
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 12th December, 1980.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met on Friday, 12th December, 1980 at 2.45 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc. (Econ.); and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Meeting is called to order. I am advised that there are no Minutes ready for confirmation.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the guarantee of the repayment by the Barbados Development Bank of a loan of U.S. \$7,750,000 from the inter-American Development Bank.

I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Barbados Development Bank Act.

I also have a number of other notices to give, Sir, but they have not arrived here yet and at the appropriate

time before we rise tonight I will ask Your Honour's permission to give notice of these at the appropriate time.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, a Bill to amend the Barbados Development Bank Act was read a first time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the Instant Order of the Day.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20 and 42(5) for the remainder of this Sitting.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Item No. 1 be the First Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 1.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Order No. 1 was called – To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. ODLE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

HEAD 35 — MINISTRY OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY

Subhead 1: General Administration

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this sum is required to supplement the Head in respect of Overseas calls and telexes and revised rates of utilities as well as a Telephone allowance to the Parliamentary Secretary. At the time of the preparation of the Estimates, the Parliamentary Secretary's telephone was paid from the Ministry of Housing. As hon. members would become aware, the Parliamentary Secretary ceased to be assigned to the two Ministries during the course of the Financial Year and is now solely responsible to the Ministry of Trade.

In addition to that, Barbados was this year, during a part of the Financial Year, Chairman to the Latin American and Caribbean Organisation, known as SELA. They had their Annual Meeting in Venezuela and by virtue of the Chairmanship of that Meeting, the Ministry of Trade, through its Chief Economist had to act as co-ordinator for the purpose of that Meeting. A number of overseas calls and telexes therefore had to be undertaken. Under the terms of our Agreement with that Organisation, these are not refundable.

We also have had to pay an increase in the rate of electricity like everyone else in Barbados and it is anticipated that for the balance of the Financial Year this sum is needed to pay for the utilities.
2.55 p.m.

In respect of subscriptions and contributions, this year the Estimates were cast in a form where each Ministry was responsible for the appropriation of the cost of Barbados' membership in international institutions. The figures that were supplied at Estimates time were estimates provided by the Ministry of External Affairs. Subsequently because of changes in currency values, a number of our contributions have to be paid at a higher rate. It is therefore necessary if we are to honour our obligations to these international institutions which come under the Ministry of Trade.

I beg to move that Head 35 — Ministry of Trade and Industry stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know, and I am not being facetious, I am being very serious about this, since when Ministers have adopted a Royal plural in referring to themselves. I did not know that the Parliamentary Secretary referred to here was a Parliamentary Secretary of the Minister. He has explained that the Parliamentary Secretary, whoever he was, was formerly attached to two Ministries and now the Parliamentary Secretary is attached to himself. If you look at the explanatory note, Sir, you will see that under Item 5 — Utilities, the sum of \$8,850 is required to supplement the provision for Utilities due to an increase in overseas calls and telexes, revised rates of utilities, a telephone allowance payable to our Parliamentary Secretary.

Now that is a designation that is reserved for Her Majesty the Queen only, unless the hon. member is now considering himself Queen of Barbados. So I think one should be a little more careful in arrogating to oneself these titles of "our" Parliamentary Secretary.

Then we come to the question of telephones. There is a situation here now with the Telephone Company and Cable and Wireless (Barbados) Ltd. dealing with overseas calls. I am not reflecting on any vote of the House. The House has decided that the Minister may designate the rate and the proportion of rates paid in respect of the Telephone Company and to Cable and Wireless Organisation. It must be over six years now that negotiations have been going on between the respective Governments and Cable and Wireless Ltd. Officers were specifically allocated to straightening out the multiplicity of legal and other accounting procedures which would be necessary to separating Cable and Wireless from the parent organisation in the United Kingdom.

In places like Trinidad and Tobago, the overseas communications are managed by the Government. As far as I know the same thing applies in many of the Windward and Leeward Islands, and in Jamaica and in the Bahamas. It seems to me an inordinately long period of time. Somebody is dragging their feet. I am not accusing the Government because the Government has no expertise in these transfer pricing arrangements that go on between multinational corporations such as Cable and Wireless, but if we have officers who claim that they have specialised knowledge, the statute of limitations is going to catch up with them because my recollection is that it must be over six years, because it certainly was at least two years before the change of Government in 1976 that we were negotiating with Cable and Wireless to repatriate all overseas communications. Therefore I would like the Minister when he descends from the royal plural to try to explain to me... (Asides) Could you ask the hon. member to keep quiet? He is being obstreperous all the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should like the Minister to inform the House what is the state of the negotiations between the Government and Cable and Wireless. I am not going to enter into the merits or demerits of the proportions that should be given to the Telephone Company and Cable and Wireless because it is a very complicated matter, but it seems to me that the sooner that we consummate the expressed desire of both political parties to repatriate our overseas communications and have them firmly under our control, then we would not have this kind of problem cropping up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If no other hon. member wishes to make a contribution, the Hon. Minister may reply.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I take the hon. member's point about the wording of the Addendum. I want to assure the hon. member that I am neither a King nor a Queen and I have no desire to be either. I think that the wording should have been to "the" Parliamentary Secretary.

Now with respect to the question of Cable and Wireless, it is a great pity that the hon. member was not here last week when that Bill was being debated. I think that would have been the appropriate time for the hon. member to raise these questions, the files would have been here and the Hon. Minister would have been in a position to reply to them. The position with respect to Cable and Wireless and its international connections and its relationships with host territories is one which has given many Governments a source of great dissatisfaction. The Governments of Trinidad and Tobago and of Jamaica solved the problem when Cable and Wireless put proposals to them for the purpose of building a satellite external communication system. Of course at that time this Government was led by no less a person than the hon. member himself, and that was the appropriate time for a decision to have been taken once and for all to vest the overseas modern telephone communications system in a statutory company of which the Government was a majority.

Regrettably we find ourselves in a position in which the hon. member permitted and allowed and gave specific permission to Cable and Wireless to bring in the satellite station under the old methods of accounting, so we are now in the position that we have to unravel matters which, had the hon. member been vigilant and had he really wanted to carry out the policy now espoused of ensuring that these matters are within the domains of Barbados, we would not be in our position. In the meantime we have made it very clear to Cable and Wireless that we are not having any argument with them about the sharing of overseas revenue. The prerogative of fixing a relationship now resides in the Minister. Cable and Wireless took the Hong Kong Government to court

over this matter. We gave the parties sufficient time to settle it between themselves, and as the Bill clearly shows, the unravelling of the accounting system of Cable and Wireless is a very difficult matter. The Bill now empowers the Minister to ensure that an accounting system is set up so that we will know the true assets of Cable and Wireless in Barbados, we will know its position in relation to its income and expenditure, and then that decision can be taken. As the hon. member should realise by now, this is a Government that is not afraid of taking decisions. We are not like the other Government.
3.05 p.m.

We took a decision with the National Bank, we took a decision on.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW rose.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: What am I being interrupted on, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the hon. member rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Government did take a decision.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member risen on a point of order?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. The hon. member suggested that when the Democratic Labour Party was in Government that we did not make a decision. If he checks the files which he admits he does not have he will see that we made a decision. It was a question of separation, but we put officers to work specifically on that exercise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I find that very strange, because when Cable and Wireless awarded the contract to Clarence Johnson Construction, when the land at Bath was sold by the Government to Cable and Wireless for the earth station, in the hon. member's time.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The land was sold by Mr. R. DeC. O'Neale to Cable and Wireless and not by the Government to Cable and Wireless.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, when the land was sold by R. DeC. O'Neale to Cable and Wireless they would have had to get planning permission. The hon. member's Government would have been in a position to know what was the cost of the land, one of the assets. He would have known what was the position of the capital cost of the satellite station, the assets in relation to external communications. If they intended at that time to localise external communications, they could have done like what

Jamaica did, like what Trinidad did, and say that we are not allowing external communications to go into an advanced stage of technology except you form a separate company and the Government of Barbados must be the majority shareholder. I well remember the hon. member saying that he does not believe in that kind of thing, so do not let us talk now, what unravelling now? That was the proper time to take the decision, that was the time they were starting fresh, they were introducing a new system. It gives me the impression that they really did not want to do it, Sir. No wonder nobody can remember seeing anything like that on the file about one decision being taken. This must be a decision that was subsequently taken by the hon. member and as usual, suffering from his usual amnesia, he now remembers that he intended to take such a decision, not that he took it.

I beg to move that this stand part, Sir.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe since Cable and Wireless comes under my Ministry that I should make something clear. Last week we debated the amendment to the Cable and Wireless Act in this Chamber, and as the Leader of the House has said, it is a pity that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who was Minister of Finance in the last Government was not in Parliament to make his views known at that time. But I have had the chance to peruse the files on Cable and Wireless and I can assure this Hon. House that the suggestion did come from Cable and Wireless that the Barbados Government should buy 51% of the assets of Cable and Wireless at that time, and that the sum to be paid should be paid out of the profits. On the file they had asked to see the accounts and there are on file several letters in which Cable and Wireless contended at that time that their accounts were all kept in London, and accounts for individual countries were not kept separate and apart.

The only thing that happened at that time when the earth station came into existence was that a new agreement was drawn up between Cable and Wireless and the Barbados Government, and one of the terms in that contract was that before any expenditure could be carried out, any refitting of the earth station could be carried out, approval would have to be obtained from the Government, and that is the only thing in the file to indicate that the Government was ever interested.

I go further and say that the Government at that time said it was not interested in Cable and Wireless, because it was not on the recognised chain of communications, Barbados is outside the recognised marine chain of communication, and that is the time when they had the opportunity to buy into Cable and Wireless, which was not done. (ASIDE). I have the file, and your Cabinet took a decision.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: But you should have been here last week.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: You were not here last week, you were....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We must not have cross talking, please.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The hon. member is famous for sitting down and saying things. I would like to bring the file and re-open it here, or I will send copies of the correspondence to the hon. member. But he does not remember the truth of the matter, he must not say it is lies. I have just dealt with the file, they had an opportunity to buy into Cable and Wireless. Jamaica bought into Cable and Wireless, Guyana bought in, Trinidad bought in, and Barbados was the only Caribbean country that had an opportunity that did not buy into Cable and Wireless. They allowed the earth station to be put in and a long agreement was drawn up as to how the finances should be dealt with and how the refitting should be done, because in the agreement it showed quite clearly that they would have to refit the earth station when the System 5 Satellite came into operation, which they are about to do next year. So he cannot say it is all lies, he knows that there are two sets of satellites up there. He knows the present earth station can only accommodate one, and there is the launching of a new satellite, which means that all the stations in the Caribbean would have to be refitted, and if at that time they were really interested in localising Cable and Wireless they had all the opportunity of so doing, and it is amazing, Mr. Chairman, that Cable and Wireless closed down its training centre in Barbados, the then Government exchanged the area at Dover with Cable and Wireless at Wildey. All of that went on during his time. They closed down the training centre because they reduced staff in Barbados, and the limited amount of training that is done is now done in London, and that happened during his time.

They have not hired anybody at Cable and Wireless in the last eight years, since 1972, and that happened during the DLP's time, so why come in here and say things which he knows are not true? The exchange of the land was a big deal. They built a new road in Wildey to accommodate Cable and Wireless, and it was all done with Government's agreement. They took over the old building and changed it into a conference centre; all that in conjunction with the building of the earth station at Bath, so what is he talking about? Do not let me go on about Cable and Wireless, Mr. Chairman. The junction at Wildey that had been considered dangerous from the beginning, a crossroad where several lives have been lost, several accidents have occurred; Town Planning even

refused it and they overruled it with a Cabinet Committee in order to put Cable and Wireless there. Town Planning said the building should not be sited in that way. They built a new road to separate Cable and Wireless and Courtesy Garage. After they overruled it by a special Cabinet Committee to put down a set of traffic lights, which have never been put down, I could bring a letter showing that Geddes Grant wrote that Government and offered them facilities to make the corner safer, and they even ignored that. Geddes Grant has just renewed the offer to this Government to put up the traffic light system there.

Do not let us go into the history of Cable and Wireless now, there is a lot that can be told.

Mr. TAITT: On this matter of Cable and Wireless, Sir, I believe that in so far as some of the technical aspects of Cable and Wireless are concerned that I am probably the only member in this Hon. House capable — well, not capable, Sir, but knowledgeable — in some aspects, and therefore qualified. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. (ASIDES) Order, please! The hon. member who is on his feet is talking across the floor, he is certainly not addressing the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: I am trying to address the Chair, Sir, but I cannot even hear myself. The fact is that the hon. member just said, and seemed to suggest some implied criticism of the previous Government because Cable and Wireless — and to quote him — closed down its training centre.

