
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th July, 1980.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock, on Tuesday, 8th July, 1980.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; 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, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A., (Econ.); Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; and Mr. L. L. SISNETT.

Prayers were read.

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, LL.D., (Leader of the Opposition) entered the Hon. Chamber and took his seat.)

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning), entered the Hon. Chamber and took his seat.)

(Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc. (Econ.) entered the Hon. Chamber and took his seat.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 1st July, 1980.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Sir, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 1st July, 1980 be taken as read.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by Hon. Members, let those Minutes stand confirmed. (PAUSE). Those Minutes are confirmed.

(Dr. HAYNES entered the Hon. Chamber and took his seat.)

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received copies of Accounts and Statements for the month of March, 1980, as prepared by the Accountant General.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of:

A Resolution to approve the vesting of land at the corner of James Street and Lucas Street, St. Michael, in the Barbados National Bank.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of:

A Bill to repeal the United States (Oceanographic Station) Act.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of:

A Bill to provide for the implementation in Barbados to the United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give notice of:

A Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill to repeal the United States (Oceanographic Station) Act be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the implementation in Barbados of the United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea, 1978 be now read a first time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: 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, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Property Transfer Tax Act be now read a first time.

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

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

OBITUARY SPEECHES

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Erma Rock of Belleplaine, St. Andrew passed away about one week ago.

Hers was never the privilege of serving in this Hon. Chamber. Our Parliament is, however, bicameral, and as a tribute to her involvement with the lives of a large number of people in this country. She had the distinction of serving for two quinquennials, first in 1966 and then, in 1971 in the Upper Chamber of our Parliament. It is fitting that we pay tribute to this outstanding woman and Senator.

The following immortal words are to be found in the spiritual diary kept by the 17th Century English poet and preacher, John Dunn and I quote:

"Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind and therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee."

She started out as a shopkeeper, in the retail trade, at a time when the village shopkeeper was more completely, than today, the economic hub around which the lives of villagers revolved.

12.30 p.m.

It was this characteristic involvement with people which was the hallmark of her life, and this involvement with people continued into her main life's venture, the transport sector of our economy. The Rocklyn Bus Company served as a link between Belleplaine and other districts considered as outposts and Bridgetown; it served as a link and as a means of moving people to and from Bridgetown, to and from the commercial, economic, financial business and service capital of our nation, and her contribution in this regard is inestimable.

As a bus concessionaire and pioneer she has made her contribution to the integration of Barbados and to the breaking down of some of those regional and parochial barriers that tended to separate our people. Agriculture was and still is a major sector of our economy. Mrs. Rock was in agriculture, and agriculture then as it is now also involves people. Her interests in plantations is well known as well. Housing is a basic need of our people. She ministered to the needs of people for the better and affordable housing. Many a small person who now has a decent roof over his or her head can thank Mrs. Rock for that position.

Mr. TAITT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

In all of these various activities, Mr. Speaker, there was a courtesy, a humility and a human heart about Mrs. Rock. A word of advice here, an unmentionable kindness there many a person can testify to these little acts of kindness. She was not given any major duty-free concessions in her various activities, yet in her own way she made a greater contribution to the employment of people than many of those businesses and industries which are given such duty free concessions.

It was my privilege to have been a colleague of hers in the Other Place during the years 1967 to 1971, and I am richer for that association with one of the most outstanding women of this country.

I pray that our usual condolences may be extended to the surviving and sorrowing relatives of this great lady. Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind, and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls its tolls for thee.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the prayer so ably moved by my friend, the hon. member for St. Michael South, let us say that it is with a great degree of regret that we have both had to speak about the passing of one of Barbados' outstanding women and citizens, for in her way Erma Rock was a great woman. I think her outstanding trait was the trait of humility, and although she achieved greatness and rose to outstanding heights in this country, she always remained at heart a simple christian woman with the greatest degree of humility, kindness and consideration for all mankind.

Like my friend, I have had the privilege of knowing her for several years, indeed since my childhood. She, as he has said, was one of those pioneers in the field of transportation who contributed a great deal to the comfort of their fellow-citizens and the economic wellbeing of the Island by making freely available their resources both human and financial to provide this country with a transportation system particularly in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s. She, like so many of those pioneers in the field of transportation was a very close friend of my adopted parents and it was on her regular visits to the home of my adopted parents who were also in transportation that I first got to know her and of course to respect her and to love her. I worked for several years as a legal adviser to her personally and to the Rocklyn Motor Omnibus Company Limited, and I can say that very often it was a question of her, like so many others of them, subsidising the public in transportation rather than the public making an economic contribution to their profit situation, and indeed The Rocklyn Motor Omnibus Company Limited went through a period when despite the fact that the State organisation was receiving capital and other assistance from the Government, the Rocklyn Motor Omnibus Company Limited and the other private concessionaires had only to rely on the same rate that was given to the public transportation system. She soldiered on as the others soldiered on until the bus transportation system was fully nationalised.

I believe that Barbadians of several walks of life owe a great duty to people like Erma Rock for their contribution in this sphere. The hon. member has spoken as well of her contribution in the retail sector. This was another sphere, in fact the first sphere in which she began business and from a small shop she saw her business grow and expand into the worthwhile and thriving sector of her many different interests. Later on she became involved in agriculture and here again she made a contribution to the agricultural life of this country.
12.40 p.m.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one would have witnessed at her funeral a very wide cross section of the populace of Barbados from the planting, the commercial, the transportation and other sectors of our community; not only members of this Hon. House but of the Upper House as well, as well as from the ordinary folk who have never had the privilege to serve in this House or indeed in other sectors of our country's life. That is, I believe, a great testimony to her.

Her service as a Vestrywoman is perhaps one that we should also stress, because she too believe in serving at the local level and being able to do several small things that may today appear trivial in the life of the country but were of great significance to the people for whom she was able to perform these acts. In the Senate, of course, as my friend has said, she served for two terms.

Obviously, Sir, I think this country is the poorer for the passing of such a lady, because indeed she was a lady. I have never heard her speak an unkind word of anyone, even when she may have been by a few people attacked. I have always known her to respect punctuality. In fact, in the years that I was associated with her I have only known her to be late for an appointment once, and that was because unfortunately there was an accident on the road on which she was travelling from Belleplaine down to town. Inevitably she was a bit early and always there to wait on you. I have never known her to harbour an unkind thought about anyone even if they considered themselves to be her opponents. She always had a kind word to say and her consideration for children, Mr. Speaker, is a point that we ought to stress.

She always found time to have some little thought for a child, or some little gift for a child. As you know, Sir, she was not herself in her own life fortunate to bear any children, but she had adopted a daughter who of course she brought to successful womanhood, and she has contributed in several other ways to several unnamed children in this country.

Her contribution to the poor in the provision of houses is well known as well, and even now I would not be surprised that the National Housing Corporation is not in her debt for houses provided several years ago, but her contribution to housing particularly for the poor section of this community is also another outstanding aspect of her work, and so although I am happy to be associated with the Resolution that I am in this Place, it is with a tinge of great personal loss and regret at the passing of a very close friend and a person for whom I had the fondest regard, and from whom I learned a lot.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, unlike the two last speakers who have spoken on this matter, I cannot say that I knew the late Mrs. Rock well, nor that she was a close friend of mine. She lived for a considerable length of time in the constituency that I have the honour to represent, and will I have no doubt the honour to represent for many years to come.

I can attest to the fact that Mrs. Rock has made a contribution to the society in which she lived. My relationship with the poor in that constituency of St. Andrew has caused me to recognise that she has been extremely helpful in many areas of their welfare. It was only in recent times that I started to have discussions with Mrs. Rock and was able to see her at close range, and in that very short time I have found her to be pleasant and to a great extent helpful. With the passing of the private sector in the communications section of this country by way of the concessions which they held, I have had much to do with her and I can say that she was not an obstacle in the path of the nationalisation of the public transport system.

As far as housing is concerned, I know that she has helped many people in that area to get shelters over their heads. They themselves had told me this. I believe in her time that she has done a lot for humanity and for her less fortunate fellow brethren. She was also the owner of estates in St. Andrew and St. Joseph, and I believe on the basis of what I was told that she was reasonably kind and helpful to the neighbours of those estates.

As the representative of the constituency of St. Andrew I paid my last respects to her by attending the funeral, at which I saw the hon. and learned Attorney General, the hon. and learned member for St. John as well taking a great part on such an occasion. I paid my respects to her then and I am happy to do so from the floor of this Hon. House. I do so with satisfaction to think that she has served her less fortunate fellow brothers and that among those less fortunate fellow brothers have been people from the area that I have the honour to represent. I speak today with their conscience on this matter, and I am sure that they will be happy to know that I record my voice in a tribute to her.

She, unlike many people who come into wealth, never ever dreamt of forgetting the poor. These people feel that the poor is always with us and must always be with us. I believe that she distributed some of what she made as a result of her toil and labour to the poor people among whom she worked and served. She was in the Vestry, she was a Vestry woman and she was also in the Senate, and my understanding is from the eulogy which was made on her behalf on the occasion of her funeral, that she was a very good Vestry woman. I know also that she served on the Governing Body of the Alleyne School and I am also told she did commendable service there.

It is only left for me to hope and pray that the good God who has given her a life of 70 years here among her fellowmen will watch over her and will guide her in the spiritual sphere, and that the mould will rest lightly on her body.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to be associated with the remarks by those hon. members who sought to pay tribute to the late Mrs. Erma Rock who was a member of the Other Place. I believe that each member enumerated in one way or another the good qualities of Mrs. Rock, but there is one thing that was most outstanding in the life of this goodly lady. She was the mother of the parish of St. Andrew and beyond. She was the person to whom each person who had a grievance would first turn, and I am certain that it was no cause which Mrs. Rock could have served on behalf of any complaining person and did not do so. She went out of her way to accommodate and to make provision for all of those who sought her help in more ways than one. I feel that she lived a full life in the service of humanity and I now

ask hon. members to stand with me for a moment in silence in respect of this goodly lady, Erma Rock.

Hon. members stood in silence in their places for one minute.

12.50 p.m.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, last week under Oral Replies to Questions, Question 43 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was ready and I think it was asked to be held over in his absence, Sir. I would like to assure hon. members on the other side that we will give the reply today, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 19, 20, and 42(5) be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting, Sir.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT TO REVIEW THE DISTRIBUTION OF VOTERS IN BARBADOS AND TO RECOMMEND THE ADJUSTMENTS OF THE ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES THAT MAY HAVE BECOME NECESSARY

Item No. 3 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the establishment of a Select Committee of Parliament to review the distribution of voters in Barbados and to recommend the adjustments of the electoral boundaries that may have become necessary.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, like other Parliamentary democracies the question of redistribution of seats in the Parliamentary Institutions of the country has arisen in Barbados. Indeed, it arose in Barbados approximately 140 years ago when the burgeoning population of St. Michael appeared under-represented to the Government of the day and at that time the House of Assembly which consisted of 22 seats from 1639 was increased by two seats to make the 24 with the introduction of the City of Bridgetown as a constituency thereby giving the parish of St. Michael four seats rather than two as it had enjoyed previously.

The benefits of that re-distribution are settled in the history books. That particular exercise brought Samuel Jackman Prescod into the House of Assembly only, I believe, the second coloured man to receive the franchise of any Parliamentary electorate in the entire world, the previous having beaten him by a short whisker in the Cape Provincial Legislature in South Africa a few months earlier but nothing was done in Barbados despite a growing disparity between the electorate in different constituencies until just over 20 years ago when the hon. member for St. John, the Rt. Hon. member, now Leader of the Opposition, was returned to the House in a by-election and with some force took up the question which I think he had previously canvassed of re-distributing seats in the single member constituencies and equalising the size of the electorate in each constituency.

Indeed, as early as March 22, 1955, the hon. member gave notice of a Resolution in the House and I will quote the Resolution in full, Sir, March 22, 1955. It will be found in the Records of the House.

"The House of Assembly considers 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 re-allocation of seats on a population basis of one seat for a unit of 3,000 voters."

That is the hon. member for St. John, 25 years ago, now Leader of the Opposition wanting the House of Assembly to have one member for every 3,000 voters. Now, times change, Sir, but in the interval since 1955 undoubtedly certain improvements were made and I say improvements although I am conscious that these improvements were not supported by my Political Party at the time in question.

Very soon after being elected to power in December, 1961 the then Democratic Labour Party Government passed an Act, the Boundaries Commission Act, of 1962. That Act was 1962:41. It recited the need for an establishment of a Boundaries Commission and it set up a Boundaries Commission which consisted of the Speaker as Chairman, the Deputy Chairman to be appointed by the Government acting in accordance with the advice of the Premier, two members of the General Assembly similarly appointed and one member of the General Assembly appointed on the advice of the Leader of the Opposition.

It was a very useful device, Sir, for keeping the Barbados Labour Party out of the Boundaries Commission of the day because the Leader of the Opposition in 1962 still supported the Government. He was, of course, Mr. E. D. Mottley and the Boundaries Commission of that day proceeded with its deliberations to cut Barbados up

into 24 single member constituencies without the assistance of any member of the party that gained the greatest number of votes in the previous Election, the Barbados Labour Party.
1.00 p.m.

I digressed slightly, because there is a saying, from their actions shall we judge them. This is the same political Party that has the insolence by its Parliamentary group, to speak of sinister activities by the Government in respect of setting up a Boundaries Commission. These are the same people, who believed to the hilt, the dictum of my late father, that Barbadians have short memories and who have the disrespect for themselves and the disrespect for the Electorate to accuse the Government of sinister behaviour in setting up a Boundaries Commission. A Government headed by a man who said that there should be three thousand voters in each Constituency, now becomes an Opposition, headed by that person and not only does its character in Parliament change, but its views and its approach to the problems of seat re-distribution also change too. One respects people who have flexibility of mind, but there is a point where flexibility of mind becomes opportunism, cheap, nasty, political opportunism and in due course, I will be inviting the Electorate, as I am inviting the Hon. House of Assembly today, to regard the conduct of the Opposition, as being as much in that character as the Rules of the Hon. House would permit me to say in here.

The Boundaries Commission of 1964, adopted the principle that each seat should have 4,200 voters and that, as far as possible, there should be no variation from that, except such as was allowable on historic, traditional grounds as would ensure the representation of rural districts which had lost population. There was some dispute, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, who was then Sir Theodore Branker, who was Chairman, disagreed both with the interpretation of the Acting Attorney-General at the time that the Terms of Reference of that Boundaries Commission did not permit an increase in seats and he disagreed also with the finding of the Commission, in that he argued that no previous Constituency should lose a member. His argument was not apparently based on self-interest, but it could well have been Sir, because when the time came for Mr. Tudor and himself to battle over the seat in St. Lucy, both ended their active careers as elected Members because neither would give way to the other. I do not think, Sir, that we have suffered by having the present Hon. Member for St. Lucy in their places, but nonetheless, perhaps, it is instinctive to look back on the battles which occurred within Parties when seat re-distributions are at stake.

The 24 seats were created from 12. The relevant Government Documents present an interesting picture of

a rearguard action, a successful, rearguard action, fought by the then Premier, now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, against those who were either pushing him to introduce Single Member Constituencies in time for the 1969 Elections, or foolishly trusting in his words expressed both in Parliament and in the Manifesto, assumed that the Single Member Constituencies would be introduced for 1966. I was one of those who had no trust in his words, but nonetheless, at the Constitutional Conference in London, pushed for a pledge that there would be no Independence until Elections, under a single member system. Well, we got one half of it secretly, Sir, at Elections before Independence, but the Colonial Office of the day did not take the further step on insisting on the implementation of the Boundaries Commission, or the brave words on file which I have here, Sir, saying that the Boundaries Commission Order should not be implemented until, with the personal consent of the Premier. I have his words and his signature to this statement. This prevailed Sir, and it was not implemented until after the 1966 Elections, I think in January, 1967 to be precise, so that the first Elections to be fought under the single member system, were fought in 1971.

But, even at that stage Sir, there were changes. There had been, between 1964, when the Boundaries Commission made its division and 1971, certain population shifts. One would think, that if there were going to be changes, they would be made in accordance with these population shifts, but this was not to be. In 1971, some few weeks before the General Elections of that day, the House of Assembly was astonished, at least Hon. Members of the Opposition were astonished, and I will say why. I will say why I believe that other Hon. Members were also astonished in a moment, to discover that with the life of the Hon. House of Assembly about to expire, and the General Elections about to be called without any Boundaries Commission, any consultation, or any public announcement, the Government of the day decided to make alterations in the Constituency Boundaries and these alterations were made to the boundaries of Bridgetown, St. Michael South, Christ Church East, Christ Church South Central, St. James and St. Andrew, a few weeks before the Elections, Sir, without any prior announcement.

Now, again I dwell on this, those alterations. Unfortunately, I cannot recite the administrative history to you regarding them. An extensive search has been made for the file which dealt with the boundary alterations of 1971. A very senior public officer in whose Department the file could be expected to be kept, has informed me that on the instructions of the then Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, he was forbidden to show the file to anyone, not even, another Cabinet Minister and he is unable to

say where the file now is. Contact with the relevant public servant.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before we go any further, I would invite the Hon. Member.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order, Sir. The Hon. Member has called my name and I ask him to give the name of the public officer who said this.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member will have time to reply.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is not a question of replying, he has made a very serious accusation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member will have time to reply.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is my right as an Hon. Member of the Hon. House to reply. It is not a concession.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the Hon. Member thinks that he has a right to receive the name of a public officer, so that he may abuse him on public platforms, as he is accustomed to, I do assure him, he has no such right. I will further say however.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I object to that, Sir. I never said so that I may abuse anyone. If the Hon. Member makes a statement, an accusation, he should be able to back it up by evidence, so that the public officer may be able to testify whether he is telling the truth or not.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member could ever be fortunate enough to get the public officer in a Court of Law, he could ask him as much as he likes, if it were he who told the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. I am not giving the hon. member any name. (*Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW rose*).

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the Hon. Leader of the Opposition rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW took his seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would also advise the hon. member to recall that this is not the first time in here, that he has contradicted what I have said that

a public officer has told me, and on every single occasion when it has been said, he has been embarrassed. It started with the Governor General's car and it has continued down to this day, Sir. I say to the hon. member, do not embarrass yourself in the maturity of your years.

If the hon. member thinks that he can perhaps surmise which public officer would have custody of the file, or which department would have custody of the file — I would also mention particularly, that I have spoken to the High Commissioner in London and that enquiries are being made from him because the exchanges of the file were between him and the hon. member for St. John at the time. I am seeking to discover whether he can throw any light on the whereabouts of the file.

1.10 p.m.

I mention this merely to say that I am unable to give the House any information as to the circumstances that led up to the 1971 boundaries adjustment as revealed in the Government file. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition. I cannot prevent my ears from hearing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I didn't hear, honestly! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, we have acquired a lot of respect for him now we see that his own party does not have any. Don't try to reduce our respect for him. He should be glad of the respect of some hon. members in here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That respect is not shared on that side.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the hon. member rise? Please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am only saying...

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: But, Sir, the hon. member has made a most profound statement. He said that respect is not shared on that side. I agree with him. That respect is not shared on that side. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot have the Leader of the Opposition heckling the Prime Minister. I cannot have it, and I do not want to ask you to leave the Chamber. (*Asides*) Let us have some order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: My opinion of the 1971 redistribution was that it was a gerrymander of the original class. The hon. member for St. Michael South, I am sure, is familiar with the exploits of Governor Gerry of Massachusetts, and the hon. member

was a member of the Cabinet at the time. Maybe he can throw some light, but I doubt it; he is too decent to have been let into the secrets in 1971 even though his own constituency was involved in them; but I believe that the activities in 1971 were carried out in the political interests of the Democratic Labour Party as it perceived those interests at the time. They were carried out suddenly, without warning and without principle or in my opinion now perhaps even justification. And again I mention this, Sir, because this is the same political party that is talking about not having a boundaries review immediately before a general election.

Now I do assure you, Sir, I have not taken the Parliamentary group of the Democratic Labour Party into my confidence regarding the date of the next general election. I give the House the solemn pledge as to that effect, therefore they would have to be reading my mind, reading things that I do not even know in my mind if they know the date of the next general election. Every activity carried on in Parliament is before a general election and it may be shorter or longer depending on the circumstances of the moment. I cannot accept that after two years of discussion and a year of gestation that a Boundaries Commission of Parliament is being carried out imminently, shortly or otherwise before a general election, and even if it were possible to accept that it is nearer to a general election than it would have been three years ago to be an absurdity, no man who has stood up in here and defended a Government's right to change the boundaries two weeks before calling an election can never tell me that any activity being carried out possibly seventeen months before a general election is to be criticised because of the imminence of the election date. This is another case of people changing their tunes the minute they change their position in the House of Assembly, and it is disgusting that a responsible Opposition so-called should seek to put this to the public of Barbados using the words like "sinister" and what else, Sir, "rape". The hon. members have spent too much time in the company of thieves and perverts to accuse anybody on this side of rape. There are too many thieves and perverts putting the case for the Democratic Labour Party on platforms.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I object to the hon. member stating that hon. members, which clearly refers to people on this side, have spent too much of their time amongst thieves and perverts. That is a reflection of the members of this House on this side. I take very strenuous and serious objection to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister never said that they spend this time in this Honourable House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg you pardon, I did not say that. I said they spend their time, referring to members on this side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not say that they spend their time in this House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Suppose he said that they committed murder, they would not have committed murder in this House. Suppose he called them murderers and thieves and perverts, do they have to prove that they were perverts in the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition is making every effort that the Chair should ask him to leave, but I do not intend doing so today.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: With all due respect....

Mr. SPEAKER: With all due respect, you take your seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you mean I cannot speak in here as a representative of Parliament?

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER rose, and the hon member took his seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am speaking with a little vehemence today, but there comes a certain stage where if you do not stand up and make it clear that you have a voice too, speaking of myself, people sometimes begin to go a little overboard and it is not me that suffers, it is the whole structure of public life in this country.

I have had a situation where an hon. member on the other side when accused of calling me drunk on a platform said "I did not say he was drunk, I said he was degenerate." We have situations where in the Advocate Newspaper today we hear something about rape. That is what we have to read about ourselves. We read about sinister, we hear about sinister because we go through the constitutional procedures for a Boundaries Commission, something that has been supported by Statute in here, something that has been supported by Resolution when the other side was in Government, and we hear that because we want to do the same thing that we are sinister rapists, and the hon. member does not want me to refer to the character of one of his standard bearers for the Democratic Labour Party's Second Eleven on political platforms and one of his former right hand men, a great adviser to a number of people on that side.

There seems to be profound belief that God sent these people to rule over Barbados in their minds and

that the electorate is wicked in putting us in power. We are the masters now and you have to understand it, and if we decide that there will be a Boundaries Commission, there will be one and the Boundaries will be changed; and you can go on the Committee, don't go on the Committee, you can come privately to us and beg for your constituency as against somebody's else and we will listen to you. Remember that.

Now in 1971 the boundaries were changed without the Commission. Now before I deal, Sir, with the specific incidents of the present situation in Barbados, I want to deal with arguments that have been canvassed in a wider forum than the House of Assembly and with rather more restraint, if not always more logic.
1.20 p.m.

Barbados is a small country, and no matter who is in power it will always be possible to point out that the expenses of Government in Barbados are high in relation to its population. That is an inescapable fact of independence. It is not anything to do with the Democratic Labour Party or the Barbados Labour Party, because once you decide on independence — and I am not going over that again you decide on having Government which will take up a larger proportion of your revenue than, for example, Government will in China with 900 million people or India with 700 million in relation to your population. This is just a fact of life. At the other extreme you have to recall that there is in practice a minimum size under which parliamentary Government can be run.

I wish to make no criticism of any other country or any other system, but it may very well be that in the British Virgin Islands parliamentary government is not very meaningful with a House of seven people. There obviously is an irreducible minimum, especially where it happened in the British Virgin Islands at the last three or four elections two political parties have got three seats each and one man was elected as an Independent — the Premier is elected as an Independent — this is a clear case where a country's population is very small and it could not meaningfully support the parliamentary system as it has evolved at Westminster because you cannot have the number of M.P.'s to justify a ministerial front bench, Opposition, back bench and so on. Indeed, there is a very strong argument that 24, leaving out anything else, is itself two small a number even in Barbados.

