

NO DIVISION OF CAINSCROSS WARD

AN 'INJUSTICE' SAYS COUNCILLOR

Complete Review Is Promised For 1957

Journal Jan 7 1957.

WHEN informed that the Local Areas and Elections Committee of the County Council had decided not to grant an application for the division of the Cainscross ward to form an additional ward, Mr. W. K. Preston said at Wednesday's meeting of Stroud Urban District Council that he considered it a "gross injustice to the people of Cainscross."

Mr. Preston said he thought it would be found in the register of electors for the coming year that Cainscross would have twice as many electors as Central Ward. He argued that if the County committee turned down the original suggestion, there were ways and means of making alterations to give fair representation.

Other councillors felt that the over-all population of Stroud did not warrant the additional member.

The letter from the County Council, which was signed by the clerk (Mr. Guy H. Davis) stated:

"I have to inform you that the Local Areas and Elections Committee have decided not to grant the application for the division of the Cainscross Ward to form an additional ward, but have decided to review all the wards in the Urban District in 1957 so that any changes which are considered necessary can be provided for in the 1958 register of electors.

"The committee are of the opinion that there is no evidence of any immediate need for a change in the division of the urban district into wards and feel that the proper course to adopt is to review all the wards when there is more definite evidence of the trend of movement of population within the urban district".

Mr. Preston said he was surprised to find that no provision had been made to deal with the increase in population in Cainscross, especially having regard to the system of "proportional representation" they had whereby a councillor represented so many electors.

He reminded the Council of the work of the Boundaries Commission dealing with Parliamentary constituencies, saying that it had recently made important changes affecting the Stroud and Thornbury Division thereby reducing the number of electors.

"Yet the County has been content to leave this obvious anomaly with more than twice the electors in one ward as compared with another. It is grossly unfair to the people of Cainscross to leave it in this way."

Mr. J. Flynn, having remarked that there was a great difference between Parliamentary constituencies and

ward representatives of a council, observed that councillors were elected to represent the town as a whole. He felt that 18 councillors could manage the small number of complaints they received.

Supporting Mr. Flynn, Mr. O. H. Phillips said he received more enquiries from other wards than from his own (Central), and especially from Slade which was growing.

Mr. Preston: that would follow; it is a small ward.

When the chairman (Mr. N. F. W. Gibson) mentioned the over-all population, Mr. Preston said it had grown by several thousands since the wards were introduced.

Mr. T. John pointed out that he had spoken at the enquiry. Had the request been granted, Cainscross would have formed two wards much smaller than any others and very much more easily managed. Uplands ward (his own), covered a lot of ground not only urban in character but rural as well. It was not a easy matter to go to Callowell or Wick Street.

He felt that if the Cainscross request had been granted Uplands, in turn, would have been bound to ask for some consideration. But the total population was not increasing very much.

"I think the decision is right; whether the time factor is right is not for me to say" added Mr. John.

BOGGING STRATFORD PARK

The Council approved a recommendation of the Pleasure Gardens and Allotments Committee that the sum of £200 for entertainment and publicity be included in the next estimates. It was stated that a further report by Mr. C. H. A. Hards, a member of the staff, regarding the matter had been

(Continued on Page 5)