3.15 p.m.

Now, Sir, that statement would be misleading not only to hon. members in this House but the people of Barbados. First of all the technology for the sending of messages by Cable and Wireless had changed. The total technology changed and we have left out the old dots and dashes and went to five unit code. For those reasons the foolish little school that used to teach people how to read the Morse Code and do three unit takes, and change dots and dashes in wireless, that school.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. I do not want the hon. member to go wrong. He must recognise that Cable and Wireless not only train people in dots and dashes. They train a whole bunch of Technical Officers who are still now complaining that they cannot be registered under the Engineers' Registration Act passed by that Government so let him talk about that whole spectrum of training in Cable and Wireless.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to deal with this matter in as calm a manner as possible. The hon. member has demonstrated that he has no idea of what he is talking about.

It is obvious to anyone who has even the remotest idea of the technology involved in the sending of messages that the Cable and Wireless at Wildey is a far cry far removed from the Cable and Wireless which he has been talking about. Furthermore I have heard this Government praising — especially when they opened it and subsequently — praising the Conference Centre at Dover and saying what a marvellous piece of machinery has been brought to Conferences in this country. I have heard that Government talking about the transformation and quality of the Conference Centre and I go further.

I have heard the hon. member for Christ Church South Central indicating that the property on the beach in Dover is property of high quality and high value. I have heard him say that and for the hon. member to look at a piece of rab land which was standing at the "Y" and which everyone concerned had agreed was a good exchange with the Government getting the better of the exchange when the land was exchanged and furthermore, in this Honourable House there was not a pip out of them when they were in Opposition because (a), they did not understand it and (b), those few who thought they understood it approved of it and now that they are in Government because the Rt. Hon. member for St. John has raised a valid point regarding financing the External Accounting of Cable and Wireless, he gets up and attempts to make political mileage of a matter that has nothing to do with politics.

The fact is, Sir, that for a Minister responsible for the Utilities, a Minister responsible for Communications, to get up and talk about the closing down of a Training Centre at Cable and Wireless is to demonstrate a total lack of understanding of what he is supposed to be doing. The fact is that when Cable and Wireless closed down the old Dots and Dashes Centre, they did not at any point call for any retrenchment of staff.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe the hon. member has some training in dots and dashes.

Mr. TAITT: Well, Sir, I do not wish to brag about my training, Sir, but since you have raised it I was an "A" Operator both in Wireless and also in Dots and Dashes. I am an "A" Operator and furthermore I have sufficient technical qualifications that I can talk about it freely but that is not my point, Sir. What is the important point is that when they went to five unit, all those persons who had been trained in the five unit were retrained but the technology that is required to operate the five unit is a far cry from the technology which was used before and all of the persons who are presently working at Cable and Wireless were retrained in using the five unit code, including your humble servant, Sir. That training takes six weeks whereas the other training takes six months.

When they moved the Training Centre, as he calls it, from Dover, they included a different kind of training, a higher training for Barbados. Instead of our going to a Training School and deluding ourselves that we had been trained technologically, what they did was to send everybody, including Barbadians, Englishmen, Maltese, they all went to a proper Technical College in London so that the ones who..... Cornwall, Cornwall, before you get up.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order. Cornwall.

Mr. TAITT: The hon. member can say Cornwall. I am saying that now Barbadians go to Cornwall like all of the others whereas the Assistant Engineers used to come out from England and we were trained how to send dots and dashes. We are now trained technically in the same way as they used to be trained so that we have persons who have gone through the secondary system in Barbados who leave the secondary training and when they join Cable and Wireless now, they go straight into the Technical College at Cornwall and if you look at the people who man the Earth Station, if you look at the people who man Boarded Hall, if you look at the people who man Wildey itself you will see that in all of the technical areas now, Barbadians are the persons in charge or nearly in charge.

I can understand if the Hon. Leader of the House made a mistake or two in this field. I can understand if any other Minister over there made a mistake in the field but for the Minister of Communications and Works who should be *au fait* with the facts if he must talk about them would get up and seek, I would not say deliberately, Sir, through a lack of acquaintance with the facts to mislead people in Barbados is wrong, Sir.

To talk about closing down of the Training Centre is to mislead because the so-called Training Centre that was closed down is something that had been brought from a basement in a house in Maxwell. It was moved from a basement in Maxwell to a house in Dover and eventually it was moved over to Wildey.

In so far as the property at Wildey is concerned, it does not appear to me that the hon. member could be serious that the investment which Cable and Wireless was called upon to make into this country in its building of that complex at Wildey, is something that the Government ought not to have agreed to.

To talk in terms of the placement of a traffic light and furthermore to suggest that the Town Planner had denied something and that the Committee had approved it is again to mislead and to give wrong information because the way in which the decisions were made had

nothing to do with the Town Planner making a decision which went up for review. The Town Planner served as an Advisor to a Sub-Committee that was responsible for planning decisions and therefore to suggest that the Town Planner made a decision and the Sub-Committee over-ruled it is to mislead the people of this country.

It is nothing at all like a Government that makes a decision, sends it out to people and then turns around and rescinds that decision and then seeks to find all kinds of silly illegal reasons for they having to turn it around. It is one thing for a Government to offer itself to the population and to use a sleight of hand or a sleight of tongue. It is another thing when seeking to justify decisions it has made and going overseas with its information to write some of the nonsense which I have seen in the Newspaper alleging to have come from the Prime Minister. I do not believe that the Prime Minister wrote that at all.

The Windows to the Sea decision made by that Government....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot. I must rise on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The contribution made by the hon. member would have been very much in order during the debate which we had the last date on this matter. I have given a lot of latitude but I do not intend to re-open a debate on that issue. I believe that this has been well covered. I will now put the question. You have dealt, I believe, with the matters which were raised by the Hon. Minister and I permitted you to reply on that score. 3.25 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: As Your Honour wishes.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There are two points, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: You cannot let him talk.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have to talk. Don't tell him he can't let me talk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Chairman said that I had wound up.

Mr. TAITT: I was not finished, so you can't get up and talk.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You are not running in here, man!

Mr. TAITT: You can't run it either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Order on the Opposition benches.

The Minister has a right to reply and I will hear the hon. member, the Deputy Prime Minister.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Of course I have a right to reply. The hon. member got up and spoke after you had asked if any other hon. member had a contribution to make, and common decency would let him understand that the Government having given me the indulgence to allow him to speak, that he should have no right....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What point of order?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Chairman has ruled.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot have a point of order coming after my ruling. You will please take your seat.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member does not even know the Rules. The position is this: the hon. member has not replied to the fundamental question that was raised on this side, that at the time when the decision was taken for Cable and Wireless to establish a satellite station in Barbados, the then Barbados Government could have acted as the Government in Trinidad, the Government in Jamaica acted then and demanded that a new company be formed for external communications and that the Government would be the majority owner. They did not act so. That is the point we are making. The hon. member has not dealt with that issue; he has dealt with a lot of peripheral issues.

The question that Head 35 – Ministry of Trade and Industry – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 40 – CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Head 40 – Cultural Affairs – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have an unusual request to make of hon. members. The Addendum itself sets out the purpose of this supplementary. The property concerned is being sold at public auction next week. The Government of Barbados has not so far been known to be interested in the matter, and I am told that it may have an effect on the price.

Hon. members who have been following recent correspondence in certain overseas newspapers will be familiar with the entire matter. It is the intention of the Government that if it acquires this property that it will be made available for researchers as set out in the Addendum. The intention is to do this through the University. A Minister is at present in London seeking an accommodation with another CARICOM Government also extremely interested in this property.

If hon. members and the press would be kind enough to co-operate by not compromising the potential price and other matters, I would be obliged. I can only ask a favour, but the Addendum certainly sets it out. I think all hon. members of the House should have some idea of what the matters relate to. A number of them are of very great historical importance to this Island, very very great historical importance indeed, and some of the rest of the property is of even greater importance to certain of our CARICOM partners. Obviously if the Opposition does not agree, we will have a whole debate, but I am just suggesting that if the Opposition agrees and the press can be forbearing in this matter, hon. members would perhaps allow me to deal with the matter at greater length at some other time, but it is entirely in the hands of hon. members.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now I just want to make our position on this side clear, Mr. Chairman. What is your problem, Sir? Can I assist you in any way?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If I can help the hon. member....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not heard a motion from the floor of this House with respect to this Head.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Obviously you want me to sit down.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have not made a motion as yet because I don't know what hon. members are asking. They can ask for it to be postponed.

I will move that Head 40 – Cultural Affairs, stand part.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can now address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The position on this side has got to be made clear. I will ask the hon. member who just sat down not to make any appeals to us on any

matter for secrecy or confidentiality because I had a very bad experience with him during the debate on the Estimates from which I have not recovered. My credibility with my colleagues has been destroyed by the actions of the hon. member asking me not to discuss certain matters relating to the Defence Force in the national interest and then doing something which I never believed that I would sit here and witness. So that whole thing about his appealing and this kind of thing, don't worry to appeal to me, don't write any letters to me — I am warning the hon. member — or send any messages to me about anything like that. (Asides) Will you ask the hon. member to shut his mouth?

I have never seen the Codrington Papers. Christopher Codrington was a slave owner. He has done something for education in this country by establishing Codrington College. He owned a slave farm in Barbuda where he picked out the most strapping examples of African manhood and put them there to breed like rabbits. I do not know what Christopher Codrington is, so miraculous are his papers. If there is an auction, this is what I am suggesting; this Resolution has no right in here at all, because all you needed was a token vote of one dollar and then authorise the people whoever your agents are in London to compete and then come in here and convince us that there was material in the Codrington Papers that would be valuable to the people of Barbados, not the esoteric exercise going on at Cave Hill with researchers, most of whom probably would not even be Barbadians presently. \$260,000 for moth-eaten letters because I suppose that is what they mean by the Codrington Papers. You know detective story writers now write somebody's papers and this body's papers which you see on television and this kind of thing. All right; Sir Christopher is part of the history of Barbados, but if he wants the press not to say that the Barbados Government is interested....(Asides)

You see what really set me up was this confidentiality business.
3.35 p.m.

If he wants the Press not to publicise what they are entitled to publicise, the proceedings of the House, go ahead and bid for them and then come in here and say this is an emergency thing we want done in all its stages because we owe the people \$250,000, but all he needed was a token vote for one dollar. The Government has \$5,000 under this Head, so this appeal is flowing right over our heads. If the hon. member has seen the papers and he is satisfied that it is something of importance to the people of Barbados, let him go ahead and buy them when he convinces us, but there is a famous saying that you do not buy a pig in a poke, and you do not buy old papers locked up in a closet either, because when you think you are inheriting a will you may be inheriting somebody else's will.

That is all I wanted to tell the hon. member. Do not worry to appeal to us because we are not listening.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw something to the House's attention. Today at 12.30 I happened to be in my car listening to the news from Radio Antilles and the news item suggested that there were three Caribbean Governments interested in the purchase of these papers. It mentioned Barbados, Antigua and another Government which I do not remember, it may have been Trinidad, but I certainly heard the Deputy Prime Minister of Antigua, Mr. Lester Bird, speaking on the radio say that they were trying to get hold of the papers because the papers were of the greatest historical value to Caribbean people. That is the position of the Antigua Government, they have made their position public.

From what the Deputy Prime Minister of Antigua said today, it seems that there is great worth in these Codrington Papers from the point of view of research and from the point of view of enabling especially the black people of this region to trace their roots, perhaps with less difficulty than Alex Hailey was able to do in his famous book, *Roots*.

If because of the sensitivity of negotiations the Prime Minister does not want any further discussions at this stage, I understand that there may be a public auction and I am willing to accede to that, but I just wanted the House to be aware that another Caribbean Government who is interested, through its Deputy Prime Minister, is making the thing an open business now.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am very grateful to the hon. member for that, because it shows the fact that the Government has been well advised as to the value of these papers, but there is only one thing that the hon. member in the course of his speech said which caused me a little concern. It appears to me that the hon. member is afraid or ashamed of his roots or origin. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You speak for yourself). It appears so. It is a known fact that all of us came from slaves, we ought to be proud that you descended from a slave and became a Prime Minister. It shows that you were part and parcel of a great race, we should not be ashamed of that, we should be proud of that, and that is why the Government is interested in showing to the world that we know our origins.