I recall, along with Mr. D. A. Wiles, being a member of a seminar or study group in fact sitting at the feet of Professor Kenneth Weir at Oxford — this is even more than 25 years ago — and Mr. Wiles and I prepared a paper which was one of the things of this seminar on the impossibility of maintaining the Westminster system satisfactorily in very small Legislatures.

These are theoretical points, but I believe that if it is carried to the extreme so that you point out that in

India the constituencies have half million population each, when you see that you realise that you cannot apply the argument to Barbados, that in India there are many more electors to a constituency so in Barbados we do not need 24, what you would need if Barbados was to adopt the Indian criteria would be a Parliament that consists of a half a person. In other words, we do not have a population big enough to fill one Indian constituency, so that argument, while it appears logical on the surface, is an argument without much depth.

There is a minimum size of Parliament. This minimum size — and now this is a question of opinion, Sir — in my view depends on whether is the sole institution carrying out governmental functions of the country at an elected basis, or whether there is a Local Government structure as well. I cannot off hand find any Independent country that does not have Local Government besides Barbados, therefore this is a question that perhaps at the moment affects only us. The researches of the hon. member for St. Michael South may have discovered that perhaps in Western Samoa there is no Local Government system, although I am sure they have Councils of the Chiefs and so on and the Chiefs still have some judicial and executive functions in small areas, whether that constitutes Local Government or not is a matter for the theoreticians, but in general it is very very far outside the norm for a country that has only a Parliament and no Local Government system. Virtually every country in the world has some kind of city that has a Mayor. Bridgetown is the largest city in the world without a Mayor, for what that particular statistic is worth. My thesis would be that where you do not have a Local Government system you ought to relax somewhat the criteria for membership of an elected Assembly, because where the system exists and you remove it you are removing people who previously took some of the burden off the backs of Members of Parliament by looking after local affairs. This is an opinion, it is perhaps theoretical because our approach to the particular problem that I am now addressing will be governed by practical considerations rather than these theoretical ones, but I toss it out for the interest of hon. members.

The arguments that in Britain M.P.'s represent 100,000 people and in the United States 250,000 people are — and this is not an opinion, Sir — not the end of the matter. There are 491,000 elected officials in the United States of America, that is one elected official per 4,480 population. In Barbados there are 24 elected officials, which is one elected official to every 10,416 people. If you include the Senate, because our Senate although not elected should in what we are talking about be counted, even including the Senate there is one parliamentarian for every 5,555 people, a better ratio than the United States. In Britain — England and Wales — there are 53 larger County Councils with a membership varying from 60 to 100 each, there are 369 smaller District Councils with 30 to 80 people each. I have not been

able to get an accurate number of all the Local Government officials in England and Wales, but I estimate that there are over 20,000.

They deal with such subjects as education, which is dealt with by a Minister in the House of Assembly here in Barbados, they deal with sanitation which is dealt with by a Minister in the House of Assembly. In Scotland, Sir, there are three special Councils for the western isles, the Orkneys and the Shetlands, all of which have a much higher ratio of Councillors to population, there are nine large County Councils and 53 sub-Divisions, and in Scotland, Sir, the proportion of elected officials — County Council and M.P.'s — is very much higher than in Barbados, and if hon. members who like to take these statistics without examining them in depth want a specific example, they can look at the Isle of Wight, and I chose the Isle of Wight because it has often been compared to Barbados in size. It has 144 square miles, 115,000 people and 42 Councillors dealing with education, sanitation, local roads, street lights, libraries and various other functions which are dealt with by Central Government in Barbados. That is 42 people in the Isle of Wight for less than half our population dealing with less than half our responsibilities. So when the argument comes forward that we have too many M.P.'s already compared to other countries, it must be recognised for what it is, it is a very conservative argument.

I don't mind the hon. members on the other side appealing to more conservative sentiments. Normally they appeal to forces of hatred, they preach the politics of hatred, they preach the politics of aggression, they preach the politics of destruction, they preach that their opponents are wicked people, the children of the Devil, they do not normally appeal to the more rational members of the society. I can think of three persons, Sir, I am not going to name them, I can think of a Senator who I am sure will oppose any change because he thinks that all change is for the worst.

1.30 p.m.

I can think of a lady who opposes any change if it is not identifiable in a conservative interest. I can think of a Doctor, not of medicine, who opposes any change if it is initiated by the Barbados Labour Party and no doubt this is the sort of statement that the argument addressed to finance that the cost of increasing the number of seats will be a burden to the taxpayers, the argument addressed to the Barbados Labour Party as a gang of sinister rapists. That would appeal to the good Doctor because he would believe that six weeks before a General Election it is alright for the hon. member for St. John to change the boundaries but following the Report of a Constitutional Commission and 17 months before a General Election is constitutional due, it would be wrong for the Barbados Labour Party to do the same. I can understand the appeal of that sort of trivial.

I doubt that members of the House of Assembly cost the Government as much as \$20,000 a year. My income tax that I paid would pay for more than one member of the House of Assembly. The tax I pay can increase the number of seats in the House of Assembly. In other words, you are really talking about trivial amounts of money in a budget of \$500 million. The salary of the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union can support three additional members of the House of Assembly if not four and I make that with no fear of contradiction on this occasion.

Indeed that, Sir, is an argument principally addressed to the question of the increase in members, a possible increase in members. By saying this it is not meant to suggest that there shall be an increase in the number of seats. That will be a matter for the Select Committee whose appointment I propose to make at the end of my speech because there are alternatives.

The Constitutional Review Commission before which any citizen could have appeared has recommended an increase of six members. The hon. member for St. Michael South West in a very cogent speech, which turns out to have more substance now that the facts have been examined than I assumed when I first read the speech, and I apologise to him for my dismissing the possibility of dividing the existing 24 seats along the lines of greater equality. That possibility does exist now that we have seen the figures and it is one that undoubtedly will be canvassed by the Committee.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West should be particularly congratulated for having put forward that argument because his seat only has half the voters of the seat of the hon. member for St. Michael North West and therefore has every possibility of being a casualty to some extent of any re-distribution although I do not think that his seat in particular, that the geography would suggest that his seat stands so to speak in the first trench, but certainly it is a possibility which would be canvassed by the Committee when in due course it is set up so we have these two extremes, the Report of the Constitutional Review Committee and the argument put forward by the hon. member for St. Michael South West and between those extremes the Committee will decide.

Other principles which will activate the Committee are clearly the arguments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition when he said that every seat should have 3,000 voters and the Boundaries Commission which said that every seat would have 4,200 voters. I do assure the House that I personally will not be supporting a House of Assembly of 50 seats which is what the argument of the hon. member for St. John has embodied in a Resolution would imply. I am not in favour of

increasing the seats by 26 but I have no doubt that the principle of equality will form a part of its deliberations.

Now the particular situation, Sir, Barbados as we find it because what I have said so far is addressed to general principles. In the last General Election, Sir, there were 134,000 electors registered in Barbados.

The computer print out, plus the computer analysis of those who are known to be voters who have not registered reveal a total of 151,721 electors likely to be on the Electoral List when it was published at the end of this month. That was the figure based on an analysis in May. This morning I was told that it is possible that that figure will be 2,000 larger up to 153,000, Sir, but I am relying on the computer analysis and dealing with the 151,721. That makes an average total, Sir, of 6,322 voters per present constituency.

An Elections and Boundaries Commission Act is in prospect and I am not going to anticipate it or discuss it at any length save that at the end of my speech I will make another reference to it. The first draft of that Act provides that there shall be an Election of the Boundaries Commission, a permanent one, not such as we are seeking to set up today and that this Commission will be charged with the duty of ensuring equality of each electorate plus a minus 10%. I myself after looking at the list thought that 10% is too restrictive. It could be done in Barbados for a small country and have good possibilities of collecting electorate statistics but I have gone for the present purpose and I will suggest this to the Committee in due course that it should also adopt on the basis that there should not be a variation of more than 20% in the electorate.

Barbados is not Britain, Sir, with large historical towns whose representation you do not wish to take away because of their character like Canterbury even when the population gets small. In Barbados, apart from the parish boundaries there are virtually no historical reasons why no part of the Island should be in this district rather than another and I think we should much more closely address ourselves with the principles of electoral reforms which are in vogue in the United States of America which are that within a State boundary districts must be equal.

I am suggesting, Sir, that a figure of 20% is more realistic in Barbados. Using this figure roughly speaking, Sir, any constituency with less than 5,100 voters should receive voters and any constituency with more than 7,500 voters should give up voters.

1.40 p.m.

It will be found that there are five Constituencies which have less than the norm, there are five which

have more than this norm and there is one marginal Constituency in each category. The five Constituencies which have too few voters are: St. Michael South West, St. Michael South Central, St. Michael South, Christ Church West, and St. Joseph. Bridgetown Sir, beary has the right number of voters, but it is expected that with removal from the Church Village area and some removals apparently, are likely once more, in the Emmerton area with the development of the Sports Complex at Murphy's pasture, it is considered that, say in a year's time Sir, Bridgetown will also be a little substandard.

The Constituencies which have too many voters are St. Michael North West, St. Michael West, St. Michael North East, St. Michael South East and St. James, a band in other words, Sir, of the immediate suburbs of Bridgetown, starting with St. Michael South East and going right around the coast in St. James. Christ Church North Central, whose population has been increased faster than that of any other Constituency, will very shortly have too many voters also. Christ Church North Central is the largest Constituency outside St. Michael and St. James. St. James and St. Michael North West Sir, have 18,332 voters between them. They have almost as many voters as St. Michael South West, St. Michael South Central, St. Michael South and St. Joseph put together. In other words, Sir, St. James and St. Michael North West are returning two members with the same number of votes, as those four Constituencies which I have recited. This is against all modern electoral principle and practice and there is an even greater, aggravating factor. You are dealing with as many persons in St. Michael North West, under the age of 16, as virtually in the whole of St. Joseph. In other words, these are young electorates in these suburban Constituencies who are coming of age rapidly and can be expected to exaggerate the disproportion.

The number of voters, Sir, in St. Michael North West comprising Cave Hill, Lodge Hill, Jackson, is very nearly as great as the number of voters in St. Joseph. It is expected, Sir, that when West Terrace is completed by the Hon. Minister of Housing, by the National Housing Corporation, that the area between Holder's Hill and the University will have as many voters, as almost to bring it up to the norm which I have mentioned. That by itself, will have more voters than all but six or seven of the Constituencies. This is what the redistribution exercise is all about. Speaking, Sir, rationally, in relation to a group of irrational persons, certain members of the Democratic Labour Party, I will actually be ashamed for them if they sought to repudiate their own arguments, all of which are proper, good and decent arguments which could be put forward by a reasonable, political Party, just

because fortune has taken them from Government, into Opposition.

I know that no Political Party likes to see a re-distribution of seats when it is not in Government. I must say that I can understand that our Party argued **against** the Single Member Constituencies in 1955 and 1956. I can understand it, although I would not forgive it. I would hope that I would have the political courage, if a re-distribution were well based, to support it, should I ever happen to be in Opposition again. I would have to ask God to give me the strength to support what I know is right and I can only regret that God has not given the Hon. Members opposite, the moral strength to support, what in their hearts, they know is right on this occasion.

The six largest Constituencies, Sir, a quarter of the Constituencies, have over 50,000 voters, more than one third of the voters. The Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central is holding up a Gideon Bible, he should better put it down, before it burns his hand, that is not his line, Sir. The bottom six Constituencies have 24,000 voters, less than half the top six.

This has been a long process, we have a Commission now, they are having another Commission and we will have an Order. But, it is a process which has to be carried out. We would be abrogating our responsibility expressed in our Manifesto, to review the Parliamentary Boundaries and to establish an Election and Boundaries Commission, if we did not carry it out.

There is a hymn tune Sir, it would be familiar to the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West, but I doubt that the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central will be aware of it, "We shall not be moved". A pleasant enough tune, Sir, we shall not be moved in this regard.

Now, I want to clear up a difficulty which arose in the mind of the Hon. Member for St. Michael South. It has already been cleared up with him, but perhaps, other Hon. Members and the general public would wish to understand the difference between this Commission and the Election and Boundaries Commission. In Westminster Parliaments, Sir, it is normal for boundaries to be reviewed by Speakers' Commissions, but over the years, these have given rise to controversy, nearly always unjustified, around the Commonwealth, which involve the Speaker in areas of controversy which, if possible in my opinion, should be avoided. There is enough controversy in the Hon. House which has a minority, which does not accept the Rules and does not accept its minority position, which sees an easy and cheap form of publicity arising

from cheap, petty, unreasonable, unfair, uninformed criticism of a Speaker. There is no need to add areas where this battle can be further fought. Our Party, therefore, has decided that there will be a permanent Election and Boundaries Commission, that it will be made a part of the Constitution, it will be entrenched in the Constitution, so that a constitutional majority will be required to remove it. It will be charged with examining Parliamentary Boundaries and reporting — I have forgotten the period Sir, I think it is every two years — of any changes which may be necessary.

Now, this Commission cannot be set up to deal with the next General Elections. Efforts could have been made to do it, but I myself believe that it would be unnecessarily forcing the issue and we would not get a job.
1.50 p.m.

It will be set up, but my opinion is that it should not deal with the next election. Just as we have decided that we will not disfranchise those persons who have refused to go and register under the new system for the next election, we have also decided that we will not introduce major innovations such as taking the electoral machinery out of the hands of a department and putting it in the hands of a Commission at this time. We would therefore be left with a situation where the disparity in boundaries would get worse and worse until three or four years pass and perhaps twenty full years pass from the last major adjustment of the boundaries before there can be another adjustment, and for this reason and also for the reason of the respect which this House holds for the Constitutional Review Commission earlier action is necessary.

We have therefore adopted the procedure introduced by the former Government of the Democratic Labour Party and we seek a Boundaries Review Commission here and now to review the present situation. Unlike the earlier occasion the *de facto* Opposition will or can be represented on the new Commission. We are making provision for five hon. members to sit under your chairmanship. We intend that the five hon. members will be divided, three to be nominated from this side and two to be nominated from the Opposition. It makes little difference to us if the Opposition choose to exercise their constitutional rights or if indeed they run from their responsibilities. I do not even want to know. They can do as they like when the moment comes. All that we can say, Sir, we will sit with them in Committee and we will sit without them in Committee, entirely as they choose. We can do our duty, but you cannot make an irresponsible man do his duty. If they choose to be irresponsible, it is entirely up to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have made available to the Opposition Appendix "C" showing the computer pro-

jection on the numbers which will be found in each constituency. For the benefit of the public I will mention the range of figures. St. Michael South West has just under 9,500 voters; St. Joseph has just over 4,500; St. James has over 8,800 voters, St. Michael South East just under 8,800; St. Michael North East 8,500; Christ Church North Central just about 7,500 and at the other end of the list — the smallest is St. Joseph — St. Michael South 4,900; St. Michael South West 4,700; St. Michael South Central 4,900.

I do not know if hon. members need maps. I have some of the maps here available if they would help any hon. member studying the situation. I also have the registrants, these are actual registrants, in each polling district. There has been some very small re-arrangement of the polling districts in one or two places. The number of registrants in the polling districts varies from 2,480 voters in DA-1 which is an area in Cave Hill down to RA-1 in St. Michael South Central which has eleven voters. Without looking at the map I do not even know where RA-1 is.

Dr. HAYNES rose.

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

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order in response to a question posed by the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has an opportunity to address the Chair and to make his contribution.

Dr. HAYNES: If you do not wish me to respond, fair enough.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think Mr. Speaker is chiding me rather than the hon. member and I accept the reproof. But hon. members will see that there is very great variation. If at one polling station which will in the ordinary way, unless you consolidated it, require a presiding officer, assistant presiding officer, and poll clerk there will be eleven voters while in another polling station 2,400 voters will have to cast their votes, they may perhaps realise that there is a great deal that requires to be done in order to tidy up the electoral procedures before next time.

Mr. Speaker, I have set out what is involved and I have with me here in the House all of the information that hon. members can need. The Government considers that there may be a logical case, and I use the word "may" for increasing the membership of the House, but it is open to decision whether there should be an increase, and if so, whether the increase should be six, five, four, three, two or one member. The Government considers that a situation where one constituency has

more than twice as many voters as another is a bad one and needs to be rectified in the interest of representation of the large constituency; Government intends that this entire process will be carried out openly, not secretly, surreptitiously dishonestly or improperly as might very reasonably have been said to have been the case in 1971. We intend that there will be a report, that the report will be followed by a boundaries order and that the next election will be fought on the basis of the boundaries order if the Commission so recommends and in the terms set out in that boundaries order.

Every one in the House will have a chance to make his voice heard to representatives of his own party on that Committee. I hardly feel it necessary to give a pledge to hon. members that the Committee will approach the division of the boundaries on a fair basis. I have already given some indication to some hon. members on the other side that neither malice nor petty partisan advantage will play any part of the sub-divisions. I know perfectly well in their hearts that decent members like the hon. member for St. Michael South are fully aware of that, but that he will be constrained to find an argument against a Commission and his only argument would be that you should not do it before the election; he has not got another argument in his mouth. He will make a long speech to that effect, he will say at length that you must not do it before the election, he will avoid dealing with the fact that the Democratic Labour Party did it immediately before the election of 1971, he will not find any excuse for the gerrymandering of that day, he will avoid saying that it is wrong that after the abolition of Local Government that you should put 10,000 electors on one man in Barbados. All he is going to say is that it is before the election. He does not know when the election is going to be, all he knows is that it is too close before the election. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central is going to say that we want to cut up his constituency so he does not have one, but no matter what we do in St. Michael he can find somewhere in St. Michael to run and get a seat. That will be the burden of his argument. The hon. member for St. Michael South West is not going to say very much because he has already indirectly stated his claim to the portion of St. Michael West that he wants added on to his constituency and he will be happy with it. But the arguments that we are going to hear from that side will pay no attention to logic, none to reason, none to commonsense, but a great deal to political prejudice and to the fact that they feel that they are the only people that have a right to cut up the constituencies in this country.

2.00 p.m.

That is at the basis of it all, that is entirely what it comes down to, that they are fighting for a chance to cut them up themselves in due course.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry to have anticipated the speeches of the hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is your privilege.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The speech that I will listen to with the greatest interest in that of the Leader of the Opposition, because I want to know how he is going to get away from 1971 and 1955, I want to know how he is going to explain that it was all right for him to cut up the constituencies six weeks before an election but it is not all right for us to do it more than a year before a potential election. I want to know how he is going to get away from that and how he is going to get away from the equality of the constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it is now five minutes after two and I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock today.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Question No. 43 was asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central whom I do not now see in his place.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Question was held over from last Tuesday for the purpose of allowing the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to call the Question so that we can give him the Reply. I do not see him in his place, again and I am wondering if

any of the other hon. members on the other side would like to call it. Failing that I will have to lay the Reply, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the point at issue. This House I think has done everything that is humanly possible to accommodate the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. If he is not now in his place, let the Reply be laid.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to lay the Reply to Question 43.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Question time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Private Members' Business be the instant Order of the day. There is a Resolution here in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central since the third week of May, 1980. Nothing has been done about it, I do not know if any of the hon. members would like to start this Resolution for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: It really is not done that way.

The question that Private Members' Business be the instant Order of the day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION TAKING NOTE OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY ON GAMBLING

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central I do not now observe in his place.

This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business. Government Business is the instant Order of the day. When the suspension was taken the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister had completed his address and had formally moved the motion that this Resolution do now pass. It was seconded by the Hon. Minister, the Acting Leader of the House, who reserved his right to speak.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that we are debating reads:

"Be it Resolved that Firstly the House of Assembly approve the establishment of a Select Committee of Parliament to review the distribution of voters in Barbados and to recommend the adjustments of the electoral boundaries that have become necessary.

And Secondly that the Select Committee shall be comprised."

I would like to take exception to the grammar, which I am sure Your Honour will also agree with me, but I can only read what the Resolution says, because a Committee cannot be comprised of five hon. members. I am only reading, I am not apologising for it.

". shall be comprised of five honourable members, with the Speaker of the House as Chairman.

And Thirdly that the terms of reference of the Committee shall be as follows:

- (1) to review the boundaries of the constituencies into which the island is divided under and by virtue of Section 3 of the Representation of the People Act Cap. 12 and Section 41(1) of the Constitution;
- (2) to submit a report to the House of Assembly showing the constituencies into which it recommends that the island should be divided.

And Be it Further Resolved that the Report of the Committee shall be submitted to the House of Assembly within three months after the date upon which the Committee is appointed, and shall state, as respects each constituency, the name by which the Committee recommends that the constituency should be known." 3.05 p.m.

In presenting the Resolution to the House, the Hon. Prime Minister gave some kind of historical review of the development of constituencies and boundaries in Barbados. He started off by saying that the first extension was made from 11 constituencies of 22 members to 12 constituencies of 24 members and a step which was taken about 150 years ago and in which he rightly noted that Samuel Jackman Prescod was elected for the City of Bridgetown.

The House of Assembly from that time until this has had 24 members, from the time when the constituency of Bridgetown was added but what is significant, of course, is that whereas the population of Great Britain and other countries doubled and redoubled during that 150 years, the population of Barbados largely due to migration and other factors remained comparatively stable during the same period of time, comparatively stable.

Certainly with the introduction of Universal Adult Suffrage the number of registering voters was increased but if I might give Your Honour some kind of indication

of what I mean. At the time of the Revolution, the American War of Independence, the 13 American colonies comprised of some three million to three and a half million inhabitants in 1776. The United States of America has now celebrated their 200th anniversary just four or five years ago. The population in the United States of America is now over two million persons.

The population of Great Britain at the time when the City of Bridgetown was added as an additional constituency to this Island the population of Great Britain was less than 10 million persons. Today, the population of Great Britain has grown 500% and has over 50 million persons.

The population of Barbados in the 19th Century was 180,000 persons. In the middle of the 19th Century it was 180,000 persons. The population of Barbados in the middle of the 20th Century in the 1950's when Universal Adult Suffrage was introduced it just about reached the 200,000 mark. In other words, the population as far as the Census or Statistics would establish has increased by a mere, let us say, 10% or 12% over a period when the population of Great Britain was increased to over 500 votes and this was largely due to the large migration and migration which has taken place from Barbados to other countries which need not be enumerated at this stage so one has to look at the picture in Barbados to see whether there has been any burgeoning of population growth to justify the measures which we are now likely to be asked to underwrite.

Various reasons, Mr. Speaker, have been advanced to support the claims which are being made for adding constituencies under the Representation of the People Act. In 1967 the Representation of the People Act which, as far as I can remember had not been changed to any great degree in 1957, was changed for the introduction of a new system of registration, the introduction of a monthly publication of register of electors which has been abolished now and the division of the Island into single member constituencies. At no time was it suggested, except by some members of the Commission or Committee which was set up by this House that the Island needed more members than the 24 members who sit in Parliament to effectively carry out the people's business.

A lot of misrepresentations were made by the hon. member during the course of his speech but we made one accurate statement among other things that the Barbados Labour Party opposed single member constituencies. He tells us today that he disagree or disagrees now with the stand that they took then. They disagreed with single member constituencies. My recollection is that they disagreed with the reduction of the voting age to 18 as well but they disagreed with single member

constituencies and he is the person who said it in here today so I do not have to go back and quote the records which I have in front of me. They disagreed with the creation of single member constituencies.

He also quite accurately said that in 1955, which is 25 years ago that the earliest record in the history of mankind, not the history of Barbados, but the history of mankind of any one asking for a more equitable system of voting in Barbados was made by the hon. member for St. George myself, now the member for St. John when I asked for the distribution of the Island on the basis of single member constituencies and I introduced the Resolution on the floor of this House in 1955 but what he takes me up on because he feels there is not sufficient support probably moral or otherwise for the increase in the number of seats, he said that I asked for one representative for every 3,000 voters. That is ridiculous in my submission, Mr. Speaker, a ridiculous argument because if there are 70,000 people on the Electoral Register I could not ask for one representative for every 8,000 or 10,000 voters and if there were more than 72,000 voters the argument would still be unintelligible because he would not think that I was going to disenfranchise anybody over 72,000 who did not have the right to vote so that would have to be a very ridiculous and contentious kind of argument that I only wanted more representatives for 3,000 more voters but what we did establish by the time in 1967 that we established the Commission that it had come to an average of about one representative for 4,200 persons which would give you pretty close to 98,000 or 100,000 people who were entitled to be registered at that time.

