

By ALEX. HEPPLE

In the last two issues of the Forum, Mr. E. Raymond Silberbauer, Director of the Bantu Wage and Productivity Association, has written two informative articles on African wages and productivity.

I would like to take the matter further. I feel that, in spite of the work of the Bantu Wage and Productivity Association, we are getting nowhere. For a brief spell after Sharpeville there was a mood of urgency about raising African wages, just as there was after the Bus Boycott in 1957. But the country has quickly reverted to its old complacency and seems content to leave it to individual employers to raise wages if they are in the mood.

Nothing could depress one more than reading the Parliamentary debates on the Labour Vote this year, when this question of wages was argued. The Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. M. Viljoen angrily asked, "If employers feel so concerned about this matter-----why do they not stop talking and why do they not put their hands in their pockets and pay these people more?"

The Minister of Labour followed with a number of further questions. He wanted to know - "Who should increase the minimum wage? Must additional machinery be created or must existing machinery be changed?"

WHO FIXES WAGES ?

I cannot understand why the Minister and his Deputy should ask these questions. They know that only the Government can enforce a national, legal minimum wage. The need for a minimum wage fixed by law should require no explanation. Among other things it places all employers on an equal footing, and prevents unfair competition

through wage...../ 2

- 2 -

through wage cutting. It also overcomes the cruel obstacles of our labour laws, which prevent African workers from winning ~~increased~~ wage increases by means available to other workers.

Wages in South Africa, are determined in the following four ways :-

- (1) By agreement between employers and employees.
(i.e. through collective bargaining)
- (2) By Conciliation Board or Arbitration Awards (i.e. by the decision of independent arbitrators, after employers and employees cannot come to terms.)
- (3) By Wage Determinations (i.e. by the Government through its appointed Wage Board.)
- (4) By employers (i.e. where there are no wage determinations or other legally fixed wages.)

The first two methods are not available to African workers, (who form the bulk of the country's labour force) being applicable only to employees registered in terms of the Industrial Conciliation Act, from which Africans are specifically excluded. It should be noted however, that the wages of many African workers are fixed under industrial council agreements. As a matter of fact, more Africans are subject to these agreements than are Whites and Coloureds, although Africans are not allowed to participate in the bargaining sessions of the councils. The employers sit down with the White or Coloured trade union officials and decide not only the wages of the White ^{and Coloured} workers, but those of the Africans as well.

- 3 -

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE AFRICANS ?

In terms of the Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act, a representative of the Department of Labour sits in at these negotiations to watch over the interests of African employees. I have yet to discover a case where these officials have had prior consultations with African employees to ascertain their demands. Presumably, like the Minister of Bantu Affairs and Development, these White officials know what is best for the Africans.

The manner in which this arrangement works was illustrated in Parliament recently by Mr. N.G. Eaton, M.P., who alleged, "At Port Elizabeth, the Central Native Labour Board representative suggested, as far as unskilled workers are concerned, a wage which was lower than what the workers (that is the trade unions) and the employers were prepared to give."

THE MINISTER AND INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL AGREEMENTS.

The Minister has the further power to refuse to publish any industrial council agreement if he is not satisfied with any of its provisions. In the case of African wages the Minister could quite easily refer back an industrial council agreement with the request that these wages be raised.

But the Minister follows his own strange policy in this regard. He told Parliament :-

"... as regards industrial council agreements, the Government does not approve of any agreement unless there is absolute certainty that it does not entail

any reduction.....4

- 4 -

any reduction in wages, or on the other hand any deterioration in the existing conditions of service. When the position remains more or less the same, or when there is an increase or an improvement, the Minister approves of the agreement."

This is a remarkable policy at a time when everyone, including the Government, agrees that wages should be increased. It is even more remarkable in the light of the fact that employers themselves are exhibiting a desire to raise wage levels. Surely, "when the position remains more or less the same" the Minister should reject the agreement!

NEW WAGES STILL TOO LOW.

Now let us take wages fixed by the Wage Board. Here again, we can base our judgement on the Minister's own claims. In the same Parliamentary speech Senator de Klerk boasted that, the recent Wage Board Determination for unskilled labour on the Witwatersrand, affecting thirty industries, conceded wage increases to the extent of 16.5 to 22.5 per cent. If he had quoted the actual wages, he would have put these increases in their proper perspective. The new wage for these workers is £13/14/0 per month, inclusive of C.O.L. allowances.

Compare this with the latest poverty datum line as proved in the recent survey of Mrs. Joy de Gruchy of the South African Institute of Race Relations, of £27/14/0d. per month for an African family of five.

NOW IS THE TIME.

The Minister, however, is quite satisfied with the new...../5

- 5 -

with the new wage rates and says, "with the available machinery they cannot rise much higher." Why? What is it that places a ceiling on rates recommended by the Wage Board?

The Wage Board functions at the direction of the Minister of Labour. He can order investigations, reject recommendations, and request amendments to determinations. If the Government really wanted to eliminate poverty wages, they could make it clear to the Wage Board that wage rates must be lifted as rapidly as possible to the level of the poverty datum line. Both the Government and the Wage Board would be on perfectly safe ground in ordering substantial pay rises, because employers themselves have been demanding such action.