Now, Sir, I will also say this on the point that the hon. member has raised. Some of us may appreciate and some of us may know the value, some of us would like to be in a position to purchase the value, but we feel that these papers should be in the Caribbean. We feel that every step should be taken to ensure that they reside within the Caribbean area.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is no point not replying, Sir, the hon. member if he has lost credibility with his party must understand that that is something in his character, not in mine. If I have such power that I could destroy the credibility of the Rt. Hon. Errol Barrow with his own followers, well my goodness gracious me, he should not even be trying to fight an election. (ASIDE).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Order. Please address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member's record of untruths on public platforms is now enhanced by his even going on the television and not just telling a lie by writing it up on a board, so there is nothing I can do to damage the hon. member's credibility with anybody. If the hon. member for St. Michael has turned so hostile.....(ASIDES) The hon. member for St. Michael South West is trying, as is his wont, to get me to attempt to humiliate his leader some more. I am not going to be led astray, you tell him that Cox was not a Minister, do not tell me, you should have told him before the Press Conference.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What the hon. member heard me saying was that there is no need to try to bamboozle the public, that everybody in Barbados knows that Cox was a Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: But the hon. member was a Minister too. He should have written up Taitt on the blackboard as well, he should have written up Sandiford on the blackboard. I do not know why he did not. Nobody could suggest that he was a Minister at the time his name was written up on the blackboard; nobody could suggest that. Anyway, I have to be kind to the hon. member. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Don't worry to be kind to me). (ASIDES).

Mr. Chairman, Sir, there was a vote for property acquisition, this vote has come on to supplement it. I am obliged to the hon. member for St. Philip North for mentioning what he has said in his speech, perhaps no great harm will be done, if I have to confess to something I have to confess to caution in my administration of the

financial affairs of this country and try to keep private and secluded things that are to be private and secluded. The hon. member for St. John, perhaps what the hon. member for St. James says about him is very wise and well said. It is best to deal with him as you deal with the Devil, keep him at very long arm's length.

If today, for whatever reason, the hon. member considers that the Codrington Papers should become the subject of publicity, it is entirely up to the hon. member, it would not be the first time he tried to do Barbados harm. The Codrington Papers, since we are talking about them, since I am being asked if I am familiar with them, I am in fact familiar with them. I have a list at home of the documents concerned, their dates, the persons who wrote them, the purport of the material. I have had this list for some years, soon after they were catalogued by the Gloucestershire Record Library, soon after they were found at Doddington. They have an interest which is historical, which is also of great interest to the postal history of the West Indies, again for what it is worth. The papers involved include a copy of the Will of Sir Christopher Codrington, a Will which still occupies our attention in Barbados today in so far as we have the Codrington Estates here, and Lodge School is one of the properties whose history is analysed in these papers and is concerned with them.

The hon. member obviously does not care for his roots, but I am told that the Codrington Papers, the exact expression used I believe is that they are important to the history of Barbados, integral to the history of Antigua and indispensable to the history of Barbuda. 3.45 p.m.

The slaves in Barbuda may very well turn out to be the only African community in the entire Western Hemisphere who can trace their families through all the vicissitudes. Since these papers include regular list of the slave inhabitants of Barbuda and a great number of all the slave inhabitants of Antigua, perhaps as much as a quarter of all the slaves in Antigua who were ever brought to the country are listed in these papers. A number of the slaves in Barbados are listed in these papers.

I, myself, do not know of any comparable collection of source documents for the history of the African as a Caribbean Island comparable to these papers. It may very well be that the anti-intellectual

instincts of the Democratic Labour Party fostered by the fact that in the last public opinion poll not one single university graduate could be found to say that he was going to vote for the Democratic Labour Party. You can ask Dr. Farley Brathwaite. That fact is well known to members opposite and therefore they are engaging in a little preliminary abuse on the graduates of Cave Hill. Cave Hill has its eccentrics but it also has a large student population who deserve a little better than the accontempt with which they were treated in the speech of the hon. member for St. John.

I do not regard the study of the Codrington Papers as satiric or unnecessary or as things that will be of interest only to academics. I, myself, was given a copy of a book called "The Codrington Papers" by a Mr. Robinson Lowe who wrote it and researched it. I, myself, have had very long hours of enjoyment having to look at the different letters and summaries of the subjects that they contain.

I cannot help it if the hon. member finds other pursuits from his eerie days at Cave Hill such as those indicated *sotto voce* by the hon. member for St. James when the day comes. I cannot afford the time to carry out garbage for anybody. I prefer to sit down at home and improve my mind in its own service and the service of the people of Barbados.

The item is there, Sir. I do not believe that certain other Governments are in the same position of Barbados to acquire these Papers and I think that it is a contribution to our cultural history which we should be glad to make.

I beg to move, once again, Sir, that the Head stand part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 40 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 44 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is for a sum of \$21,720 and it is to supplement grants to the Hostel at Black Rock. There is a Hostel at Black Rock, Sir, and the cost of running it as anticipated at the time of the Estimates provision was under-estimated and it is necessary that we supplement it to ensure that the work that is carried out there is carried out in an adequate manner.

I beg to move that Head 44, Item 2, stand part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON BOUNDARIES AND DESIGNATION OF CONSTITUENCIES

Order No. 2 was called – to move the adoption of the Report of the Select Committee on Boundaries and Designation of Constituencies.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in moving that the Report of the Select Committee on the Boundaries be accepted, I do not want to spend a great deal of time going into the details of representation in the House of Assembly in Barbados over the centuries. Sufficient to say that the origins of the House of Assembly are to be found in the year 1639, that at that time there were either 20 or 21 members, that in a few years time, Sir, there were definitely 20, that St. Joseph was then organized as a parish and had two members so that we had 22, that in the House of Assembly will be found a book setting out details of all elections to the House since, I believe, 1650 of everybody who has ever been a member, that these details indicate that from 22 members in the 1640's or 1650's were moved to 24 in 1843 when Samuel Jackman Prescod took his seat as one of the two members to the newly created City of Bridgetown seat, that in 1964 there was a Select Committee to the House which recommended increasing the number of constituencies from 12 to 24 and reducing the number of members in each from two to one.

3.55 p.m.

After seven years and an intervening election and some other boundary changes these recommendations were put into force, that there have been population shifts since that time, and that a Select Committee all of whose members deserve the thanks of the House has now reported that the number of seats be increased to twenty-seven. Coincidentally with this has been a shift in some boundaries, re-alignments and of course the changes necessary to produce another three seats in the heavily populated metropolitan areas of central and northern Bridgetown and St. James. That is the bare bone of the entire matter.

There are, however, Mr. Speaker, certain essential features of all boundary re-alignments in all parliaments all over the earth at all times. I say without any fear of contradiction that no boundary alignment has ever passed through a Parliament anywhere without the side which was in minority complaining about the changes made even if they were made by a completely outside commission, far less if they are made by the side that was in the majority, and it is unfortunately necessary to put up with accusations from persons who have nothing else to say, that the exercise of constituency increases and boundary alignments owes more to politics than to representation. We have had to go through the argument which I must confess, Sir, is unusual, I do not say it has never been heard before, but we have had to go through the argument that to give people more representation is to take away their rights. I have heard many things, but I must confess I have never heard that before, but I would not say it has never been said. We are hearing that to give people a greater number of persons who can put a case for them in Parliament is somehow to take away their political rights, and other sensible people, people otherwise sensible have allowed politics so far to divert them from reality as to repeat this argument or seek to sustain it.

We have even heard it said, and this is a much more widespread view and more honestly held, that to increase the number of seats in Parliament is to impose a burden on the taxpayers. Well, Sir, anything imposes a burden on taxpayers that involves Government spending. We have just passed a vote for increased salaries at the Black Rock Polyclinic; we have just passed a vote to buy the Codrington Papers. The increased salaries at Black Rock of course exceed the cost of a new member of Parliament and the Codrington Papers exceed the cost of ten members of Parliament. Just to take an example of the relative triviality, and I use that word quite deliberately and without any apology, to give an example of the relative triviality of the cost of a member of Parliament, consider that a large Datsun or Toyota motorcar imported into this country carries as much tax on it as will be the cost of an MP for a year, so if we want to recoup the cost of three new MPs, we can give Courtesy Garage a licence to bring in three Datsun 280s. It is as trivial as that, and I am glad that hon. members are joining with me in laughing. The cost of a Mercedes comparable to that owned by the hon. member for St. John, a new one, would pay the cost of three MPs in terms of the import duties and the consumption tax. I am not suggesting that the taxpayers had to pay for the hon. member's car. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have no cross-talk, please. The hon. member will address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member will understand I am elucidating a point. I honestly would

have to say if you add up the cost of a member's salary, a member's allowances, what it cost to feed a member — they give \$12 a day for feeding members, 50 times a year, so even if you say that you give them tea and dinner sometimes, it costs about \$7 000 to \$8 000 a year to feed a member; the salary is \$1 400 a month, the allowances are \$500; the cost of pensions: suppose you calculate it at 20%, what amount would you get in the end? \$25 000 did it cost to keep a whole member of Parliament for a year?

Hon. members must come with a better argument than to suggest that three MPs are some kind of burden on the treasury and that the removal of the three MPs will make things easier in Barbados. Let us have a sense of balance; let us understand, and I repeat, let us understand that the tax the Government gets when a big motorcar comes into this country, one, is enough to pay a member of Parliament's salary for a year, feed him, give him an allowance and contribute to his pension eventually. So let us get away, Mr. Speaker, from any emotional argument that this somehow relates to a burden that the taxpayers can feel. There is no way that the taxpayers can feel a burden of \$50 000 or \$75 000, not divided among 250 000 taxpayers paying as they will this year perhaps \$400 million plus in taxes. We must carry honest argument to the electorate.

Politics itself will be debased if you try to trivialise issues to people who are trying their best to understand the real issues that lie before them. To suggest that to increase the membership of the House of Assembly is in any meaningful or sensible way at all by three seats a burden supportable or even noticeable is to trivialise politics; it is to pursue an issue in the belief that it contains some popular element to try to justify it by using arguments which may possibly bear for an evening or two the examination of a popularity test cannot bear a test in logic. When the Government came in here and sought to guarantee a loan to International Seafoods, the eventual ramifications of that were sufficient to pay the entire cost of all the members of Parliament, the Senators, the Ministers and all their travel and everything for a period of ten years. One bad Government investment can carry the cost of all of us for ten years, and at my age and after this country has been independent fifteen years, I have to come in here and hear that three members of Parliament will break a whole country.

4.05 p.m.

That is what we call trivialising politics, and those arguments I dismiss with contempt, and I am ashamed to think that decent, sensible, intelligent hon. members like the hon. member for St. Michael South may be forced to make them in the interest of his party and in the interest of grasping at an argument that appears popular, when in his heart he has to be sensible enough to know that it is

nonsense and decent enough to be ashamed he has to say it. I would respect hon. members on that side, I cannot expect it from the hon. members for St. John or St. Michael South Central, I would respect hon. members on that side a good deal if they tell us that we gerrymander constituencies before they tell us that we put a burden on the taxpayers, because you can get down into the guts of politics if they are accusing us of fixing boundaries for political rather than demographic reasons. It is the duty of an Opposition to say that even when it is not true, if you want to hear. Hon. members will like that, Sir, and notice the hon. members who laugh. The hon. members for St. Michael South Central and St. John, they want to hear it is their duty to tell a lie, because that is what they enjoy more than anything else in life. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You had better speak for yourself).

Now, Sir, the number of seats. On the 20th day of March, 1955 the hon. member, the senior member for St. George, then a Mr. E. W. Barrow, gave notice of an address in the House in the following terms:

"The House of Assembly consider that in order to give fuller and more equitable representation in the General Assembly of this island legislation should be introduced at an early date to provide for a reallocation of seats on a population basis of one seat for a unit of 3,000 voters."

When the hon. member was elected to the House of Assembly, the present hon. member for St. John, in September 1951 as senior representative for the parish of St. George, the electorate at that time was just a little over 95,000 voters. By 1955 the number had reached 100,000 and in the general election of 1956 in which he lost his seat, the number was 103,000. So the hon. member's views, the Leader of the Opposition, in 1955 were that the House of Assembly should have 33, 34 seats depending on how the voters' list was on the particular date. Three thousand voters was enough for the hon. member at a time when Local Government still existed in Barbados. At that time for the hon. member, but no doubt later on he is going to say that 6,000 is not enough in 1980.