Sir, I will deal with that right here. I am the first person to have introduced that on the floor of this House in Barbados to ask for single member constituencies and in my speech in 1971, I quote it and it is here in front of me and it was not any six weeks before an Election and it was way back in May, 1971 when we were updating the Register and the various things that had to be done that I presented to the House certain refinements and realignments which I need not go into here now like cutting the City Boundary which used to go up to a place called the "Bridge" which nobody could find at all, straight across Jemmott Lane and then it went through my Grandfather's property with the red line mark when one half of the bar was in the City and the other one was in another part of St. Michael and then down to Pelican Island which has ceased to exist and that sort of thing.

We recognised the boundaries in the course of that debate with the approval of the House in 1971 and when we came to St. James... (ASIDES) I do not have the Boundaries Debate. I will lend the hon. member the

debate. The Boundaries Commission had taken off certain of the areas in St. James or certain of the areas in St. Andrew which crossed St. James as far as I remember, Sir.

3.15 p.m.

It was recommended here, on the Floor of the Hon. House, that a certain part of St. James be added on to the Constituency of St. Andrew, it was my recollection and then, there was some discussion about whether the line should go through the gully in Springhead, or up on top of the hill Sir, but basically, the concept remained that what we were trying to do at that stage, was to equalise the number of voters since the 1967 recommendation of the Boundaries Commission which was at that time, to quote my words, *functus officio*, having reported to the Hon. House. It was like this Select Committee, any other Select Committee, but it became *functus officio*, having discharged the duties of its office and there was no permanent Boundaries Commission and therefore, the Hon. Members of the Hon. House sat in here, as far as I remember, Hon. Members of the Hon. House in here, as far as I can remember, Sir — I am speaking, subject to correction Sir, I do not want to waste time now — unanimously approved, certainly in Committee, and certainly in the third reading — I would have a search made for the passage we set up — unanimously approved the Representation of the People Act, which was introduced here in May, 1971, the Elections did not take place until September and the Hon. Minister in introducing the Bill, explained that since the Boundaries Commission had made their recommendations that under the Act, that the Hon. House had the authority and the Hon. Minister had the authority to make recommendations which would be approved by the Hon. House of Assembly on the question of boundaries, in order to keep the number of voters in each Constituency as even, as was practicable and as far as I know Sir, that is still the power of the Hon. House. There was no power inherent, neither is there a power inherent — if the Hon. House at that time, under the Representation of the People Act, to get up and merely say that there are Single Member Constituencies because the Constituencies were defined in the Representation of the People Act.

Sometime ago, I made a statement to the effect that there was no Mandate for either Party to increase the number of seats in the House of Assembly and that I understood that it was the intention of the Government to increase the number of seats. This was met by an emphatic denial from no less a personage, than the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister himself, who said that he heard that the matter had been mentioned by the Boundaries Commission but certainly, it was no part of the policy of the Barbados Labour Party. I do not have the Report, here Sir, I am speaking from my recollection but I have the Report, I do not have it here, I can get it in fifteen

minutes but I cannot interrupt my speech to get it. Some time after that, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister addressed a gathering of seven to nine persons, two dogs and three stray cats in Edgecliffe in St. John, five of whom travelled from as far afield as St. Michael. (ASIDES: That is what he calls the people in Barbados, dogs.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not refer to the Hon. Member at any part of my speech, so I do not know what the Hon. Member is concerned about. (Asides). Do not call the Hon. Member by name, it is against the Rules of the Hon. House.

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister said then that it was their intention to divide the Constituency of St. John into two parts and that is the first intimation that it was any part of the policy of the Governing Party to increase the number of seats because that came about three months after he had emphatically denied that there was to be any increase in the number of seats.

Now, it appears, that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, from the tone and manner in which he introduced this Resolution, is highly agitated. I am not going to say that he was neurotic at all, but he was highly agitated because of the positive statement made by the Parliamentary Group of the Democratic Labour Party on the question of increasing the number of seats. He accused the Hon. Members of the Democratic Labour Party of associating with perverts and all kinds of other things, which one would not normally expect, you even Mr. Speaker, will not normally expect to hear in Parliament.

After starting out with such an analytical and historical survey of the representation of the people in Barbados from the year 1629, I was surprised at the way in which he allowed himself to fall from that kind of presentation, to one in which he completely distorted the attitude of myself in 1955, when I created history in this Island, by asking for Single Member Constituencies, and saying that we are being 'hypocritical, illogical, and unreasonable' now to suggest that they should not parenthetically increase the number of seats, when I wanted only three thousand voters to a Constituency. Twenty-five years later, he is saying that. He said that the Hon. Member for St. John wanted one Member to three thousand voters.

3.25 p.m.

We passed the Boundaries Commission Act way back in 1962. The hon. member also said that under that Act when the Speaker was the Chairman and there were two members of the General Assembly and one member on the advice of the Leader of the Opposition the Barbados Labour Party was deliberately left out of the Commission. The Barbados Labour Party was not the Official Opposition. This is not a system in Barbados

where we have proportional representation as you well know, Sir, and you are either in the Official Opposition or not in the Official Opposition. But both at that time and subsequently at the time of the independence talk, the way it was being presented the Opposition would have had more members on Committees, the combined forces of the Opposition, if we followed their dictum, than the Government itself. They wanted more members to go up to the Constitutional Conference between the Conservative Party and the Barbados Labour Party than the Government had, and at that time we said we would pay for two members no matter where they came from, and they went throughout the length and breadth of this Island criticising that, saying that we did not recognise the unofficial Opposition. You are either official or you are not official. If they had an unofficial Opposition here, you could not consult the unofficial Opposition because there is no reference to an unofficial Opposition in the Constitution of Barbados. In some Parliaments in Europe there are 32 unofficial Opposition Parties. Think how ungovernable or how more ungovernable some of these countries would be if you had to consult the unofficial Opposition every time you wanted to do something which affected the administration of the country.

These kinds of tendentious arguments that are produced are not very impressive no matter how you raise your voice or lower it for effect. You have to examine what is being said. You have one kind of argument. You opposed single member constituencies and now you want more constituencies under single members. That is your prerogative. The hon. member has virtually apologised for the actions of his party at that time. Now he says that we are being inconsistent, that we are opposing an increase in the number of incidentals, but he does not know whether there is going to be an increase in the number of representatives. If he does not know, I know. I know from his actions and from what the hon. member has said that the whole purpose of this exercise is to accommodate certain persons who are not certain they will be accommodated by the electorate unless there is an increase in the number of seats. I have called no names because it would be unparliamentary for me to call names in here. The hon. member for St. James thinks he will be affected but he says he can get a seat anywhere.

I say that the whole community knows that the object of this exercise is not to give the people in Barbados fuller representation, but to try to safeguard seats for certain people in this Island. What may happen is that they might not get the seats at all, but I do not see why this experiment should be carried out at the expense of the taxpayers of Barbados. Now we hear that cost is unimportant, yet in their very manifesto in the manifesto of the Government Party they said they were going to reduce the cost of Parliament. I am only quoting them. You cannot reduce the cost of Parliament by increasing parliamentary salaries including the Opposition and backbenchers and

Ministers' salaries. You have to be consistent, and then to add insult to injury or to compound the felony as it were, using the word not as a legal term but merely in a metaphorical sense, to compound it you go and increase the number of seats which logically would then not only add to the number of members but must add to the expense of running Parliament. It stands to reason that you cannot make fish of one and fowl of another. You cannot pay some and not pay the others. You may have hon. members of Parliament but you cannot have honorary members of Parliament. You can be an honorary something or other in a club, but inside here you have to be paid once you come in until you abolish paying members. You cannot have some who are honorary like an honorary vice-president of a cricket club who does not get paid or an honorary treasurer. You have to be a member who is paid to represent the people like anybody else and therefore it is going to add to the cost, and we are opposed to that. We are opposed to it because we never were in favour of it. We have always been in favour of single member constituencies. What we are in favour of is from time to time the House re-adjusting the boundaries, and that is the prerogative of the House, and provided we do not get a sudden splurge of work permits — and I see there is \$1 million in the Estimates which I have worked out would be 5,000 non-Barbadians coming in the work force this year alone. The hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Prime Minister said bank managers pay \$5,000. Well that would be 200 bank managers or 5,000 workers at \$200 a piece or 200 bank managers at \$5,000 a piece. There is \$1 million in the Estimates and unless we get like 5,000 now for the next five years and go on like that for the next 50 years where the population will double not by the rate of natural increase, but will double by the influx of people who are coming in here to accept the voting patterns of Barbados, people who are not committed to this country, people who do not understand our politics in Barbados, but who feel grateful to the people who issue work permits to them after being here two weeks and getting Government houses after sometimes two and a half and three weeks, they are the people that we have to watch. If we get that kind of thing going on, you are bound to get an upset in the population distribution of this country, and that is a very dangerous thing.

I said a long time ago and the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Prime Minister has quoted me as saying that we are going to wake up one morning and find that Barbados does not belong to us, and I am very serious about that. \$1 million we have in the Estimates now for issuing work permits this year. That is in the Estimates and we passed the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you are not reflecting on a vote of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, I am just emphasising the vote of the House, not reflecting at all. I do not think I have emphasised it enough, I am sure you will agree. What I am saying is this: that in Britain there are over 30 million odd people on the register. There are about 632 members of the House of Commons, *(Asides)* 630 odd. I doubt you ever get 635 of them sworn in at any one time. Between the time the election is held and the time of the first sitting of Parliament, you have three by-elections, even if it is four days later. It is as strange as that, but that happens all the time. Check it every year. There are 630 odd and less than 640. I wrote the other day for somebody to draw some money; I was going out of the Island and I had to put "not more than one hundred and twenty dollars" because I did not know what the exact amount was. I had to make sure that they did not go and add on any noughts; I did not know the person. In Britain there are not more than 640 people in the House of Commons and there are 30 million voters odd. That gives you 50,000 people to each member.

I heard some discussion in here a little earlier on, not today, a little while back when we were discussing salaries about how burdensome it is for an M.P. in Barbados with 5,000 or 6,000 voters and people coming and annoying you about jobs and that kind of thing. It has never been any burden to me. If I had 10,000 people to represent it would be no burden to me, and if I were a Britain M.P. and I had 50,000 people to represent, it would not be any burden to me.
3.35 p.m.

It would be no burden to me if I had 50,000 Barbadians to represent, because I still have to represent the ones who voted for the Democratic Labour Party who are not represented in Parliament by a sitting member, and that amounts to probably 20 or 25 thousand when I have to take care of some constituencies that are not represented in here, so do not let us talk about all this burden and juggle around with figures and say there is a minimum amount of expenditure. When we were saying, Mr. Speaker, that in a small country there is a minimum number of Ministries that you must have, the Constitution of Barbados, not the one that we introduced here, the Independence Constitution, but the Constitution before that had stated that there should be a Premier and not less than five Ministers. The Constitution stipulated that you should not have less than a certain number of Ministers and we did not do that Constitution, so we know that there is a minimum number, but we got along for 351 years by my reckoning — either 341 or 351, the records go back to 1639, some people said we started in 1629 — If it is 1629 it is 351 years with 22 members, later increasing to 24, and now all of a sudden, they say it is not on the eve of the election? Every day is the eve of

the election under our Constitution because we do not run a presidential system here where the Chief Executive has a fixed term of four years. From the time you get elected, as I tell people all the time, you have to realise that you can face an election constitutionally within the next four weeks or 26 to 28 days, because the law allows it and sometimes the situation demands it.

In some countries, such as Canada, they have been running minority governments. Mr. Joe Clarke did not stay in office 11 months, so every day was the eve of the election for him, he was on borrowed time from the day he got in because he did not have an absolute majority in Parliament, so when we are accused of saying on the eve of the election, it is the eve of the election because we have less than 15 months constitutionally to run before the election, and we are saying that whereas the House has an inherent right under the Representation of the People Act, that part of it which has not been adulterated, the House has an inherent right to readjust the boundaries, the provision has been made for that. We are not challenging the right of the House or the Government to readjust the boundaries, there is no justification whatsoever for increasing the number of seats in this Parliament and we say that if you wish to increase the number of seats in a Parliament, then this is a matter for the people who put you there to say that they do not think that they are adequately represented.

Mr. Speaker, you can go so far as to have 300 people sitting in Parliament and the people may not be properly represented if you do not do the people's business properly when you come in here, or if you are not allowed to. You can get up there and talk and curse one another and you may not be doing the people's business, you may be dealing with irrelevancies, or you may be introducing legislation from week to week which is of greater benefit to people who are not residents and citizens of Barbados, so that for the people who put you there it could be total dereliction of the people who put you there to represent them, and you can have 300 members doing that and the people are not properly represented.

On the other hand, you can have a half dozen or 14 people who know what they are doing and have the interest of the people at heart, and the whole island, if they are doing it without fear or favour, will be properly represented with 14 people inside here. It is not a question of quantity, it is the question of the quality of your representation that counts. How do you know you are going to get better representation with three, four, five or six more people? That is the question which we have to ask ourselves — I am not asking you that question because your answer would be just to treat me with dignified silence, it would only be rhetorical

— but how do we know that we are going to get better representatives or better representation if we merely increase the seats? Nobody is being fooled by this exercise, least of all the Opposition on this side.

I just want to say this, under the Representation of the People Act the House of Assembly has the inherent right to realign the boundaries as was done in 1971, minor adjustments were made, questions were asked, a long debate took place, suggestions were made and the thing was done in a very democratic manner. There was no question of anything being done surreptitiously or two weeks before the election. That is nonsense to begin with, Sir, you cannot do anything in Barbados two weeks before the election with Parliament, because first Parliament has to be prorogued, then you have a certain number of days for issuing a Writ, then you have a certain number of days before nomination, and then a certain number of days before the election itself, and the minimum time which has to elapse is 26 days. The Representation of the People Act whereby we debated the adjustments and so of the Act of 1967 took place in May 1971 and my recollection is that the election was not until September, 1971.

The debate in 1971 centred around the exact alignment of the boundaries and so on. This was a very long debate and I would not say that it was any kind of acrimonious debate at all. The debate started on the 18th May, 1971 with the second reading. There was absolutely no question on that day of anybody adding on any constituencies in this island, absolutely no question of it at all, and to come now and suggest as the hon. member has suggested that it is cheap opportunism to oppose additional seats, it is not cheap opportunism at all, it is economy.

3.45 p.m.

It is not cheap opportunism at all. It is economy and although there are some people in this country who may feel that there is no limit to the endurance of the taxpayers of Barbados, unless we set an example here in this House people are not going to think that we are serious of cutting down on the burden which is inflicted on the taxpayers in Barbados. It is for that reason why even within the ranks of the Democratic Labour Party when His Honour the Speaker himself submitted a minority Report in which he said that there should be an increase in the number of seats, the majority of people in the then Government Party did not agree with the minority Report that there should be any increase in the number of seat although they were people, fortunately they were in the minority.

I do not wish to go so far as the Hon. Minister and say that it was based on self interest because one cannot impute, according to our Standing Orders, im-

proper motives even to past members. If a person has an opinion, he is entitled to that opinion, but the point was that the majority of my colleagues did not agree that there should be any increase in the number of seats because we did not see how the efficiency of the administration was going to be increased by the number of seats.

Now, the hon. member went on to make some references to the fact that in the United States there were thousands and thousands of elected officials and in Barbados we only had 24 elected officials. I never thought that I would hear him indulging in that sort of discussion at all. Judges are elected in the United States of America. Dog Catchers are elected officials in the United States. The Dog Catcher's job is one of the grounds of office in a place like Hobogan, New Jersey and Barabas, New Jersey, those two particular constituencies. A well-known singer comes from the first one and places like Hobogan and Barabas, New Jersey around the Water Project, a Dog Catcher's job is an elected official.

Commissioners of Police are elected officials. Can you compare them with the 24 members and say, well look in the United States they have so many elected officials when the very Judges are elected officials and we try to compare them with the political representatives of the people who are passing legislation? We are speaking now about legislators. We are not speaking about dog catchers. We are speaking about legislators and in the United Kingdom which is the best comparison you have less than 640 for an electorate of over 30 million.

The Local Government Council as far as I know are not paid in the United Kingdom and their duties as far as I know you have various levels of Local Government. You have Village Councils. You have Bar Councils. You have Municipal Councils and when you get to the London City Council you have all kinds of Parish Councils and that sort of thing, if you want to rake in all of those and call them legislators. I do not call them legislators, but their duties are becoming more and more circumscribed. You have the Watch Committees who look after the joint Police Force of the country or who probably do a useful job because there is no centralised Police Service in the United Kingdom except in Metropolitan London where you have the Metropolitan Police Service but you cannot compare Local Government.

If you want to re-introduce Local Government, re-introduce Local Government but you cannot speak of a place like the Outer Hebrides and expect that anybody in Westminster is going to concern themselves with repairing the roads in the Outer Hebrides so you need Local Government but Local Government is not a substitute or an appendage to Central Government in that

particular respect. It does not derogate from the right of the Central Government to do a whole plethora of actions which concern the welfare of the community and the safety of the State.

It is in the Central Government that the authorities reside where all the big decisions are made. You can have all the Local Government Councils in the World. It does not diminish the responsibility of Parliamentarians. It does not derogate from the authorities of Parliament in any respect.

I do not think personally that the work of Parliament in Barbados has in any way increased because of the abolition of Local Government. What has happened is that the size of the Civil Service has increased because we have taken over people like the Public Health Inspectors and we have appointed certain Boards like the Cemetery Board, the Sanitation Board, Parks and Beaches and Commissions and so on who are doing a lot of the work that used to be done by the Local Government Authorities or should have been done by the Local Government Authorities but was not being done efficiently either through lack of funds or lack of foresight but you cannot say that the work of us Parliamentarians has increased considerably, that we have to attend here more hours per day and that if we had four or five more people in here to help us or half dozen more people to help us that that would take the strain off the Local Government, that we in Barbados after the recommendation of Mr. R. M. Jackson who looked into the whole system and found it wasteful and I do not think the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, would say that he wanted — I know that some people during Elections said that they were going to re-introduce Local Government but I have not seen it come about yet. Maybe they have learnt the error of their ways but be it administrative, the parochial boundaries which were drawn up in the 17th Century had something to do with distance that someone could walk.

In Yorkshire, it was the distance a person could ride. In Ontario there are still called Ridings because a Preacher and a Doctor could reach somebody in the course of the day's riding. In Barbados it was the parochial boundaries because an old mule drawing a buggy could take the Doctor or the Minister comfortably from the Rectory to the parish boundary to make visits and that was supposed to be an administrative district as well.

There is no justification for the retention of a parochial boundary even for administrative or any other purpose, even for the Representation of the People's Act but the solution of that is to readjust the boundaries from time to time, not to add in the constituencies, readjust the boundaries. Forget that St. George ends somewhere up by Salters and Waterford bottom or just

beyond Hothersal Turning and that Christ Church is at Bush Hill and try to readjust you population groupings in a realistic kind of way that it would be easy to define both from the point of view of the Registering Officer to the enumerators and that people would know where they have to go and vote and try to make them as equally balanced as possible but there is no justification in a little two by four place like Barbados and I live in a two by four country, let us face it, in terms of the magnitude and colossus of Brazil and those places. You cannot even draw the outline of Barbados on a map of the World. You have to put a name and underline it.

Why are we trying to be so big and grandiose and saying that we must have this and we must have that. We manage very well. The fact that we have been doing things for a long time does not necessarily mean that it becomes sacrosanct because I never would have introduced a Resolution in here to change from double member constituencies to single member constituencies in 1955 because I would have said we have been doing it for over 300 years, let us continue it that way. That is the logic. 3.55 p.m.

But, it is equally illogical to say that you are going to get more effective and efficient representation by increasing the number of seats in the House of Assembly and I cannot get away from it, that that is the object of the exercise. I do not care how many Committees you appoint, the Opposition is going to be in the minority and I am going to come to another point, in a moment.

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister would not come in here and I would have been surprised, if he had come in here, I would have been disappointed, knowing the way how he operates, if he had come in here and he had not got his boundaries made out already. Let us face it Sir, it has got nothing to do with any Committee that is being set up. Let any of the other Commissions and Committees, Select Committees — You set up a Committee (*Asides*) to publicise what you have decided on, so we go through democratic motions, but the Hon. Members of the Opposition are not going to say, no you must not do this, and then, the Government says well, you say we must not do this and it is not going to be done. The Government already knows that it wants to increase the number of seats and how those seats are going to be increased. There is nothing — if you want to keep something secret in Barbados, you do not tell the first person. I did not say you do not tell the second person, you do not tell the first person. That has been my experience in Barbados. I do not have to say any more, but I will say this, I am not saying that there is anything to quarrel about it, this is the way in which they operate. You want to do something and you come through here and you tell people how democratic you have been by doing this. You set up a Select Committee, the other people have no say, you come back in here and say, this is the Select

Committee Report and if there are Hon. Members of the Opposition on the Select Committee — We even had in 1962, or, whenever it was, when we set up a Select Committee, the Speaker himself, no less a personage than the Speaker himself, wrote a minority Report but, the majority of the people in the Government felt that the Speaker was wrong, he was the presiding officer of this Hon. House and his minority Report — Well, when he got back in here, all he could say was all Hon. Members in favour say aye and all Hon. Members opposed, please say no and that was the end of his minority Report. But, he expressed his personal opinion and that is all that we are entitled to, to expressing a personal opinion, but, ours goes beyond personal opinion because we have never been in favour of the idea and I do not see anywhere down the road, that I would ever be in favour of the idea.

I said that if we go on issuing Work Permits at the current rate, the population doubling in five years' time, that maybe, we would then find ourselves in a position, where, we may say that things are getting a bit congested now, and people are clamouring for more personal contact with their representatives. I just do not know. I am not going to make rash statements and say, that never in the history of Barbados, that you will want more than 24 Hon. Members. There used to be a song to that effect one time, "Some other time, but not now", or within the foreseeable future because it is not justified.

I wish to come to the business Sir, about computerised — I just want to quote him accurately — the Hon. Member said that he has given to the Opposition, like if he were doing a big favour. What the Hon. Member did, was that he circulated the other Report on the National Registration Programme. All that he has put down here is no classified information of any kind. We used to published a Register every single month under the Representation of the People Act, until the Hon. Member changed it and now, you are only having a Register in January. Every single month, any member of the public — and he is talking about computerised — this is not computerised, this came off a cyclostyled machine and he has the Reporters rushing about in here about how he give you, all this computerised information. Look at it here, this foolishness here, about this computerised business. Every single month, anybody in Barbados could go to the Supervisor of Elections and inspect the Register which had to be updated every month and if his name were not there, get his name on it.

Now, a few — I do not want to put any descriptive adjective — a piece of cyclostyled, duplicating paper, he says how he gave me computerised everything, Sir. I brought in the 1401, the 360, the 370, the 711, dealing in computers in Barbados long ago, ten, twelve years. I took the Civil Servants in Jamaica and Trinidad to

Mexico to learn about computers, so you are not treating me by telling me that you gave me a few sheets that anybody in Barbados could have gone and inspected, up to the time you changed the Law and stopped us from seeing what was going on. You are talking about your getting computerised foolishness, let us grow up now. Tomorrow, I will read in the newspaper how he gave the Opposition this thing. Anybody can go and inspect and we are not happy about that change in the Representation of the People Act, whereby, there was a continuing Register which was updated every single month.

I should like to quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Debates in May, 1971, the same thing which he called surreptitious and everything. Now, in that Debate:

"This Bill when enacted will for the first time in the constitutional history of Barbados",

I am reading from page 3043, the Debates of 18th May, 1971 and I am quoting from the left hand side, on page 3043.

