

various heights, but I am afraid it has descended to a very ludicrous point in the speech which we have just heard from one of the potential leaders who perhaps some time next year might be sitting in the position of Leader of the Opposition.

It is important for us to listen to the speeches of the potential Leaders on that side of the House because, obviously, the day will come when somebody will have to succeed the present leadership, and we should know from now how they think and how they would be likely to act; and it is distressing for us to know that of the prominent candidates on that side who have laboured so far have succeeded in producing little drops of nonsense from a bucketful of rubbish.

Mr. Speaker, I am the representative of the Government on the University Council. Regardless of who else might speak in this House on the matter of the University, it is my duty to report to Parliament as Parliament's representative on the University Council on this matter which concerns the University. I wish to begin by reading a statement which was made by the Vice Chancellor of the University—

This morning's issue of the *Daily Gleaner* and I quote—

"... makes reference to my meeting with the Prime Minister and the Cabinet in connection with Dr. Walter Rodney. The report is grossly unfair to me in leaving the impression that I knew of, and agreed with, the decision of the Government to ban Dr. Rodney. This is not so. I told the Prime Minister and Members of the Cabinet that I had no grounds for any action by the University against Dr. Rodney. This remains so. Dr. Rodney remains a member of the staff of the University of the West Indies."

In his advice to the Cabinet, the Vice Chancellor did express the view that from the information which was given to him, there was no ground on which he could take action to terminate the contract of employment of Dr. Rodney. Mr. Speaker, the Vice Chancellor himself made it quite clear that he was not aware of the activities of Dr. Rodney.

Here is a man who is entrusted with the vital role, and I have to report this to the Parliament, of leadership of the country's principal educational institution and indeed, one of the major institutions of the country but an institution which is concerned with education, who is himself uneducated about what goes on about his Campus; who is himself unaware that taking place on his Campus regularly, every week, were meetings at which the statements quoted here by the Prime Minister were made with regularity.

Was there not a member of

staff who could have whispered to the Vice Chancellor that this was happening? Was there not a student to have reported this to him? Is he so distant from his staff and from the students that he was unable to detect any sign of this very major unrest that was developing within his institution but it was left to the Government far removed from Mona to call him in to so inform him? I have to report to Parliament, Mr. Speaker, as your representative on the University Council that the Vice Chancellor of the University is an uninformed man.

It is also inescapable from the statement given by the Vice Chancellor that while he stated in this statement certain views that he did express, he failed to mention other views that he also did express, views in which he accepted the information which was given by Government concerning the subversive activities taking place on the Campus, views in which he offered the opinion that the change which had come about in a student which he termed a good student in under-graduate days to a subversive person who had been categorised as a danger and threat to the Society had come about after his visits abroad.

By not giving the full position, stating only a part of the truth and nothing but the truth, Mr. Speaker, I am forced to report to Parliament that the Vice Chancellor is an inaccurate reporter in a time of crisis. This is not the level of performance that I expect from my Vice Chancellor, this is not the level of performance that we expect from our Vice Chancellor, and as your representative on the University Council, regardless of what else is said in this Chamber on the University, regardless of what else is said about the Vice Chancellor, I am making this report as your representative on the University Council here tonight.

I must report to Parliament that I am perplexed at the posture of the Vice Chancellor when confronted with the record of Mr. Rodney. When told that Mr. Rodney was a grave security risk, he did not venture to say what was possible to transfer Mr. Rodney from Mona Campus to another Campus although at the request of the Head of another Government he recently transferred a Jamaican Lecturer from the St. Augustine Campus of the University back here to Mona.

The Vice Chancellor is an experienced administrator. He should know without our having to say so to him that any show of support to the views of students who had by then, at the time of making his statement, embarked on a course of demonstration would, whether deliberately, which I am quite sure he did not intend, certainly give reason to the students for carrying their demonstrations further.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker,

that when the Vice Chancellor made his statement, he committed the error—and I am quite certain he had no intention of doing so wilfully and of encouraging students in demonstrations outside the Campus of the University—but he committed the error especially in the closing sentence of the statement for he says 'Dr. Rodney remains a member of the staff of the University of the West Indies', which gave, unwittingly, support to the students that they had his backing unreservedly.

I am quite sure that whether it is a statement of fact, there is a time when facts have to be tampered in several ways: not by distorting facts, by not stating the whole truth but by stating the truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The Vice Chancellor, I must report, to Parliament, did not handle the situation very well and in the words of the Bible—'Mene Mene Tekel upharson'—he has been weighed and found wanting. I am sorry to have to make this report to Parliament because it is a sad end to an otherwise good contribution to his career as Vice Chancellor of the University because he goes on retirement next year.

The University of the West Indies is a Campus of 5,000 students. The Campus is split into three countries—Trinidad, Barbados and Jamaica. It does not consist of a Vice Chancellor alone but instructors and students. Three-fifths of the students on the Mona Campus, which is the largest of the three, are Jamaicans.

I want to turn to the position of the students and the instructors in making this report to Parliament on the University in this matter. One of the best ways to look at their own position in this matter is to judge their views as these views occurred after a day of demonstration which left behind in the words of the Prime Minister's statement, 'a trail of damage, destruction, pillage, loitering, looting, arson and other things'. After this day with all memorable things that occurred including deaths, the instructors on the staff members of the University and the students held separate meetings. The Faculty Staff took the following decisions at an informal meeting, not an official meeting—

1. Close down the University indefinitely.
2. Contact other territorial Governments to discuss and take certain stand on University control and administration.
3. Use Press and radio to air their side of the story and refute the Prime Minister's speech.
4. Establish communication with students so that both can act as one.
5. Intensify the publication of 'Scope' so as to have a

University organ to speak for the University of the West Indies."