You had the Vestries then, I do not think there had then been a changeover, you had not had the Maude Report, St. George had a Vestry, St. Thomas had a Vestry, there were 11 Vestries in the island with annual elections; you had a Legislative Council and you had a House of Assembly, and the Leader of the Opposition, then the senior member for St. George, said that you could have one M.P. for every 3,000 voters. You can look it up in the records of the House, it can also be found in the Advocate newspaper for the relevant date, but something has changed in the interval. Is it a sea change into something rare and strange? What type of change is it? Or is it a change of principle just based upon the change

from being a Government member — I suppose he was a Government member then, perhaps not — into an Opposition member? What has happened in these years, since the Leader of the Opposition said that you should have one M.P. for every 3,000 voters to 1980 where apparently one M.P. for every 6,000 voters is not the right proportion?

Since then the hon. member has abolished the Local Government system. The Local Government system took care of local roads, garbage collection, street lights, welfare. You did not go to your member of Parliament in those days if you wanted a street light or a tenantry road made up in the greater part of Barbados, you did not go to your member of Parliament if your daughter could not afford a pair of shoes or a school uniform, you went to your Vestryman or your Local Government representative. If the garbage was not picked up you did not go to your M.P., you went to your Vestryman or your Local Government Councillor. That, as far as I can see, is the chief thing that has changed, but now in 1980 faced with a situation where the constituency of St. Michael, North West had over 10,000 voters and the constituency of St. Joseph had less than 5,000 voters, we meet a situation where necessary changes are impugned not only on the grounds perhaps of boundaries themselves but on the ground that there was no need for an increase.

I can really say no more about that, Sir. I am looking forward to hearing the hon. member for St. John explain the change in his views since 1955. I am looking forward to hear him explain why in 1955 in order to give fuller and more equitable representation in the General Assembly of this island legislation should have been introduced at an early date to provide for reallocation of seats on a population basis of one seat for a unit of 3,000 voters, I want to hear why those views have changed. Remember, Sir, that even at that time the number of voters would have dictated more than 30 seats, and we are looking for 27.

Now, we look at the report of the Committee itself. The Committee was faced, Sir, with pressure of population in Christ Church and St. Michael, and I think that all hon. members, and particularly the Chief Electoral Officer who assisted us and to whom I wish to pay very high tribute, approached their task with seriousness, honesty and a very fair consideration. We were not able, after the first meeting, to achieve the consensus which at one time appeared likely. Reference to the Minutes of the Committee which have been laid in the House will indicate that the openness of mind which attended our earliest deliberations had somehow vanished by the time we came to consider the final elements of the change.

I do not wish to embarrass the hon. members for St. Lucy and St. Michael South West, and I will therefore only thank them for their faithful attendance at the meet-

ings and the contribution which they made to our deliberations.

4.15 p.m.

You know, Sir, they are going to talk on this Bill. The hon. member for St. Lucy is going to be peppery, quarrelsome, forceful, accuse you of gerrymandering, tell you how he voted against all but two of the boundaries. He even voted against Christ Church East Central because we had changed the name without changing the boundary. He is not going to tell you that at no time in the Committee did he ever tell us we should not have put Brereton in St. John, neither he nor the other hon. member. I know that that is one to catch him at.

Those two hon. members will at no time be able to tell you that they objected to putting the Ivy into St. Michael East and Carrington's Village into St. Michael South Central. No objection was raised by them but they are going to come in here and be violent, be forceful and you will hear the hon. member for St. Michael South West. You are going to hear him. The only objection which he made to anything we did was when we decided to change the name of his constituency from St. Michael South West to St. Michael West and we even made a joke with him that he had been bowled because he had already had the T-shirts and now we had bowled him again because he had the stationery for the forthcoming Election and he would have to change the constituency name on it. We made that joke with him and it was a joke encouraged by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Now, Sir, I would also like to thank, Sir, the Deputy Clerk of the House, Mr. Brancker, for the care with which he wrote the Report and represented the views of all hon. members. I am very glad to say that we were able to reach unanimity on the Report, not on its conclusions, obviously, because there was disagreement on the number of seats but we were able to agree that the way the Report is set out that it very accurately represents the views of a majority and the views of a minority. The majority prevailed throughout. We only had unanimity as far as what the new constituency should be with St. Andrew and St. Lucy.

The Report sets out very fully the majority view. The minority view expressed by the hon. member for St. Michael South West was that the 24 seats could be divided equally. The methodology which we approached after the first meeting when all of us said we had an open mind, was to ask the Chief Electoral Officer to prepare a series of different scenarios. We took evidence from him first and the Chief Electoral Officer gave us his opinion that the Island could not be divided into 24 equal constituencies without great dislocation of the present boundaries and he recommended 28 seats. We asked him to

prepare sample divisions for 24, 26, 27 and 28. When we came back we looked at the 24 and the 27.

Now, the hon. member for St. Michael South West said of the 24 that the City did not have to be made so big and that we could shuffle about the boundary areas in St. Michael to reduce the size. He did not refer to any of places. I pointed out that if you wanted to bring St. George up to size and St. Joseph up to size that you would end up with St. George in the middle of Welchman Hall, St. Thomas and you might end up with St. George South probably in the Ivy, almost certainly in the Ivy. These were all of the arguments which were raised. We took a vote. We agreed on the 27 by a majority. All of this is set out in the Report, Sir.

Page 8 points out that the Chief Electoral Officer recommended that the most practical and equitable distribution would be into 28 constituencies. The actual words of the Committee Report, Sir, are these: "The Committee considered Appendix B, 26 seats, C, 27 seats and D 28 seats of the Report of the Chief Electoral Officer and by a majority vote accepted the proposal for the division of Barbados into 27 constituencies based on Appendix C with amendments with an average electorate of 6,101 voters for each constituency and an allowance of a 10% deviation from that average." That is how the Report sets it out.

I think, Sir, that most of us by now have read the Report seeing it affects us. It does not affect the hon. member for St. Lucy or the hon. member for St. Andrew. Virtually, it does not affect the Deputy Prime Minister, the Hon. Leader of the House but I better perhaps set out for the benefit of the public some of the rationales which affected certainly myself and I think others of the majority.

The Parish Boundaries sometimes give difficulty because they go through villages and they go through Districts and the only people who know where one particular house lies are the people who live there and who by reputation have heard that they live in St. Michael rather than Christ Church or St. Andrew rather than St. Thomas. We have not straightened out all of the anomalies by any means but we have tried to straighten out some.

We rationalise the boundary between Christ Church West and St. Michael South in the King's Village area and some other area. I am not familiar with these, Sir, but I just want to say that some of these boundaries I know because I just read them at the Committee. I have not been anywhere on them or made any analysis. The Chief Electoral Officer was asked to rationalise the boundary between Christ Church West and St. Michael South and it was rationalised and I read it and I accepted it because I have trust in the Chief Electoral Officer. I have trust

in Mr. Smith. The boundary was rationalised, I believe, and an area called King's Village is put all in one District rather than being divided. Sir, I do not even know if it is Christ Church or St. Michael. I just know that a straight thing was made.

I am told that a straight thing was made also in the Britton's Hill area between Christ Church and St. Michael and that carried over into another constituency where a road boundary was found in the Clapham area between Christ Church and St. Michael, Sir. I think there has been some movement of population up there. Christ Church West has been getting a little big with other rationalisations and a boundary was found.

In the City of Bridgetown, Sir, we have pushed the boundary out to certain well defined road boundaries, Hall's Road, Martindale's Road, Collymore Rock and St. Paul's Avenue right down to Beckles Road and the sea on the one hand and on the other hand out to President Kennedy Drive.

I believe, Sir, that the hon. member for St. Michael South West can tell you more about that boundary than I can, boundary at President Kennedy Drive. I believe so. Certainly, I only know that a rationalisation was made. This is a boundary that has often been changed. Just before the last election the City/St. Michael boundary was carried out to Pickwick Gap. That happened, I believe, in 1971. On this occasion, because of the City population getting smaller, it has been carried out to President Kennedy Drive which is perhaps a more rational boundary than Pickwick Gap anyhow because the people who live on both sides of Pickwick Gap are the same people. Pickwick Gap does not represent any social, geographical or cultural cut-off point in the way that President Kennedy Drive does so the whole area will now be enclosed by Westbury Road/President Kennedy Drive.
4.25 p.m.

Indeed Christ Church East Central — I am going down the list as set out in the Report — is one of the smaller constituencies. I think it is the 25th largest, and the reason for that is quite deliberate. We have left it small because the Kingsland-Wotton area is one where I think Key Homes and another building company have received planning permission for a great number of house spots and are building. We can say that the population will rise there and we have therefore made provision for population increase by not making the seat too big at the present stage.

It is worthwhile knowing that out of the four seats in Christ Church, three are among the four largest in the Island. The Christ Church seats are very big seats and perhaps the Chief Electoral Officer knew better than us when he suggested 28 because it may very well be

that the Christ Church seats should have been reduced somewhat in size by the addition of another seat, but that will be for the future as I will say before I end.

The next point noted relates to St. Philip South and North and the Four Square Valley. Four Square Valley was an area with a few votes geographically located in St. Philip North, but in fact you could not get to it from any part of St. Philip North; you had to drive through St. Philip South to get to it. We have accordingly put it into St. Philip South. It should always have been there, Sir. The two St. George seats were seats with insufficient voters. It was therefore suggested and I accepted it that areas of St. John which are closely associated culturally and otherwise with St. George could be added to the two St. George seats. A piece, I believe the area is Todds and Cherry Grove, I do not really know the areas, was added to St. George South, and another area whose name I cannot even tell you, I do not know what the generic name is, but it was bounded by a road, was added to St. George North, and these additions have done something towards bringing the two St. George seats up to the standard of 6110 voters. St. George North would now have 6 077 and St. George South 6 176.

There were special problems in St. Joseph. St. Joseph was much the smallest constituency, but it adjoins another relatively small constituency St. Andrew. It adjoins St. Thomas relatively large and St. John relatively large. It appears obvious that it could not get votes from St. George which itself needed votes. The Chief Electoral Officer had originally recommended adding three villages and half of a fourth village in St. Thomas to St. Joseph, but I was able to prevail upon my colleagues that you should not divide a village, that is Proutes Village, and so we bent off a little bit from the Chief Electoral Officer's recommendation and we added a few hundred votes from St. Thomas into St. Joseph. Now this still did not bring St. Joseph up to anywhere near the required number, and you could not go any further into St. Thomas without taking in what is after all the biggest and most significant district in St. Thomas which is Welchman Hall, and we therefore added from the other large constituency adjoining St. Joseph which is St. John, parts of Venture, again the map will show, but the northern part of St. John which shares the cliff; Hackleton's cliff shares estates established on the high cliff region of St. Joseph. Again, Sir, Venture is a divided village; part was always in St. Joseph, a part was in St. John. The people's cultural attachment rests with the plantations at Hackleton's cliff rather than with the seaside of Martins Bay and so on or the peasant holders of further south. That is the rationale of adding Venture rather than Martins Bay. Either could have been done, but the two ran into each other across a boundary that goes through Venture and that was chosen. This then made St. John too small because the number of voters

in St. Joseph, St. George, St. John and St. Thomas were not quite enough for five seats.

The hon. member for St. Michael South I think will see the logic and I am addressing my remarks to him because he has indicated that he is to be the principal Opposition spokesman on this matter. He will see the point. St. Thomas, St. Joseph, two in St. George and St. John did not have enough for five seats. Having shuffled them around, you needed more voters. We decided to add these voters from the only other place which was St. Philip. The numbers fitted very precisely. There is an isolated village in St. Philip called Brereton next to an isolated village called Ebenezer. You had that choice; you had the choice of taking the boundary down to the road to St. Philip Church or you had the choice of taking in Blades Hill and Bayfield. Blades Hill and Bayfield would have had too many voters. To take it down to St. Philip's Church would have divided Church Village, St. Philip. Brereton is a village isolated from St. Philip North and South alike that you have to go through St. John. People seem to forget Bydemill and Featherbed Lane are in St. John. Bydemill is in all three parishes, and we decided to take an isolated village and add it on to St. John. There it is. (*Asides*)

I would not doubt the capacity of certain hon. members when in power to do the very things that they are now accusing us of. They would not accuse us with such force if they had not done them themselves. In any event hon. members who know the district well will recall that Kendal Tenantry, St. John was largely moved down to Featherbed Lane on the border between St. John and St. Philip North, so the people from Brereton and Ebenezer, the people from Kendal Tenantry, Edgecliff Tenantry, Bydemill constitute one agricultural community in the south central part of Barbados, and I would say this: you may well be able to have your choice: try them St. George, try them St. John, try them all St. Philip, but it is one agricultural community consisting of a number of plantations in, I repeat, the south central part of Barbados; but the demographic considerations on this occasion pointed to a certain area.