The climate is right for the Government to fix an adequate national minimum wage. It could never be better.

END.

Johannesburg.
9/6/60.

Epok
3/6/60

READERS' LETTERS

Trade unionist replies to Mr M. Louw

To the Editor of the Evening Post

SIR, — In your issue of May 23 you generously devoted considerable space to a letter from Mr Martin Louw, in which he castigates organised industry and commerce for "their tendency to converge upon the political field".

I leave it to businessmen to answer Mr Louw's casuistry, if they care to respond to his special pleading of the Nationalist cause.

My purpose in replying is to take him up on one passage in his letter. It reads:

"I notice, for instance, that the Associated Chambers of Commerce in principle favour the establishment of multi-racial trade unions with collective bargaining powers.

"If the body in question had taken the trouble to make a detailed study of the documentary evidence submitted to the Treason Trial (much of which has not been published) it would stand aghast at the extent to which Communist influence has permeated non-European trade unions in this country.

"Indeed, in pushing forward the above proposal the Chambers of Commerce would be unwittingly creating a Frankenstein intent on their own eventual destruction!"

Surprised

First, let me say that this reads dangerously like contempt of court, since the Treason Trial is still proceeding.

I am surprised that Mr Louw, who should know better, so recklessly pronounces judgment on an issue that remains to be decided by the court.

What practical experience has Mr Louw had in the trade union field? Has he ever participated in collective bargaining? Has he ever observed the normal procedures of industrial democracy?

Most of the businessmen who have backed the proposals of the Association of Chambers of Commerce speak from years of practical experience in negotiating with workers through trade unions.

Prejudices

They recommend the extension of trade union rights because they have learned that this is the best way to regulate relations with their employees.

When Mr Louw threatens businessmen that trade unionism will be a Frankenstein, he exposes the extent of his ignorance in this matter.

Has trade unionism destroyed industry and commerce in Britain, Europe and the United States, where the processes of industrial democracy are the mainstay of employer-employee relations?

Instead of beguiling your readers with his sophistry, why does Mr Louw not frankly tell us that he is opposed to collective bargaining and trade unionism because these democratic institutions conflict with his racial prejudices and might broaden the basis of democracy in South Africa?

ALEX HEPPLE.

Johannesburg.

Mr Hepple was a Labour Party M.P. for ten years and has been a trade union organiser. — Ed.

6-1/51

WHITE TRADE UNIONS AND AFRICAN WAGES.

by ALEX. HEPPLER

It has often been said that White workers are the main stumbling block in the way of improving the wage rates of African workers.

This argument is based upon the fact that White workers earn so much more than Africans that they fear any change, which might challenge their position of privilege.

The labour pattern in South Africa has always been such that skilled White workers are ^{considered to be} somewhat in the rank of labour aristocrats, attended and waited upon by an unlimited crew of African assistants.

~~xxxxxxx~~ Although this is an exaggerated view, it is nevertheless ^{true} that a considerable amount of African labour is squandered in providing what are jocularly described as "hammer-holders" and "tea-makers".

The practice of providing skilled workers - and even semi-skilled workers - with a generous supply of African assistants is a good South African tradition, firmly based upon the simple economic attraction of the cheapness of African labour. Because Africans could be paid next-to-nothing, could be hired and fired at will, could be roughly and quickly disciplined, and were available in unlimited numbers, no employer ever worried about having too many "boys" on the payroll.

From the employers point of view, it was good business to see that the higher-paid workers were kept going by an ample staff of ^{cheap} African helpers.

In the process, little or nothing was done to train these African assistants, even in the rudiments of performing simple labouring tasks efficiently. The Africans were merely required to be quick to obey commands, respectful to ~~of~~ their White bosses, pleasant, docile and uncomplaining.

2/..... Although -

Although untrained, they were expected to know their work; although paid and treated as ignorant savages, they were expected to be highly intelligent and to understand the ~~White~~ coloured and uncoloured language of their White masters.

A WAY OF LIFE.

South African farming, industry, commerce and even domestic life has been moulded around this extravagance of low-wage African labour. The cost was never measured by final accounts; only the initial outlay of miserable cash wages was counted.

For many years now, economists and others have been warning against this false economy. But habits die hard and the habit of wasting African labour seems to die hardest.

Fortunately, a break from this old way of life ~~has been~~ forced by the rising tempo of industrialisation which followed the war. Labour shortages have thrown the question into a better perspective and employers in many fields have found themselves compelled to adopt a more intelligent attitude towards the training and the payment of Non-Whites.

But the resistance to wage increases for Africans remains very strong. In spite of all that employers in industry and commerce have been saying, there remains a distinct reluctance to lift wage rates ~~to~~ ^{to} even/the level of the poverty datum line. In this, we have a classic example of "passing the buck". Everyone blames everyone else. The Government says there is nothing to stop employers raising wages; the employers say they cannot unless the State enforces the increases generally. The question of productivity is raised and argued back and forth. It is even suggested that White workers stand in the way.

WHAT DO WHITE WORKERS SAY?