The meeting also warned against being used by other factions.

It called on undergraduates at their own meeting to act. They decided to:

1. Remain from lectures indefinitely.
 2. Use Press, radio and television to present their side of the story—and to condemn the Prime Minister's broadcast.
 3. Aim at putting the blame for violence on the Police intervention.
 4. To work in conjunction with Faculty Staff and to implement their plans whatever they may be. Black Power Group.
 1. Reject advice of faculty staff against alignment with off-campus groups.
 2. Decide to march tomorrow (a) U.W.I. students to wear gowns to act as decoys, while Black Power non-campus groups beat, burn and even kill; (b) All students included should go armed with knife, gasoline, reggs, matches, bottles and any weapon available, and attack Police. People in gowns should peacefully approach Police while the mob sneak up and attack or, if convenient for armed students to attack, they should do so. Possibility that some outsiders may also wear gowns. Again, all may go without gowns.
 3. Rastas and P.N.P. malcontents are to be mobilized to shoot, burn, smash and above all, to attack the Police. It is pointed out that Soldiers and Police together number roughly (and I will not mention the figure given here) and they can muster 6,000 to 8,000.
 4. Should establish system of communications to give signals and commands.
 5. Secondary school boys should also be recruited.
 6. Real aim of Black Power "is to overthrow Government."
- One feels that the time is ripe for never before had they had this spontaneous and overwhelming support from the public.
- They are sure they can succeed.
- Even suggestion to inveigle Army to take over was made.
- Opposition Members:** What document is that, and who printed it?
- Mr. Seaga:** This is a docu-

ment captured by the various Authorities who are keeping us informed of what is happening.

I have to ask the question: are these really the innocent students who have been defended by the Leader of the Opposition, who have been defended by Members of the Opposition, including the Member who spoke last?

These youths who are hiding under guise of a Movement which has acquired dignity elsewhere, are patently not members of the Black Power Movement, but, rather, of Red Power.

Mr. Allan Isaacs: Please read that document again.

Mr. Seaga: I am sorry, but it appears that students here have been looking overseas at the situation at other Universities. They have seen protests occurring at other Universities; and there is a feeling that they are being left out of the world of protests. They feel that in order not to appear to be left behind in the processes involving protests, they have to become part of such protests, which, of course, is the age-old mistake that is made in Jamaica in relation to other countries. I have to remind them that they are not looking in Jamaica at the same sort of situation that exists in other countries. And you only have to look at it, Mr. Speaker, to realise that the Jamaican situation is entirely different from that which exists in other countries.

For example, there is the right in Jamaica for all students to attend Universities—a right that is not permitted in other countries. Then, also, one is free to enter and live in this country once he is a Commonwealth citizen; and I think that the staff of the University should welcome the prospect that there are no different set of rules, setting them aside from any other citizen. I think they should accept it as a privilege granted by this Government for those who are Commonwealth citizens.

This is a privilege which is given to the University to help it recruit qualified staff. But no one should use this freedom as licence.

Well-thinking members of the University staff, should accept the full obligation of citizens of this country and not use the privilege given to them as licence. As a matter of fact I think many are concerned with the security of the institution. They are quite concerned about the security of their job. And I am sure that they are glad to get rid of a cancer in their own group, which is causing the institution and themselves to lose the integrity which they have

built up over the years.

I believe the situation which has come about will have a salutary effect. I believe it focuses on the Jamaican side and the Jamaican position within the University. Many Jamaican students have not joined with the forces which are organized on the University campus. Up until now, many of these students have regarded as a playful pastime, participation in the meetings; and up until now, they have not taken the issue seriously.

And I believe that the situation will highlight the fact that here is a Jamaican side to this situation, and will strengthen their hand. And the Jamaicans there who see others using the freedom of the University as licence, will come to take a stand and to realize that no one has the right to reside at the University and regard its freedom as licence.

There are students who are forced to reside in the University; and they must realize that they must conform with the Rules and Regulations of the University.

The University is a place of study.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the point that Jamaica is the territory which is discussing with the University, a programme for expansion. At this point I would rebuke the last Member who spoke—he said that this Government is not in league with the expansion or improvement of the University.

Let me inform him that it is this Government which has discussed a nine-year expansion programme with the University—a programme which includes expansion of the present structures and the addition of a new Faculty of Business Education, because we want Jamaican students to be trained in Business Education in order to participate in the economy, which is expanding.

It is this Government which is discussing that plan with the University.

The Government does not wish a University which is harbouring elements within the society, some from without and some from within, who have no loyalty to the country, some who have no birthright to protect and by harbouring those elements encourage them in destruction, encourage them not to think of the University as a place to learn, as an institution for realizing occupational hopes, as a place where people are trained to add to the pool of skilled learning so as to enhance the development of the country, but rather as a place which believes that before one can change one must tear down everything that exists.

That is too easy a solution.

It is far more important, it is far more difficult, it taxes the ingenuity of the young, it taxes the ingenuity of anyone to devise a solution to work around the problems and then find a solution in the end so that while it solves it does not destroy, while it solves it does not create additional problems.