Now to come to St. Thomas, in St. Thomas the boundaries have been rectified so that the area to the west of Highway 2A has been added to St. Michael North. There are not many voters there. In fact there may not be any voters there unless a couple of houses have been built very recently in Clermont. The area north of that has been added to St. James South. That would be a dozen houses I suppose, and Highway 2 has been used as the boundary up to the point where it meets the division between St. James North and South and then turns down; so that Bagatelle Gardens has been added to St. James North. There are alterations which have been made in St. Thomas. I beg your pardon;

it is St. James South. I am confusing myself. I am not even sure of some of the boundaries myself, Sir.

I think there could have been other changes made in St. Thomas. I personally think it very odd and anomalous that on Mount Hillaby Tenantry road you drive through St. Andrew for half a mile, you drive for 150 yards in St. Thomas and then you are back in St. Andrew, so there is a little group of houses in the middle of St. Andrew surrounded by St. Andrew consisting of parishioners of St. Thomas, but as the Chief Electoral Officer pointed out to me when I said this to him, he said in the fullness of time a Boundaries Commission can make extensive recommendations for correcting this sort of anomaly.

St. Andrew is unchanged, Sir. St. Peter; the business of integrating a small part of St. Peter with St. James North. St. Peter had too many voters and St. James North too few. Opportunity was therefore taken to find a road boundary between the two which would add some voters to St. James North.

4.35 p.m.

I will come to the division of St. James in a moment, so that we have taken the St. James North boundary up to the Scantlebury River just north of Cobblers' Cove Hotel, but on the seaside of the road only, and then when it meets the Richmond to Bakers Road, it goes up the Richmond to Bakers Road and meets another road boundary. Again, that is not a big alteration, Sir, 175 voters.

Now, St. James is divided, Sir, into two. The two constituencies in St. James are relatively small. Efforts have been made to supplement the population of St. James North. At one time, Sir, it was under consideration the keeping of Paynes Bay, I think, in St. James South, the whole of St. James North would go further to the north, but we strove to maintain the status quo as far as we could in relation to parish boundaries.

The division is Holders Hill, and turning left to the top of Holders Hill towards the St. Thomas boundary, because St. James South broadly speaking is the Cave Hill Development area. It is the smallest constituency by a considerable margin and the figures in the Cave Hill — Oxnards — Husbands — Paradise Heights — a little piece of Cave Hill itself, Hinds Hill area, I believe, pieces of St. Michael, but all part of the same bluff. The coastal district of St. James, plus the upland districts of southern St. James, the former Husbands and Oxnards Estates. That is really what St. James South consists of plus Holders Hill, which is now a boundary.

We have left the number small in St. James, Sir, because there are known to be something like 500 new voters awaiting transfer to the Haynesville Area, because the housing estate there has been expanded. Hon. members perhaps don't find themselves taken to Durants Village, upper St. James, the upper part of the Cave Hill Development, and they should perhaps drive up there and see the beautiful houses for the workers which the hon. member for St. James has built on the ridge overlooking the St. James coastline, houses which I believe a private realtor told him look like tourist accommodation rather than National Housing Corporation houses at \$25 per week. The valuation put on them is \$200 per week if they were being built and rented out privately. That is the kind of accommodation that the hon. member is giving to his constituents on the beautiful ridge at Holders Hill, but numbers of houses are being built and it is expected that the new electoral lists will show these new residents of St. James South.

I have covered, Sir, the out parishes and a little piece of St. Michael. I can really say very little more about St. Michael, except this. When you are adding one or two seats, or even realigning to make new boundaries in a metropolitan area, you can make many choices. You can decide to put the boundary here or put it there. Inevitably the choices you make are not going to be found agreeable to everybody, but I very honestly and sincerely believe that no sitting member can possibly have any complaint about the alteration made in St. Michael. Really from the bottom of my heart, Sir, I would have to say that if any sitting member complains, he would have to complain of God. I am not suggesting that the deliberations of the Committee were particularly informed by Divine intervention, Sir, but we have tried to create seats of the same size. Where we have created a small seat it will be found to be in a growth area, like St. Michael North, where we have created a relatively large seat, as the new St. Michael West, it will be found to be in an area where there is not much room for growth.

Many hon. members will no doubt feel that given a chance they would make a slight alteration. The hon. member for St. Michael North West pointed out that he will be losing the vote of such voters as the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, as well as many of his canvassers, because St. Michael North West is divided. I have no doubt that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central will find something to say about the new boundaries, I do not believe the hon. member for St. Michael South could have too many complaints, but nonetheless, Sir, I dare say that he will argue that he would have like Dunlow Lane, Nelson Street, Belleville, Highgate, and so on, places that he perhaps is not averse to discussing at a different stage in these proceedings, but we have done the best we can in St. Michael. The seats in St. Michael now vary from just under 6,000, two seats are over 5,900, two are fairly well under 7,000. The biggest is

St. Michael West which really does not correspond to anybody's seat, because it is an amalgam of a number of seats and it has 6,600 voters.

The small seats — well, I cannot call St. Michael East small with 6,000 voters, very nearly average — in fact, Sir, you cannot really say any seat is small. St. Michael North East is probably one of the smallest but there is plenty of room in St. Michael North East for possible developments in the future, if the water zone problems should be got over. St. Michael North is a growing constituency. I think they are the two smallest, St. Michael North West also is a growing constituency, but there they are, Sir, we have done the best that we can.

We have changed a number of names to correspond more precisely with their geographical positions. The central seat in St. Michael, the most central of all, is now called St. Michael Central. It consists of pieces of St. Michael North East, St. Michael South East and St. Michael North Central, those three old constituencies, it is a new seat right in the middle of St. Michael, and we have put circular names around them. The seat that is west of the north is called West Central, the seat on its east is called St. Michael East, the seat to the north of that is called St. Michael North East, St. Michael North then is away from the two; a seat to the south of it is called St. Michael South Central, a seat on the west of it is called St. Michael West. The only seat really to the South West of it is the City, and we prefer to keep the name City of Bridgetown for the City rather than change that to St. Michael perhaps South and change the present St. Michael South to South West, but we have made the names more realistic.

In Christ Church, Sir, Christ Church West which was a small seat has taken over the Rendezvous area from Christ Church North Central, which was one of the largest of the seats. We were very surprised to find a number of voters that we did in Christ Church North Central, very surprised indeed. There have been some adjustments along the coastline as well.

Christ Church East Central has the same boundaries. Christ Church East, which would have been a very large seat, the very largest if we had not removed some of its voter, has lost its eastern part to join on to St. Philip South which has then given a piece of its eastern part to St. Philip North.

I think I have covered the entire spectrum, Sir. Now, Sir, I said I was going to deal with gerrymandering. I have learned, after bitter experience in here, how dangerous it is to wait to answer people. I have also learned that certain things can be said without any justification, and you can even say that you have no justification, and they will still be treated seriously. I read in the

Nation newspaper that the Leader of the Opposition had called the report a cynical exercise in naked political gerrymandering, and when he was asked if he had read the report he said he did not know what was in it, he had not read it yet.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, the proper exercise is, if you are drawing attention to anything that appeared in the *Nation* Newspaper, that you should be presenting to me a copy of the Newspaper and then you would lodge your report. We have had over two weeks ago a similar exercise and we went to a lot of trouble inside this House and we are trying to avoid this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Perhaps I should not dwell on that but I would just say this that there are certain types of irresponsibility nearly all of which has been demonstrated by the Leader of the Opposition on some occasions past. I should say, Sir, that I cannot believe that the Leader of the Opposition could be so irresponsible as to criticize the Report, criticize the motives of persons who presented the Report and who were responsible for its contents and then when asked said he did not know what was in the Report.

I would have to regard a man, not as being less than a man but as being nothing at all. Finding something to say he then betrayed himself by saying he did not.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member has not produced the Newspaper and then he goes on to misquote what was said in that Newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is not now discussing the Newspaper.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He did say that I said something to the Newspaper, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: As soon as I drew it to his attention what the position respecting the Newspaper was, I think he tried to sail away from the Newspaper.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He is sailing too far away from it, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry about the hon. member, Sir, but we do make these slips sometimes especially when we reach threescore years and

Mr. SPEAKER: There will be no cross-talking.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: When we reach threescore years and one, Sir, the memory cells are getting eroded. Mine are getting eroded now, Sir. I am sure that when I am that age that mine will be in worse condition.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are addressing the Chair, now.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hope I will have sense enough to keep my mouth quiet.

Now, Sir, if an hon. member is going to use the word "gerrymander" and he is going to say that there is something in this Report that reflects a gerrymander, I want any hon. member who says that to ask the Chief Electoral Officer for the number of voters registered in the then constituencies of St. James and St. Andrew in November, 1970. He will find that in St. Andrew there were 5,732 voters. He will find that in St. James there were 5,716 voters. There were 16 voters difference between the two seats.

At that time St. Andrew contained the districts of Orange Hill, Baywoods, Endeavour, Rock Hall and all of that area and it also contained Spring Head, Sion Hill, perhaps a little piece of Rock Dundo, St. James, which are parts of St. James and the electorates were equal in the two places, 16 people difference, no more than that and I sat down in that Chair that the hon. member for St. John is now occupying and writing so industriously from and he stood up at this microphone and with my own two ears I heard him saying that it was necessary to transfer the districts of Spring Head and Sion Hill from St. Andrew into St. James. Two constituencies of equal size and he found it necessary, without a Select Committee, without a Boundaries Commission, without any discussion in the House, without consulting the hon. member for St. James, and he found it necessary to take something like 800 voters out of St. Andrew and put them into St. James and the result was that at the General Election of September 9, 1971, St. James had 5,787 voters and St. Andrew had 4,290 so he took two equal constituencies, a couple of months before the General Election and took 800 voters out of one and put into the other, two equal constituencies three months before the General Election of 1971 and took 800 voters out of one and put into the other.

Now, I suppose that it is only a coincidence that those 800 voters, there were not as many as 800 then, that they gave Mr. Bob Moseley all of the 54 voters in 1956 and gave Mr. Ellison Carmichael 110. I am sure that was only a coincidence and that the hon. member for St. James, my colleague on my right, got a margin of 450 votes over the candidates of the Democratic Labour Party in Spring Head and Sion Hill. I am sure it was only a coincidence because to have taken 800 voters, some number, but getting up to about 800, to have taken 800 voters, something like 20%, a little under 20%, out of a constituency and put them into another constituency when those voters vote in a certain direction in an election without warrant because two constituencies were equal in size, it has to be only a coincidence because if it was not a coincidence, it would have to be a wicked, naked,

hypocritical, vicious, nasty piece of gerrymandering. That is what it would be if it was not a coincidence.

If the hon. member knew that what he was doing was making one constituency big and another constituency small by removing the Labour Party's voters from one constituency and putting them into another three months before a General Election it would be a stinking, disgusting, nasty thing to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, I believe you would wish to polish your language.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will withdraw the words stinking nasty and disgusting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: And I repeat, Sir, no warrant. If the constituencies were unequal, it would have been a different matter. I am not accusing those who originally put Orange Hill and Spring Head into St. Andrew of gerrymandering. Now, note the difference. I am not accusing anybody of gerrymandering because St. Andrew was small and St. James was big.

I am aware of the decisions that went on in 1964. I am aware that there was a choice between dividing St. James into two and dividing Christ Church into four if you were not going to increase the seats. I am aware that there was a question in 1964 of dividing Christ Church into three and St. James into two. I am very familiar with that.

I am aware that one of the members of the Democratic Labour Party who sat in the then Roebuck Street and worked out some of the boundaries to present from the background for the Select Committee was Mr. Eric St. John and he was accused, they said "wait, you mean you made four constituencies in Christ Church so that your brother can get one". I am aware of that and ask the hon. member for St. John if he is not aware of it too that that accusation was made but I do not call any of that gerrymandering because in retrospect, looking back on it I believe that an honest attempt was made to divide the country into 24 constituencies. A choice could be made. The Speaker at the time recommended having 30 seats which would have solved a lot of the difficulties including his own and Mr. Tudor's.
4.55 p.m.

