply was: because we did not allow the Doctor to return to the hospital. The debate since that incident has risen to