"allow elections to be conducted on a basis of single member constituencies, but the change to single member constituencies was made a long time ago when we set up a Boundaries Commission which became *functus officio* when it had delivered its report to Your Honour and then delivered it to the House. Your Honour, I believe, was Chairman of that Boundaries Commission, and that Boundaries Commission is not a standing Boundaries Commission, that Boundaries Commission became *functus officio* because it was established by the will of the Legislature and its terms of reference were limited to the function which it had to perform; Your Honour is well aware of that.

Those amendments were made in 1966, and in 1969 the Register of Electors (Special Provisions) Act came into force. As a matter of fact there is another bit of legislation, the Election Controversies Act, which has also been enacted but will only be proclaimed and become law, having been passed by both Houses of Parliament, the Election Controversies Act will become law when this Bill becomes law, and it is now in a state of suspended animation"

I go on Sir, I would like to skip a few lines.

"Certain changes have been made in the Representation of the People Act, but substantially apart from the system of registration and the keeping of registers the Bills are very similar; there are

five or six substantive changes, and in the first place certain boundaries have been rationalised."

I then went on to explain how the boundaries in the five or six Constituencies had been rationalised, in the Bill itself, which was discussed on the Floor of the Hon. House.

Later on, Mr. Speaker, I went on to explain that this Register was a permanent Register, that every month the Register was revised, that the Register was open to inspection, that any person could go to the Supervisor of Elections and object to the exclusion of his name, or the inclusion of somebody else's name who is supposed to be on the Register and after due enquiry, the Supervisor of Elections could either add, or delete a person's name.

Shortly after assuming office, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister came in here and expunged, from the Representation of the People Act, the requirement that the Register should be published monthly. So, a veil of secrecy was then drawn across the whole operation. Then, later on, we heard that an enumeration was taking place and various conflicting and contradictory statements were made from time to time.

4.05 p.m.

Statements were made from time to time and up to now I have not been able to unravel the true nature of the enumeration. Great concern has been growing in this country over the whole electoral process. The Prime Minister is concerned about the statement issued by the Parliamentary group of the Democratic Labour Party. That statement reflects the concern of the people in Barbados and as the representative of the people in Barbados, we not only express our own concern, we express the concern of the populace, and when a Prime Minister has to get up to be abusive and talking about being associated with perverts and matters of that kind in order to vindicate the passage of a Resolution seemingly innocuous in its nature, then we have to be more concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the hon. member is suggesting that the Chair permitted the Prime Minister to be abusive in this Hon. House.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: You said it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What did I say, Sir? The Prime Minister said that the members of the Opposition supported perverts and you said it was nothing unparliamentary about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: You said the Prime Minister was abusive, and when the Prime Minister addressed the Chair I was in the Chair. You will kindly withdraw that remark now.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are asking me to withdraw the remark?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not asking you, I am calling on you to do so.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, I withdraw it, but I will say this: when the Prime Minister accuses or has to accuse the Opposition of associating with perverts, criminals and thieves, I was told by the Chair he did not say inside here. What happens inside here I have no control of. If we have to associate with perverts, criminals and thieves inside here, the people put the people inside here, but when he accused us of doing that outside to vindicate the passage of a Resolution, then we have to be concerned because Parliament has sunk to a new depth. That is what I said and then we have to be more concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now you no doubt are trying to carry parliament to the new depth that you have in mind. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have been in here 31 years, Sir.) I do not mind how long you have been. The contraption under my feet prevents me from rising every moment, but when the Speaker is addressing the Chair the member who is addressing must take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I never heard the member standing must sit. I know when the Speaker rises, but if you tell me that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what I said. The contraption under my feet prevents me from rising when the occasion demands it. Please continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The contraption under my seat does not allow me to continue.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution that is before us had four objectives; basically it is to review the distribution of voters in Barbados; secondly it is to review the boundaries of existing constituencies; thirdly it is to designate or redesignate any existing, altered or any new constituency which may come into being, and fourthly it is to set up the machinery whereby these three objectives may be achieved, that is, by means of the establishment of a Select Committee of Parliament.

Now in looking at this particular matter, Resolutions of this type normally contain an Addendum which has explanatory material setting out the reasons or the

purposes or the necessity why the proposed measure is being introduced, and when I received my copy of this Resolution and I look at the Addendum to the Resolution I was shocked because I was looking for the reasons why this particular measure has become necessary, and what did I find in the Addendum? "The Cabinet has agreed that a Select Committee of Parliament should be set up to review the distribution of voters in Barbados and to recommend the adjustments of the electoral boundaries that have become necessary."

Now I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that that was the height of arrogance, that while members of Parliament are looking for reasons through the appropriate mechanisms established long ago in Parliament, what do we see: pure power play. There is tension in the air, there is tension everywhere. This is the Cabinet, the Cabinet has decided and so must it be. No reasons are given, no arguments advanced in the Addendum to assist members in understanding. All that is said is that the Cabinet has decided, the Cabinet has spoken and that is that.

I was a bit concerned or further concerned when in his address to this Honourable Chamber the Hon. Prime Minister underlined that level of arrogance when he stated, and let me be accurate in this: "We are the masters now" he said, "and you have to understand it". If we decide there will be a Boundaries Commission, there will be a Boundaries Commission. Those are the arguments advanced. There is to be a Boundaries Commission, the Government has decided that and so will it be. Caesar has spoken.

Mr. Speaker, the other attempts to explain this piece of legislation I have taken as a sort of window-dressing. I have asked myself in the absence of explanatory material in the Addendum why is this Resolution before us. I am unaware of any call, any demand or any insistence from the voters, the electorate or the people of this country for an increase in the number of seats or for a review of constituency boundaries. That is not an issue in this country. I know what people are concerned about because they talk about the cost of living, they talk about inflation, they talk about bad roads and such matters, those are the matters that are agitating the minds of people in this country, but I am unaware that there is any agitation, any demand for any increase in the number of seats in this House of Assembly or that there should be any redistribution or re-drawing of the constituency boundaries.

4.15 p.m.

It is just not an issue in this country as far as the electorate is concerned, therefore we must rule out any reason that this matter is before us because of a demand from the electorate. Then why is it before us? I can only come to the conclusion that it is before us because the

Cabinet of this country has decided that it is in their own interest to bring this matter here and that is why it is here. In other words, it is for the political convenience of the Government, not the good of the country, but the political convenience of the Government, and that is the only argument that I can find for this matter being before us.

I have heard a number of other special pleadings advanced, a kind of ratiocinations, because they are not justifications as such. These are a type of camouflage, something advanced which is not the real reason as such but a kind of a justification, and we were taken through the Isle of Wight, we were taken through the whole of the United States and through Britain in order to justify this. We heard about Gerry, where is Gerry? I do not know which Gerry it is. We heard about gerrymandering, and we know that Governor Elridge Gerry as far as I can recall was one of the Founding Fathers of the United States, I believe he was present at that Constitutional Convention, it must have been in 1787, which met and drew up the Federal Constitution of the United States. That is one of his major claims to fame. But I also know that as Governor he gave his name to a particular device used by politicians thereafter — and I see the Prime Minister quoting Gerry so I do not know if he is amenable to the type of chicanery that Gerry got himself in — but Elridge Gerry in redrawing the constituencies in his particular area ended up with a constituency which was in the shape, I believe, of a salamander, a kind of a reptile, and he is given the name 'gerrymander', that is how we get the word 'gerry-mandering' into the political vocabulary and we have heard it quoted today. Well, we do not want any gerrymandering in this particular matter at all.

There comes a time when in this country people must get up and they must indicate that what is for the particular convenience of a political party, or what a political party may consider at a particular time is for its own convenience may not be for the good of the country, and I am submitting that this measure before us represents a disservice to the political institutions of this country and that the Government — I am calling upon the Government to defer any consideration of this particular matter. I am saying it because there is substance in it. If we are talking about the redrawing of constituencies, this is not a matter — and I am submitting this in all seriousness — in which the political party in power should seek to gain an advantage over the Opposition. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Tell me about 1971). I am looking forward, I do not mind if you get upset, you have to listen. That is what you are paid to do, to listen. Did you not see I did not get upset when you were speaking? I smiled when you were speaking.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way, on a point of elucidation. I am not upset at

what he is saying about the Barbados Labour Party Government, I am upset about what he is saying about himself, because he is letting himself down in what he is saying. It is in his interest that I am heckling, not ours.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I know you are looking after my interest, just as how you deprived me of my entitlement to pension. I know you are looking after my interest now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member now reflecting on a vote of this Hon. House?

Mr. SANDIFORD: No, I am not reflecting, I am just underlining the fact of what happened. I am not reflecting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I consider that you are reflecting on it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If I am, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry about that.

Now, let us talk about the discrepancy in seats. We are told that there are some constituencies which are large, which are almost twice as large as other constituencies, and we had a quote. I do not think St. Joseph was actually used, but the projected listing for June, 1980 is 4,549 for the constituency of St. Joseph, and in St. Michael North West the figure is some 4,498. I would like to make the point that that type of discrepancy is really minor when we consider the discrepancies which we may find in a place like Britain. Let me give some information on this.

In Britain, in a constituency like Salford East there were 32,718 voters in the 1979 elections, one of the smaller constituencies. I will not go down to the smallest, because I believe the smallest must be about 17,000 voters, but I take Salford East, 32,718, and one of the largest constituencies, Horsham and Crawley, over 100,000 voters in the 1979 elections in Britain where you have frequent revisions of the boundaries. There is permanent machinery in Britain, but you have more than a three to one difference in the constituencies in there when you take the smallest and compare it with the largest. I have not quoted Antrim North or Antrim South and I did not go down to the smaller constituencies which I know my learned colleague from Christ Church East would know about, Manchester Central or Manchester Ardwick. I know he would be very familiar with those constituencies, but to come and say because in Barbados one constituency is twice as large as another constituency as though this is some undemocratic or anti-democratic form of existence is really to draw a red herring over the argument.

I have not heard anyone advance the argument that Britain is undemocratic because there is a difference of that magnitude between the smallest constituency and the largest constituency. Why apply it in Barbados? That is no argument for a revision of the boundaries or an increase in the seats at this particular moment. In Britain I believe that there is one Member of Parliament for about 64,000 or so voters; in Barbados there is one representative.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is another point of elucidation. The hon. member I gather is suggesting that I said the constituencies of Britain are equal. Would he agree that I said they are not equal despite efforts..... 4.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation. The hon. member I gather is suggesting that I said that constituencies in Britain are equal. Would he agree that I said that they are not equal despite efforts and I indicated that there are historical reasons for that. Would he also agree that political commentaries in Britain constantly harp on this inequality and that he is incorrect in saying that there is no demand in Britain for greater equalisation of seats, that there is a constant harping in Britain all the time about the seats being of unequal size and that what he is saying about Manchester Central and what he has recently seen about Glasgow Central, what he could see about Canterbury and on the other hand what he could see about Bill Ricky and the big seats is something that you see in the newspapers in Great Britain. You do not have to go and look it up in Whittaker's Almanac. It is under constant comment from political commentators.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken but I do not support that part of your argument which seeks to strengthen your position and to put what you said previously in a better light than what the hon. member has seen.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would proceed. Now I want to make the point that we have been promised that there would be a Register published at the end of June. I want to know how we can take the words that come from that front bench as far as electoral matters in this country are concerned.

We were given a solemn promise on the floor of this House not less than two or three weeks ago by the Deputy Prime Minister that by the end of June there would be published a Register of Voters and that this would become available and up to today that is not available. We have not seen that. We have not seen that particular piece of information and this is a very serious matter because how can we be considering these matters, how can we be given these solemn promises and we can

go through the whole debate and no reference of this up to this particular point. No reference of it at all.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member obviously missed when I said that the list would not be published at the end of July. I said that very early in what I was saying but apart from anything else, perhaps it is appropriate since he raised it at this point and other members would want to know that in fact I was asked by the Chief Electoral Officer if it could be postponed until the end of July because they simply are not ready.

If you read the Report you will see that the Data Processing Unit has been advised that the draft Electors List must be ready by the 30th of June. They simply have not produced it. These things do happen. The hon. member was a Minister of Government and he knows that you give a deadline and it simply is not met. If he wants a specific report on why it has not been met I would make contacts and I hope I can still make the contact with the Chief Electoral Officer but I do know that it relates to the fact that when they came to match the names they found that there was a large number of names that could have been matched by the computer but were not matched and they are taking a little longer to match. You are dealing with something like 50,000 people having their position on the old voters list to put on on the new and it is these extra 50,000 people that they did not expect that is causing the delay.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am grateful to the Prime Minister for that information. It is a matter that concerns all of us and if I missed his original statement which could not have been very extensive, he said in passing, but that was a very slim solemn indication given here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw another attention because we are going on this computer print out information that was circulated to members. If I may refer to my own constituency, St. Michael South, I see a projected listing here of 4,900 voters whereas in 1976 the voters list was 5,095. Now I find it impossible to believe that there could be any reduction by 195, any decrease in size of the electorate in St. Michael South. I just cannot believe it so I am distrusting this information that is before us. I am saying this openly. I do not believe it and I want to know what type of information is being given to Parliament because there are no more empty houses or closed up houses in St. Michael South. If people move out people move in and I am saying here now that it is my belief that persons who were entitled to be registered for one reason or another have not been registered in St. Michael South and I am saying that there are over 400 of those in the St. Michael District Hospital which for some reason or another nobody went in there to register the people and hence

you can come in here and say there is a decrease in St. Michael South when in fact there should be an increase and then come up with an argument that St. Michael South is way below the quota that should exist.

I would like to get an explanation for this situation on the floor of the House because it is a serious charge calling into question the whole registration process that has taken place. My colleague the member for St. Lucy had referred to this but when you do not put the right machinery into play these type of inelegancies occur. I believe that this House requires an explanation for that type of situation and I would not like any arguments to be constructed on a weak data base because if you want constituencies we can find that type of major error. It leaves me to wonder what is happening as far as the other constituencies are concerned.

Now I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, the whole burden of my argument is that there is no demand for any increase in seats or redrawing of boundaries by the constituents or by the people of this country. I am saying that the Government of this country has no mandate to do any such thing. They have no mandate. The mandate that they have and which they gave at the 1976 Elections is to set up and establish an Elections and Boundaries Commission. That is what you have been entitled to and that is what you have been mandated by the people of this country to do and I would be the first one, if this was the measure that was before us here now, I would be the first one to come here and say, yes, if the machinery is right, I would support it because you have a mandate for it. That is what you have a mandate to do, not to come in here and increase seats and when I hear the argument advanced that you are doing it to equalise constituents I have already exposed the fallacy in that argument.

For the 24 members of this country to provide better representation, there are other requirements that would become necessary, not increasing the number of seats because if you increase the number of seats all you would be doing is increasing the present frustrations and difficulties that exist that members find in performing their work as members of Parliament. The way to increase the efficiency of members is to take other measures, not to increase the number of seats but to take other measures to make the work of Parliamentarians more efficient.

It is not for me at this time, in limited time, to suggest what should be done. I believe the Government knows very well what should be done. I believe so. It is not for their political convenience so to do and hence they take no action in that regard.

Now, I am submitting that as far as the machinery is concerned, and this is the fourth point I made as I

saw it as set out in the Resolution that is before us, the procedure for a Select Committee.
4.35 p.m.

I would think that because of the crucial and central importance of Elections to the existence and continuance of the democratic process in this country, that as far as possible, the election machinery should be impartial, that any change in the electoral machinery should not be open to charges of gerry-mandering, or tampering, that it should be removed as far as possible, out of that and that it should be isolated from such charges. It is against this particular background, in the absence of any call, from the people of this country, for an increase in the number of seats, in the absence of any Mandate from the Electorate to increase those seats, it is against this background, that I am saying, that this whole matter should be postponed and should be re-considered at the start of a new Parliament. I am submitting, that these matters should not be considered in the dying days of a Government which is going down to defeat. I am saying that it should be isolated for all of that, because justice must not only be done, it must be seen to be done. That machinery must be impartial machinery.

The Opposition must have, either equality of representation, or as near that as possible because this is not a matter.....(ASIDES: Tell Barrow that in 1962).

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think that it is time that we start looking forward in this country, because if our only machinery in life, is to say I will punch you, or punch you back, then, we are heading down the wrong road. I am saying that you are full of confidence. Why are you bringing this particular matter now? Why? This is the question which has not yet been answered. Why is this being brought at this stage? I am saying that I am opposed to the review at this stage. I am not saying that in the right circumstances and at the right time, that a review of boundaries may not be necessary. That may be necessary, but I am saying that, for the good of the whole electoral and democratic process in this country, that it is wrong to bring this measure, at this time, because if you are so confident that you will win, why are you bringing this now? I am certain that you are not bringing it for your disadvantage. If you are bringing it for your disadvantage, say so now. I am submitting that you are bringing it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you are addressing the Chair.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, I am not certain that you are going to bring anything, Mr. Speaker, I believe that

you may step out. This matter is here for the advantage of the Government. That is why it is here now.

I am opposed to this review at this stage, for the reasons which I have advanced. I do not believe that there should be any re-drawing of constituencies at this stage and I do not believe that there should be any increase in the number of seats in this country, certainly at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this matter because when one considers the climate which exists in the Caribbean today, it is most essential that we, in Barbados, should have free and fair elections that, not only, should there be free and fair elections, but that the entire population of Barbados should feel that they are participating in such an exercise.

Now, the background to this particular matter, rests in the fact that the Government allocated to one of its Hon. Ministers, the task of reviewing the history of the elections in this country since 1951, to identify those areas which might, in given situations, be readily swung towards the Barbados Labour Party, to identify where they have marginal seats, seats perhaps, with majorities under 200 votes and to see what they can take away from one area and add into another area.

Maps have been seen in the office of that particular Hon. Minister, who has taken great pride in showing to people, how he proposes to recommend to the Government that the constituencies of this country should not only be realigned, but, in what way they could be increased to the advantage of the ruling Party. So, let there be no mistake. Let it be clearly understood that this is a political exercise, in order to give the present Administration, a distinct advantage over any other political group in the forthcoming elections.

I have listened, Mr. Speaker, to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister who said that on the argument relating to equalisation and Single Member Constituencies, that the Democratic Labour Party has been proper, good and decent in its argument and listening to his presentation today, and listening to the presentation of the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I can only say, that I agree with him that the arguments put forward by the Democratic Labour Party have been proper, good and decent.

His speech, Mr. Speaker, consisted largely of half truths and quarter truths.
4.45 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister also made the alarming statement that a public officer had the file which he was told he should keep in his sole possession and show to nobody else and that that public officer now cannot find the file. It is quite obvious to me that if the public officer was asked to keep the file and not to show it to anybody and cannot produce the file now, the only person who can know where the file is is the same public officer. So it was that kind of red herring and irrelevance that dominated the presentation by the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is suggesting that the Chair allowed the Prime Minister to indulge in irrelevancies and he must withdraw that reference which is a reflection on the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: As you wish, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it. I can assure you there is no question of any reflection on the Chair. He also made great boast of the power that he has to do whatever he likes or whatever his party wishes, and indeed he went so far as to say that whether we agreed or not this is what they intend to do and we are aware of that kind of position taken by the present administration in the past. Now, Mr. Speaker, if democracy is to survive in this country, people who present themselves or parties which present themselves to the electorate and issue a manifesto have a clear duty to follow the spirit and as far as possible the words of that manifesto. In this manifesto which has been made a document of the House by me on several occasions, this is what the present administration had to say: "In particular the party will seek to establish a permanent electoral and boundaries commission with full constitutional protection to preserve free elections and put an end to the sorry system under which the machinery of elections in the constituencies is largely in the hands of persons known to be supporters of the Government."

That is what they said. They are now setting up a Select Committee under your distinguished chairmanship with three members on their side and suggesting two on this side. If that is not largely in the hands of people known to be supporters of the Government, then I do not know what could conceivably be largely in the hands of people known to be supporters of the present administration. It is a dangerous practice. There are at least 50 other areas in this manifesto where you have had this kind of presentation to the public and doing something completely different. This kind of behaviour, Mr. Speaker, totally undermines democratic processes because it makes people feel that they cannot believe anything that is said to them by people running for office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that when a party comes out with a clear statement of this kind in a matter relating to elections which is fundamental to the democratic process, when they have made a statement of this kind and they go contrary to it, not only, as the hon. member for St. Michael South stated, do they have no mandate, but they cannot and should not proceed to act otherwise in such a fundamental matter unless they have a referendum, and I am calling on the Government, I am calling on the present administration that if they are going to divert from the solemn promises that they made to the public of this country in respect of elections, to have a referendum and assess what the views of the public are on the matter. Should they fail to do so, Mr. Speaker, I think that the public can only come to one conclusion and that conclusion must be that the Government is prepared to fly in the face of any promise which they make to them.

The hon. member for St. Thomas, Mr. Speaker, has dismissed the question of cost. Already, Mr. Speaker, between 1976-77 and this year 1980-81, in the Estimates for this year, the cost of running this Parliament has gone up by 100%. It has doubled. From \$632,654 to \$1,241,546. It has doubled in the short space of four years, not to mention Conferences and Delegations. That vote has gone up from just over \$½ million to \$1 million this year. It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to come forward and put up the argument that if you are an independent small country that your administrative costs must necessarily be higher than if you were a large independent country. That portion of the argument is acceptable to us, but because that is the case, that is no reason for pushing up the cost unnecessarily, and to talk about percentage of revenue that is spent on Parliament, those percentage figures are misleading. We have to look at the real dollars that are charged and we have to bear in mind that the money that we will be spending will be coming out of the pockets of poor people in this country, the vast majority of whom will be earning less than \$200 a week, and we must be concerned about any expenditure that we commit ourselves to; and I cannot just dismiss the matter of cost in this manner.

Then there is the question of the statistical base Mr. Speaker, this is a nonsense. This is a photostat copy of what purports to be the existing total electors in St. Michael South Central and what the projections are. The list in January this year alone had over 6,000 voters, and you have a document here saying that the projected list would be 4,482, therefore you have a small constituency. Now since this was laid in Parliament I have done only a very small section of my constituency on a house to house basis and we have picked up either seventy-five or seventy-six people who have

either not been registered or who alternatively have moved into the district since the time of registration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's only problem now is that he told this House not many days ago that in politics truth does not matter.

Dr. HAYNES: Well that is your business, Mr. Speaker, not mine. If you want to intervene in the debate, you can do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not my business.

Dr. HAYNES: That's right, and I did not say so either. To continue, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. The hon. member is saying that he did not say so. In other words, that the Prime Minister knows that the Chair is lying on him.

Dr. HAYNES: It is being taken out of context. That is what I am saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please! The hon. member must withdraw.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, if you intervene in the debate and you ask me to withdraw, I will withdraw. I will continue.
4.55 p.m.

There is something very wrong about these projections. If you were to take, Mr. Speaker, the Brittons Hill area, bounded on the one hand by Villa Road and Collymore Rock on the other hand and Brittons Cross Road, there is no way there can only be 1,374 voters in there. If on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, you were to take the area of Carringtons Village, Belleville, the Pine Road and George Street on the one hand, there is no way there could be only 845 voters inside there. The only area on these projections here that looks to me reasonable is the area of RC which is the area bounded by Halls Road, the lower side, the proximate side of George Street, Belmont Road and Collymore Rock, that is about the only area that is about right, all these others are wrong. So if you are going to start chopping up and changing boundaries based on this statistical data, I will submit to the Hon. Prime Minister who is responsible that he should have a further look at these particulars, because my suspicion is that that constituency as it stands now, St. Michael South Central, will probably contain about 6,000 voters, and I am pretty sure about this. (Mr. BRADSHAW: You are worried now). I am not worried because everybody knows that one of the major objects of this exercise — and the fact that the Prime Minister said I am going to say so is not going to stop me from saying so — is to try and chop up St. Michael South

Central in whatever way you want to chop it up, but the point is that once there is a shared confidence between myself and the people of the area, then I am pretty sure that they would repose that confidence in me again, and no matter how much you all try to mess up my constituency, no matter how you try to chop it up, that act itself may well be a saving grace. I say no more. People in this country have a sense of fair play.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way, I am trying very hard to follow his arguments and I may be in a position to help him, but if he could just repeat those figures again, he said there were only 800 voters in Brittons Hill according to what we have given him? (Dr. HAYNES: I said 1374). 1300. How many in Belleville? The hon. member should read the descriptions. RB1 and RB2 are different areas. There is now a division down Belmont Road and the voters in Belleville have been separated from the voters in Carringtons Village, so he must not seek to mislead the House as to what actually is contained in a report.