There were various decisions that could have gone another way, but did not go another way. I do not believe that the first exercise had any dishonesty in it, but when I think, Sir, that we have gone the course of appointing a Boundaries Committee of this House, we have based ourselves on the recommendations of the Chief Electoral Officer and on the recommendations of

a Constitutional Commission, and I have to hear some talk about gerrymandering, some accusations of dishonesty from people who changed the boundary in St. Patrick's shortly before the last general election, and Thornbury Hill, Carters Gap, people who took Dunlow Lane out of the City and put it into St. Michael South, people who took Springhead out of St. Andrew and put it into St. James in no case having the justification of an equalisation of numbers, when I hear these people accusing us on this side of insincerity, I really have to say that wonders never cease, and that my father's greatest doctrine was that Barbadians have short memories.

I did not hear of any gang of three holding a meeting to protest the move of Springhead from St. Andrew into St. James, and yet I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central and Mr. Vernon Smith were all in the Island at the time. The gang of three made no protest. (*Asides*) That is why I say the gang of three. They are not in the doctor's pocket.

Mr. Speaker, the boundaries, whatever may be said about them, and I am going to have a lot to say in here and outside of here about the type of hypocrisy, violent and vicious hypocrisy that has informed certain criticisms outside this House — I can't say inside this House. I am going to have a lot to say about it. The apostles of violence walking about looking for violent people to achieve a violent overthrow of the Government and catching at every straw, trying to climb to power on a sea of hatred, trying to appeal to the worst in human nature to get power in this country I am going to have a lot to say about that. Physician heal thyself will be what I will say in the fullness of time. Heal thyself, give thyself some consideration in the fullness of time.

This report represents a lot of hard work by a lot of people. The devoted officers of the electoral department have walked these roads all over the Island at very short notice when changes have been suggested. They have gone out and they have identified areas, they have identified voters and numbers of voters so that the report can reach the House in this particular form. Such input into the movement of the boundaries came, I must say, from the majority because I did not hear, and I repeat, no member of the Committee sitting opposite us in the Committee room, and the Minutes will reveal this, I did not hear any member of the Committee object to one of the boundaries. I commend the report. I thank all hon. members who sat on the Committee I thank the Chief Electoral Officer and his devoted enumerators and office staff.

I beg to move that the report of the Select Committee be accepted.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I do not find it necessary to abuse anyone in order to make a contribution to this debate. If one wanted to compile a lexicon of all the words which should not be used in a Parliament, one would have to go to the hon. member who has just sat down.

There are just one or two things which I want to make clear. In the history of Parliament from 1639 until 1980 I was the person, and I am proud of it, who moved an Address for the first time in the history of this Parliament that the Island should be divided on an equitable basis of single member constituencies. Nowhere in the debates, Mr. Speaker, will you find at any time from 1951 when I first entered this Chamber until the present date have I suggested that there should be more than 24 constituencies. The hon. member juggles around with figures and said I said divide the Island on a basis of one representative for 3 000 voters, and therefore I was saying there should be 36 seats. The gravamen of my Address for single member constituencies, if a figure was drawn, was based on an erroneous impression on the number of registered voters at the time, and we did not have a continuous register until about 1965 or 1966. Only people who are concerned with trivialities will take this up, but when single member constituencies were introduced, the only person who was a member of this House, and I was still a member of this House, who suggested was the Chairman of the Select Committee which was appointed to rationalise the boundaries, and that was the then Speaker of the House of Assembly. So let us get the record straight.

If I was doing the mechanics and I wanted thirty or thirty-six seats in Barbados, I could have said so. I had plenty of opportunity to do so in 1955, in 1964, in 1965, in 1971 or at any time since I have been a member of this House. I do not want to go into that. What I find interesting, to take up the hon. member where he has just left off towards the closing moments of his Phillipic, although I cannot really equate him with the orator Demosthenes in the level of his debate is that the very constituency that he complains against the geographical delineation of the boundary of St. James and St. Andrew is the one constituency or the one that he has not interfered with. As a matter of fact, Sir, I heard him in the course of a broadcast saying that in the original allocation by the Boundaries Commission a certain part of St. James had been added on to St. Andrew because St. Andrew had such a small number of voters, and that what was done in 1971 was to give back to the parish of St. James what it had before.

The hon. member calls that gerrymandering and whenever, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants to justify anything that he is doing, he tries to find a

precedent. He likes to quote your humble servant, Mr. Speaker, as the authority for doing what he is doing. That is passing strange. Every single time, Sir, not once or twice or three times, but on every single occasion when he is in doubt that he is doing the right thing or he knows he is not doing the right thing, he goes back and searches the records of the House, searches the debates diligently or has somebody search them for him. He can come and quote here today that Mr. Eric St. John was accused of adding on a constituency for his brother and I know about it. I know nothing about that. He had better try and find out from the persons who gave him that information who was present if that ever happened.

5.05 p.m.

The hon. member comes in here and abuses me, abuses my party, says this, that and the other. This exercise, I make no apology for saying, as I said before, that it is an undiluted act of political chicanery. I am not going into any detail because it is unnecessary, we are unalterably opposed.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But I think the hon. member for St. John could hardly really mean that I sat here in this Chair and allowed the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to abuse his family.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To abuse whose family, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Your family.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I never said that, Sir. I never at any time said that, you are under some misapprehension, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, I am glad for you to put me right.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said I never said that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: What did you say?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: As a matter of fact, it is so far from what I said that I cannot even relate to what part of my speech I could possibly have said that, so you have me at a great disadvantage, Sir, a tremendous disadvantage. If I said the hon. member for St. Andrew it would be a different thing, but I never said anything about the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right. Continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: As I was saying, Sir, it is unnecessary for me to go into any kind of detail on this. You were Chairman of the Committee, an unbiassed

Chairman, and I do not think that you did not submit, like the former Chairman of a Select Committee, a minority report, and I do not in any way attribute any fault to Your Honour for what has transpired from the Committee, what has actually reached the floor of this House from the Committee, because it is very very clear to me that the Government had made up its mind what it wanted to do in order to secure what it wanted secured before the Committee ever sat. This is patent, because it was rumoured abroad, it was in the public domain exactly what was going to happen, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, that is again a reflection on the Committee. You are suggesting that the Committee was a rubber stamp committee.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying that the Government had made up its mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are saying that the Committee was a rubber stamp committee.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not use those words, Sir, I said the Government had made up its mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree you did not use those words, but it is exactly what you are inferring.

Rt. Hon. E. BARROW: Can I explain what I said, Sir, for your edification and benefit?

Mr. SPEAKER: It might serve a good purpose.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I am saying, Sir, the Government had made up its mind what it thought should be done and they managed to get the Committee to go along with it; the majority of the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want the House to understand we are here debating the report of the Committee, which is a majority report.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Correct, Sir, and not a minority report, and as I was pointing out that not even Your Honour felt yourself constrained to publish, as a previous Chairman had done, a minority report. You did not deem it necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Chairman of a Committee will only follow the best precedents, only the best.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: In other words, you feel that the Chairman should be impartial and not try to superimpose.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I maintain I will follow only the best precedents.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I agree with you, Sir, that you may have views far divergent from what has emanated from the Committee, but you did not feel yourself constrained as a Chairman to interfere with the majority will. Does that rightly reflect your views, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us debate the Committee's report. It is a majority report.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. I appreciate everything that Your Honour has said, it is a majority report. What I did say at the time, you misunderstood me, Sir, was that the majority report coincides with what was noised abroad as the Government's view on the reallocation of the constituencies. That is all I have said, Sir, I am not casting any reflection on any members of the Committee as a Committee.

I heard a lot of specious arguments advanced, that it does not cost so much. We have heard that argument in relation to a lot of other things, but every drop that goes into the bucket causes the bucket to overflow eventually. Every straw that is added to the bale eventually creates a burden that breaks the camel's back. There is no point in arguing to me, and treating us like children over here, that a salary of another member is less than the cost of the tax on a Datsun. We know that the Government is flooded with taxing motor cars, but the Government does not pay any tax on Datsuns, and the rest of the community is not so fortunate as to get a licence even to buy Datsun motor cars, although a lot of Toyota vans are on the road giving competition to the Transport Board.

What I am saying is this, Sir. There is no point in telling a legislator that this is a trivial amount of money, the principle of the thing is what we are unalterably opposed to. If you say that \$50,000 does not matter here and \$50,000 does not matter there, and the increase in Ministers' salaries — we heard it at the time when the Ministers' and parliamentary salaries, our salaries, everybody's salaries were increased — that the cost of Parliament is infinitesimal as compared with this, that and the other, but we still do not have enough money in Barbados now that we can underwrite our capital works out of current expenditure. I am not saying that we will ever achieve such a state of affairs, or that it is even entirely desirable, but we are borrowing money year after year, so we do not have all this kind of money to fling around and have this high style of living and that kind of thing. The expenditure on the salaries of members of Parliament is only one aspect of the increased expenditure. The elections are going to cost more, furniture is going to cost more, staff will cost more, everything will cost more.

We live in a small island. The one argument I did not hear today, which I have heard previously, was that six or seven thousand people, Ministers were overworked, people come beseeching them and beseeching parliamentarians with all kinds of complaints and that kind of thing, and the workload was getting too much for parliamentarians. I did not hear that argument today, I heard a very oblique reference to the abolition of Local Government. I should like to know this. What Local Government Councillor could in any way compare his duties with those of a parliamentarians? I have not taken over any duties of any Local Government Councillor in St. John, because you have a Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, you have a Parks and Beaches Commission. (Hon. L. R. TULL: But I did). I know that the hon. member provides a lot of jobs for people in the School Meals Service in St. George South by dismissing other people and replacing them by persons of his choice. That is not Local Government work, that is a different kind of work altogether.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have never yet dismissed one single person from the School Meals Service, nor have I ever yet employed one single person in the School Meals Service.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I stand corrected, Sir, I withdraw. Like a good lawyer, I should say caused to be dismissed or caused to be employed, and the hon. member is quite correct to correct me, Sir.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In the time I was in the Ministry of Education just one single person has been dismissed from the School Meals Service, and that person came to me and admitted they were wrong and asked me if I would use my influence to get them re-employed. One single person, Sir, in four years and three months.
5.15 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I really do not want to waste time. It is not relevant to the debate. Those who know would know. All the ones who got notices that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We are dealing with constituency, boundaries.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But he was looking after constituencies within the existing boundaries and he said that he had a lot of Local Government work to do. What Local Government work is here that we have to take on? I really do not know. The Local Government used to meet and they had a limited budget and when the Local Government met they used to look after some parochial roads but the roads are not being looked after now by the Minister.

The majority of the roads used to be looked after by the Department of Highways and Transport anyhow and they had their limited budget and they met periodically and I suppose they felt fairly important and so on but you cannot compare the two lots of work and you cannot say that because of the abolition of Local Government that members of Parliament have more work because I have felt no greater strain because, as a matter of fact, the strain has been less on my constitution since the abolition of the Local Government than it was when they were existing either under the Vestry system or the Reform system of the Northern, Southern District Councils and the Bridgetown City Council.

Whenever one is finished, Sir, if the media kind of population was 6,700 and you look at this exercise, you will find that there are constituencies which are left with less than 5,000 and some with less than 6,000 and what we are maintaining is that within the confines going over the border here and there, St. Michael and its neighbouring parishes, the inordinate increase in certain Districts like, I think, St. Michael North East, could have been accommodated and redistributed within the confines of St. Michael and its neighbouring constituencies, that is all we are saying without doing violence to the electoral process as we maintain has been done in this particular exercise, and so you would have been able, Mr. Speaker, to maintain a balance throughout the Island.

Even now, Mr. Speaker, there are not two constituencies that have the same number, speaking under correction, because I am not reading the Report right now. There are hardly two constituencies that come within 100 or 200 votes of one another and some are as far out as 1,000 so there has not been a equalisation exercise. There was some other kind of exercise but not an equalisation exercise and for very obvious reasons that unless you are going to do what we used to call, Sir, in my younger days, Skinners and Potters with the whole map of Barbados. It would be virtually impossible to equalise the number of voters in the constituencies, however many there may be in Barbados, virtually impossible, so we are left with a situation now where within the ordinary process there will be six more.

When I mentioned this to the Press some time ago, the Prime Minister himself said that he never knew anything about it, that he had heard a vague reference in the Constitution Commission about increasing the number of seats and he did not know where the hon. member for St. John had got this outlandish idea from at that time. That was over a year ago but now we see the results of his innocence. We are debating the results of his innocence here.

There was also the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, of St. James in 1971, the same area which it was claimed

was a grossly, illegally or in some manner unlawfully detached and given to St. Andrew and it has not been returned to the fold. It is one that has been untouched, unscathed. It is the exercise that we carried out in the interest of equalisation at that time, therefore, it must have been correct.