Mr. Glasspole: I would like in what I expect is the closing stage of this debate to just bring the House back to the Resolution that was moved by the Leader of the House and the Minister of Home Affairs, and the Amendment which expresses the view of the Opposition. The Mover of the Resolution:—

"Resolved that this Honourable House taking note of the action of the Minister in declaring Walter Anthony Rodney a prohibited immigrant in Jamaica, he being deemed by the said Minister to be an undesirable inhabitant of, or visitor to the island, hereby approves this action of the Government in the interest of the security of Jamaica."

The Opposition introduced an Amendment which expresses the feeling of the Opposition:

"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 final action was taken."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the sum total of the Opposition's stand in respect of this matter.

During the course of the debate as is common practice a large number of spokesmen on the Government Bench proceeded to denigrate the Vice Chancellor, to denigrate the Leader of the Opposition, and to pour scorn and contempt on their heads. We are accustomed to that, but what I would like them to know is that as long as they live they will never be able to make the contribution to Jamaica as men like the Leader of the Opposition and the Vice Chancellor of the University of the West Indies. As long as they live they will never be able to make the contribution that those men have made to the progress of Jamaica.

There are some of us who are throttling over what is happening. I would suspect that they remember losing their Ministerial Colleague because of a clash with the former Prime Minister in respect of Migration Regulations relating to the teaching staff of the University, and naturally those who throttle will seek to put the knife as hard as they can in the backs of those that they seek to stab as hard as they would like to, but we are not worried about that. Indeed, Mr.

Speaker, they can proceed on their way. History will forget a lot of them but I am certain history will not forget the Leader of the Opposition nor the Vice Chancellor of the University.

Having said that, I come to the point of the Amendment. One of the Members on our side have dealt very clearly with the failure of Government to take appropriate action at an earlier stage. The second part of the Amendment, 'deplores the inept and provocative manner in which final action was taken.' Mr. Speaker, the first time the public at large knew that something was happening in respect of this Doctor was when a news item appeared in the *Gleaner* of Tuesday of this week. When I read that report I came to the conclusion that the Vice Principal had gone to Cabinet meeting at the invitation of Cabinet and had himself agreed that the Doctor should be declared *persona non grata*.

When the Vice Principal read the article he must have come to the same conclusion like thousands of other Jamaicans and he thought it best to defend himself. Who gave the *Gleaner* the information? There are only two sets of people who could have given the information, one, some one of the Ministers or two, the Cabinet Secretary.

The Vice Chancellor would never have given the information in the way the article was printed. It was one of the Ministers who must have leaked the information to the Press and shaded it in such a way so as to put the Vice Chancellor in very bad light so far as the matter was concerned.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what the Prime Minister's statement says, and I wish to underscore it: "The Vice Chancellor left Cabinet with the understanding that he was to consult with the University Authorities and report back to me shortly on the matter."

Anybody reading that sentence must come to the conclusion that the Vice Chancellor left the Cabinet meeting with the understanding that no finality would be arrived at before he reported back to the Prime Minister. If that is not the interpretation put on that sentence I don't know anything about the English Language. The Vice Chancellor, and I quote, 'left Cabinet with the understanding that he was to consult with the University Authorities and report back to me shortly on the matter.' The great sentence is the next one. 'In view, however, of his positive statement that from a University point of view, Dr. Rodney's appointment could not be terminated, the Cabinet decided to accept the Vice Chancellor's suggestion that Dr. Rod-

ney should be declared *persona non grata*.'

The Vice Chancellor had left the Cabinet meeting and he was under the impression that he was going to the University Authorities to discuss the matter and then report back to the Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker, nothing in the previous paragraph suggests that the Vice Chancellor had invited the Government to do so, nothing suggests that; but what is important, this is where it underlines an attitude of the Opposition, the Prime Minister would ask us to believe that the Government did not know that the Doctor was out of the country. But what does the Minister of Housing say? He says the decision was most timely, timely, the decision was most timely, but it was most timely because the gentleman was abroad.

Now the Prime Minister is an honourable man and he would like me to believe that what he said in his statement is that the Government did not know the gentleman was abroad. What is timely about the action of the Government, timely in relation to the philosophy that the man was preaching and would continue to preach, but the very Government say they did not know the gentleman was off the island. What is timely about it, how can it be timely when the gentleman had been preaching this doctrine for ten months? The Ministry of Home Affairs had all the information; the Prime Minister had all the information. I am prepared to concede it does not get this sort of information until the final stages are reached.

But the Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs are supposed to be advised continuously about what is happening in relation to the movement of people like the Doctor in this case. The Honourable Prime Minister tells us that we should accept his word that they did not know where the Doctor was, but the Minister of Housing has said that the decision was most timely.

Mr. Allen: Is it proper for the Member who is addressing you to be assuming and repeating that the statement made by the Prime Minister is untrue? The statement so solemn to this House, and confirmed by so many other Ministers? Is it proper that he should be repeating that this statement is subject to doubt, that it is not true?

Mr. Glasspole: I am entitled to question any statement made by any Minister in this House.

The Speaker: I will say, this, that this matter has been ventilated ably, very eloquently, and it now becomes repetitious.

Mr. Gyles: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: And I would ask that you don't labour this matter any more.

Mr. Glasspole: Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to an answer. Why was the decision so timely on Monday last when the gentleman was off the island? I am entitled to an answer, 'who leaked the story to the Gleaner?'

The Speaker: I think you are arguing a hypothetical statement, you are not really expecting an answer to that?