Mr. SPEAKER: I don't think he is really seeking to mislead the House, he might only be misreading the report.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Hon. Prime Minister is a little confused over this matter. It is the same matter really which he essentially raised when he referred to RA1 having 11 votes. What has happened, as I understand it, is that the polling districts remain the same but under the new registration system those polling districts are subdivided into different areas within the same boundaries. Therefore RB remains the same but instead of being RB now it is subdivided into RB1, RB2 and RB3. RA the same thing, RA would be subdivided into RA1, RA2 and RA3, but overall there has been no change in the internal boundaries either in my constituency or in other constituencies, it is just a new kind of administrative arrangement within the electoral office. That is my understanding of the situation, there has been no change yet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned, and I think the hon. member for St. Michael South and the hon. member for St. John have echoed these feelings. Confidence is important. You cannot approach elections as though you are playing a poker game. This whole thing started off on the wrong footing, the selection of persons to carry out the registration raised serious political questions and the only answer that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister could give us in here was that everybody is related to everybody in Barbados. I think one member even went so far as to say that even the dogs are related in a particular area in St. Lucy, and went further. When we challenged him he asked us if we expect him to appoint Democratic Labour Party yard-

fowls. They were his own words, the words of the Minister responsible for elections in Barbados.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was only during his absence, despite a formal question by the Leader of the Opposition and despite many attempts on the floor, that the Deputy Prime Minister and a back bencher volunteered the information that at the next election people who are presently registered would be able to vote and that two numbers would be published, the old number and the new number, and that only if a sufficient number of people are registered under the present system that there is likely to be an amendment to the Representation of the People Act to make this current exercise which is being carried out under the Statistics Act be the voters list for the next election. That was only during his absence, and I think by mistake that that was done, that that was said inside here, so when he comes in here today and talks about volunteering information, he need not volunteer any information. It was only because we got under the skin of the Deputy Prime Minister — and you know how hot he gets from time to time — that he let out the information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we on this side believe in the ballot box and I want it to be publicly known that each and every one of us totally reject the idea of changing any Government by force. We totally reject it. Therefore it is our duty and of great importance to make sure that there are fair elections and that there is no gerrymandering of the boundaries and so on. We start off on the assumption that we are not interested, we are totally uninterested in any form of political violence in Barbados, we are not interested in the changing of any Government by force, we are interested in persuading people to vote for us, and therefore we are interested in protecting the electoral system. Now that is as clear a statement as anyone could wish as coming from the Democratic Labour Party, so never let it be said at any other time that we have any other interest in this matter other than making sure that not only that there are fair elections but that the people outside, the public at large, feel that the elections they are participating in are free, and I am saying the Government has not done anything to help in this matter. The kind of slyness, the kind of cageyness, the kind of double talk that you have outside and inside outlined by the hon. member for St. John has done nothing to enhance the confidence of the public of Barbados in the electoral process of this country. And I go further, and this is a personal view of mine, and it is a personal view that I wish to express on the floor of this House. Barbados has been very lucky in the past to have been led for a long period by a man like the late Sir Grantley Adams, they have been very lucky to have been led by a man like the Leader of the Opposition, the Rt. Hon. member for St. John, and it is my personal belief that if the people of Barbados wish for the survival of democracy in this country, the more frequently they

change the Governments that is the best thing they can do.

5.05 p.m.

That is my personal belief, a belief that I hold very dear not to allow any group to get itself established and I refer not only to members on the other side, not only to politicians but I am talking about other groups that form a power group within the society. (*Asides*). It is amazing how ignorance prevails in certain areas. Now, Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I must have some order, please.

Dr. HAYNES: I need not deal with the question of equalisation. The fallacy and the thinness of that argument has already been totally exposed by the previous two speakers on this side. A small population like Barbados, they can be no need, no justification for any increase in the number of seats.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if one is genuinely interested in improving the levels of representation, there are other factors that one needs to look at other than the number of electors. You may have a constituency, Mr. Speaker, where there are a large number of people in their reproductive ages with a large number of children in that particular constituency and you might find that the demand of a constituent does not necessarily relate to the number of electors. That is not the only criteria of which you have to look.

You might find a constituency which has a large section of people and who are in the middle/upper class to middle class and only a small sector of people who may be demanding welfare help and things like that. Although the constituency may be bigger yet the demand of the representative might yet be smaller so that you have to look not only at the number of electors if you are thinking of improving the quality of representation but you have to look at the type of constituency and you also have to look at the number of people who have to be represented because from any.....

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

Dr. HAYNES: From any assessment of the possible spread of demands within a constituency, it is quite clear that the age range within the constituency and the social problems are the generators of that demand and not only the question of numbers. Not only the number of electors but also the number of people actually in the constituency.

Mr. Speaker, any changes based on the data produced before this Honourable House is bound to be

wrong and indeed if hon. members would look at their constituencies, many of them might find that some problems exist and indeed I sincerely hope that the Government will take to heart the words that I have tried to get across that you must inspire confidence in the people in the electoral process and that their behaviour today has been very far from that very desirable objective in order to maintain the cause of a democratic state within our society.

Thank You, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for your assistance and indulgence. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this Resolution about Parliament. From time to time in every country of the World there is a movement of population from one district to another, as a result, certain constituencies become very much larger in number than others.

In Barbados, the Government having seen this, decided that the Electoral Office would proceed to enumerate the people of this country. The enumerators went out and came up with certain figures. The speaker who just sat down said it was nasty and slimy and all sorts of remarks, Mr. Speaker, when the thing is so transparent, so absolutely clear, honest and above board that the Government should send enumerators out from St. Lucy to St. Philip to find out where every man, woman and child are living and to go about this matter in a proper democratic sense and to be referred to as nasty and slimy. Why does that come into it at all? As a result they came up with certain figures that clearly showed that the Government was in order to have a recount of the electors in this country.

In the constituency of Christ Church North Central which I have the honour to represent it was increased to 1,900 votes. The hon. member for St. Michael South questioned the honesty of the civil servants of this country.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and I am saying that the hon. member who is now speaking or who has just sat down is misrepresenting what I said. I never questioned the honesty.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You have risen to elucidate a point.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am saying that the words which he used should be withdrawn because I never questioned the integrity and honesty of the civil servants of this country. I never did that.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker, he said that these figures, this piece of paper could not be right. He disagreed with it and he said it was not true that it was not worth anything and the civil servants prepared this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member for St. Michael South to know, whom I really have respect for....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I would really like to assure the hon. member that the political element of the office has nothing to do with that piece of paper. Some of these things that I have heard in here today, the explanations that I have heard are explanations about things that I am hearing for the first time and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central can explain them, R.A.1's and so on. I have seen them for the first time since I have been back and hearing of these things so it has to be the civil servants who are under criticism in this matter.

Mr. WARD: As I was saying, I have respect for the hon. member for St. Michael South and I was just drawing certain facts to his attention. When I found out that there were 1,800 new voters in my constituency it jolted me a bit, Sir. On a bit of research I found out that the majority of these 1,800 people had been living in Christ Church North Central prior to the last Elections but had never had their votes transferred. It is not to say that 1,800 new voters have moved into Christ Church North Central since the last Elections so when the hon. member for St. Michael South says there are no new houses or no closed up houses that might be correct. There are people who have been living out of St. Michael South that have only now had their registration corrected. They were not living there before although they were on the registration paper and this has happened right across the Island. *(Asides).*

I refuse to believe, Mr. Speaker, and at this time I would like to state that this Government has full confidence in the civil servants of this country and if the Opposition are going to make remarks that are gerrymandering or anything else we are not part of that. I have full confidence in the Electoral Officer of this country. My dealings with him when we were in Opposition and my dealing with him when we are in Government are on par and I think it is a bad thing to slight any worker in this country who does nothing but to serve this country in all honesty.

Mr. Speaker, firstly now I would like to deal with the matter of the change in the boundary and then of additional seats.
5.15 p.m.

It does appear that the Opposition is not seeing eye to eye on this because the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that all they did when they changed the boundary in St. James was to equalise the voters in constituencies. He said that is all they were doing, trying to equalise. That is all the Government over here is trying to do. Exactly what the Rt. Hon. Leader of

the Opposition said, to change the boundaries if necessary, so that all constituencies have an equal number of voters, or to the nearest margin. We have not differed. If the Hon. Member for St. Michael South differs from the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, why did he not tell him so when he was here? (ASIDES) (LAUGHTER)

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the Hon. Member tell the Chair that something is correct?

Mr. WARD: Absolutely, Sir. The point remains, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition had better get themselves in line. They are out of line, they are not walking in step. Some of them are disagreeing with changing the boundaries, some of them are agreeing with the change of the boundaries.

The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that from time to time, you have to change boundaries. This is the time. Why do you not listen to your Rt. Hon. Leader, no wonder he left you all in here alone. The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that from time to time, you have to change the boundaries. He changed them in his time, we are changing them in our time. Get the reading. (Mr. TAITT: Which is your last time). That is quite possible and I will continue working for my bread and butter for my wife and children for the first time, last time, or third time. I am not here to work for my living, but I know that some people in here want to win the Elections so as to work for their living. I am here — because I could live without coming in here — but I wanted to represent the people of this country, I offered myself and I won. (APPLAUSE) (CHEERS).

As far as the changing of the boundaries is concerned, Mr. Speaker, these figures have shown clearly, that in St. Michael, there are some constituencies with seven thousand, eight thousand, nine thousand voters, and others with four thousand voters. There could not be any argument about changing these constituency boundaries and doing it, not on the eve of any Election, the Constitutional Elections are due in September next year, fifteen months away. We have no reason why this Government should come prematurely, for what purpose? (ASIDES: Tell him.) Not tell him. I asked him to bring it earlier and he said no. So, it is he who has decided to bring it at the right time. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. So, do not worry to place anything on the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister wanting them early, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has the full confidence. (ASIDES: You have Tom real vex. You should see his face. Look at his face.) (LAUGHTER)

Mr. SPEAKER: Alright, let us have some order now.

Mr. WARD: In Christ Church, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this a bit because there are four constituencies in Christ Church and by these new figures, it works out to be 24,000 voters in Christ Church. With a few minor adjustments, we could all have approximately six thousand voters each. I do not see any reason at all why any boxes should be brought in from any other parish of Barbados into Christ Church to make any adjustment. The adjustment could be made very simply, by small boundary changes in the parish of Christ Church, where each one would have six thousand voters.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am fully in agreement with the Government and I give it my wholehearted support, that we should have a change of certain boundaries, and I feel that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is to be congratulated for bringing this matter very early, very far away from the next General Elections. There is nothing in it, it is very far from the eve of the next Elections, or, anything else.

The next matter which I would like to deal with Mr. Speaker, is the matter of the number of seats. For my own part, Mr. Speaker, I am awaiting the result of this Select Committee to decide how many seats are to be added, or if no seats are to be added at all. Whatever the Select Committee comes up with, I fully go along with. But, by simple calculation, this is only my calculation, Mr. Speaker, I see that we need about four additional seats. (Asides) When you get up, you could spoil it, or do not spoil it. I am prepared to wait until the Select Committee comes up with what they feel is right and proper for the country. They will certainly receive my support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few remarks here which were made in today's newspaper which I would like to make a comment on. Firstly, it says, and I have dealt with the eve of the elections already, it says: "The increased cost to Parliament of additional seats." As I calculate it, one Hon. Member of Parliament on the Back Bench in Parliament costs the Government about \$15,000 a year and if Hon. Members were to give way to saying we had about — it costs the Government about \$15,000 per annum — if we had four seats, how much expense would that be on Barbados? Would \$60,000 per year be a burden on the taxpayers of this country? What sort of ridiculous argument is that? They are only going to have one Speaker, they have the Clerks. What would an additional four seats in Parliament cost this country? Sixty thousand dollars per year.

The next point Mr. Speaker. This is the point I would like to get at, he said.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the Hon. Member is entitled to use the newspaper.

Mr. WARD: That is correct. I will memorise. They said that additional seats would erode the democratic system of this country. Mr. Speaker, I could understand that argument if we were reducing seats, I could understand that argument if we were saying that we are reducing the seats from 24 to 20, we could talk about eroding the democratic rights of the people in this country. But, if it so happens that we need four additional seats, I do not see how we could erode democracy by giving people greater representation. How could that erode democracy? This saying has come into the Democratic Labour Party all of a sudden. Anything which the Government does, is eroding democracy. That is what he comes saying now because we do not accuse the Democratic Labour Party of trying to demolish or undermine democracy, and they should know, that this is a recognised Party in this country, the Barbados Labour Party and we have no intention whatsoever, of eroding democracy in this country.

Mr. Speaker, that is basically what I had in my mind to speak on. I fully support the Resolution before Parliament, I will await the results of the Select Committee and if it is that we are going to change boundaries, I am happy with it. If there are no additional seats, I am satisfied and if there are, I will give it my complete support. I believe that this Resolution is timely, honest and sincere, coming at a distance before Elections and the Government is to be congratulated on it and there is nothing unclean, or dirty about it.
5.25 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by reading the Resolution, because it seems to me that the debate has degenerated into one where there are arguments being put for and against an increase in the number of seats. Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with the Resolution with respect. The Resolution says, and I would have thought that all of us could have read and certainly would have been able to understand:

"BE IT RESOLVED that firstly the House of Assembly approve the establishment of a Select Committee of Parliament to review the distribution of voters in Barbados and to recommend the adjustments of the electoral boundaries that have become necessary."

There is nothing there. I am doing this just as I would be doing a charge in court to make sure that the jury understand the charge, and I want to make sure that the Press understand what we are dealing with.

"And secondly that the Select Committee can be comprised of five honourable members, with the Speaker of the House as Chairman.

And thirdly that the terms of reference of the Committee shall be as follows:

- (1) to review the boundaries of the constituencies into which the Island is divided under and by virtue of section 3 of the Representation of the People Act Cap. 12 and section 41(1) of the Constitution;
- (2) to submit a report to the House of Assembly showing the constituencies into which it recommends that the island should be divided.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Report of the Committee shall be submitted to the House of Assembly within three months after the date upon which the Committee is appointed, and shall state, as respects each constituency, the name by which the Committee recommends that the constituency should be known."

There is nothing in here which explicitly or otherwise speaks of an increase or decrease. I am not saying that it is not open to members for the sake of venting some political problem that they may be experiencing to get it off their chests and talk about an increase, but strictly this Resolution has nothing to do with an increase. This has to do with the adjustment of boundaries and in the light of the statement published in today's newspaper which Mr. Speaker would be consistent with the view expressed in this House last Tuesday by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that truth does not matter in politics, but it is impressions.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: The hon. member is perhaps mistakenly misleading this Honourable House. My words were that the Hon. Prime Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please! The hon. member is now seeking to elucidate. He must not do this.

Dr. HAYNES: I am presenting to you what the substance of my point of order is.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot rise on a point of order and set out to elucidate in that when he was on the floor he said so and so and another hon. member is now misrepresenting what he said. This is not a Sunday School, and the hon. member having risen on a point of order, he cannot now be heard because he is elucidating.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the point I was making is quite simple and it was that the impression that was to be given to the public of Barbados by today's publication was that this debate today was to do with an in-

crease in the number of parliamentary representatives at some date in the future when in fact it has nothing to do with it. It has nothing to do with an increase, Mr. Speaker, just as it had nothing to do with an increase in 1971, but before I come to deal with the historical postures adopted by the Democratic Labour Party I want first of all to try and understand the three positions as put up by the members of the Opposition who spoke to-day. I took copious notes until I went outside for a bit during the speech by the hon. member for St. Michael South. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition stated and I quote "we needed to keep numbers in each constituency as even as possible. That was the power of the House and as far as I know, that is still the power of the House." He went on to say he sees nothing wrong in Parliament arrogating to itself the right to make adjustments to the boundaries.

Now the official Deputy Leader of the Opposition finds himself at variance with the position taken by the Leader. This is what he said: "I am calling on the Government to postpone further consideration of this measure until after the next election. The third member, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central now gets up and says he wants a referendum to refer this matter to the people. So here, Mr. Speaker, the lack of coordinated policy on the other side in relation to this matter engaging our attention has to be exposed to the public. There are four different positions; one taken in today's newspaper by the Official Parliamentary Group talking about the rape of constitutional rights and all that, one taken by the Leader of the Opposition that there is nothing wrong with it if it is only boundary adjustment, that is the power the House has, and I heard the Hon. Deputy Leader when I was in the dining room.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you mean the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. The hon. member for St. Michael South talked about an assault on political institutions or words to that effect, when his leader was saying that this is something that the House has its own inherent power to deal with; and then the hon. member for St. Michael South Central asking for a referendum.

Now I cannot understand how they want people to accept them as a credible Opposition without any preconceived and agreed plan in respect of a matter as simple as this. I should have thought when I read today's newspaper that they had got together and worked out the various ramifications of the measure and come forward with one settled policy. I heard three different things being called for today. No wonder the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was so disgusted that he walked out and disassociated himself from the nonsense he heard being trotted out. Now that is merely by way of introduction Sir. I had to get that out of the way first.

In 1971 on the 18th May it was the Democratic Labour Party then in power which introduced the measure in this House for the change of boundaries. The change went beyond mere administration of the parish boundaries as we had them on a geographical basis as we had been led all our lives to understand. In Barbados there have always been geographical boundaries which coincided until 1971 with political divisions, but in 1971 when they were in power parts of St. Andrew people from the geographical entity of St. Andrew found themselves voting in St. James, a separate and distinct parish; so they set the standard for the cross over from geographical boundaries by, if you like, political or geo-political considerations and factors. I think they accept listening to the speeches that there is an uneven distribution in terms of the population shifts that we have had in the Island, and it will continue to be so. As soon as you have a programme of massive housing development or put a number of houses in a particular parish, that is going to make a severe alteration to the population base of that particular constituency.

5.35 p.m.

Wilkey is a good example. The Oxnards/Cave Hill area will be another when the houses are built at West Terrace, and there needs to be machinery for a constant review of the population shifts so that one M.P. is not unfairly overburdened by having a disproportionate number of persons to represent in relation to another M.P. Indeed, Sir, in 1971 in the debates for the 18th May at page 3047 the then Prime Minister, now Leader of the Opposition said this, Sir:

The question of adjustment is really done by the House on the recommendation of the Minister. In other words, the Minister of Home Affairs will request the adjustments, and such adjustment have to be approved by this House from time to time. Nobody is taking away anything from a Boundaries Commission, because we do not have one now. If we were going to divide the Island into 30 constituencies, as Your Honour recommended in a Minority Report, we would need a boundaries Commission to do this, because we would then have to discard all the parochial boundaries and have a long drawn-out examination of the population distribution and the geographical features of the Island.

It is not always possible to reconcile the two political, geographical considerations, that is, getting the population balanced precisely with geographical landmarks and boundaries. Some attempt has been made here to rationalise, but it is not going to work out with mathematical precision. There are still constituencies in the Island which have 8,000 voters and some which have 5,000. At this stage we could not go in for an overall examination, but I hope that after this year we will look at the whole Island and decide whether it would not be better to have a complete re-adjustment

which entirely, ignores the old-fashioned administrative boundaries of the parish in order to get the voting population more evenly balanced.

Now, let me examine that, Sir. In 1971 in May the then Prime Minister promised that, I would presume, some time between 1971 and 1976 he would have done an overall examination for the whole island. (ASIDES). That is what he said, I will pass it to you. For five years on the basis of that consideration — I am not putting it out as a promise or pledge — it was a consideration which he had in mind and for five years they did nothing. Suffice it to say that they saw the need nine years ago for a complete examination of the whole island. Now, they must concede that the emigration opportunities constricted in the last nine years and with even though a gentle natural increase in population there has been an expansion in the voting population in most of the constituencies, if not all. If a complete overhaul was something that was reasonably contemplated nine years ago, it cannot now lie in their mouths to find fault ne'er more to criticise as they have attempted to do today something that they never had the courage nor the will — I believe in the last five years of their regime they did not have the will to do anything — to do, but the fact that it was canvassed as an idea in 1971 clearly suggests that it is not an inappropriate time in our history to have readjustment of boundaries exercise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out this. To have this readjustment as is envisaged in the Resolution before the House does not preclude the establishment of a Boundaries Commission before the general election of 1981, but that is a matter for us to work out. We will not be led by the whims, fancies and the desires of the other side, so that until the election is held — or put it another way, if an election is held — and we do not establish a Boundaries Commission before that time, then the Opposition will be entitled to say that we have been in breach of a pledge in the Manifesto, but it would be premature for them at this stage to suggest that we are in breach of faith with the people on the basis of the pledges in the Manifesto, because one year and a few months away from elections — if elections will be September next year, because they are constitutionally due next September — that at this stage we have broken faith with the people, but I understand the position of the Opposition. They need to get some publicity and need to create issues. It was the hon. member for St. Michael North Central at a special meeting of the DLP constituency groups in March who said "don't worry about a policy, issues will arise. Wait for issues and beat them." I will not quarrel with that attitude today, what I have to say about that would be better said on the platform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if as is alleged by members of the Opposition there is still some unhappiness with

this registration exercise that has been carried out and is still being carried out, as far as I understand it, over the last year or so, the Opposition have themselves to blame. The position of the Government in respect to the registration exercise, what it was designed to do, was made clear in here by the Prime Minister on television and by numerous speakers of our party at constituency group meetings and so on. If in the light of that people still say they don't understand, I believe some blame will have to be attributed to the Opposition who have a role to play in the education of this young nation. They cannot abdicate their responsibility to assist in the political education of this nation by keeping silent or by being sensational, they have a role to be positive. If they have not understood it, we must only express pity, but like so many other things originating from this side, including off-shore banking, the concepts have been a little above the capabilities of certain members of the Democratic Labour Party to understand. I did not say anybody in the House, I said certain members of the Democratic Labour Party, that entity is too big.

I want to deal now, Mr. Speaker, specifically with comments made by members who have spoken before I have. Just before he sat down, the hon. member for St. Michael South who of late appears to me to be losing some of his erstwhile debating skills and ability — I don't know if he thinks he is being hounded by a Labour Party candidate in his constituency giving him a little mental pressure — but he is losing some of his skill in debating rationally.
5.45 p.m.

He asked of the Government this question. If you are so full of confidence that you are going to win the next Election why change the boundaries now? I would put it back to him this way. If his Party was so sure that it would have won the Election in 1971 why did it change the boundaries on May the 18th, 1971? You won 18 seats. The question of confidence did not have any role to play in this at all, Sir. It had nothing to do with that.

I think I have already dealt with the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I see he has withdrawn from the Chamber. He made no points and there is nothing really for me to respond to. There was an attitude of cynicism that he introduced in the debate to say that this exercise makes people feel that they cannot believe anything coming to them from people running in high office and I do not understand it because the Government has not thus far proposed an increase in the number of seats to 30 or done anything which would erode public confidence. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that if the hon. member for St. Michael South can say that people do not believe anything coming to them from people running for office and that there is this cynicism,

a lack of trust in persons willing to enter the public domain as has been otherwise expressed, when there are statements such as the one made by the hon. member last week in this Chamber about the fact that truth does not matter, facts, he said, do not matter, just impressions.

If he is finding that his own language ill-considered and ill-chosen as it may have been is now getting through to the public who are now able to read him for what he is, then he must not seek to lump all politicians in the same pot and hope that all of us will stew. I certainly will not be joining him. If his own language is going to run him in trouble with the public I am going to make sure in a different capacity from that in which I stand here today that the public never forgets the words uttered by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central last week. I gave that assurance to my colleagues that the public will hear about that until they are sick.

Mr. Speaker, I began by saying that the Resolution before the House in my view having read the words today does not contemplate an increase in the number of seats. It mentions nothing at all about an increase or a decrease. It looks at the adjustments but since members have dealt with the question of an increase in seats, I just want them to be aware of two facts, the Report of the Boundaries Commission which was headed by the then Speaker, Sir Theodore Brancker (I am not sure whether he was "Sir" in those days), but anyhow, and it had Sir Frank Odle, Mr. Winter Crawford, Mr. Russel Lowe and Mr. E. D. Mottley as members of that Commission.