Now, I am saying this, Sir, that if you are going to do any gerrymandering, you do not gerrymander for one person. Only Governor Gerry did that. Governor Gerry gerrymandered for Governor Gerry and he lost. My recollection is that he lost in Massachusetts. When you gerrymander you have to gerrymander because you want to stay in power so do not tell me that an exercise which restored lawfully to the people of St. Andrew the number of voters which they should have always had and vice versa with St. James which you have not.

You have gone into St. John and you have looped the loop into Brereton. You talked about Potters and Skinners. You looped the loop into Brereton and into Ebenezer, come up Featherbed Lane and then I listened to the Prime Minister with a great deal of interest. He said we have taken off part of Venture because of the cultural attachment but I never knew that people voted culturally when they voted at Elections. They vote for political parties. Their cultural affinity and attachment of the people between that part of the constituency which I represent and the constituency of St. Joseph. Then he give to the Chairman of Committee's constituency, St. George North, another part, those people from Wakefield Tenantry, Wilson Hill, Knight's Village and so on.

Then he gave to the Minister of Education himself, as if he did not have enough problems, a big slice of the South Western part of St. John in the Cherry Grove/Henny Tenantry area and so on. He attaches that to some of the most remote villages in that parish, Macaroni. This is more a spaghetti exercise than a macaroni one because at least macaroni is straight but this one is not straight at all. This one, Sir, was spaghetti.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the hope of a meal.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: So this is Macaroni Village and then having taken off three big slices of my constituency, goes into Ebenezer, down Featherbed Lane — I did not really intend going into this but I am only showing you the absurdity of the whole exercise — then having taken off those you have to try and make back up St. John to give me 1,300 voters from down inside the constituency of St. Philip North thereby relieving the member of St. Philip North of some of his anxiety and you say that is a straightforward exercise but then he goes back to me all the time.

Now, when I am finished up, Sir, I am 500 voters less. Having added on 1,300 one place, having taken off some in another place, all of that manipulation just to take off 500 votes. If he wanted to take off 500 votes, take off 500 votes. Take Edgecliffe, take Hothersol, take part of Venture or alternatively.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Alternatively, Mr. Speaker, go down to Massiah Street and take Montreiffe and give that to St. Philip but you do not come all the way up to Four Cross Road Corner and then go around Mr. Peter Morgan's wall, even the last house, three quarters of a mile away, and then shoot down the road at Clifton Hall and go right down around his wall and push over into St. Joseph.
5.25 p.m.

He does the same thing at the corner of Four Cross Roads in St. John, put the Bank in one constituency, the Fire Station in another constituency. He gives the Bank to the hon. member for St. George North because he wants more security up there I suppose; he puts the Fire Station with the hon. member for St. George South because he needs protection from fires, and he left me with a supermarket and the Telephone Exchange — four corners.

Mr. Speaker, when I speak like this I think I may appear to be in a jocular mood, but I am not really in a jocular mood. I really do not think that this exercise really has done credit to this House. I do not think that the hon. member has done credit to the intelligence of the people of Barbados, and I would like to say this, Sir. You can take cattle and you can push them in a pen. In Jamaica they call districts like Bay pen and so on, meaning a district. Some of these pens are even voting districts in Jamaica. You see what happens in Jamaica. They are trying to corral the people of Barbados into pens like cattle. You can draw lines on a map, but because you count how people voted in a certain election and then you draw lines on a map trying to corral them into certain pens, it does not work that way in human affairs. That is the warning I want to give. You cannot treat people like cattle and get away with it because people will realise that they are being treated like cattle and they will react, because when they get in the pens, they can butt and kick and knock down the rails metaphorically. When they put their vote, don't care where you put them they will register their protest in that way.

I do not care how the hon. member construes my Resolution asking for single member constituencies, it was from an electoral point of view a revolutionary step to be taken in this Island in 1954 on the 22nd March

or whenever it was in that year when I moved that address to His Excellency, the first time in the history of Parliament in Barbados anybody ever breathed a word about it. They say that because I said in an off-hand way to provide for one constituency for 3 000 persons. That could never be for all time and at no time did I say that we were to have more than 24 seats; even when I was in charge of Government and we carried through an electoral exercise, at no time did I suggest it, and I opposed the idea put forward by His Honour for whatever reason he had at that time. You would understand what I mean. You do not have any reason for this thing. You do not have any reason to have it stay or go the other way, so you would not have to deliver any Minority Report, but whatever reason the then Speaker had we did not support it, in the same way that I do not find our way to support this increase for this and for an abundance of other good and proper reasons.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, in joining to support my colleague who has just sat down.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion when the hon. member for St. Michael South West was addressing this Honourable House, he took it upon himself to offend the dignity of this Honourable House. He will not be heard in this House until he shows some regard for the dignity of this House. In other words he will not catch my eye.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The same applies to the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if you can tell me in what way I offended the dignity of this Honourable House.

Mr. SPEAKER: All I want to hear from you is that you show some regard for the dignity of this House. No questioning whatever. I will merely ask you to leave unless you apologise; no word at all. In other words, as Barbadians usually say, your prayers and that's all.

Mr. SANDIFORD: All I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is in what way.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You do not question the Chair. There is one way you can question the Chair and that is by a substantive motion. If you have no contribution to make to this debate you can go.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am again asking in way I have offended the dignity of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot question the Chair except by a substantive motion.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Why can't I ask a question? I would like to know. You asked me to apologise and I would like to know.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of privilege, I think that as Leader of the Opposition members of the House are entitled to know if a member has offended the Chair. There are certain procedures outlined in the Standing Orders where the House can deal with a recalcitrant member which we are quite willing to observe, therefore, if Your Honour would indicate, we will be very willing to accommodate Your Honour in any proper ruling that Your Honour gives on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that Erskine May would be kinder to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition than I intend to be this afternoon. The hon. member for St. Michael South must apologise to this House, if not he will never ever catch my eye.

We must have some order. That is their contribution.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We are not allowed to make a contribution. I am surprised that I was allowed.

All members of the Opposition withdrew from the Chamber at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who want to make a contribution?

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the redesignation of boundaries has in my view, generated more discussion than is reasonable in terms of logic. Now this House of Assembly has always had 24 seats for well over 200 years. At the same time the voting population of Barbados has increased to such an extent that today's representation needs to reflect a more equitable distribution of representatives per thousand of population. If the principle which was accepted by the Opposition at the Select Committee is that as far as possible each representative should have a more or less equal number of constituents making due allowance for variation from a mean figure of 10% either way in terms of decrease or increase above the mean, then the next step for determining the number of representatives that could best give effect to the principle of equal representation would be to divide as far as possible the total number of voters in the Island by a number which would give more or less equal representation to one representative. It was I at the Select Committee, Mr. Speaker, and it is reflected in the

Minutes of that Committee, who proposed that there should be an increase in seats from 24 to 27.
5.35 p.m.

At the same time, at the first meeting which was held, it was decided to ask the Chief Electoral Officer to do an exercise based on a division of the island into 24, 26, 27 and 28 constituencies. The Minutes which are attached to the report clearly show that the Chief Electoral Officer at that first meeting made it very clear that it was his considered opinion that the fairest division of the island should be 28, but in so far as we had directed him to do an exercise on 24, 26 and 27, he was going to do it, but that if he had done an exercise based on 24 he was sure, even at that early date in September, that the result of an exercise based on a division of 24 would not have been acceptable either to the members of the Committee or indeed the nation as a whole. It was not possible to do it and at the same time obtain equal and fair distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I want it clearly understood that the Opposition members who sat on the Select Committee themselves agreed with one basic principle, that is to say, that parish boundaries established under the Parish Boundaries Act, that parish boundaries as presently known to Barbadians did not constitute a barrier to a realignment of constituencies. In fact, the word "barrier" was used by the hon. member for St. Michael South West. He accepted the principle that in realigning the constituencies one could cut across parish boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, you yourself will recall that for the avoidance of doubt at the last meeting of the Select Committee I asked again if my understanding of the Opposition's position that parish boundaries could be gone across was correct, and the hon. member for St. Michael South West assured the Committee that he had no quarrel with that principle. Now, having agreed that you could go across the parish boundaries, they cannot now complain specifically of Brereton, for example, and let me deal first of all with St. Philip North and get that out of the way.

Before I deal with St. Philip North I want to repeat the words of the Leader of the Opposition in here the day when this Committee was set up. Again, for the avoidance of doubt and out of an abundance of caution, He said on that occasion, Mr. Speaker, that the House has full powers to realign constituency boundaries, and he saw no objection to it. The Leader of the Opposition himself did not then oppose the realignment and readjustment of boundaries. Today you will hear something different. They were not then going to sit on the Select Committee, but when the team was being picked they volunteered two members.

When we came to discuss St. Philip North, indeed the parish of St. Philip, it was recognised by the two Opposition members that Foursquare Valley was an anomaly. It was pointed out that, for example, if I want to go from Church Village, which is presently in St. Philip North, to Foursquare Valley to see anybody in Foursquare Valley which is presently in St. Philip North, I have to go through Marchfield and Six Roads which are in the south to get to St. Philip North. What I have is on one side St. Philip North, in the middle St. Philip South, and on the other side St. Philip North, hived off by itself and butting and bounding on to Christ Church. One side of the road in Foursquare Valley is the north, the other side is the south. It was agreed by all of us in the Select Committee that that anomaly could not remain. You will well recall that the members of the Opposition said yes, they were in agreement, Foursquare Valley had to be put in the south or somewhere else, but it was not properly part of St. Philip North.

Now, Foursquare Valley, as part of St. Philip North, was a direct result of what they did when they were in power in 1971. They now come back nine years later and agree that it is necessary to rationalise that district. O.K., we rationalised it and put it on to St. Philip South. From St. Philip North therefore 200 votes are lost.

When St. Joseph was found to be too small, having regard to the mean of 6,100 voters, and you had to build up St. Joseph, you had then to bring people from the adjacent constituency of St. John into St. Joseph to bring them up to a more acceptable number, having regard to the accepted position, that the average constituency should be 6,100, give or take 10% on either side.

Having reduced St. John by the addition of those votes to St. Joseph, St. John now becomes too small, because at the same time parts of St. John had to go into St. George to bring those two up to the required number at points where they touch St. John more or less the parish boundary on the present parish boundary basis, so you take out of St. John persons to increase the number of voters in St. George, so St. John becomes a steadily contracted constituency.

All that was done in respect of Brereton and Ebenezer was to extend the boundary. Now this is how the present boundary runs, Sir. You come down Kendal into Featherbed Lane. You have about nine houses in Featherbed Lane which are part of St. Philip North, and next door to them all the rest of Kendal is St. John. All they did was to extend the boundary down to the main road, the Frenches — Chapel Road, turn left at Featherbed Lane, come up to the Y and go across below Chapel where there is a Cabbage palm walk, right down to Carrington Road, virtually it comes out opposite Carrington Factory, and put that on to St. John. In fact, all we have done is to add votes which were formerly nine or

ten houses in St. Philip on to St. John, extended the boundary down to Carrington and added them on.

The reason for that was in pursuance of another principle which the Committee accepted, and I mean all the members of the Committee, including the two Opposition members.
5.45 p.m.

That as far as possible you will retain communities as communities so that you would not take off a bit of Ebenezer and say that they are in St. John and a bit more in St. Philip. You retain Ebenezer as a community and you retain Brereton as a community.

What nobody seems to understand in the criticisms I have read, I have not heard any but I have read criticisms about Brereton. What nobody seems to understand is that having given up Brereton and Ebenezer I now have to take in parts of the South of St. Philip. They had a boundary in the Lighthouse Gap. One side of the Lighthouse Gap was mine, St. Philip Lighthouse and the other side was the South. What we have done is to have one boundary going up to the Lighthouse and on both sides of the road will be St. Philip North so I have taken in what is presently St. Philip South from Lighthouse Gap down to Long Bay Corner, across Long Bay Road to an imaginary line straight into Shark's Hole. Everything about that line, Sam Lord's Castle and so on are now in St. Philip North.

In the last Election that was St. Philip South and there is no doubt that Mr. Weekes beat Mr. Rouse in that area, Sir. There is no doubt. It is there to be seen in the Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is this Mr. Weekes.

Mr. SIMMONS: Sorry, Sir, the hon. member for St. Philip South.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for this House.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, the hon. member for this House. I apologise, Sir, so that I have taken parts of St. Philip which if you look at it from a party point of view did not support our party overwhelmingly in 1976.