Mr. Glasspole: There is no hypothesis about it at all.

The Speaker: It is a hypothetical question which does not need an answer.

Mr. Glasspole: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I speak from the position of experience of being a former Minister of a Government of Jamaica, and I know how a Cabinet operates and I know that no reporter from the Gleaner can get information about Cabinet activities unless he is given it either by the Minister or the Cabinet Secretary. The Secretary will not disclose it, so it must be a Minister. The people, in fact, who disclosed the information first was some Minister or other.

I have disposed of that and I come now to the question of 'timely' in relation to the matter. I don't know... I still want an answer, I am still looking for an answer. What is timely? What is timely in respect to a decision? I didn't say so — it is their spokesman who said so.

Government Member: Find another point!

Mr. Glasspole: Sir, I made the point enough to irritate them, and when I remember the words of the Leader of the House that they are anxious to get it out of the way, I can understand because, Mr. Speaker, let me say this — the Minister of Education suggested that I had not the authority or it was not proper for me to question the veracity of a statement of the Prime Minister. May I point out, Sir, that it happened in the British House of Commons where the Prime Minister of a Conservative Government was asked a question about the behaviour and activities of one of the Ministers of his Government, and he got up in the House of Commons and defended that Minister in the most powerful way — and what happened? A couple of months after that the man was dismissed from office because the answer the Prime Minister gave to the Member who asked the question the answer was wrong.

Don't tell me that I must accept the same... the Government knew nothing about it when another Minister says that... the Minister of Housing is saying that the 'decision was timely'. I have made the point strongly enough, Mr.

Speaker, and I make it no further.

Now what caused the violent reaction amongst the people at large? What caused this reaction from not the politicians only, not the Leader of the Opposition? The thing that caused the strong reaction was no violent — I beg you pardon — the action does not apply to what took place in terms of the violence yesterday — the action of the Government in the circumstances made people feel miserable and worthless. Here was a Government that had taken action of that sort. The man's wife was in Jamaica; the man's child was in Jamaica.

Government Member: Somebody said that already!!

Mr. Glasspole: I know it touches you.

Yes, yes, please go away, I don't mind how many of you go away, and don't come back and vote either.

As I was saying, Sir, it is because of that why people felt so hurt about the whole issue, that is the reason why; and that is the reason why we include in the amendment that we deplore the inept and provocative manner in which final action was taken. We don't hesitate to say we deplore it.

The fact is that this is an end of a build-up of the satisfaction of the manner in which the Government handled passport matters and other matters of that kind. When you are in office you are told 'it is arrogant' Mr. Speaker, if this country wants to see arrogance they see it on the Ministerial Bench of the Jamaica Labour Party. One only has to hear the Prime Minister when he was addressing the country yesterday and you hear the arrogance in his voice. We know that people have power, but we want to see that the men having the power will exercise that power in such a way that the people will still feel that they can look at that man as the Leader of the country. After his speech yesterday over the Radio and T-V, there was a feeling of revulsion in the people's minds.

Government Members: Nonsense!!!

Mr. Glasspole: You are just serving your first term of apprenticeship will you keep your mouth quiet and listen.

Government Member: That is arrogance!!!!

Mr. Glasspole: What I have done for this country you will never live long enough to do.

The Speaker: This is Parliament you know, I don't want to hear any guffaws!

Mr. Glasspole: Mr. Speaker, this matter could have been handled in such a way that not a single bit of trouble would have taken place, and the country would have been solidly behind the Government in the action that they had taken, des-

pite the fact that the Government was right on the information they have produced to us to take the action... the fact is that it has a bitter taste in a large number of people's mouths who believe in Law and Order.

I hope it will be a lesson to them. I hope they will understand that the wheels of political fortune turns round and round, and one of these fine days they will find themselves on the Opposition Benches. I hope that when the People's National Party takes over we will never conduct ourselves in the manner they have conducted themselves here today, tonight.

The Resolution has passed and I suppose the Amendment of it will be thrown out, but that does not mean that the Opposition's point of view is not in the thinking of thousands and thousands of decent minds in Jamaica, and I hope that as long as our democratic processes continue we will even see a repetition of that ineptitude.

They try to throw the blame on the head of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition, and on the Vice Chancellor... they are afraid just as they are afraid for example in the method of Voter Registration...

The Speaker: That is irrelevant.

Mr. Glasspole: I must not go any further on that point? In the same way in which they are afraid to use their influence to examine many of the other problems confronting Jamaica but a view to changing them for the better... I don't believe that even what has taken place here will be the sort of lesson that will be of value to them in the future. They are too arrogant to learn, and they are too hard-headed and indifferent to public feeling and insensitive to criticism ever to improve their manner of dealing with matters of public importance to Jamaica. (Hear, hear).

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, I am a little sorry for the Opposition because their Leader blundered badly. They try to extricate him, so they try to do it by moving an Amendment that is nonsensical. Their Leader blundered by making a statement which on the face of it actually encouraged some of the lawlessness that took place.

Mr. Glasspole: I rise to a point of Order, Sir. He says that the Leader of the Opposition encouraged the lawlessness that took place. There is no evidence that there was any connection whatever...

The Speaker: I do not think the conduct of a Member of this House is really to be debated. It can't be debated and I must ask you to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Allen: Beg your pardon, Sir, I said nothing about his...

Opposition Members: Withdraw; withdraw.

The Speaker: I am saying you can't debate his conduct, except on a substantive Motion.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, can you hear me on this?