I have canvassed this question with

trade union officials and with workers themselves. I found none who were opposed to wage increases for Africans. On the contrary most of those to whom I spoke were vigorously in support of such action. Even those ~~were~~ in favour of job reservation and/^{who} showed strong colour prejudice, declared ~~that~~ that Africans needed and deserved substantial increases in pay.

The belief that White workers generally are opposed to the payment of higher wages to African workers because that would be a challenge to their aristocratic position and lose them their present privileges, can be discarded as holding no water nowadays.

This is borne out by the recent positive actions of the S. A. Trade Union Council, the largest of South Africa's federations of registered trade unions. The Council has been prominent in the demands for increasing African wages. It has made representations to the Government not only for a national minimum wage, but also for the legal recognition of African trade unions.

The President of the S. A. Trade Union Council Mr. R. F. Budd, stated in his address to the Council's annual conference last March that this minimum wage should be no less than £6 per week.

The National Union of Distributive Workers, in a memorandum to the Wage Board last month, made a special plea on behalf of African employees in the shops and offices throughout South Africa. The memorandum said, "A rapid upward revision of minimum wages paid to Africans is urgently necessary, not only on economic and humanitarian grounds, but also on the grounds of removing - or at least alleviating - one of the fundamental reasons for unrest among urban Africans"

In the engineering industry, where seven

4/--- registered -

registered trade unions are now negotiating with their employers for a new agreement, the question of African wages is receiving high priority. The trade unions have already agreed to include wage increases which will benefit the 90,000 Africans employed in the industry.

Among these seven unions are some which are considered to be the most conservative in the country, with a strong bias against Non-Whites.

WAGE DIFFERENTIALS.

However, this should be considered the beginning and not the end. There is a long way to go before the wages of South Africa's labouring class can be considered to be adequate.

One of the greatest obstacles to be overcome is the narrowing of wage differentials between ~~the~~ skilled and unskilled jobs. The low-wage policy applied to Africans has developed a pattern of wage differentials that is the wonder of the rest of the world.

In other Commonwealth countries, the gap between artisan wages and labourers' wages is considerably smaller than in South Africa. In Britain, an engineering artisan gets 19% to 33% more than his assistant; here in South Africa he gets 400% to 600% more. The building artisan in Britain is paid 14% to 20% more than the labourer who serves him, whereas in South Africa the difference is anything from 400% to 700%.

A similar pattern exists in all our fields of employment. It is not only ⁱⁿ the skilled ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxx~~ occupations that this happens. In factories, shops, mines, and offices throughout the country these wage differentials exist merely because wages are based upon colour and not upon services rendered.

The question which needs to be tackled with urgency is how best to break down the bad habits of the past, in order that workers should be paid decent, living wages, without regard to race or colour.

It is a tremendous task, which requires a bold lead from the Government. ~~Without~~ Unfortunately, the Government seems to prefer the shame of poverty wages, rather than bow down to the sane dictates of progress.

Johannesburg,
15/7/60.

NO, NO, A THOUSAND TIMES NO

SE 2/10/60
SUNDAY EXPRESS
JHB

ON Wednesday South Africa's strangest courtship ends. The spectacular wooing of anti-republicans—especially the English-speaking section—will then have to be answered finally in the drab polling stations throughout the country.

These have been almost dream days. The campaign for a republic has been an exciting experience for non-Nationalist South Africans, who had long come to the sad conclusion that they were unwanted and unloved.

Suddenly, in this year of the referendum, they found the Nationalists billing and cooing on their doorsteps. For a change, not being a Nationalist became an attraction and brought great prestige to those who gave ear to republican propaganda.

Overnight, the inflexible masters of intolerance relaxed. Magically, they were our bosom friends.

Not only were we wooed with handshaking posters, proclaiming YOUR country, MY country, OUR country, but from the remote seclusion of the Prime Minister's residence there appeared a beautiful, blue *billet doux*.

Lover-boy

DR. VERWOERD, the unbending autocrat of the Nationalist caucus, appeared in the surprising role of the gayest political lover-boy of the age. The seductive appeal of this letter from *Libertas* might yet find its place among the world's great love stories.

The wooing will carry on until Wednesday.

But what of Thursday? Will that be the end of the whirlwind romance? What will lover-boy do when the votes have been cast?

The answer, of course, lies in

From TANTALUS

the history of the Purified Nationalists.

The legislative programme of the Nationalist Party over the past 11 years shows very clearly that they are busy carrying out the threats they made when they were in opposition and when South Africa was engaged in fighting Hitler and Mussolini.

In the fierce determination that obsessed them in the dark days of the war, they laid the plans which are being put into operation today, and which are earning South Africa a bad reputation abroad.

The scheming Broederbond hierarchy spent the war years forming the "Afrikaner Front" and laying the foundations for the laws, decrees and acts which have brought shame on South Africa throughout the world.

Past record

THE High Court of Parliament, the enlarging of the Senate, the removal of the Coloured voters from the common roll, the abolition of Native Representation, the drastic restrictions on the trade unions, the Church Clause, job reservation, the persecution of those against apartheid, the declaration of a State of Emergency and the many other things we suffer today have their roots in the past planning of the Nationalist Party.