Now I hear foolish talk today, Sir. Sorry, I will withdraw that, Sir. It is reflecting on the quality of what other members have said. I heard talk today about the proposal to give the Opposition two seats on the Select Committee and the Government three and it is being suggested by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that in so doing the Government was giving itself an unfair advantage.

In 1962 when this Boundaries Commission was set up, you had Brancker, a Dem. Sir Frank Odle — I do not know whether he was a Dem or not. Crawford, a Dem, 1962, not after he ran away from you. Russel Lowe, a Dem; E. D. Mottley, a Conservative then playing a Dem so you had a full house of Dems or Demish people. Nobody from the Labour Party was represented at that.

There was talk today about an Official Opposition. Well, what rubbish, Sir. The Chairman, I do not know for what reasons and I have no intention of looking into Sir Theodore's mind to find out any obtuse reason for this Minority Report. I am not going to suggest that

it was because of any disagreement internally between himself and Mr. Cameron Tudor. I know that the hon. member for St. Lucy benefitted by the fact that they could not make up their minds who was to run but the Chairman himself found it necessary to publish a Minority Report in which he recommended 30 seats. Indeed, he is normally very careful in anything he says but he said 30 additional seats. No wonder the Minority Report was not paid more attention but I think he meant 30 seats, not 30 additional seats to the 24 but he said that and it might be quite possible that in increasing the maximum to say 30, additional seats would be available to provide for 50 people in the Metropolitan and Central parishes, J.D. Theodore Brancker.

There should be 154. You see he does not give a lot of base for arriving at that decision but that is not so foolish as we might be laughing at now because if we were following the then Prime Minister and his Resolution of 1955 which called for one M.P. per 3,000 voters, and let us say you had 151 persons eligible to vote, three into that would give you 50 seats so you might have been close to the mark.

There is only one further point I want to take issue with.

Mr. SPEAKER: And you have two minutes in which to make that one point.

Mr. SIMMONS: How much, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Two minutes.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, I will dismiss it in seconds. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned that in 1955 the voter population was 72,000 voters. That figure which is wrong because the voter population then was 96,000, that figure when he found himself trapped today coincided beautifully, Sir, with his then Resolution for one seat for 3,000 voters. I believe that if the Hon. Leader had related the population today as he did so then, 72,000 he said to 3, Sir, divide it by 3 and he would have got the exact same number of 24 seats. He would have got the 24 seats but the voting population in those days, March, 22, 1955 was 72,000. He gave 72,000 today because he was trapped on his own Resolution. It would have given the House about 32 in 1955. That is what it is. The Opposition found itself tied today, Sir.

All I will do is to appeal to their better sense. Their history of participation, as Your Honour is well aware, is nothing to be proud of but this one affects them, it affects the people of Barbados. It affects maintenance of democracy and the continuing stability of this country than anything else and I would appeal to them to come

and sit and participate meaningfully in this exercise. I am much obliged to Your Honour.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say that it is remarkable that invariably, when Your Honour goes to the Chair, it is at the point when I am about to speak, or, when I have been speaking for a short time Sir. I do not know what is the significance of that, but, I welcome you in the Chair, Sir.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to make a contribution to this Debate and I find myself in some little difficulty because as I listened to the last Hon. Member who just sat down, and I observed what has been said so far, I find myself wondering if the Hon. Member who sat down was sitting in his chair, I honestly cannot remember, when the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, who introduced this Resolution spoke because if he were sitting in his chair, he would have recognised that the question of the direction in which the Debate went, was determined to a large extent, by the Introducer of the Resolution who proceeded, almost immediately he got up, to talk about an increase in seats. Furthermore, in the course of his presentation, the Hon. Member for St. Philip North said that there seems to be some differences which he discerns between Hon. Members on this Side, and yet, when he, himself was speaking, he seemed not to recall that, not more than one hour, or earlier, that his Leader, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister had stated fairly categorically, what the position was on a Boundaries Commission before an Elections in 1981. He said it was impossible. He considered the.....

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of Order, I did not understand the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to say that. He said to set it up and report. It can be set up but, to get all the mechanics and that he did not see that at all. I think that you misunderstood him, with respect.

Mr. TAITT: Clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we could get into an area of words because he prefaced what he was saying, by establishing that there was a Bill coming down, to establish a Boundaries Commission. Therefore, I am saying that his position, on the Boundaries Commission, bearing in mind all that the Hon. Member wishes me to bear in mind, still was that, given all the circumstances, he does not see a Boundaries Commission and I understand him to mean, in the context of what is promised in his Manifesto because Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one little issue which it seems that Hon. Members on the other Side have missed. The reason why the Hon. Members on that Side are apparently extended by the Press release coming from my Party, was subsequently cleared up on that Side. If they read the Press Release, in the

context of the promise which they have made in their Manifesto, in which they said they would establish a permanent — and that is the word, Mr. Deputy Speaker — a permanent Boundaries Commission and then they came in here.....

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of Order. Page two, column 1, we never said that we would establish Sir, we said that we would seek to establish — I have got you, son — a permanent Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir, it is a point which we have been labouring for four years, Sir. He has now established clearly and beyond the slightest shadow of doubt, that the Manifesto was designed to confuse, "seek to", ordinary people reading it and said they would establish a permanent Electoral Commission but, he now gets up and says oh no, we did not say that, we said that they would seek to. I concede that they were seeking to, Sir. They are seeking and have been seeking for four years, Sir. No tricks in 1976, but God knows what would happen afterwards. (*Asides*).

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really do not wish my contribution to degenerate into a political exchange between myself and Hon. Members on that Side because I should like to say a few words on this whole question which we are debating.

It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is some confusion generally, as to what it is that we are about to do, or ought to be doing. Now, it is impossible for anyone to disagree that from time to time, it will be necessary to make adjustments in the Electoral Boundaries in any country. I go further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have said before, and I say again, it is not adjustment of the boundaries which created any question in the minds of the Opposition. It is when, as we have heard for the last three years, it is suggested that they will be seeking to increase the number or representatives in the House of Assembly, under the ambit of adjusting the boundaries, that is where we have taken issue with them and we state categorically, in the context of the size of the population in Barbados — bearing in mind, even what the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister said today — of an average voter population of 6,322, it is clear that the time has not arrived in Barbados, when we need to increase the number of seats beyond 24.

No one can argue with the statistics put forward, which show that some constituencies like the one which you have the honour to represent, Your Honour, have reached upwards to nearly eight thousand voters and maybe, beyond. No one can argue, that when such a population shift should occur, that it is necessary to adjust. It can be adjusted and it should be adjusted. I do not need faint praise because finally, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister

understood what I was saying. The fact that I am in a constituency which has only four thousand people and the Hon. Member for St. Michael North East, is in one which has over eight thousand people, I am a Representative and the people whom I represent expect that at some time, there would be an adjustment which would bring his down and carry mine up. There is no quarrel with that. There has never been any quarrel with that. All that we are saying is, do not let people come to feel, that in order to find a place for Tom, Dick and Harry, you might do a gerrymander.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in every Parliament, all over the world, whenever the question of re-alignment of boundaries should arise, there has been contention. There has been contention inter-Party, there has been contention intra-Party. It is very simple, no representative who has done the work and taken the trouble to entrench himself in a particular area, wishes, whether he is in Brooklyn, whether he is in London, or, whether he is in Barbados, to take the extra trouble to go and cultivate a whole new set of people, or, conversely, to lose a set of people whom he has cultivated and who know him and he knows them.

6.05 p.m.

That is a simple straightforward matter of men and women. Sir, in the great United States as you very well know, I only know it because there was a time when I used to teach American Government, there is no special genius, but, Sir, you will recall that from the time of the founding of that Republic until 1962 legislatures that were charged constitutionally with making periodic changes in apportionment refused to do so or did so in such a way as to, as we discovered later, to take action that was unconstitutional, and throughout that history from 1776 until 1962 the Supreme Court of the United States refused to touch any issue relating to apportionment of voters. It was only in 1962 and between 1962 and 1966 in what have now been called electoral cases... (Asides) Well 1964 was the leading case. 1962 Baker and Carr, Reynolds and Sims and a whole line of cases in which the Supreme Court finally agreed that if... (Asides) This is politics; it does not come up in law so much, it is more political. Every political scientist must know this, otherwise he does not qualify. But, Sir, it is only in that 1964 case finally when the Supreme Court said first of all that it was justiciable, that the Supreme Court has a right to intervene, and secondly they said we now say that the basis on which apportionment must be done is population. As a matter of fact, I think it is fair to say that that is the first time or beginning with that time that population as the basis of apportionment became the creed of all the democracies in the

world. They finally accepted that population was the basis for apportionment, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, that sparked off a tremendous row among politicians, among political scientists, among judicial officers, a tremendous row because there are people who strongly believe and have spoken of their belief that there are criteria other than population which should and must be taken into consideration when apportionment is about to happen.

Now, Sir, let us come to Barbados. A lot has been said about the fact that we had twenty-four seats a fairly long time now. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact that some people were over represented some time ago is no reason for us now, now that we are persons of a certain kind who run the affairs of this country, to make the same kind of errors that were made and which we recognised to have been errors. I have heard it said that Local Government having been abolished in Barbados there is sufficient ground for an increase in seats. I think that if our population went up to 300,000 we could probably accept that argument, but if one looks at what used to be euphemistically called Local Government in Barbados and if one is non-partisan and reasonable in one's approach to that look, one would recognise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what used to happen in the name of Local Government in Barbados was not a delivery of social and other services to the people of Barbados in an efficient manner, but it was more in the provision, if you will, escape valves or safety valves for a number of persons who by dint of their peculiar activity in the community felt that they had a right to some form of representative position and a number of them therefore found a niche in what was described as Local Government. I am not denying Local Government per se, but I am saying that such Local Government as we had was brought to us from England wholesale and without any particular examination of our needs and our wishes.

I think that the recent exercise by the Commission that was set up in which I believe Your Honour had some part to play is an exercise, even though I disagree with a number of the recommendations, that was carried out by Barbadians among Barbadians to see what Barbadians think is good enough for them, and I think it does not fall well out of the mouths of hon. members on that side or on this side for that matter to suggest that Local Government was some special dispensation sent directly from Mount Olympia for Barbados and that the day when it disappeared was something wrong for Barbados, something despicable. Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the greatest respect for all those who have served in the past, I do not believe that the dispensing of a pint of cod liver oil, 50 cents here and there and the odd

shirt and parts for a poor woman down in one of the slums of our community is what constitutes local Government, and I am one of those persons who do not mourn its passing. What I do mourn is the failure of Government to continue to eradicate the basis on which that constituted something in our society, and I hope that Government will stop with the rhetoric and get on with the action so that we will no longer use certain hobby-horses such as Local Government to make points where we have reached the point where no points can be made.

Sir, the people in Barbados in so far as their elections are concerned wish a categorical statement or they wish to be able to believe that elections in Barbados will not be rigged; they wish to know that, they wish to feel it. All of us in here wish to feel it, and more so the people outside wish to feel that elections will not be rigged. They wish to know that they will not be deprived of their right to vote in any form or fashion. The people in this community wish to continue to have the freedom to attend political meetings, and they wish to be able to hear vigorous language on political platforms. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the greatest acts of hypocrisy one could come across is when the arch cursers in politics get up in anywhere — I have to be careful, Mr. Deputy Speaker — here or any other place and try to give the impression that somehow something somebody said about them on a political platform has struck them to the bone. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I used to be in the Other Place and held ministerial position, I had the privilege of hearing some of the things said by hon. members who now sit over there on political platforms. You know, Sir, I know Sir, and they know that they said some things then that they wished they had not said. I once heard the Hon. Prime Minister at the corner of Eagle Hall telling the people at Eagle Hall to ask one Branford Taitt what happened in his garage in Brooklyn. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe those were the words. I am not referring to the person in this Honourable House. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I subsequently asked him to tell me what happened in the garage in Brooklyn and he said "why, I don't know either". Now, Sir, in the heat of political campaign I think that is good political sport and we as politicians must understand that we must stop being hypocritical that on the platforms sometimes especially as we get near to the election date, people get rough with their mouths.

Now I do not believe in some of the personal character assassinations which pass as political speeches and I think that the people of Barbados are the only ones who will change that when they refuse to go and hear those persons who by dint of their lack of ability to communicate resort to that kind of political character assassination. I am satisfied from my own experience

that it is not necessary. You have to give a fellow a little lash here and there otherwise people will stop listening to you. When you go out there you cannot talk pure economics; you have to call the Prime Minister's name or the Speaker's name or somebody's name occasionally. My name gets called regularly, but I would like to suggest to the hon. members on the other side that the people in Barbados are not fooled by any posturing on this issue because the hon. members on the other side are the Champion abusers, there is no question about that, the champions in their own right. You know about Invader No. 1 and Invader No. 2, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But can you come back to the Resolution?

Mr. TAITT: That is all part of the process of electioneering. Invader No. 1's head is getting a bit too gray now, Sir, but when the two of them start on you and start with the sponging and working a little cry, all of these things form part of the political process. 6.15 p.m.

All of these things form part of the political process and it also forms part of the process when they come to this Hon. House and seek to make political hay, but, Sir, all of that notwithstanding, let me quickly deal with a couple of the harder facts put up by the Prime Minister. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman is not in his place, but I would like to suggest to him that a 10% variation I agree with him is too tight, but I would suggest that a 20% variation is a little too high for Barbados, and a 15% variation would probably bring us within range. We said 20%, and I think 20% would carry us a little too far.

I wish to see also that the question of apportionment or reapportionment be taken out of the range of the political arena. In the same way that we have a census every ten years we should have a mandatory reassessment of the boundaries along with any census that is done. It stands to reason that if you are having a census that you should deal with all matters connected with population at or about the same time. It would make the whole exercise cheaper for Governments who would succeed in the future and it would ensure, as is done in a number of progressive countries, that people know that when a census year comes up there is going to be a census, there is going to be enumeration, there is going to be realignment and politicians holding office or aspiring to office would also come to understand that that is the time when it is going to happen, so that every ten years when we are doing a census we would have that type of process.

Someone from the other side said that he was surprised to see that we on this side did not have the moral strength to support what they know in their hearts to be right. Sir, that falls very cheaply in the light of what the Prime Minister himself said earlier that at least somebody on this side had dealt with the matter. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the moral strength to support what is right comes not out of your political party, it comes out of the individual that you are, and I really do not think that morality lies on one side or the other, we have no doubt little slivers of immorality in all aspects of life and it is not for me to deal with the immorality on the other side, if any, but I will say this, it would be wrong for anyone to have a constituency of 4,000 voters and pretend that he does not wish a change in his constituency boundaries. However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what has to be borne in mind is this, it is not only the voters that should count, and again one of the suggestions which I should like to put out is that we include as part of the criteria which will be used for the change of electoral boundaries would be to see what is the nature of the total population in a constituency and would be to deal with the people and not necessarily the voters in a constituency. My constituency, that of St. Michael South West, has been pointed out as one of the smaller constituencies, but it is only so in terms of the number of voters. When however, that constituency is taken *vis-a-vis* another constituency with maybe 500 more voters you will find that I have more actual people in St. Michael South West than in some constituencies that may have a higher number of voters, and the reason is simple. My constituency has an 86% lower socio-economic group and it is well known that in the lower socio-economic groupings you have a greater need for services than in some of the terraces where they have got accustomed to a family of 2.5 children as was put out by some statistician some years ago. I do not mean it individually but it is a fact that most hon. members fall into the category now of middle class, and most hon. members in this House, if not all, who are middle class, their children will not be getting any 15 children or 12 children or seven children, they will be getting two and three and so will be spending their resources a little better and will not be calling on the resources of the central Government in the same way as persons living in any of the city or surrounding areas of a constituency.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have two minutes in which to wind up.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in those two minutes let me just dispose of one argument which has been put forward by the Prime Minister and other members on the other side. They said it will cost \$15,000 for one new representative. That is patently false, it is wrong thinking and it must not be allowed to go abroad

because it is unfair to the rest of the community. If you have two more seats you have a recurring continuing cost from them for all times. Everything that is done in a constituency will be added and duplicated by those two for all times, it is not only the \$25,000 that they might get the next time the House reviews their salary, it is that you have to set up electoral machinery for that constituency as well. You have to set up other machinery for those constituencies that are formed so that the additional cost would be a direct contradiction of the position taken by the party on that side when in its Manifesto it suggested that the cost of Government was too high. It went further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and suggested that they would reduce the number of Ministers precisely because the cost of Government was too high. When we accused them of being immoral on that issue — and note I said on that issue — that is what we are talking about, you have led people to believe one set of facts and one set of thinking and when you come back to do what perhaps you think you must do then you cannot come and say it will only cost \$15,000, or in the words of the hon. member for Christ Church North Central, \$60,000 for four. I think that on reflection the hon. member will agree that it will cost a lot more over a period of time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence and hope that my contribution is taken in the spirit in which it was given. I want to finish by saying this. The other side need not keel on this issue, this issue is some ways transcends political parties, it involves representation of the people which we all say constantly that that is what we are asking. I would not wish any position I take to be used against me or for me in terms of my political party if it is not going to include along with that that my political party supports representation of the people. Since both of these political parties say that their main and primary objective is proper representation of the people, then we should argue this issue seriously and sensibly and we should remove from it all the petty politics which we know we have to put in from time to time because that is what helps the political system to spin. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.
6.25 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I crave your indulgence at this point in time because I have indicated to one of the speakers from the Government side who wanted to speak that I would prefer to speak now because I have another engagement.

Now, I think it is fairly clear that the debate which has taken place here today is one of fundamental importance in that it affects Parliament in a very real way and the whole question of representation that comes to the fore. Now it seems as if the Prime Minister and the members of the governing Party are somewhat upset

by what has turned out to be a rather prophetic statement which was issued by the Parliamentary Group of the Democratic Labour Party yesterday and which appeared in today's issue of the *Advocate News* because the debate has taken a turn as indicated very clearly by the Prime Minister on the discussion to an increase in the number of seats in Parliament.

Indeed, this position was reinforced by the hon. member for Christ Church North Central when he indicated very clearly the position that at least there should be an increase of four seats and we all remember the little laugh that we had when after having the brief which obviously was placed at his command by the Prime Minister when the Prime Minister looked around and indicated to him that he had indeed delivered the brief word for word and correctly so that I think we have to be very very clear.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have to take up the hon. member on a point without order in this matter. I was not even aware that the hon. member for Christ Church North Central was going to speak. I am familiar with his speaking qualities and it therefore came as no surprise to hear such an outstanding speech from the hon. member but certainly I had not the slightest idea that any word was going to be said. A lot of things are happening in here today that I certainly was not aware that were going to happen, Sir, and that was one of them and if the hon. member was here he would have objected that it was not according to the rules of the House by suggesting that he was making a speech which has been prepared for him by another hon. member.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, be that as it may, Mr. Deputy Speaker it is pretty clear, certainly from what the Prime Minister said before the luncheon break that as far as he was concerned and as far as the Government was concerned the population growth in Barbados would necessitate an increase in the number of seats which we have existing in this country at the present time. Indeed, he chastised the Opposition for taking what he described as a conservative approach to this particular matter. He was very emphatic at this point because what he was trying to indicate was that rather than adopting what, for the lack of a better term, would be a revolutionary approach and conceded that there is need for an increase in the seats of this Parliament, that what the Opposition was doing was that we were adopting a rather conservative approach and indicated that we should have no increase in the number of seats in this Parliament. So that I think that the debate has really turned on to this political point.

Sir, I was rather surprised to hear the member for St. Philip North when he got up and while deliberat-

ing attempted to give the impression that so far the Government "has done nothing to say that the number of seats will be increased" and he was speaking after the two previous speakers that I have referred to so that when therefore the Opposition takes the position, certainly in this statement which was issued by the Parliamentary Group, this is why I said that it seems to me as if we were somewhat prophetic in that particular statement.

We must ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why are we going through this exercise at this time. Why, and it seems as if the present Barbados Labour Party Administration likes to do things on the eve and just before Elections. Now I know that we will hear, as I am quite aware, that Elections are not constitutionally due until September, 1981 but I think all of us in this Parliament know that Elections or we can actually feel that Elections will take place in Barbados before that time and it brings me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to a situation which the Opposition was critical of on the eve of the by-election in St. Michael South Central.

I believe that you will recall that on that occasion the Opposition questioned the haste and the hurry with which the Government brought down an amendment to the Representation of the People Act and that amendment basically was to improve the publication of the Voters List on a monthly basis and to decrease that as from that time and only one list would be published and that would be in January each year and we questioned the whole rationale and the whole object of that particular exercise in the same way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are questioning today the rationale and the whole objective of the exercise which we are now being called upon to deal with.

We feel and we have said from the statements which have been issued and the statements made by the hon. members of the Opposition, it is very clear that we feel that this Resolution is ill-timed because it is coming at a time when the election fever is gaining ground and we think to go through an exercise like this at a time like this will lend itself to all sorts of charges and counter-charges and indeed will lead to the development of a certain feeling among the voters in this country.

The member for St. Michael South West made a very significant point, a point which I do not think that hon. members should overlook and he talked about the question of confidence, people feeling that things are not being done to deprive them or to make them feel that they are not going to have the opportunity to participate freely in the electoral process. I think that this point has got to be borne in mind and certainly coming at this time, when as you said the heat is moving

up and rising, we must be very careful and certainly the Government would be advised to be very careful in this particular matter.

The Opposition has stated in very cogent arguments be objective which we have had and which we will continue to have against the increase in the number of Parliamentary seats in this country. We have not been convinced of the arguments which have been adduced about the disappearance of Local Government and there is a need to increase Parliamentary representations. One must only point out that since the abolition of the Local Government there has been the establishment and the increase of Statutory Boards which do a lot of the work that used to be done by the Local Government and certainly there has been an increase in the number of people and the size of the Civil Service and Public Service generally speaking so that the kind of argument which we have been hearing we are not particularly convinced by that kind of argument so that I think that the Government ought to think again on this particular matter.

We are quite aware that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has indicated that this is a decision of his Government and there is nothing that we can do as it were to change that particular decision. I think that as a responsible Opposition we have to draw to his attention these things and whether or not the arguments which we have adduced are accepted by him, that is a matter for him.

6.35 p.m.

We consider it our solemn duty to draw these points to his attention and in the final analysis, I am sure that he, and his Party, would have to bear the brunt of criticism and whatever problems which may develop from an ill-timed and untimely measure like this.

Thank you.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Incidentally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I believe that there is no subject which excites sitting Hon. Members of Parliament more, than the subject of upcoming Elections and as a result, every sitting Hon. Member has a vested interest in ensuring that he is returned and there is no subject, which excites Opposition Parties more, and I speak as an Hon. Member who has sat in Opposition, than the subject of re-arrangement of constituencies, either by a boundary adjustment, or, increase, or decrease in the number of seats obviously, again, because they have a vested interest in winning the Government and Opposition Parties are usually apt to overstate the case, when it comes to making certain necessary changes, or, in the Representation of the People Act.

Basically, Barbados has maintained, ever since Adult Suffrage, basically free Elections. I was happy today to hear the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, although rather belatedly, pay respect to the changing of Governments, by ballot box rather than, by violence. I said that I am heartened to hear this because I have heard from Hon. Members of the Opposition and their minor Political Party, the People's Pressure Movement, the sort of statements which cast grave doubt on whether we are going to remain a country with a democratic tradition, wedded to multi Party democracy and the changing of Governments periodically, by people voting at Elections.

I have been amazed indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in reading sometimes, Reports of public meetings held in this country, in listening to the tapes and in fact, myself, attending some of these meetings at which, in particular, speakers from the People's Pressure Movement and even speakers on the Democratic Labour Party platform, have come close to recommending a change of Government, well ahead of the constitutional period due and if there were to be that change, it could only have been by pressure, not of a legitimate kind.