Opposition Members: Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. Allen: Would you permit me ...

The Speaker: I ask the Member to withdraw his remark about the Leader of the Opposition, and not to pursue it.

Mr. Allen: It is difficult for me to ...

(Opposition Members here left the Council Chamber en bloc.)

The Speaker: I must ask the Member to withdraw the remark he made.

Mr. Allen: It is difficult for me to understand what I am to debate, Mr. Speaker. I am debating something relevant to the issue before us.

The Speaker: This ruling of mine is covered by Standing Order 35, Clause 8, and the Standing Order says that these are matters not to be debated unless on a Substantive Motion: The conduct of Her Majesty the Queen, the conduct of members of the Royal Family; the conduct of the Governor-General; the conduct of members of the Privy Council or the Senate or the House of Representatives. This means you must not discuss the conduct of any Member of this House, and I ask you to withdraw what you said and not pursue it.

Mr. Allen: I am placed at a great disadvantage because the statement made ...

The Speaker: I have read you the Rule.

Mr. Allen: Mr. Speaker, the Rule goes to the roots ...

The Speaker: I am not going to argue. I have reminded you of the Rule. Please withdraw and then proceed.

Mr. Allen: My problem is that I don't know what to withdraw.

The Speaker: That the Leader of the Opposition incited, by what he said, certain persons

Mr. Allen: If you interpret it that way, I withdraw; but that is not what I meant.

Now, Sir, we all know that there was a riot. We all know that there was misconduct. Certain persons made certain statements in the Press and some of those persons are responsible persons and when irresponsible elements of our Society read those statements they form the opinion that these responsible persons were in agreement with the students, and because they felt that those responsible persons were in agreement with the man who was banned from landing in Jamaica, and it is because

they felt that this man Rodney had been wrongly banned that they rioted. And if those persons who made those statements had taken the trouble to think of the consequences of the irresponsible things which they said you might have had some students coming down town, but you might not have had any rioting or any looting.

Now, Sir, the Prime Minister should have been congratulated by the Leader of the Opposition and every Member on the Opposition Benches. What has the Prime Minister done? The Prime Minister has led his Cabinet to save Jamaica from one of the most dangerous men to ever set foot on Jamaican soil.

What did this man want to do? Let me remind you, Sir. All brownskin mullatto people and their assets should be destroyed.

That man did not have to mention whites; did not have to mention the other races in Jamaica. He only said Jamaica was a black country; and in other words what he meant was that everybody who was not recognizably black should be destroyed in this country and to have anyone come here and move a Resolution about this man not getting to talk to his wife, about this man not being allowed to land, and why he was not dealt with earlier when they know the reason, I should say it is shameful and disgraceful and I regard all such statements as unpatriotic.

They ask why was action not taken earlier? The people who asked that, one of them was the Leader of the Opposition who knows why there were so many people whom he stopped from travelling or landing here; he knows what kind of evidence he had. Why did he not take them all to Court? Nearly everyone of those whose passport he stopped was guilty of some seditious or unlawful act and he was an experienced Lawyer and handling Security himself at that time; and he was Head of the Government, why he did not go to Court and take action instead of stopping them? Even the Vice Chancellor himself did not know his lecturer was not in Jamaica.

It was in broad daylight that the Vice Chancellor was invited to come to Cabinet and everybody on the premises, everybody on the street could have seen that he had visited Cabinet, any person on the street who was looking on and who would not have to divulge any Cabinet secrets saw him and after seeing him come, they knew that he stayed and they saw him leave.

The next thing, Sir, is that they heard his Lecturer was not allowed to land. Does it require any Solomon to put these events together and to realise that it is more than apparent that the Prime Minister must have invited this gen-

tleman to come to Cabinet and to discuss Rodney because Rodney was the man not allowed to come back to Jamaica. There was no necessity for anyone to leave out anything and I am amazed at the amount of time spent by the Opposition over these nonsensical arguments that they have been advancing.

Then, because the Minister of Housing used the word 'timing', it has been pointed out that one of the things you can do when you declare a man *Persona non grata* is to stop him from landing and if after so declaring him, you don't have to go and search for him. He may have gone into hiding.

There was a time when they had two or three men hiding in the hills of St. Catherine and they had Police and dogs and I don't know what they did not have, but they could not find them. They could not apprehend them. Now, there was this man returning to Jamaica and he could be found on a 'plane and Security knew he was on that 'plane. What was more timely than to meet him there and say 'Don't put your foot on Jamaican soil'. That is how it was timely, Mr. Speaker, I join in saying it was timely.

I join also in saying that every word in the statement made by the Prime Minister as regard what took place in Cabinet on the occasion of the visit of the Vice Chancellor was absolutely true. It was absolutely true that not one of us in Cabinet knew that the gentleman was abroad.

Now, Sir, I would like Jamaicans to note one or two facts. First of all, this is not a question of the security of Government, this is a question of the security of our Society. I regard the security of Government as important but I regard as still more important the security of Society, and the most wicked thing anybody could do to a country like Jamaica whose Motto is 'Out of many — one people' is to come here and stir up racial troubles. We have enough of this in South Africa and elsewhere in the world, we don't want any of it in Jamaica.

Another serious thing, it has been touched upon but I don't think sufficiently emphasised, is that so much subversion has come to be based on the University campus. It is a very very serious thing, Mr. Speaker. It is serious because Jamaica subscribes more than 43 per cent of the money that goes to the University; it is serious because although the majority of the students who are there are Jamaicans, over a period of eighteen years, I do not think that more than two Jamaicans have been President of the Guild. What really happens there is that agitators from abroad come here and although they may not be in the majority, they manage to get elected and most of the trouble and most of the subversion that take

place up there come from non-Jamaicans.