When Mr. Schoeman said in 1941, "There must be changes in the foreign British system," he meant it. When some of our present-day Cabinet Ministers, as the powerful inner circle of the secret Broederbond, subscribed in 1944 to the objective of "the Afrikanerisation of our public life and our education in the direction of Christian-Nationalism . . ." they dedicated themselves to its fulfilment.

Dr. Hertzog and Dr. Diederichs, the bosses of the Reddingsdaadbond in those days, were not fooling when they made the main objective of that body, "to make the Afrikaans labourer part and parcel of the national life."

These are the clues to the day after the referendum. Anyone who falls for the blandishments from Bryntirion will be left with nothing but the tear-stained love letter, sad memories of the breathtaking courtship and a return to the ugly old policies of favouritism and discrimination of baasskap Nationalism.

Charm school

ON Thursday, Dr. Verwoerd's men will be busy correcting the misconceptions of the seduced, telling them

to look again and see that the posters should have read as "YOUR COUNTRY?? OUR COUNTRY?? MY COUNTRY!!!"

The charm school of the Nationalist Party will then get back to the job of attending to their first love, the Republic of 1942—defined by them as "A Christian-National, Republican State, based upon the word of God, eschewing all foreign models . . . with a Christian-National educational system . . . and the strongest emphasis upon the disciplining of the people."

If Dr. Verwoerd fails to get the votes he wants for a republic, he will be broken. His reputation depends upon a victory in the referendum. If he fails, his band of extremists will be unable to keep him on his tottering pedestal. They will no longer be able to hold the Party caucus in meek submission.

Defeat will stir revolt within the ranks of the Nationalist Party. Even a small majority would be tantamount to defeat.

That is why Wednesday's answer must be a clear "NO!"

S. EXPRESS
9/10/60

What comes next?

DR. VERWOERD has got the Republican victory which he so badly needed to save his political future in the Nationalist Party.

Soon we shall all be card-carrying members of his Christian - National, Broederbond Republican State. Naturally, the first thought that came to the minds of most people after the result was known was, "Little man, what now?" What more does Dr. Verwoerd want?

What follows when the celebrations are over and the gloating of the Nationalist politicians has died down? Not only South Africa, but the whole world awaits the next step.

The Prime Minister has said that the Republic will be decided during the next session of Parliament, and that the probable date is May 31.

He says that a period of time must be allowed to let the grass grow over the bitterness of the struggle and that time is needed for negotiations with other members of the Commonwealth.

To remind us who really decides, he added one of his usual warnings, that "if that period of time is abused to the detriment of South Africa, whether it be her prosperity or calm, we will have to accelerate the pace."

This is the voice of the conqueror—in spite of all his honeyed broadcasts.

Unity

WE were promised that a verdict in favour of a republic would bring about White unity and pave the way for a successful solution to the colour question.

So far, no Nationalist politician has succeeded in explaining exactly how this unity will come about. Unless, of course, the Nationalists expect everyone now to line up behind their disastrous policy of baasskap apartheid, accepting without question or doubt whatever the Broederbond hierarchy decrees.

The smallness of the Repub-

By VIGILANTES

lican majority—less than 5 per cent.—reveals a sharp difference of opinion that can hardly be reconciled overnight, if ever.

It shows that Dr. Verwoerd had good cause to declare in advance that a majority of one would be sufficient for his purpose. It shows that nearly half the electorate will be conscripts into the Broederbond Republic.

The other 90 per cent.

BUT that is not all. What of the millions of non-Whites who stood on the sidelines last Wednesday, watching the referendum operation in silence?

We cannot exclude the 12 million non-Whites from our calculations in considering the future, for it concerns all 15 million inhabitants of the Union and not only the three million Whites.

Taking everyone into our calculations, we cannot escape the stark fact that nearly 90 per cent. of the people are NOT for the republic. A bare 10 per cent. are for it.

No matter how the Nationalists try to justify this peculiar adjustment of democratic processes, the rest of the world will refuse to accept that the fate of the entire nation should be decided by a handful of Whites alone, merely because they are White.

Racialism is being rapidly outlawed everywhere in the world and the exclusion of Non-Whites from the referendum will be denounced as blatant racialism.

Burning issue

WHICH brings us to the burning issue of Commonwealth membership. What does Dr. Verwoerd expect other members of the Commonwealth to feel about the result of his exclusive referendum.

Can Dr. Verwoerd expect non-White members of the Commonwealth to support South Africa's application to remain a member, when he insists that the non-Whites in his country have no right to decide upon the constitutional structure of their homeland?

The Prime Ministers of India, Pakistan, Ghana and other non-White states will ask Dr. Verwoerd how he comes to talk of "White" South Africa, when four-fifths of her people are non-White.

Even if every single White person in the Union rallies to Dr. Verwoerd's side, as he asks them to do, they will be unable to extricate him from this unhappy predicament.

The "unity" that Dr. Verwoerd wants

SEXPRESS

16/10/60

DR. VERWOERD has a brilliant plan for national unity. He told a gathering of Republican students in Pretoria that national unity cannot be bought by the sacrifice of principles, such as the sweeping away of Afrikaans organisations or by discarding policies aimed at preserving White civilisation.