I believe that the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, who has some considerable influence with the People's Pressure Movement must go a bit further, he must not only profess here that the Democratic Labour Party is against violence. That might be a tactical statement, having regard to the fact that Constitutional Elections are due before the end of next year. I want him to go on Record, at one of his meetings saying that he disassociates himself from the People's Pressure Movement, when they advocate violence in this country and call to people to throw themselves in front of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister's car, or refers to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister as a mongoose and ask them to kill him, or to say that the Hon. Attorney General wants assassinating because that has crept into public life and it has been from statements made particularly, by the People's Pressure Movement and I have seen, at those meetings, leading members of the Democratic Labour Party including Mr. Cameron Tudor, applauding those statements. I am not speaking from hearsay now. So, if that Party is genuinely in favour of proper, electoral reform and not gerrymandering, they must go further.

I am glad that the Hon. Member has come back in here because I do not want him to be a latter day, converted saint. I have known him to come into this Hon. House when he says that he was denied the right to speak by the Speaker, to call out the people, because there was going to be no holding of meetings in here, unless he is allowed to speak. That, I told him then, was a wrong tactic, I told him that by degrees, he would learn in politics, when he becomes mature, that the best system

of Government is democracy. It has a lot of inequities as well, but multi-Party democracy with fair and free Elections, as far as is humanly possible. As the Hon. Member for St. Michael South would tell him, a student of Government like myself and good Government will tell him, it is still, ultimately, one of the pillars of a safeguard of the long term people interest.

I am glad to hear him curbing his exuberance. Obviously, he was, like all of us, at one stage, when you came into Parliament, you came in brimful of ideas and willing to change everything. But, there must be, between the main political Parties in this country, if Barbados is to remain an oasis of tranquility, progress and democracy, the main political Parties, and they must eschew violence from political life and they must hold firmly to the principle of fair and free Elections, at reasonable, periodic occasions.

I am happy to say, that the political Party with which I am associated, is wedded, quite clearly, to these principles. (*Asides*) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I expect that the Hon. Member, for the very limited time which he will have in this Hon. House, will learn a few more lessons, and when we look around in the Caribbean, I think that I will agree with this statement of his, I think that we are fortunate in Barbados, that we have had, since Universal Suffrage, three Premiers and two Prime Ministers, Sir, one Prime Minister having been a Premier, three Premiers do not let us forget Dr. Cummins not as people think, was an interregnum, but, a very solid Barbadian, who guided their Party towards respecting the ballot box of this country.

I think, that fundamentally, between the two Parties, is this understanding, although in recent years, particularly, since the bye-Election in St. Michael South Central, I have been having my doubts and I have at times said, whither Barbados unless we are sensible.

I agree with him further, that from time to time, Governments should change and in fact that was one of the arguments which I advanced in 1976 that the Democratic Labour Party had got into power for 15 years. 6.45 p.m.

In fact this was one of the arguments that I advanced in 1976 that the Democratic Labour Party had got into power for 15 years, we had had fifteen. They had had fifteen and a little arrogance set in. You know after hubris there comes nemesis, and their nemesis came. I believe that any Government needs a reasonable period of time. Where he and I disagree is that where like now this Government is performing adequately they need a longer period of time to continue with good performance; so that is where we part company. I am sure there will come a time when the Barbados

Labour Party Government will change. We will be succeeded by somebody else, maybe the Democratic Labour Party and there will come a time when they will be changed again, and this is a healthy and good thing for democratic traditions in this country.

I want to say, Sir, in my short time having an interest in politics in this country, that I have seen gerrymandering in one form or another, and I do not want now to list the areas of gerrymandering. I witnessed the 1961 elections here and at that time the Democratic Labour Party which was in Opposition was saying that there was gerrymandering in the sense that they wanted single member constituencies immediately. They won despite the allegations of gerrymandering. What I witnessed however in 1971 was unbelievable, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I witnessed the then Minister of Home Affairs, on the direction of his Prime Minister changing boundaries in Christ Church South Central overnight with a couple of days to go to the election in order to cause the hon. member for Christ Church South Central, Bernard St. John to lose his seat. I am saying that in 1971 the worse form of gerrymandering was carried out by the Democratic Labour Party as against the present hon. member for Christ Church South Central who was then and had previously been the senior member for Christ Church. It was a vicious piece of political action on the part of the Democratic Labour Party. I want that to go into the records of the House because I will be dead and gone and when the history of this country is written, it must be fairly written. There were people who went to the polls to be told although they had cards and circulars from him and the other man showing where they should vote that they were no longer on that electoral roll, they had been changed with seven days to go to an election.

Now whenever I get a party with that tradition coming to me in a reformist zeal, I examine their bona fides very very carefully and I am not surprised that because the Democratic Labour Party particularly in 1971 created an atmosphere of distrust and lack of good faith that it is now under the impression that instead of us turning the other cheek we are going to do unto them what they did unto us, and hence all the talk about increasing the number of seats, changing boundaries etc., and of course naturally being a party out of power they pick on the in-built prejudices of the electorate to believe that anything that looks as though it is going to cost a bit more money is bad for them to exploit this issue to its fullest.

Now let me tell you something: there may be some electoral advantage, and it is very doubtful, to be gained from less than an objective approach on this issue, but in the long run in the interest of Barbados, a division by political parties on issues such as this could do more

damage to the democratic tradition than the gain which we may get in the short term. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are certain fundamentals. We should all be devoted to the principle of proper representation in Parliament and as fair a reputation as possible. That principle is manifested in another principle, one man one vote. I do not think it is any difference between political parties on the principle of one man one vote, but that principle has a co-relative. I am going to repeat it. The principle of one man one vote has a co-relative. It is one that is not often honoured even in a country such as the United Kingdom which has a long tradition of democratic voting. It is honoured in the United States to a large extent, and that is the principle of one vote one value.

Now our constitution has been changed in 1956 in which we have certain fundamental rights, and I am not even sure now, I have not given a legal opinion on it, but I believe that we should look to see whether we are not in breach of the fundamental provisions of the constitution by maintaining constituencies where there is such gross inequality that the value of a vote in St. Michael North West, your constituency, Sir, has less value than a vote in St. Joseph or in St. Michael South Central or in St. Michael West, because you cannot have the position where one person in St. Michael North West is one of 10,000 electing one representative where one person in St. Joseph or Belleville is one of 5,000 persons or less than 5,000 persons representing one representative. It is basically wrong.

If the hon. member has been following the very valuable course of lectures given only a few weeks ago by Professor H. W. R. Wade, the leading institutional law authority in England, he will see in the Reith Lectures that he pointed out to the British that it was about time that Britain paid more than lip service to the principle of democracy and the democratic tradition by giving votes an equal value as near as humanly possible and practicable, and the danger we have here is that population shifts have moved to such an extent that it is becoming inequitable to maintain existing boundaries, and because it is becoming inequitable, it is undermining the democratic tradition of this country.

I want to read into the record a statement made by none other than Chief Justice Warren, one of the outstanding Chief Justices of the United States, when in dealing with the case of Reynolds and Sims in 1954 he said this:

"Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests. The basic principle of representative Government remains and must remain unchanged. The weight of a citizen's vote cannot be made to depend

on where he lives. This the Supreme Court said was one of the fundamentals of democratic Government."

And this is what Professor Wade in the Reith lectures had added about Britain. "The British Parliament addicted though it is to the pursuits of equality in so many ways does not seem interested in equality of representation between voters any more than between the different parts of the United Kingdom. Since 1948 it has insisted rigidly on the principle of one man one vote. When will it accept the co-relative principle of one vote one value?"

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That entire quotation is from the Reith Lectures?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am reading from the Reith Lectures in the second chapter at pages 7 and 8. That was delivered less than four weeks ago, Sir, for the benefit of the hon. member. I have had the value of the advice of Professor Wade; indeed I was a pupil. I sat at the feet of him as Gamaliel. No doubt I have imbibed a bit of his teaching and his firm dedication to this principle. I believe and I know the Government intends before the light of this Parliament expires to have a permanent boundaries commission set up. I think it is crucial and it will come, and one of the reasons I believe firmly in it is because I saw what the Democratic Labour Party did in order to get rid of the then Leader of the Party.
6.55 p.m.

One of the reasons I believe firmly in it is because I saw what the Democratic Labour Party did in Christ Church South Central in order to get rid of the then leader of the party. I believe Cameron Tudor had a hand in that. You can go back and tell him I had this to say about him, I believe he did. I don't believe that if you compare Cameron Tudor and the hon. member for St. Michael South you are comparing like with like at all. On the one hand the hon. member for St. Michael South has firm devotion as a man, he is a man of principle when it comes to matters such as this and I don't believe if he had a hand in it he would have done it, and we know that these things happen. I think it was a shocking example and I would like to hear the Democratic Labour Party say, that it would never do a thing like that again. That is why I believe it is crucial that there should be bi-partisan representation of the Boundaries Commission.

Sir, I do not prejudge the issue as to whether we will decrease or increase seats. In my view, if we take 9,800 as the maximum number we will end up with 15 seats. If we decide that 4,500 was the maximum number or thereabouts we will end up with an increase in seats, but somewhere we must find a mean regardless of whether it means an increase or decrease in seats or the

size of constituencies we must find a mean of getting the equivalent of one vote one value, and that is one of the strongest arguments that there is for this system.

I know, Sir, that the Constitution Commission has made various recommendations. I would hope, and I expect, I have some responsibility for constitutional affairs, although the Constitution Commission is a matter that comes under the Prime Minister's Office, but I would hope and expect that we will have a debate on that report. I think it is crucial that we should debate it, I think that basically it is a good report. Some of the issues probably should have called for more drastic changes than others, I am not prejudging the discussion there, but let me tell the hon. members that already we have started in our department to look at the constitutional changes that are necessary resulting out of that report, and legislation will take time. We have drafted an Ombudsman Bill which will shortly be going before Parliament, we have drafted a Bill dealing with the position of the DPP and the Judges which should shortly be going before Parliament, but there is a lot of legislation that will result if the constitutional report is accepted by the Government and by this House, and I think that members should look at constitutional reform also in the context of the need to preserve certain basic fundamentals if we want to continue to see this country progress, regardless of the colour of the Government in power.

Now, I think there is another drastic step to which we have to address attention, because for one vote to have one value we also have to look at first past the post. I believe both political parties are at present dedicated to first past the post in the system of voting. The person who gets the highest number of votes in any constituency wins and you can find the position as has happened before between the parties where the number of seats in the House do not necessarily represent the number of votes in the country as a whole, and it is for some consideration whether certainly beginning with the Upper Chamber we should look at a form of proportional representation and election rather than appointment of an Upper Chamber, because make no mistake about it, the present method of choosing the Upper Chamber is archaic and arbitrary and haphazard. I said so before the constitutional conference in England in 1966, that was the view we looked at, we were by-passed in several of those issues, but it is still for consideration out of the constitutional reform whether we should not move to an Upper House that is elected by proportional representation to mirror more accurately the feeling of the people who are represented in Parliament. I know that Sir Carlisle Burton has put in a minority report on this issue, but both political parties should be paying some attention to that particular issue as well, Sir.

Sir, I see nothing sinister about the Government's intentions on this issue. What I would like to see is that

we have all of our electoral machinery properly debated without any sleight-of-hand, any worthwhile suggestions which come from the Opposition either in Committee or in this House are taken up, their views taken into account, the views of the public outside and legislation on the Statute Book which will minimise any possibility of a gerrymander.

Now, I want to pay a bit of tribute to the civil servants who are administering the machinery. I believe we are fortunate that by and large the civil servants who administer the machinery of elections have managed to be non-partisan. I am not accepting from the Democratic Labour Party that all the people who participated in the electoral process in 1976 or 1971 or otherwise leading up to those elections were always non-partisan. I refuse to accept this, and let me start in my constituency.

Mr. J. C. King was in charge of the vote at ZB at St. Matthias. He had been a prospective candidate for the Democratic Labour Party before he headed the vote there. Mr. John Daniel who is now the candidate against me was a member of the Democratic Labour Party and was one of the people dealing with the votes. I can go through another list of them. In fact, when I turned up at St. Matthias on that day I wondered whether I was at a meeting of the Christ Church West Constituency Branch of the Democratic Labour Party. I am going to make that point, I am not accepting this from them, I am calling two names, not to run down the gentlemen, because both of them despite their political persuasion I consider to be friends of mine, but the point remains that on election day for me to be face to face with people who were card bearing members of the Democratic Labour Party and manning the electoral poll could have lead to an awkward situation if I were not a reasonable, level-headed man. (ASIDES). I will let the hon. member know that even if they change my constituency to include the parish of St. John I can still win, Sir. They could include the whole of the constituency of the member for St. Michael South Central and I would still win, Sir, so I don't bother where they draw the line. I am not concerned where you draw the line, because I am sure, the only thing I warn you about is not to touch Forde's Road, the people of Forde's Road will refuse to vote if you move them out of my constituency, Sir.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. Is the hon. member trying to suggest that the present administration is trying to alter his constituency to his disadvantage?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: No, Sir, I don't need any advantage or disadvantage in elections, I just want a reasonable opportunity to explain to people how I could represent them, what I have done and what are the policies of the party with which I am associated. I don't need it, Sir, because I have not bought a seat, do not intend to buy one, I am not interested in representing a

seat *ad nauseam* and I don't think the people would want me to stay there *ad nauseam*.
7.05 p.m.

I believe that if electors do not want you and they reject you, you will have another opportunity like everybody else. It does not bother me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Five minutes.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: All I am saying is that it is necessary for the political party to ensure that on a matter like this that everything is done correctly, appears to be done correctly and is done so that it is widely discussed by everybody. That is the whole point and that is exactly what we are seeking to do.

Now the hon. member in the by-elections complained that somebody was changing the Electoral Act in order to gerrymander the Elections. I listened to him. I listened to his campaign speech and all of that and I was disappointed. Although he was not then a member of Parliament I would have allowed him to come up, if he wanted to, and look at the legislation, to talk to the Legal Draughtsmen on it and not only that but to see as well the report of the Electoral Officer which we filed arising out of the 1976 Elections if he believes that the by-election was gerrymandered, why is he sitting in here? Because he won and won conclusively and won in circumstances because I can tell him that some of the people who voted for him did not live in his constituency at the time. I can tell you, Sir.

The hon. member had a long list of people who were living outside of the constituency who used his cars and his friends went and brought them into the constituency to vote for him. Some of them had lived outside longer than six months.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. I think that the hon. member might have been inadvertently misleading this Honourable House. The Act under which the Voter Registration is compiled certainly does not make it illegal for a person who is interested in another constituency or who was registered in another constituency and who did not change his registration not to vote for another candidate. I think the hon. member was giving the impression that because persons were living outside of the constituency that they did not have the right to vote. As long as they were registered in that constituency, Sir, they had the right to vote.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: But the Act make it illegal for them to remain on the Register. The hon. member must know that so if he remains illegal there can be a legality. The hon. member knows that but we did not make a fuss about it but what will happen now is that there will be an adjustment.

Sir, I just want to wind up on a few points. I have said in speaking as the representative of Christ Church West to the Chief Electoral Officer that I am personally not satisfied that all of the persons who have been entitled to register in Christ Church West have not been on the register. My constituency, I believe of all of the 24, is the one which has suffered from the electoral machinery not being properly up to scratch and I have hesitated myself particularly because I am a Minister in getting into taking people to be registered, some I know to whom the people had not gone and I know that Mr. Nat Clairmont is doing a job as well as he could, given the circumstances, and himself personally of giving his spare time to try to rectify this event and I hope that any Boundaries Commission that is appointed would therefore have the interest of any corrections that are necessary being done before recommendations are brought back to this House from such a Select Committee so that if there are still outstanding people in our various constituencies who ought to be on the record but are not now on the record that they first be placed on the electoral roll before we make final recommendations to this House. I believe that time will permit us to do so.

I cannot promise the House that my office can complete all of the legislation that is necessary to give effect to the Constitutional Commission or a complete review of the Representation of the People Act. We will try our best but it takes time but I can promise the House that once there has been the final decision making of the Electoral Boundaries Commission that we will give it the highest priority because I think it is very vital that we should not have a new Parliament without a permanent Electoral Boundaries Commission and I know that our Party remains wedded to that principle and there will be no deviation from it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If no hon. member wishes to speak, I propose to reply to the debate. Sir, this has been a difficult debate to follow as it has proceeded because hon. members opposite have achieved levels of inconsistencies that I have rarely ever seen in the House.

The former Prime Minister, now the Leader of the Opposition explained at length his unique participation in reaching the World's history in having a boundary realignment over a period of 10 years, how he had to fight for it. He then went on to say that there is nothing wrong in changing the boundaries, I have never heard him say that this was the wrong time to change them.

The hon. member for St. Michael South put up a strong speech, not quite as strong, in favour of changing the boundaries as the Leader of the Opposition and then he said that this is the wrong time. He made a very

revealing statement. He said that you are in the run-up now to an Election that you are going to lose so this is the wrong time. The hon. member was therefore saying that the Barbados Labour Party has no right to change the boundary that God has given the Democratic Labour Party alone the right to change the boundary and that they must wait and do it when they get back into power. I am forced to treat the speech of the hon. member under those circumstances as being highly opportunistic and unworthy of the respect of this side.

The two hon. members made few points that need response. The hon. member for St. John said that the figure of 3,000 in his Resolution of 1955 was related to 72,000 voters. This point has effectively been disposed of by the hon. member for St. Philip North who pointed out that there were 96,000 voters in the 1951 General Elections in which the hon. member for St. John was returned with over 3,000 votes as Senior member for St. George. I do not know how the figure of 3,000 got in his head. I think he got 3,001 or 3,002 votes in St. George.

7.15 p.m.

But, I think it much more likely that, as has been bruted abroad at the time, he was making way for an increase in the seats because the figure which he quoted, would then have produced 32 seats in the Hon. House of Assembly. I do not accept that he ever believed that there were 72,000 voters. I think that he has got that figure, in the preparation of his speech. He multiplied three thousand by twenty-four, came up with 72,000 and said that that was the number of voters in 1951. I do not think that he was ever telling the truth, I do not think so. I think that he had no knowledge in 1980, of how many voters there were in 1951, but that if he went back to his notes, if he has them, to his arguments, if he could find them and to current newspaper comment at the time, if he cares to look for it, he will find that he was then speaking about 32 seats. I think that that by itself, undermines the argument of the Opposition against that increase in seats. It is one thing to say that you were for an increase 25 years ago, but that you are not for it now. It is another thing to say that you are never for an increase, except, as he has said, at some time in the future, but that that time has not yet come.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Member alone, qualified his arguments by saying that there could be an increase at some time in future. Those of us who know the Hon. Member, know that what he has done is compromise, in the face of the young Turks, the young Turks feel that there is electoral advantage to be gained out of pretending, that an increase in the number of seats in the House of Assembly will be a financial burden on the taxpayers. It is easy to put this forward, burden on the taxpayers. So, the young Turks feel that you must oppose an increase at all cost. I think that they have achieved

imposing their will, on the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Whether they will achieve an imposition of their will on the Select Committee, is a different matter.

As I have said, Sir, the logical basis of a review of the boundaries is well settled and we accept, on all sides and I do not think that I have to labour on that point. In passing, I will altogether dismiss these absurd remarks about the Work Permits. The young Turks Sir, especially the doctors among them, ought to impress, on the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that obsessional psychoses, I cannot just call them neuroses, do not sit well on political shoulders. The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition is obsessed with the fact that the Estimates of Revenue show that we are projecting \$1,000,000 in receipts for the Defence and Security Division. He cannot accept that there are a number of Work Permit applications, Passport applications and other payments which may justify this project of revenue. He is convinced in his mind, that we intend to bring a great flood of migrants into the country, to out-vote the Democratic Labour Party. It really is time that the Hon. Member laid this idea to decent rest.

The obsequies can be pronounced by the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West who is leaning forward, pronouncing obsequies, not only in ideas, but perhaps, of political ambition, of a number of his colleagues, not excepting the Hon. Member for St. John.

The speech of the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central opened with some remarks which have a great deal of quarter, half and full truth in them. The Hon. Member is on Record, that facts do not matter and that truth is

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of Order. The Record is that the Hon. Prime Minister knows that truth and facts do not count in politics, but impressions do and that is the basis of his success.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Please continue with the Debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has already made it clear, that he was invited to agree with a remark that facts do not matter and that he does not agree with it. I will take any money that Hansard at no stage, has ever contained the words, that that is the basis of his success because the Hon. Member was shouted down and when he realised what he had said, he tried to pull it back, he tried to bring it back.

The Hon. Member said something about the climate in the Caribbean and then went on to say, that there was a necessity for free and fair Elections. The climate is, that losing Parties accuse the winning Parties, at all times, whether there is any truth in it, or not, of fiddling with

Elections. So far, in Barbados, this has not happened, but the Hon. Members opposite have done their best to create a climate in which this will be said, it will not happen, but it will be said. I thought that that remark about the climate in the Caribbean was a very revealing one and a very important one because if there is one person in the public life of this country who intends to reduce the political climate in Barbados, to what he describes as the political climate in the Caribbean, it is the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central. If the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central is ever given the opportunity, by the Electorate that he wishes, I predict that he will reduce the political climate of this country to that which prevails in Guyana, far less, Jamaica, within a matter of a few years. There is no man more erosive of the smooth running of the political system of this country, than the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central. Vote for him and you are voting for the gun battles in Kingston, Jamaica and the bombs in Guyana. You are voting for a man who will destroy the fabric of public life in this country and I am not saying this casually, Sir, this is the settled and considered opinion, not only of Hon. Members on this side, but, of a great segment of the Barbadian public, whose respect you have tried to catch at today, by talking in fear and dulcet tones. But, no more than the leopard can change his spots, can that Hon. Member change his speech. We saw what you were like in St. George in 1976 and the Electorate spat upon you then. That day will come again. (ASIDES)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He talked about the climate in the Caribbean and about fiddling with the Elections. The very statement is designed to give the Hon. Member the opportunity to get up on platforms and attack the Government for interfering with the Electoral process. I predict that, as sure as I am going to walk out of here, that within a fortnight, that I will be reading that the Hon. Member says that the Government intends to gerrymander the next Elections, or some expression.

Anything which is destructive which has been said in Guyana, finds an echo in the speeches of the Hon. Member and it is Hon. Members of his Party who are the most threatened by what he says.

The Hon. Member has an appetite in which scruple plays but a very small part where it comes to pursuing his political ambitions, a very small part, indeed. He has never been reputed, never, for being able to resist an inflammatory remark, irrespective of the truth on which it is based and I hear again, climate in the Caribbean and electoral malpractice in the newspaper today, what is it? Sinister rapists, the Government are a pack of sinister rapists. (ASIDES)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Another sinister attempt to further erode. No, the Hon. Member for St. Michael South would not split an infinitive like that, he can write the English language. Another sinister attempt to further erode the democratic rights of the people of this country. The democratic rights of the people of this country. The democratic rights of the people of this country are eroded by this Government. I will not stand idly by and allow this naked constitutional and financial rape to take place without challenging it.

7.25 p.m.

They said that they will not stand idly by and allow this naked constitutional and financial rape to take place without challenging it, and yet hon. members are surprised when they realise that the climate of hatred in this country has already been sown when people walk through crowds at political meetings and they hear people that were thought to be decent people — you want the car numbers, I can tell you some of the car numbers — say, you know what we want in this country, you must overthrow Tom Adams; you know what we want in this country? We want some blood; and so on. The meeting at Redmans Village; and yet hon. members are surprised when as they say stones were thrown at the meeting. When you create hatred like that, they feel there has to be organisation when hatred in response is generated. I hope hon. members will realise, I hope hon. members know, I hope that hon. members are prepared for the fact that there are two sides in this country, and that this side will not necessarily lie down and be walked over and trampled. That is what I would like to say about the climate of the country.

Now all of this about the figures, a suggestion that the Chief Electoral Officer has fiddled with the figures. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central is very fond of attacking the bona fides of the control of the electoral process.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the burden of my argument was that the projections of the number of electors in St. Michael South Central are certainly below, and I think probably about 1,000 below what it would be, and that any decisions taken on that data basis would be an incorrect decision on the wrong data basis. I am not attacking the Electoral Office because it is probably not their fault. I think it is the same problem that the hon. member for Christ Church West pointed out in respect of the projections in his constituency, so I think there is a misunderstanding here.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad the hon. member has implicitly apologised for any assault on the

integrity of the officers in my office. I will convey it to them. He likes to imply that the electoral process is being perverted, but when it is pointed out that the same decent upright and honourable man is running the elections who has been running them for a long time, who has been recognised in the then existing honours system for the competence and fairness that he brought to the elections, you then retreat. When I think of the things that have had to go on Mr. Smith's shoulders! I was hearing only today something to do with the same 1971 electoral boundaries, how an accusation was made that when I asked for the documents in the House that was only a cover up, I had already seen the photostat of the relevant document that had been shown to the Cabinet and that is why the file had to be secluded. When I think of that, and having put that on him in Government, you now come and put these things on him in Opposition, I really have to say that you have to feel for a civil servant.