Now I want to speak about 1971. Six weeks before the Election in 1971, there being no exercise such as we have gone through, that is to say a Committee of this House and let us remember one thing. When we came to deal with the increase in the seats, the Constitution of Barbados gives the House of Assembly ample power in Section 41 to increase the number of seats. Six weeks before the General Election in 1971 they put four

Square Valley into the South. They set the boundary for St. Philip....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are referring to the former Government.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, the former Government, the one that just walked out. They put Four Square Valley into St. Philip North. They used the Main Road as a boundary and said those living on one side of the road could vote in one constituency and those on the other side could vote in another.

In respect of St. Philip North especially in the area of Merrick, East Point and Linden Hill, Sir, you had people who lived on what should have been the South by law registered in the North and voting in the North. It was a new system which they introduced. I had a lot of evidence, Sir, and when I consulted the now Leader of the House about it, the names of people, the numbers and everything who had voted in the wrong constituency, I was told that you cannot do anything about it because they will say that it was an administrative error, computer problems and all sorts of things but the boundaries were changed in 1971 in such a hurry — I am not going to ascribe any motive — but in such a hurry that there was great confusion as to where people should properly vote and the result was that there was a lot of unfair voting in 1971.

It did not cease in 1976 and I want to tell you how I know because in 1976 at 5 o'clock when I checked the number of people who had voted in Brereton with the Polling Clerk the number of names that had been crossed out as having voted already at 5 o'clock 252 voters had allegedly polled. By the close of the polls at 6 o'clock 484 people were shown as having voted. In one hour the difference between 484 and 252 was made up.

Now I want to say this, Sir. At Bayley's School which was a Polling Centre, there was a lot of nonsense being talked about my having won by 7 votes. If the truth is ever going to be told and I am trying to find some of it today, I did not win by any 7 votes. That may have been an official thing like when the West Indies were beaten 2:1 in Australia in 1961 when everybody knew that the West Indies won the series because when Sobers caught Kline the Umpire said "not out" and when McKay was hit fully in the wicket the Umpire said "Not out" but the records would go down that the West Indies lost 2:1.

In the Bayley's area at about 7 o'clock in the morning I received a call to come over to Bayley's School in a hurry. I went, Sir, and I found the Presiding Officer of that School, an ex-policeman, an ex-Police Sergeant, Sgt. Sergeant sitting down at the Polling Station with the box right under him so and

the people in the line drew it to my attention that he was putting votes into the box and I behaved very badly. You know that I can behave badly when I am ready. I behaved very badly and asked him to move the box and put it away from him a little distance so that there could be no accusation. He asked me to move it. I said I am not touching the box, not me. I am not touching the box and I would not leave until I checked the table with the box on it and I told him that I would kick it down and mash it up and he saw then that I was being more ignorant so he moved the box and put it in the middle.

Now, I raise it for this reason that when it came to the time of counting the votes the night and a re-count was asked, two boxes the DLP candidate asked to be re-counted, that one at Bayley's where there was this unhappiness of infelicitous conduct at Brereton where 252 had voted at 5 o'clock and 484 had voted by 6 o'clock. Now that is history. Those are some of the things that went on.

I am sorry — I saw somebody in here today who would be very interested in this but he has gone because, Sir, I want to write this in the Records of this House again. I have done it already that the Presiding Officer at Bayley's School at 12.40 p.m., I, together with my Lawyer Mr. Gollop of Yearwood and Boyce went to Trinity School and there saw the Presiding Officer down in the yard, the Polling Station was up in the School. We had to climb a line of steps to get into the school. That is where we voted. That is where the ballots were.

I saw the Presiding Officer, Mr. Carl Lorde in the yard by a car together with my opponent, Mr. Franklin and his brother and about five men with ballot papers writing on the ballots on the top of the car, 12.40 a.m. 5.55 p.m.

I drew it to the attention of my lawyer, asked Mr. Lorde if he understood what he was doing, bringing out ballots from the school and writing them up in the presence of the candidate and his brother, and he told me he saw nothing wrong with it. I had to bring Mr. Moseley the Returning Officer to speak to Mr. Lorde and Mr. Moseley asked him if he did not realise he could be prosecuted. He said he saw nothing wrong with it.

Now those are the kinds of things that we had to put up with as members of the Opposition up to 1976 by people belonging to a party which had the nerve to hold a mass meeting last night and attract 225 people or whatever and 43 cars in the Ivy to abuse this Government of gerrymandering.

Mr. Speaker, this House has already had the benefit of information from the Prime Minister concerning what was done to the people in Orange Hill in 1971, not justifiably done, because here it is you had two consti-

tuencies of more or less equal size. The difference in the numbers in fact according to the registrations of 1971 was sixteen, and they removed people from Springhead, Orange Hill and other places, put them into St. Andrew and made one constituency 1 500 voters more than the other. Nowhere in this exercise have we done any such thing. Nowhere in this exercise can it be said that any constituency is palpably low in relation to others. In the one constituency which may appear on the face of the document not to have 6,100 or to have fallen short a little bit outside the 10% one way or the other, that are good and sufficient reasons advanced that. Take St. Philip North, for example. Taking in parts of St. Philip South, the present number in St. Philip North would be 5 576 as of September this year, but members can rest assured that by the time of the election this number will increase.

Mr. Speaker, I am asked to draw to your attention that there is no quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that where a constituency may appear on the face of the report to be slightly low in numbers, what the Committee took into account is the fact that there are in some cases ongoing housing development which will attract in the case of Haynesville, for example, it is estimated another 500 voters which will pull St. James South up to about 5 300. Similarly in St. Philip North. Since I have now had to take in part of St. Philip South, below Shrewsbury School in particular there is a lot of development going on there, house building and a new development taking place which is between Shrewsbury and Long Bay. The completion of that development will obviously throw more votes into St. Philip North. At the same time the Hon. Minister of Housing has made it clear that there is to be a housing area in St. Philip North in the area of Lucas Street. There are 29 acres to be acquired there for housing development. When that housing area is completed again there will be an appreciable increase in the number of voters in St. Philip North. So I would say that within a year to eighteen months the voting population of St. Philip North will well exceed 6 000 voters, and that is why we were content to leave it as it is with the 10% variable, and it comes out at 5 572.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to state it publicly that the Committee at its deliberations, and the Minutes are made appendages to this report and will bear out whether I am speaking to the truth or otherwise, there was absolutely no question about realigning boundaries on the basis of how the Labour Party will do here or how the Democratic Labour Party will do there. It did not enter

into the discussions at all as is shown and reflected in the Minutes of the report and the report itself, and I think it must be made very clear to the public that it was an exercise entered into by the six members of the Committee including the two Opposition members without any weight being given during the deliberations to relative party strongholds or voting patterns.

Now I cannot see what the Opposition has to query about when they themselves agreed, and I quote from page 8 of the report: "The minority would (1) ignore parish boundaries, if necessary." That is the minority, two of the Opposition. They themselves agreed to it. They cannot complain now if people in Brereton will be treated for electoral purposes as voting in St. John. They agreed to it. So you ignored the parish boundaries and took in what is presently part of the parish of St. Philip into the electoral district of St. John. They cannot complain, Sir, because it is proposed to increase the number of seats from 24 to 27. I think it was only this morning I heard that there are thirty something thousand voters in Bermuda and I believe that they have a House of nearly 40. They had 36 and they have increased it to 40 as far back as about ten years, and they do not have a voting population of 164,978. There is an overwhelming case for an increase in seats, and when you bear in mind the relatively low salary that ordinary members of Parliament get, it cannot be a burden to the taxpayers. If you were going to double the number of seats, even increase it by fifteen or ten I could understand that.

6.05 p.m.

Tobago now has its own little thing, Tobago now has to give greater representation to the people of Tobago to ensure that they do not feel themselves disenfranchised and left out because Trinidad is its big brother, and Barbados would really want an issue over the increase of seats from 24 to 27? How much is this going to cost us? It has been written that what we should be concerned about is the quality of representation. We cannot decide that now, we have to decide a principle. Do we need an increase in the number of seats or not? Is there a case for it? There is a case for it, it has been shown beyond doubt that there is a case for a small increase. The quality of representation depends on the types of candidates that are put up by both sides in an election. If the DLP put up people who are not interested in representation — do not forget, Sir, it was last year that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that he was not running some of the same people who ran with him in 1976, because he was satisfied that a lot of them were not interested in representing. Now, that is a malady affecting the heart of the Democratic Labour Party. He recognised and told his own party that certain of those who ran with him before could not make the team this time, because he was satisfied that they were not interested in representation.

That has nothing to do with whether you have 24, 27 or 28 seats, that is a disfunction in the personality. It is nothing to do with the system which allows for 24 or 27 seats, unless by some kind of extended argument we can say that if we have 27 seats it is going to be very difficult for the DLP to find 27 candidates of any quality at all. That, Sir, may be stretching the argument too far. I want to base the argument on principle. There is a case made out for 27 in this House, not only today but previously, a case for an increase. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition himself, as I showed in here earlier this year.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has two minutes in which to wind up his debate.

Mr. SIMMONS: I will make the point in two minutes Sir. As I showed in this House earlier this year, on the 22nd March, 1955 when the present Leader of the Opposition was a member for St. George, he piloted a Resolution in here asking for a redistribution of seats on the basis of one representative per 3,000 voters. Having regard to the voting population at the time, being 96,000, that would have given 30 seats in 1955 by his own words. Now today he begins his argument by saying that he may have moved such a Resolution but he did not say the number of seats. That is a typical legalistic dodge. I did not say so and so, so you are not entitled to draw a logical conclusion from the primary facts which are laid. He laid the primary facts, one representative per 3,000 voters, but he does not go on to finish the equation, because when you ask how many voters there were the answer would be 96,000 and if you divide that by 3,000 you know what you would get. That is the kind of logic that he is famous for and was famous for at the Bar, going half the way, even with the truth, but not going the whole way.

Now, today he is hoisted on his own petard. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee, I commend the report to the House. I must point out that I indicated to the Prime Minister that in terms of the written delineation of the boundaries in St. Philip North there appears to be an error. Where it says "Sea View Road" it should really be "Long Bay Road" but that will be dealt with in the process of time, but I draw it to the House's attention that the written demarcation of boundaries for St. Philip North does have an error.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the report to this Hon. House and to the nation as a whole, and in doing so I want to pay public tribute to the Chief Electoral Officer who sat with us, gave us of his time and expertise, and who was very prompt in submitting any requests which were made by the Committee, and in whose ability and whose impartiality and sense of fairness and justice I have utmost confidence. I am obliged to Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who would like to make a contribution to this debate?

The question that the report of the Select Committee be adopted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Item Government Notices be recommitted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Notices is the instant Order of the Day. This Item is now reopened.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act.

FIRST READING OF BILL

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill entitled the Representation of the People (Amendment) Act 1980 be now read a first time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is intended that this Bill be completed in its stages in this House next Tuesday. When I introduced the Report of the Select Committee last Tuesday I said on that occasion that it was expected that the House will have to meet again on Friday to resolve the new boundaries, according to the procedure in the Representation of the People Act. The Attorney General has now pointed out that it is possible to put the new boundaries in the Schedule of the Representation of the People Act and move them by amendment on Tuesday. This is what is being done with the Act which has just been given a First Reading. It should contain the boundaries recommended by the Select Committee, and we will therefore not have to come back on Friday of next week, and the Recess can be expected next Tuesday, but there is one very important matter that should be mentioned at this stage if Your Honour does not mind me anticipating a little bit.

The occasion has not arisen in this debate to state that it is intended that this exercise with the boundaries should be the last carried out by the House of Assembly alone, because next week we intend to give notice of a Bill to amend the Constitution to provide for an Election and Boundaries Commission Act which will take effect after the next election and which will govern elections and boundaries in the future. We intend to debate that next month, Sir, in January, after the Recess.
6.15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That concludes Government Business for today, Sir, and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 16th of December, 1980 at 12 o'clock noon.

I would like you, Sir, as well as those who are responsible to ensure that the Bill of which we have just given notice is circulated. (ASIDES). I understand it has been circulated already so that there can be no question that people did not have notice.

Whenever we meet on Friday, and there will be a Meeting again on Tuesday, we have to ensure that the measures are circulated and I would hope that a copy of the measure which we have given notice of now would also be circulated in the Other Place so that there can be no question that adequate notice was not given because we would not want the Other Place to meet nearer to Christmas so I trust that the appropriate direction will be made to ensure that the proper procedures have been followed for this.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 16th December, 1980, at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER, adjourned the Sitting accordingly.
6.20 p.m.