In other words, the Broederbond and its subsidiaries must carry on with their work and baasskap apartheid must be the axis around which the country's whole life must revolve.

If these bones of contention, which have caused so much disunity in the past, are to be perpetuated, how then do we get national unity?

It's quite simple, according to Dr. Verwoerd. All that is needed is reasonableness on the part of his opponents. They must sweep away their organisations and discard their principles.

This was the meaning behind his radio broadcast. On that occasion he indicated that only a further splintering of the anti-Nationalist forces can bring about the national unity which everyone desires.

NO SUBTLETY

IN presenting this demand, the Prime Minister threw subtlety to the winds. He invited English-speaking South Africans to break from their present political affiliations and form a Conservative Party. He even prescribed the policy of this new party; he said it should have a similar colour policy to that of his own Nationalist Party.

To light the road to this exciting prospect of national unity, Dr. Verwoerd carefully explained that he is anxious to know exactly "who are the real active English political leaders who agree with our policies for consideration when forming the first Government of the Republic."

To ambitious politicians this is surely a glittering attraction. It hints at Cabinet posts and other comfortable jobs, waiting for those bold enough to abandon their present party loyalties and form a Verwoerd-approved English-speaking

By VIGILANTES

party, as a satellite of the Nationalists.

This is Dr. Verwoerd's plan for national unity. It was quickly seized upon by the official Johannesburg daily of the Nationalist Party, which called upon Sir De Villiers Graaff to do the big thing and disband the United Party forthwith.

This demand came at the moment when Sir De Villiers was dashing overseas to plead with friends to keep South Africa within the Commonwealth despite the provocative follies of the Government.

BURNING DESIRE

A PART from the burning desire to destroy the United Party completely, what lies behind this Nationalist proposal for unity?

Is it only unity the Nats. are after? We must look to Parliament for the answer, for Parliament is a hindrance as well as a help to the Nationalists.

The South African Parliament is constituted on democratic lines, with an elected Government and Opposition and protected by tested rules of procedure. Apart from the fact that the 12 million Natives and half a million Indians have no representation in the House, and the Coloureds are limited to three White representatives, the South African Parliament is very similar to the Parliaments of other Commonwealth countries.

At present the House of Assembly consists of 159 Whites, of whom 102 sit on the Government side of the Chamber and 54 on the Opposition side. These 54 Opposition members are divided five ways—41 United Party, 11 Progressives, 2 Independent, Coloured representatives, ex-Nat. Japie Basson and ex-United Party Sakkies Fourie.

Now Dr. Verwoerd wants this divided Opposition further divided. He wants to draw off a number of United Party members. He wants to weaken the Opposition. Not satisfied with his present majority of almost two-thirds, he wants nothing less than a juggernaut majority in the Assembly.

IMPATIENT

THERE is a good reason for this desire. Dr. Verwoerd and his henchmen are impatient with the delays and frustrations of the democratic procedures of Parliament. They have so much to do and so little time.

The fewer voices that are raised in question and argument over the floor of the House, the sooner will the votes be taken and the work despatched.

If Dr. Verwoerd can rely upon the aid of a sympathetic ally,

drawn from the Opposition benches, he will be in a position to ridicule the handful who struggle to resist his Bills and question his administration.

He will say, as he did of the Labour Party, the Liberals and the Progressives, that they speak for no one but themselves.

Dictatorships are unpopular in these days. But the Nationalists seem to be seeking the next best thing to a one-party State — a Parliament with nothing more than a token opposition.

What else can Dr. Verwoerd's proposal mean?

1962—Year of the Press blackout?

NEXT year South Africa will put up the banners of the Republic. By the look of things, it will also put up the shutters on the free Press. Ever since they came to power the Nationalists have waged war against the "English" Press. Not satisfied with having their own party-controlled Press, the Nationalist hierarchy wants the English-language newspapers to render the same servile service.

There was nothing new in Dr. Carel de Wet's attack on the Press last week. He was merely repeating, with slight variations, what his leaders have been saying with monotonous regularity for the past 12 years.

However, it would be foolish to dismiss Dr. De Wet's speech as the ebullience of an ambitious politician, carried away by a partisan, responsive audience.

This young doctor is one of the up-and-coming men of the party, close to the Prime Minister. It is quite likely that his pronouncement was inspired by the party bosses.

Significantly, there has been no attempt to repudiate him, or even mildly correct him.

Dr. de Wet complains that "certain newspapers and specifically certain English newspapers play a despicable, deplorable role in South Africa."

From the Nationalist standpoint that is quite true. These newspapers focus a searchlight on things which the Nats. would prefer to be kept dark. They alert public attention to events which the Nats. would rather conceal. They embarrass the politicians by publicly commenting upon the astonishing views expressed so often by these public men.

Dilemma

WHAT the Government would like to do is to take the English-language Press by the scruff of the neck and forcibly compel it to toe the Nat. line.

For years they have been wrestling with the problem of

By VIGILANTES

how to subdue their Press critics and shut down on unfavourable newspaper reports.

The signs are clear that the patience of Mr. Louw and his colleagues is becoming exhausted.