I must just say this too, Sir, about the 1971 matter before I forget. The hon. member for St. John said that was not done just a few weeks before the election, that was all the way down in May according to him. Now the general election of 1971 was called in July; Parliament was prorogued in June, those boundaries were changed within two or three weeks of the last possible date at which they could have been changed. There was hardly any more time left to change the boundaries. And you know, Sir, I do not worry too much with the whole issue of the gerrymandering, but since you are talking to us about Governor Gerry and the mander, I had to point this out at the time. Those boundaries were changed allegedly in the interest of straightening out things. St. James which before the boundaries change had 5,716 voters was given 6,682 voters; St. Andrew which had 5,732 voters, only 16 more than St. James had almost 1,000 taken off, 935 taken off, so that it had 4,766. That is what you call a gerrymander. You have two seats almost exactly equal, just a few votes between them and you take 1,000 off one to put on the other, 600 coming from what was the most solidly labour party district virtually in the whole north of Barbados. There were 935 votes in all and I believe that when the point came, that the hon. member got over 600 of the votes and Mr. Moe got 44, and they were the votes which were moved. That is what you call a gerrymander.

Now in Christ Church East the Chief Electoral Officer had proposed a re-organisation of the boundary between Christ Church South Central and Christ Church East; the whole of Atlantic Shores and a little piece of Oistin would have been put into Christ Church East and the boundary would have gone along I think it is through Leadvale, so the whole of St. Patricks would have been put into Christ Church South Central. This apparently

was designed to throw all the Democratic Labour Party votes in Christ Church South Central and an alteration was made from Christ Church East having 4,143 votes to it having 4,773, and from Christ Church South Central having 4,700 it went to having 4,070. Now they are acts of which Governor Elridge Gerry would have been proud and his chief disciple in theory at least, the hon. member for St. Michael South, because he reveals a knowledge of Governor Gerry that really I only have a nodding acquaintance with. It seems the hon. member could write a biography of the good governor. Governor Gerry would have been proud of that. They were not carried out for the purpose of equalising seats; they were not carried out for the purpose of bringing in distant voters and making the constituency smaller. I understand that an aeroplane even had to fly over Rock Hall and Endeavour and the back of Plum Tree and then it flew over Westmoreland Gully to find Spring Head so that they could find a gully bottom. I do not believe there is anywhere else in the whole Commonwealth where a gully bottom is an electoral boundary. I had to laugh at the time.

Now that is what the Democratic Labour Party did. The hon. member for St. Michael South I believe was a member of the Cabinet at the time too. I have to exempt the hon. members for St. Michael South West and South Central. They set up the changes in the seats. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central is taking credit for it too. Well I promised the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that the only gully bottom boundary he will have to contend with is Glendairy Bottom after the Select Committee sits. That will be the only one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the record of the Barbados Labour Party in respect of electoral changes, in respect of the electoral process is an honourable one and we do not intend to sully it by resorting to the methods of 1971. We are not going to disgrace ourselves with foolishness; we are not going to disfigure our records. I do assure hon. members that the deliberations of the Select Committee will guide the Government on the question of increased seats. I really do assure hon. members about that. I personally still tend to think that it will be a very difficult matter to accommodate all the boundaries changes that must be made in St. Michael without some increase in the seats. I do tend to think that, but the Select Committee on which I intend to serve will argue and will hear the points which are made and we will determine in due course what will take place. I have listened to the pleas of all hon. members who have put up cases for change to the East, change to the North, change to the South. I have heard what the Leader of the Opposition had to say about ignoring the parish boundaries.

7.35 p.m.

I have heard what the Leader of the Opposition had to say about ignoring the parish boundaries, I do not altogether agree with him — I know they are the views of the hon. member for St. Michael South West as well — but it is my impression that in the country there is still a sense of parochial identity which is offended by disturbance of the parish boundaries in the electoral process. That is just my impression, I sit for a country seat and I campaign a lot in the country.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member will give way for a point of elucidation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on that point of the parish boundary, I have said before and I just wish to clarify for the hon. member that it would be impossible, it seems to me, to divide up Barbados in its present situation without each parish having a substantial part of any constituency that is designed. One would have to do precisely what he is arguing against in order to do that. If one looks at the current distribution of the seats it is the St. Michael suburban belt that creates a problem, so that St. James could get two if you were dividing up, St. Thomas could add a piece or lose a piece, but it is unlikely that a parish would drop out, so I think we can retain the 24 and still have equal representation, etc.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If you allow the 20% variation, yes; if you allow the smaller variation, no. I think that the area of St. John and St. Philip may require some adjustment.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I crave your indulgence on a point of elucidation. Obviously the Prime Minister was not here when I indicated that while he had said a 20% variation and that he had looked at it to move from a 10% to a 20%, I really think that a 15% variation is more in keeping with what is required in Barbados. 20% will tend to require a review too often, and I think the Hon. Attorney General said 12.5% would be ideal, but you will see that 20% will tend to take too long before the review and a 15% would seem to be desirable.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I didn't hear that part of the hon. member's speech, but I believe that that may very well be founded. I have only taken 20% as a rule of thumb. I don't want to delay the talk too much, but I think that once you begin talking about constituencies, and there has been some talk, that you must reassure people.

The problem with country constituencies and the eastern part of Barbados is the size of St. Joseph. That is the problem. St. Joseph cannot gain voters from St. Andrew which is itself small and therefore its other neighbours, St. Thomas, St. George and St. John, presumably St. Joseph will have to gain a thousand voters — I am putting it now in factual terms — it might have to gain more than that if you do not increase the seats, but some figure of around a thousand voters would have to be gained from the border districts of St. Thomas, St. George and St. John, and I think the Select Committee will find that once it begins to make the movements that there will be a few consequential gruntings and groanings to the south.

In St. Michael/St. James it clearly cannot be left as it is, because it is not only large, in the suburban area St. James cannot be left as it is because it is not only large but it is growing very rapidly and will grow very rapidly with West Terrace Development and you therefore will immediately shake up the whole of St. Michael, and the central St. Michael seats bounded as they are on all sides by other seats will naturally feel some of the movement, and I am looking forward to the contribution that hon. members opposite will be able to make to this process.

I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South say there should be an equality. I wonder if by that he means that we should make room for the three small St. Michael seats to be represented on the Select Committee. It is significant that the only three members of the Opposition to remain in their seats until the end of the debate are three hon. members all of whose seats have been identified as being in need of change, and I congratulate the hon. members for sticking to their interests so persistently until this late hour. The others have gone home confidently. St. Lucy has gone home cool and confident, no change is the message. But St. Michael South and St. Michael South West cannot have the same Resolution of spirit as will allow them to depart. St. Michael South Central says that the statistics are wrong, Mr. Smith is wrong, the Government is wrong, his constituency has the right number. That is what he is saying, that he is not really worried.

I will just say finally to the hon. member that he is basing his view on the present figures on his view of the voters in the bye-election. There is no reason to believe that the bye-election figures are right and these are wrong.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. I specifically stated that I was not basing my views on that but on a survey of a limited area of the constituency which I had done since this document was handed out, and to my surprise about 75 people were picked up immediately who either would be transferred or who would not be registered, in a very limited area and I think when you project that through the constituency it is about 1,000 people. I also tried to show that the Brittons Hill area and in the RB area that there are bound to be major errors in those areas.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member's survey I am sure is wrong and the enumeration by the Chief Electoral Officer is right as far as Delaware Clinic is concerned, but outside Delaware Clinic the hon. member will have to make his clinical findings in accordance with the laws of Barbados, not the laws of Dr. Haynes. Let him confine his diagnoses to his referrals and his medical practice, let Mr. Smith do his diagnoses with the aid of a computer and the methods in which he has been trained. The hon. member will learn before he has been in here very long that there are very few circumstances in which he is right and the rest of us are wrong. Doctors bury their mistakes, politicians unfortunately have to face them

at the next general elections or indeed the next bye-election if the occasion arises. We therefore have to have a type of statistical precision for which persons are trained, and I do not believe that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is trained in these particular matters. If he found 75 people, which I should not contradict because I have no means of proving of whether he is telling the truth or not, but which I doubt, if he found 75 people it may very well be that those 75 are persons who are projected, who have been analysed by a computer and found to be electors that have not registered under the new system, in which case they will be in the final figures, or persons who no matter what they told the hon. member are not in fact voters in that constituency and are registered somewhere else. I remember the hon. member objected to a lady who lived in Martindale's Road, he sent in a form of objection to the Chief Electoral Officer saying that she did not live in the constituency, and we found the lady, spoke to her and produce her grand son on the political platform. So the hon. member has been proved in the past to have made mistakes, through over-enthusiasm in respect of the voting rights of his constituents, and I have no doubt he will be proved in the future also to have done so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

7.45 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. members for St. James, St. Philip North and St. Thomas be members of the Select Committee.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, from this side I beg to move that the member for St. Michael South West and the member for St. Lucy be the members from this side to sit on the Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no further nominations those members who have been nominated are appointed to the Select Committee together with His Honour the Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 be the Instant Order of the Day.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE OF THE LEASE OF LAND AT GUN HILL, ST. GEORGE TO THE BARBADOS NATIONAL TRUST

Item No. 4 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve of the lease of land at Gun Hill, St. George to the Barbados National Trust.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is to lease to the Barbados National Trust the

signal station at Gun Hill. The National Trust as you know is particularly interested in the heritage of Barbados and wherever possible that they can find places of some great historical significance they have always written to the Ministry requesting either the purchase or the lease of these places for the purpose of restoring them.

There is very little more which I can add to this Resolution. It is a lease which the Government has entered into with the National Trust. The lease is for some 25 acres, Sir, rented somewhere at a rate of \$5 per year. The National Trust, of course, would take care of this and of the work which is for the purpose of restoring the signal station and putting it in very good condition for the purpose of Barbadians and visitor life.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LANDS AT LAMMINGS, ST. JOSEPH, FOR THE PROVISION OF A HOUSING DEVELOPMENT, A CULTURAL CENTRE AND A RECREATIONAL AREA

Item No. 5 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Lammings, St. Joseph, for the provision of a housing development, a cultural Centre and a recreational area.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, for a very long time there has been a problem of the slippage of lands in St. Joseph and therefore the Government always tries to make sure that they can move people into areas which can be more suitable. St. Joseph, as you know, Sir, there are certain areas that the rain only has to set up and therefore the people living there find themselves in very difficult conditions. It is hazardous, Sir.

We realise that lives are involved and therefore the Government has approved of Lammings in St. Joseph for the purpose of a Housing Development, a modern type of Housing Development which is in keeping with this Party. It is very clearly seen from what has been done at Fernhurst in Black Rock.

Also, there are not only the aspects of housing but a recreational facility at Lammings and this obviously would assist those 50 persons, those 50 card carrying persons in which there were a number of young people and of course, a number of them came from Bank Hall, Prince of Wales Road. Sir, these people would also enjoy some of the facilities there.

We have no intention of moving people from St. Michael to St. Joseph but we are making sure that we provide for the people in St. Joseph something which they can be justly proud of as in any other parish in the Island. You will observe, Sir, that I do not only examine constituencies which members of the Government hold. We also look at the constituencies overall like in St. Philip at Six Roads. In St. Philip North there is going to be a Housing Development there comprising of some 40 Terrace units and you have also St. Cecilia where the hon. member has made it very clear — he has written to the Ministry of Labour and Community Services asking not to put down any house there to put down recreational facilities. Well, it is my land for now. I am the landlord, the superior landlord and therefore no Community Service Minister can say what is going there. I say there are houses going there for that member who represents St. Michael South Central. I will give you a Housing Development. That is how we operate and therefore I feel very proud to associate myself with the Lammings Project and this is in keeping with the policy of the Government to provide the best quality of life by way of housing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in rising to second this Resolution I am indeed happy and proud to be the representative of a constituency that has stood with the Barbados Labour Party from the time that there has been this kind of representation in Barbados.
7.55 p.m.

I was indeed sad, over the weekend, when I read a statement coming from a prominent Hon. Member of the Democratic Labour Party, after he had carried 40 people from other parishes in Barbados, to St. Joseph, handed out to them Passports of the Democratic Labour Party and at that meeting, to have made a statement which, it is alleged that the Hon. Member of this Hon. House, a prominent Hon. Member of the Democratic Labour Party..... (Mr. TAITT: The President). The President of the Democratic Labour Party made the statement saying that many people go to sleep hungry every night and that nothing has been done for them for the last 25 years. Now, I do not believe that that has been the statement of the Hon. Member. I do not believe that. I am well aware of the distortions which are made by newspapers in this country so therefore, I do not want to believe that because if I believe that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would say that the reason why they go to sleep hungry, or that they went to sleep hungry, was because of the Democratic Labour Party and the Members of the Democratic Labour Party. (ASIDES)

There is a man called, I wonder if I can call his name, a fellow called Cadogan, not the barber, the other fellow, and he was supposed to be the Welfare Officer in

St. Joseph and those persons who went to sleep hungry for the last 15 years in St. Joseph were the old people who went to the Welfare Officer in St. Joseph, were rejected and got nothing. If they went to sleep hungry, or, are still going to sleep hungry, it is the lady down in Tent Bay who fought the Democratic Labour Party, although she is and was, a member of the Democratic Labour Party, for all the years, you could not put down a standpipe for the fishermen to wash their skins, or wash their faces in Tent Bay, or to carry water out to sea, who has now set up a paling on the land, to prevent fishing boats from being drawn up in times of rough weather. So, that is why they are going to sleep hungry. If they went to sleep hungry, it is because the former Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. F. G. Smith, got in this Hon. Chamber and said that if he had the rid of the people in St. Joseph, he would build a wall around and shut it out from this country because they do not vote in this country. If they went to sleep hungry, it is because of the spite meted out to them for 15 years, by the Democratic Labour Party in this country. (Asides). No, I was in there now since 1970, not 4.

It is because of me that they got Lammings School because when they heard that Bolden was going to run in the Bye-Election, all plans changed, they put up a school which was given to this country by the Canadian Government and they said that it was designed for St. Joseph. They went up and they started to eliminate St. Joseph. They started putting lights. Mr. Dudley Smith said that if you do not vote for the Dems, we are going to take down the lights and carry away the school. That was the Bye-Election.

In 1971, they went into Lammings and started to put down water and left the road dug up the same way, after the Election in 1971. That is what happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But, if you want to see what is happening now, this Resolution will show the people in St. Joseph what is fair representation. You know what you did in St. Joseph, the Democratic Labour Party? You built one road for the fifteen years that you were in power, in this country, for the people in St. Joseph and that road served two people. It served a man called Anderson Mapp, whose position in politics was the Secretary to the Democratic Labour Party branch in St. Joseph and it served a man called Lloyd Smith Jnr., who was the candidate for the Democratic Labour Party. That road cost \$40,000 it carried away a man's wall, it encroached on his land, only to serve two people.

But, Blackman's, the people were crying out in Blackman's for years and no road was ever given to them. The Social Centre in Bathsheba was staffed by a member of the Democratic Labour Party, who not only prevented people from coming in there, but he used it, as his little private domain, first, to carry out his tailor trade and next, to carry on his gambling activities until, after I

fought on the floor of the Hon. House to re-open the Social Centre. It was pulled down, not refurbished, it was dismantled, so if you want to talk about what has happened to the people in St. Joseph, the Democratic Labour Party has been responsible. If you do not want to hear, get up and go outside.

You bought part of Lammings and put people in Lammings. Up to this day, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there is a fire in the field and anybody tries to get through the back door of the houses, they would break their necks. Look down in the Records and see. Houses were placed in Lammings, where the front of the house was on the ground and the back of the house was 12 to 14 feet above the level of the ground and that is what you did in Lammings. I am hoping, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are Chairman of the National Housing Corporation. The Hon. Minister has promised a modern development in St. Joseph. They deserve it. I do not want to see houses going up there that people cannot come through their back door comfortably, I do not want to see it. St. Joseph deserves a proper cultural centre and I hope, that by the time it is finished, that the ten persons from St. Joseph, who joined your political Party (ASIDES: A lot for St. Joseph). Are ten a lot for St. Joseph? Half belong to me, my friend.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I am speaking to the Chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am saying to you that out of the 50, 40 came from elsewhere, 10 came from St. Joseph, of which five belong to me and I hope that they will enjoy the facilities as well. I know of the promises made to them, I know who they are, and when the roof goes on, we have it in our hands.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not normally have joined this Debate which provided the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works with an opportunity to say something after four years, on behalf of his constituency. I think that he is entitled to have a word in this Hon. House about his constituency. But, it suited him to invoke the name of the President of the Democratic Labour Party and I wish to agree with him that the newspaper did not quote me correctly.

I wish to tell him what I said, so that he will be under no illusion. I am the President, Sir, in case you do not know. I said that it is a shame — let me say it slowly, so that you will get it, and everybody will get it — I said that it is a shame, that after 40 years of representation by people like us, that we could have people outside St. Joseph and in St. Joseph going to sleep hungry in Barbados. That is what I said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: I took the defence. It was not the armoured car, I will deal with that. (*Asides*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: Hon. Members, on that Side, must know, I am sure that they know, that I have never said anything in here, or outside of the Hon. House that I would be embarrassed to say again.

On the question of St. Joseph, I spoke as a person who spent a considerable part of his life living in St. Joseph.

8.05 p.m.

You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are some hon. members who believe that some of us came into the world suddenly on a day when our names started being seen in politics. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I went to St. Joseph as a person, let me repeat who spent a lot of my childhood in St. Joseph, and I spoke to a number of young people many of whom indicated that they had not seen any representative up there from either party for a long time. Since we had never held a seat, I can only conclude that they meant the hon. member, the Minister of Communications and Works. (*Asides*.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Continue your speech with relevance to the Resolution. Please address the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I went on to say that it is not right that the Barbados Labour Party have been representing St. Joseph for so long and that they must be making fun at the people of St. Joseph when they could feel that they own the seat. I made the point that it was canvassed on both sides and well known that when the Hon. Prime Minister was giving some consideration in running in St. Joseph in the last election that he spent some time having discussions with the hon. member who now holds the seat and the hon. member who now holds the seat said that he was not prepared to shift. I am only explaining a point made by the hon. member.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I really need your guidance. When somebody tells lies on you in Parliament, what Rule do you get up under? Really what do you do, Sir? The hon. member knows perfectly well that I never spoke to anybody about running in St. Joseph; I have never sought to. It is a wonderful parish and the fact that I am able to get a larger majority in St. Thomas that it was possible to get in St. Joseph really only means that St. Joseph has too few voters. But what can I do with the hon. member? There is a Rule in the House of Commons that when you

say something that is not true and you are called on to prove it, generally speaking you have to withdraw it even if it is about an outsider. What do you do when it is about a member in the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please speak to the Resolution.

Mr. TAITT: I am speaking to the Resolution, the acquisition of land for people at Lammings in St. Joseph. The Prime Minister does not move me when he gets up with that Ciceronian approach.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not speaking to the Resolution now.

Mr. TAITT: You see who tells the lies, Sir? Imagine the Prime Minister saying I have to explain Ciceronian to him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you would address the Chair and the Chair only, there would be no problem.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the representation in St. Joseph was only worse than it is now. If the Prime Minister had succeeded in his quest, it would have been worse not because he is a worse representative in his parish than the current representative, but it would have been a continuation I do not wish to go any further on that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really do not appreciate the hon. Minister getting up and suggesting that somehow we took people from one part of Barbados to St. Joseph to give them passports. I think that is an assault on my integrity and it is an assault on the integrity of a political party that has made a significant contribution to Barbados. (*Asides.*) Mr. Deputy Speaker, please protect me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: I am saying that it is an assault on a political party that when the history comes to be written, (*Asides*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must not be interrupted when he is speaking. Please continue.

Mr. TAITT: Is he a member of the Defence Force?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member address the Chair only and please continue?

Mr. TAITT: I must tell you, Sir that I am amazed that the Prime Minister was able within a short time to speak personally of his own knowledge about each person

or any person who gets a passport in the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not now speaking to the Resolution.

Mr. TAITT: I am trying to comply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you would speak to the Resolution there would be little problem.

Mr. TAITT: With the greatest respect, I was seeking your indulgence because the hon. member had in his speech been given sufficient latitude to make statements which I feel bound to refute.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, but if you will confine yourself to the Resolution and ignore the asides, there would be no problem.

Mr. TAITT: I crave your indulgence just to make this last point. The Democratic Labour Party is an honourable political party.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, the Democratic Labour Party has a history of moving people from one parish to another parish for their support. It started with the by-election with Mr. Coward when you used to have the bus loads assembled there in Baxters Road to go up to St. Joseph. That is part and parcel of your history. The person that does it now is the Indian man at the shop, Sawh.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with your speech. If you would confine yourself to the Resolution..... order please! Please continue.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was said that this land is being acquired for the purpose of providing houses. I hope that unlike other places where housing has been provided that the number of people and their names have not yet been prepared. I hope that some of the people from St. Joseph will get a chance. After all, there cannot be so many Dems in St. Joseph and I hope that some of the people who attended the meeting at which they got their passports..... (*Asides*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members must not interrupt the hon. member when he is speaking. Please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member was inviting us to give him the names to assist him with helping some of the Dems. If he gives us the names of the people that attended the meeting we would be glad to help him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those names can be given behind the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: I would never do that. Like how they get the motor car numbers, you do not know what would happen to the people whose names they got.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with housing.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that just as happened in other areas in Barbados where new housing has gone up that people will not be forced.... (Asides) I hope that the way in which people are selected for the Lammings houses will vary somewhat from the way it is alleged they have been selected for other houses.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason why I am having a little difficulty putting precisely what I wish to put is because I am aware that Your Honour carried the title of Chairman of the National Housing Corporation and I should not wish to dwell on that while Your Honour is sitting in the Chair. I therefore will veer away from it for another day when Your Honour is not sitting in the Chair so that I can speak more freely on the activities of the Minister in relation to housing.

The Minister in passing touched on what he is proposing to do for St. Joseph. All that I suggested and will continue to suggest is that the people of St. Joseph really ought to get a little better representation than they have been getting. I was heartily surprised and very pleased to see the number of young people who were in the particular meeting in St. Joseph, some of them from Lammings, and the expressions which they were making suggest that at long last the population content in St. Joseph is such that there is a goodly number of persons between the ages of 16 and 26 whose decisions in the future and in the near future will be significant. It is therefore very vital that some consideration be given to them.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me finish by saying this: we in the Democratic Labour Party are never going to be afraid of anything reported to persons in the Barbados Labour Party about what we say. We are going to win the St. Joseph seat anyhow. We are glad to see that steps are being taken to put some housing in St. Joseph. Put in a swimming pool, too and put in solar clothes driers too. Give them what they call this new concept in housing. (Asides).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Please continue with your speech.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have kept the Reporters up so long and I do not think it is necessary to go any further. I really wanted to review

the seconder of this Resolution's position and I will stop at that point.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
8.15 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ELLERTON, ST. GEORGE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this takes almost the same form as all the other Resolutions for acquisitions. There is a piece of land which the Government wishes to acquire for the purpose of erecting a school at St. Lukes in St. George. It is one of these World Bank development projects.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass, since there is very little I can say on this Resolution.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT RETREAT, ST. JOSEPH

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, St. Joseph again, on this occasion it is for a primary school. We were the pioneers of the secondary school at West St. Joseph and now you can see that among the World Bank projects on education we selected the parish of St. Joseph, Sir, so that Mr. DaSilva would have an opportunity to send his children there to school, or Mrs. Welch — I think that is her name — that crowd, and the Ministry of Education will make sure that they do not go to sleep hungry at night.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday the 22nd July 1980 at noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly.
8.23 p.m.