This is not to say that every student from the other islands is a suspect, this is not to say either that every Lecturer from outside is a suspect. Perhaps from the tenor of this debate someone reading might think that this is what we mean. We do not mean this. There are foreigners there, there are West Indians there who I believe to be decent and good citizens and good residents in Jamaica who abide by our Laws and who are not connected with all these nefarious practices. There are also students from other islands up there who are no security problem and perhaps it is not necessary to emphasise this but we have to pay very serious attention to those who come here to practise subversion.

Another thing that disturbs us, Sir, is the abuse of academic freedom, where some Lecturers seem to get it into their heads that because they are on the University staff, they have freedom to run all over Jamaica and do anything. I do not think that any Jamaican Lecturer in Trinidad or in Barbados has any right to run all over Trinidad to practise any subversion against the Government or the people there, neither in Barbados, in the same way I do not think that any of these other West Indians who come here should think that they have any right to indulge in anything like this. One of the benefits, one of the good things I hope will come out of this exercise is that it will be realised that every one who comes to Jamaica, just like every Jamaican who goes abroad, must be of good conduct.

Another thing that is not fully realised at the University is that the Federation of the West Indies is dead and so far as Jamaica is concerned, it is going to remain dead so that when they come here, they must remember they are on Jamaican soil, and when we go to their country, we will remember as well that we are on the soil of their country; when they come here they must conform with our Laws and when we go to their country we conform with theirs.

This is not a federation with a common Law and every man who comes here must hold himself free to go up and down and to join with this and to join with that to upturn and overturn the Jamaican society.

I understand also that a certain amount of bullying is taking place there against students who did not join in all this folly and subversion. Well, those students who did not join and who are being bullied, I would like them to know that if it comes to anything they have the backing of the Jamaican Government as long as they abide by the Law, that they should not under any circumstances, whether it is a lecturer who wants them to practise

sedition or some other student or group of students, join with people who have no stake in Jamaica to hurt and damage Jamaica.

I should like to say also that when Sir Philip Sherlock visited the Cabinet he was told that Rodney was indulging in certain dangerous and subversive doctrines and teachings and that these doctrines were dangerous to Sir Philip himself. That was a broad hint of the kind of subversion and that is why, although I am one of those who recognise the services that Sir Philip has already performed in Jamaica, I am one of those extremely disappointed in his conduct in this matter.

I want to point out also that new techniques which we have not seen in Jamaica before, techniques in lawlessness, were practised on this occasion. The techniques, for example, of seizing a J.O.S. bus, turning it across the road, using it to smash business premises so as to get in and loot, this is something new and I believe that it is part of the teachings of some subversive element.

Mr. Speaker, at this hour of night I do not wish to detain the House but I close by saying that Jamaica owes a great debt to gratitude to the Security Staff of this country and to the Prime Minister for the leadership he has given and for the efficiency with which he has dealt with this matter.

And I wish to say that the Authorities at the University should take a greater interest in what is going on on the campus there. I think there is some dereliction of duty when things, such as have been disclosed to us, some of which were known on the streets in various parishes in this country, were apparently not known to those in authority at the University.

And I hope that Jamaica will never again have this experience, and that, never again, when the Minister of Home Affairs exercises his duty in protection of Jamaica by saying one or two men must not go to Cuba, one or two men, maybe, must not go to Russia — I hope we will never again see everyone — the radio, the television and the Press, as well as the public — wanting to tear him to pieces.

What Jamaica must understand is that the Minister of Home Affairs has the security of Jamaica — all of the 1.8 million of us to think about. And he has the security in his hands. And many times when he is abused, he, in fact, deserves congratulations.

Dr. Duhaney: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Motion and I feel obliged to do so because I am not in the Cabinet, I am a Back-Bencher, and I would like to express a few points; and I cannot be blamed because, today at our Parish Council meeting, we of Clarendon unanimously passed a Reso-

lution, recording our congratulation to our Prime Minister on the statement he has made. We passed that Resolution because we know of all the things about which he spoke. We know of it, and we were glad that he did what he did.

In the words of the Bard: "For judgment now has fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason."

I would like to say that you can read about revolution in a book; and such books are printed time and time again. I have read them while in College.

One way to start a revolution is to seize authority—the means by which people rule people. From the beginning of time, this has been so.

You know that in the old days, strong men ruled. You know that 'King' was the operative word for authority in the old days; and then 'brains', and then 'money', and then by Law. And then classes grew up. And today we get democracy by numbers.

Now, the business of numbers is what the small men cannot understand. He thinks that he should rule because he is smart, and he cannot understand that in a democracy, it is a case of 'one man, one vote,' and that it is by this means that they elect their leaders.

And that smart man went about to discover how to get the numbers. And so books were written about it; and the books read like this — "Take charge of the executive"; 'take charge of the Opposition,' then you take over the police and Army' and 'then you take over the civil servants' and then you 'take over the educated — the elite', and then you 'take over the businessmen' and then you 'take over the country.' It is written in the books.

And when I came here tonight, I was not in any position to know anything about it; and I have heard these things here tonight—these things which are written in the books.

Don't you see it is a planned thing? It is the old story of how small people can take over the students in order to take over the democratic principles on which the country is built.