The Prime Minister, in his victory broadcast after the Republican referendum, made a special point of warning the Press, "We cannot allow the Republic and the future welfare of the nation to be ruined by sensation-mongering, incitement or the besmirching of our country's name or that of its leaders."

Apart from what the Press Commission may recommend, the Government already has on hand advice on how to control the Press.

It comes from another Commission—the Commission of Enquiry in Regard to Undesirable Publications — which submitted its report four years ago.

This Commission wants the compulsory registration and control of newspapers and publishers. It proposes that editors who offend against standards defined by the Commissioners should be banned from employment in any capacity with any newspaper or magazine.

A Censorship Bill, which came before the last session of Parliament, is likely to be passed next year.

This Bill provides for the banning of newspapers deemed to be "undesirable." What is "undesirable"? The Bill answers, "any newspaper which is on any ground objectionable."

Few newspapers will survive

long once Dr. De Wet's Press Commission wields this broad sword against those who criticise the Nationalist politicians.

The year of the Republic may well be remembered as the year of the Press blackout.

S.E.
23
10
60

SE
30/10/60

Unhappy route to new Senate

LAST Wednesday the Nationalists beamed as they elected their men to the "first Senate of the Republic." For other South Africans the event was an unhappy reminder of the strife and turmoil caused by the ruthless determination of the Nationalists to impose their unpopular discriminatory policies upon the unwilling majority.

Before welcoming the reduced Republican Senate as an improvement upon the enlarged Senate, it would be well to look back on the history of this august Upper House.

Wise precaution

AT the National Convention in 1909, one of the strongest arguments in favour of having a Senate in addition to the House of Assembly, was that it provided a way for putting the four provinces on a footing of equality.

The men who made Union also took the wise precaution of giving the Non-Whites a line of communication to Parliament.

They wrote into the South Africa Act that one-half of the nominated Senators should be chosen "on the ground mainly of their thorough acquaintance, by reason of their official experience or otherwise, with the reasonable wants and wishes of the coloured races of South Africa."

The clear intention was that it should be someone's duty to speak up for the Non-Whites in the making of laws and the ruling of the country.

The Senate remained unchanged in form until 1936, when Parliament removed the Native voters from the common roll and gave them, by way of compensation, three elected members of Parliament and four elected Senators.

The next change

THE next change came in 1950, when the Malan government added two elected and two nominated Senators to represent South-West Africa.

By VIGILANTES

The third change in the composition of the Senate was the sensational transformation of 1955, when the Nationalists created the enlarged Senate of 89 members, 77 of them being Nationalists.

The enlarged Senate also departed from the principle of provincial parity, for it raised the Transvaal quota to 27 and the Cape to 22, leaving Natal and the O.F.S. with 8 each and giving South-West 4.

Now that the enlarged Senate has served its purpose, the Nats. blandly produce their 54-man Senate, 43 of whose members were elected on Wednesday. (Eleven more are to be nominated).

Parity abolished

THE 1960 Senate Act says that one of the two nominated Senators from each Province "shall be thoroughly acquainted with the interests of the Coloured people" in his Province.

The interests of the 10 million Natives have been completely ignored. Earlier this year their Senatorships under the 1936 Act were wiped out when Native representation in Parliament was abolished.

All this shows that South Africa, by a devious and unhappy route, has wandered a long way from the spirit and intention of Union when the South Africa Act was framed.

It is not good enough for Dr. Verwoerd and his henchmen to

tell us that the only important change the Republic will bring is the substitution of a President for the Queen. Is not this reduced Senate a radical change from the Senates of 1910 and 1936?

It abolishes the parity of the Provinces—something deemed to be highly important in 1910—having 14 Senators from the Transvaal, 11 from the Cape, 8 each from Natal and the O.F.S. and four from South-West Africa.

Not for them

IN the second place, it completely cuts off communication between the 10 million Natives and Parliament. The democratic forum has been sealed off, in case the Native majority should be tempted to fall in love with democracy.

U.P. challenge to Dr. V.

WILL Dr. Verwoerd agree to a Bill of Rights for South Africa? Will he agree to entrench in his new Republican constitution the basic rights demanded by Natal? Will he increase the powers of the Provincial Councils and allow them to run their own police force and control the civil service in their provinces?

This is the challenge issued by the United Party, following upon the referendum. The Prime Minister has been given advance notice, by way of the decision of the Natal Provincial Council and the United Party motion in the Transvaal Provincial Council, that his draft constitution will meet with fierce opposition.

Dr. Verwoerd has said that the Republican constitution will be put before Parliament during its next session. He has declared that it will be very much the same as the present constitution, as contained in the South Africa Act.

But the United Party want the new constitution to be really new. They want to entrench fundamental human rights and to extend the powers of the Provincial Councils.

Such provisions are a radical departure from our existing constitution. They would change the whole character of our political system.

The South Africa Act has two entrenched clauses. One protects the equal franchise rights of non-Whites (which lost all meaning when the Natives were taken off the common roll in 1936 and the Coloured voters suffered the same fate in 1951); and the other guarantees the equality of the English and Afrikaans languages.

Guarantees

THE Natal resolution calls for guarantees of fundamental democratic rights that can be ensured only in a Bill of Rights. This would make the Constitution of the new South African Republic a rigid one, after the United States' style, whereas Dr. Verwoerd is committed to the continuation of the present flexible constitution, which follows the British pattern.

Natal had an opportunity at the National Convention to get a rigid constitution but lost it because their delegates came to

By VIGILANTES

the Convention badly prepared and not very sure of what they wanted.

They asked for a loose form of federalism but at the first show of resistance were unable to argue their case convincingly and weakly collapsed.

In the end they unhappily settled for the Constitution Natal now wants to change, plus a few rights of taxation, lower education and control over roads and hospitals.

Heed the warning

THIS time there will be no National Convention, only a Parliamentary debate. But the United Party should heed the warning of 1909 and do its homework now, so as to be able to avoid the many pitfalls in the demands put forward by Natal.

There has already been one occasion when the call for a Bill of Rights landed the United Party in trouble.

In 1951, speaking on the Coloured Vote Bill the United Party through Mr. Strauss, promised to entrench in the S.A. Constitution a Bill of Rights in which not only the voting rights of the Coloureds would be safeguarded but also the fundamental rights of the people.

Mr. Strauss carefully specified these rights. He said the United Party would entrench freedom of the Press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of conscience, freedom of movement and freedom of lawful association.

The cheers on the United Party benches turned to panic when Dr. Malan blandly enquired if "freedom of movement" meant that the Indians of Natal would be free to flock into the Transvaal, the Free State and the Cape.

The call for a Bill of Rights was dropped after that episode.

Confusion

IF the United Party wants to avoid a repetition of 1951 they should make sure what they are after and prepare themselves for the many questions which are sure to be fired at them, by friends as well as enemies.

What will the United Party say, for example, when the Nationalists ask them about the important freedoms omitted from the Natal resolution? Are the United Party interested in some fundamental democratic rights but not in others?

In addition, there is need to clarify the declaration by the United Party leader in the Natal Provincial Council, who said, "We cannot enter a republic unless these basic rights are enshrined in our constitution."

Does this mean that the United Party will refuse to have anything to do with the Republic if Dr. Verwoerd turns down their proposals? Or does it mean only

that Natal will try to secede? These questions arise because of the confusion which exists in Natal at the present time.

The United Party must watch their step. The Nationalists are not interested in any suggestions that call for a change in their policy. But they are very much interested in finding opportunities to ridicule and rout their political opponents.

If the United Party want to avoid a debacle in the debate on the Republican Constitution next year, they must make up their minds exactly what they want and how far they are prepared to go for it.

SE
1/13
60

Nel wants news black-out

THE English Press have been at it again. They have seriously offended the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, because they told the public all about his hush-hush Bill for the control of urban Africans. This 167-page document had been sent out to local authorities and other selected bodies for their comments.

Some of the people who saw it were so shocked that they immediately spoke out against it.

Wideawake newspaper men promptly picked up the news. One or two newspapers took the liberty of offering their own comments on the contents of the Bill.

Mr. M. C. de Wet Nel saw this routine job of reporting as "A large-scale campaign of inaccuracy, suspicion and prejudice carried out by the English Press," and asked that "these despicable methods" be discontinued.

These are angry words. Mr. Nel's friends will understand this outburst, for they know that ever since he became the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development he has been tortured by thoughts of the evil influence of English-language newspapers.

In 1957 he moaned in despair, "If the English Press would leave us alone for only one year and stop implanting imaginary grievances in the minds of non-Europeans, we will see a new South Africa."

This was nothing less than a request to the Press to suppress news and comment that might be unfavourable to the Nationalist Party. He was asking the English-language newspapers not to print anything that was likely to provoke opposition or criticism among the public.

Peculiar

MR. DE WET NEL'S latest effort once again expresses the peculiar attitude of leading Nationalists towards the Press.

By their reasoning, all would be well in South Africa and there would be no criticism overseas, if only the English-language Press would stop expressing

By VIGILANTES

opinions on Nationalist policies and impose a black-out on all news concerning protests, demonstrations, riots and such events.

What they want is a blanket of silence over every unpleasant happening which arises because of their unpopular policies.

They do not think it unreasonable to ask the English-language Press to abandon its duty to bring the news to the people. As they see it, everyone would be wildly happy if the critical Press would shut up for a while.

Because the Press refuses to pander to the Nationalists in this fashion, it is subjected to a campaign of abuse, designed to create the impression that the Press needs to be controlled.

No cause

MR. DE WET NEL'S current attack upon the "English Press" should not lead anyone astray. If anyone needs rebuking, it is the Minister himself. He has no cause to blame others for what has happened.

Why did he think it necessary to keep his Bill a secret from the general public? Why should they be kept in the dark? Surely a Bill of such importance, affecting as it does so many people, should receive the widest publicity?

Why could not the Minister have published his draft Bill in the Government Gazette, as is so often done?

This would have been the wisest course, especially as the Minister is so afraid of suspicion, misrepresentation and distortion.

He assures us that all he sought to do was to revise and consolidate all laws and regulations affecting urban Natives, with a view to eliminating regulations which cause irritation and unnecessary hardship.

The full-time official he appointed to do this job drafted a Bill which the Minister says he sent to local authorities without studying it in detail.