They are trying in every way to get this opportunity so that they can get into power. They will try anything.

And I say we in Clarendon are tickled to the teeth that Government has acted in the matter, because we can now begin to drive our cars, ride our bicycles and drive our jackasses in peace. We in Clarendon have a case.

One cell is dead, but two are there and are growing bigger and bigger; and I am calling upon the Attorney General tonight to make the Director of Public Prosecutions aware of

the fact that there is trouble in Vere. And he should get the Director of Public Prosecutions to go into it.

The Speaker: I must warn the Member that he should not stray.

Dr. Duhaney: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Opposition strayed a bit and so I thought 'might be permitted to stray a little too. (Laughter).

I believe in these things — in education, in democracy, in principle, in planning, in talking and in love. I do not know if this is straying, but these are the principles which I have believed in all my life.

And I believe that if I see trouble, I must talk about it.

There have been big events in our history. We have had a silent revolution, Russian ships, big demonstrations at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting, when those people with access paraded with banners right up there at the University.

We have had the big demonstrations at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference when the people paraded with banners right up there at the University; we have had these big events in our history. Yesterday we had another big one. I am not going to mention any names, I don't know how to go about this, I can only tell you the truth and the truth is all Jamaica, all Jamaica was disturbed, all Jamaica was intensely interested.

It is the first time I have seen this place crowded, some people are even standing. All Jamaica is intensely interested in the Government's action and they had action and thank God, I congratulate the Prime Minister, I congratulate the Cabinet, I congratulate the whole Government on this serious stand and they were forced to take and they took it and God bless them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shearer: Mr. Speaker, before the Honourable Leader of the House closes the debate, I wish to take very few minutes to make a number of points. I want to put on Record the admiration of the Government for the support, the approval by the Opposition of the action taken by the Government as set out in the Resolution moved by the Honourable Leader of the House. The Opposition has agreed with the terms. They have, however, proposed:

"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 final action was taken."

but this is a separate contention altogether. The Resolution:

"Resolved that this Honourable House taking note of the action of the Minister

in declaring Walter Anthony Rodney a prohibited immigrant in Jamaica he being deemed by the said Minister to be an undesirable inhabitant of or visitor to the Island, hereby approves this action of the Government in the interest of the security of Jamaica."

I wish the country to know that following the statement by the Government tonight in the House, and following the submission by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, the Opposition in this country led by its Leader accepted and supported the Action of Government, but went on to criticise that they should take more appropriate action. So far as the Government is concerned, the details given in the statement are based on facts.

The Government accepts as reliable the reports of the Security Agencies of the Government and based on those reports we have taken the action which the Opposition approves of along with us. There has been criticism about the time that it was done. I wish to say in this debate that when the decision was taken no Member of Cabinet, including myself, knew that Rodney was off the Island and the Vice Chancellor himself has admitted and it has been publicly recorded that he did not know his Lecturer was off the Island.

There have been some questions as to why and when the Vice Chancellor came to Cabinet and there has been suggestion about a leak of news to the newspaper. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Vice Chancellor came back to my office on Tuesday and his picture leaving my office appeared in the newspaper. I saw a picture of myself without coat walking in the corridor to go to the end of the room. I do not know who leaked. I do not know who informed the newspaper that Mr. Sherlock was called back to the Prime Minister's Office on Tuesday but it was in the newspaper on Wednesday, and not only a report but a picture of him.

I don't know who told the newspaper to the extent where they were able to supply, to provide and have on hand photographers, so it is not only one visit that was reported, it was both, the second confirmed by a photograph of the gentleman leaving my office; and bear in mind that he was not called by telephone, a letter was sent by Special Police rider to his home and given from the rider at his home and it is when the letter was opened that he knew he was required. I ask, who leaked the information that he was coming again to the Prime Minister's Office on Tuesday?

There has been question as to why the Vice Chancellor was called, and reference to timing. Sir, I think I owe a duty to this House and to the nation

to say why. He was called because under the Immigration Restriction (British Subject) Law a Commonwealth citizen who is in Jamaica for a particular period of time can only be dealt with in a certain manner. If he is over that time he is dealt with in a different manner from the manner in which you would deal with him when he is within the time, and in an effort to make sure as to how it should be handled we sought to get the information from him, and we used the term in the statement, he volunteered the information because when he pointed out that as a Commonwealth citizen, after being here for seven years you cannot declare that person *persona non grata*, the information was volunteered to us that in this case that did not apply because that person had only been engaged here for less than the time.

When it was established as to the time that the individual was in Jamaica it determined under what section of the Law, what process should be pursued and we pursued it and we have no apology to make to anybody for taking the legal action allowed under the Law in this case in the interest of Jamaica.

Sir, I accept the validity of the circulars that have been supplied to the Government as documents connected with planned sabotage and subversive activity. I had a very strange experience tonight from a Member of the Bar, a Queen's Counsel, who in criticising or questioning the reliability of the document admitted the existence of the document but says that whilst the students were marching somebody put it in their hands, so am I to understand that this spontaneous demonstration which began at seven o'clock in the morning, coming down Mona Road somebody was able to arrange to print the document, print these circulars and reach up there and arrange all of this? Sir, nothing of the sort.

This document was in the hands of the Authorities long before the march the other morning. This is not a document that developed on Tuesday. And here are other items of information which I have not disclosed to this House and I will not... much not important, much more dangerous than that secured long before Monday morning.