If the Minister has not studied the Bill and is not fully conversant with its contents, how can he be so sure that the Press criticisms of it are so wrong as to warrant his angry words?

Fantastic

THE hush-hush Bill contains provisions for urban Bantu Commissioners to take over many of the powers now held by local authorities. This goes far beyond the Minister's explanation that all he wants to do is to re-

move irritation and hardship.

The same applies to Clause 23 of the Bill, which empowers the Minister to appoint Native tribal representatives to replace the existing Native Advisory Boards.

This is sure to cause irritation, not remove it. Naturally, to say this is to offend the Minister. But not all of us live in his fantastic dream world.

Those who live in the harassed cities and have close contact with the Native population there, wish the Minister would understand that the affairs of urban Natives cannot be guided satisfactorily by inexperienced tribesmen from the rural areas, who have no understanding of urban life and its problems.

However much Mr. de Wet Nel tries to push the Natives into a tribal existence, the pressures of modern city life and the influences of progress will defeat him.

In the process, unfortunately, townfolk are likely to suffer.

For that reason alone the Press has a duty to speak out. If Mr. de Wet Nel does not want to tell the public what he is about, the Press can at least cushion shocks for them by giving as much fact and comment as possible in plenty of time.

U.P. will ride with Nats. in pursuit of Progressives

THE political highlight of the week has been the Progressive Party conference in Johannesburg, at which it was decided to give equal voting rights to all, irrespective of race or colour. The decisions of this conference reflected the extent to which the acceleration of political development throughout Africa is forcing the pace in South Africa.

The Progressives have come out with a plan to give the vote to everyone over the age of 21, White and non-White alike, who attain an educational standard of Junior Certificate or its equivalent and to other literate persons with lesser education who possess property or earn minimum incomes.

For all those who do not qualify in terms of these conditions, there will be a special "B" roll. Here, too, there is a qualification: to be eligible persons must pass a literacy test in either English or Afrikaans. Voters registered on this "B" roll will elect 10 per cent. of the Members of the House of Assembly.

The Senate will be of a new kind, designed to provide safeguards against group domination and prevent abuse of power by a racial majority in the House of Assembly.

These radical proposals have already provoked widespread comment. The first reaction of the United Party hints that they will attack the Progressives strenuously during the coming parliamentary session for daring to adopt a franchise policy of this kind. We can expect to see the Nationalists and the United Party in full cry against the Progressives for surrendering White domination of government.

Nat. view

FROM the point of view of the Nationalists, who see no alternative between domination and disaster, the Progressives are inviting the Native majority to swamp the voters' rolls, eliminate Whites from Parliament and drive the Whites into the sea.

By VIGILANTES

The Liberal Party, on the other hand, says that in the Progressive plan, the right to vote is so hedged around with qualifications that it will require a constitutional lawyer to decide who can vote and that the "B" roll is an insult to the majority of South Africa's non-White population, in that it gives them lesser rights and a second-class political status.

What is likely to add to the controversy over the decisions of the Progressive Party conference, is the fact that this party was born out of dissent within the United Party and the Progressive members of Parliament were elected on the United Party ticket.

In spite of what they have said or supported in the past, these public representatives are now telling the people who elected them that times have changed and policies must change with the times. The real message from the Progressive conference is that the White electorate must make concessions to the non-Whites and make them quickly.

As things are, the Whites will not elect to power any political group which advocates a wider franchise or anything that will endanger White domination. This attitude used to be one of arrogant superiority; today it is one of fear.

No colour bar

THE leader of the Progressive Party, Dr. Jan Steytler, emphasised that his party stood for the complete removal of the colour bar everywhere, including meeting places, restaurants, homes and marriage.

This means that the Progressives are committed to agitate and work for the repeal of such laws as the Group Areas Act, the Mixed Marriages Act, the Immorality Act, the Natives (Urban Areas) Act, the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act and the pass laws.

More important, they are committed to fight the many discriminatory labour laws which are the main cause of non-European discontent.

By their Bill of Rights, the Progressives are asking the White electorate to support them in demanding the abolition of a number of Native labour laws (e.g., the Native Labour Regulation Act, the Native Building Workers' Act, the Native Labour Settlement of Disputes Act, etc.).

Practical men

In addition, the Bill of Rights means that the Progressives have

now adopted a policy of equal trade union rights for all workers, irrespective of race, giving Natives access to the collective bargaining machinery of the Industrial Conciliation Act, granting the legal recognition of Native trade unions, the end of job reservation and the removal of all obstacles which block non-White employment in many trades and occupations.

What makes these momentous proposals more remarkable is the fact that they are made, not by starry-eyed Liberals, reckless revolutionaries or conspiring Communists, but by cautious politicians many of whom have made their mark in Parliament, industry and the professions. Some of them are known for their practical hard-headedness and shrewd political judgment.

It now remains to be seen whether the Progressives will be able to persuade enough Whites to follow their bold lead in racial matters. The answer will come at the next general election which is less than three years away.

Collection Number: A3393

Collection Name: Bob Hepple Papers

PUBLISHER:

Publisher: Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand

Location: Johannesburg

©2015

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document forms part of a collection held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.