It is as a result of those documents and those reliable items of information that the Vice Chancellor was called.

Sir, the pattern of demonstration and the looting, and the blocking of the roads with vehicles is not new to this country. We had similar experiences during the J.B.C. strike too. Jamaicans forget

that, that a similar pattern of disruption, the blocking of the roads, defiance of the Authorities, took place in this country already during the strike involving employees of the J.B.C., the Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation, and it is no secret as to who organized, supported and took part in those demonstrations in that pattern.

Representatives of the Opposition political party in this House and the Union which publicly supports the Opposition Party in this House.

These tactics are not new, they are bigger and they apply to a different section, but they were in use already. King Street, Windward Road by Doch and Doris, Half Way Tree!!!. Jamaicans are not of short memory. What is all this hypocrisy about the contents except the concern is that they have been secured by the Security Agencies of the country and they did not want it to reach their hands?

Sir a statement has been made, repeated in here, saying that the Nation should keep cool despite the intervening incidents. It is easy to gloss over intervening incidents, but what are the intervening incidents which have precedence in the J.B.C. strike, which fits into the written instructions in circulation, in the hands of our Security Forces?

Some fifty buses were damaged and quite a number of employees have been put out of work. Hundreds of lawful, decent citizens have been savagely assaulted and injured. Over One Million Pounds of damage to homes, cars, business places and goods—looting. And let me not hide it from the country because these people know that this damage is going to cost the taxpayers of Jamaica. This is not an insurance business nor the man's business — this is damage that is going to be paid for, not by the students there but by the Jamaican people, and it is going to be a high item of cost to the taxpayers of this country.

Not to mention, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the damage to the reputation of Jamaica, which reputation has been built up to such an attractive and satisfactory level by the efforts and the dynamism of the people of the country under the intelligent and sound leadership of the Government of the Jamaica Labour Party, that have combined to produce confidence in the people and in the country. (Loud applause by Government Members).

Mr. Shearer: Let me make it absolutely clear Mr. Speaker, that there is no justification whatsoever for the conduct of those members of the student

body of the University of the West Indies throughout Kingston on Tuesday of this week.

To those who question the efforts of the Police to contain the demonstration, let me make it clear that on these Statutes, in these Books, there are a set of laws for everybody in Jamaica. There is no Law for students and no different Law for the nationals. There is a Law for everybody.

There is a Law about marching and demonstrations and it applies to everybody. The students have no special licence to march and demonstrate. The Law says what should be done when anybody wants to march, and if it is not done they breach the Law, and when they breach the Law the Authorities of the Constabulary and other peace-keeping agents will apply to them as to anybody else.

The Government rejects the complaints about the conduct of the Police. The Police acted within the Law and the Police were acting in the interest of the security of Jamaica.

Sir, I want to say two more things. One: students or anybody else who are foreigners or visitors to this country, who are guilty of misconduct in this country, are not welcome in this country. (Applause by Government Members).

And I want no misunderstanding about this matter from any quarter. Whether they be students or adults. Whether they are visitors, temporary residents in this country, they must respect the people of the country and they must respect the Laws of the land. Those who are guilty of breaching those requirements are not wanted, are not welcomed in this country and by this Government.

I think I would like to also put on Record, Sir, that I had originally on Monday or thereabouts informed the President of the Guild of graduates, that I would be willing to meet two of them tomorrow morning...

The Speaker: This morning...

Mr. Shearer: That is so, it is morning now... this morning. At that time the looting—when I took that decision the looting and the massive destruction of property and assault of people had not taken place. Since then it has taken place, and in view of that development and the abnormal conditions obtaining in the University, I do not propose to meet any deputation from the University students to discuss this or any other matter until normalcy is resumed at the University. And I will have to re-examine the question of the composition of the deputation if they want to see me. This matter is a matter affecting Jamaica, Jamaica's reputation, the Jamaican Nation, the Jamaican

people, the Jamaican security. I do not see myself discussing the matter with anybody other than Jamaicans. (Applause by Government Members).

So, Sir, having made the Government's position clear, I just want to say that I note that despite the hasty, irresponsible and mischievous statement of the Opposition, they have now agreed with the Government that the Government is justified to ban Walter Rodney.

So far as their Amendment is concerned, that we should take more appropriate action at an earlier stage, they are not in a position to criticize either the amount of action or the kind of action. The Government rejects that. The Government rejects the criticism of the manner in which the issue was handled; the Government with all the facts at its disposal! The Government is totally satisfied that what was done was exactly right. The manner in which it was done was exactly right and it is exactly right in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. McNeill: Mr. Speaker, I see no need for carrying this debate further. I think all that is needed to be said has been said and I now formally move the Resolution standing in my name.

The Speaker: Now there has been an Amendment to the Resolution. I will put that now. The Amendment seeks to add the following sentence to the substantive Resolution:

"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 final action was taken." That is the Amendment; those in favour?

The Motion for Amendment was lost without division.

The Speaker: I now put the Resolution. Those in favour?

The Resolution passed without division.

Mr. McNeill: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Adjournment of the House until 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday next.

The Speaker: Before I put the Motion for Adjournment, I would like to say that this has been a most important debate for Jamaica and it has been conducted with a great deal of restraint by all those who have taken part and I congratulate them on it. I now put the Motion for Adjournment.

Motion for Adjournment passed.

The House accordingly adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (October 18, 1968) until Tuesday 22nd October, 1968, at 2.15 o'clock in the afternoon.