

12. 22.8.16  
NATIVE PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION.

Mr. Molteno opened the discussion by ~~reminding~~ indicating to members that ever since the present ~~background~~ Government ~~had~~ <sup>has</sup> been in power, there has been a threat to abolish the present system of native representation. If the Bantu Authorities system <sup>were</sup> put into full force ~~and~~, the appointment of Government nominees would undermine independent African representation in the Senate.

Mr. Molteno then outlined the history of Native representation since 1926 and the <sup>date of the</sup> various Bills that <sup>had been</sup> ~~were~~ put forward. <sup>from then until</sup> ~~the Bill~~ 1936. Each succeeding ~~Bill~~ proposal <sup>gave</sup> ~~included~~ less and less representation for the African people. The final bill which was passed in 1936 provided for <sup>3 members of the House of Assembly for the Cape and 4 elected members to the Senate and for the</sup> establishment of a purely advisory Native Representative Council. In 1946 the Council, whose requests had always <sup>it</sup> completely been ignored, adjourned indefinitely in protest and in 1951 <sup>it</sup> was abolished. Mr. Molteno also sketched the part ~~in~~ the Institute had played in 1935-36 in ~~opposing~~ the Bill.

Mr. Molteno pointed out that the system of representation provided for had been completely ineffectual from the point of view of influencing policy - at ~~the~~ most it had been able to put forward a certain amount of useful propoganda, and as the years passed <sup>the a</sup> sense of frustration <sup>with the</sup> increased amongst the African people. <sup>system</sup> ~~it~~ <sup>from the evening</sup> ~~during~~ the discussion by members <sup>it</sup> ~~it~~ emerged that there was <sup>was reached</sup> general agreement that a statement should not be issued unless the Government put forward a proposal regarding the abolition and modification of <sup>existing</sup> ~~present~~ African political rights.

Differing points of view were expressed on ~~whether the Institute~~ what form of action the Institute should take:

1. that although the ~~present~~ existing form of legislation was indefensible as a system, as an existing right the Institute should defend it that the Institute should oppose the abolition of the existing rights, <sup>and the substitution of</sup> ~~but~~ should make it quite clear that it regarded the present ~~position~~ system as thoroughly unsatisfactory and ineffective and that the ~~Institute~~ should demand effective Non-European representation.



2. That the Institute should support the abolition of the existing ~~the~~ system <sup>for the substitution of a better one</sup> on the grounds that it was completely ~~was~~ indefensible <sup>moreover</sup> and ~~gave a wrong impression~~ <sup>gave the impression to people</sup> ~~that~~ its very existence blinded people to the fact that it had no impact at all on Government policy; ~~at the same~~ time the Institute should press for ~~an~~ extension of the franchise to the Non-European peoples, and that the ~~the abolition should make way for~~ The Institute should emphasise that the abolition of the present system should only give way to a more extended franchise.

~~3. That the Institute should~~

3. That the Institute should support the abolition of the existing system on the grounds that it ~~was~~ is completely indefensible and moreover its very existence blinded people, <sup>both in this country and parts</sup> to the fact that <sup>it was unable to</sup> it could not influence Government policy; at the same time <sup>of the</sup> the Institute should demand effective Non-European representation.

4. That the Institute should sincerely and honestly put forward a positive statement on its attitude towards the franchise which would be a challenge to the thinking of people in South Africa. ~~And~~ That the Institute should also clarify its attitude to the political representation of Non-European peoples generally.

5. ~~That the whole question of the franchise should be discussed~~ that although the Institute should state its attitude towards the franchise it <sup>would be</sup> was fruitless to discuss <sup>various</sup> ~~specific~~ proposals <sup>for the franchise</sup> except in general terms. ✓ ✓ ✓

6. that the Institute's attitude should be discussed at the January Council meetings.

7. that the subject <sup>of the franchise</sup> could not be ~~discussed~~ debated in open Council without heated and perhaps inflammatory and unrewarding argument, but should be discussed at the next Executive meeting.

IT WAS AGREED (1) not to issue a statement on the proposed abolition of <sup>the present</sup> native representation in Parliament unless ~~the~~ the Government announced a firm intention to introduce the Bill this session.

(2) that the General Purposes Committee should, if necessary, issue a statement opposing the



make a statement opposing ~~the~~ ~~introduction~~ any Bill which would substitute lesser rights that was introduced, but ~~emphasising~~ emphasising that it regarded the present form of representation as ineffective and unsatisfactory.

(3) that Mr. Molteno should prepare a memorandum outlining the history of native representation <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> for use with the statement

(4) that the ~~the~~ General Purposes Committee should appoint a special sub-committee to examine and the Institute's attitude to the the various forms of franchise which exist, ~~franchise~~. This Committee would report to the next Exec. meet ~~and~~ On the basis of ~~their~~ its findings, and the Gen. P. C. should decide whether, <sup>in addition,</sup> the subject should be <sup>put on the agenda</sup> ~~discussed at~~ the next Council m ~~in addition,~~

(5) that in any event, ~~the~~ Council should be asked at its <sup>its January</sup> next meetings to re-affirm the Institute policy regarding the franchise as outlined in "Go forward in faith".



## DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESERVES.

Prof. Hobart Houghton introduced the discussion (to be circulated as a separate paper at a later date). He pointed out that the only positive aspect of the Government's apartheid policy was its programme of development for the reserves and he ~~considered~~<sup>thought</sup> that the Institute would have to consider whether to support the development of the Reserves, quite apart from the fact that such a programme was a part of the Government's apartheid policy. His opinion was that the Institute must encourage a development programme.

In looking at the development programme from three points of view, viz. the welfare of the Africans, of the Europeans and the general economic welfare of the country as a whole, one had to take cognisance of the fact that these did not always coincide.

In a White Paper, the Government had modified the report of the Tomlinson Commission in four main ways and the Report and the Paper constituted the main statement of their policy. They had also announced the appointment of Dr. Francis de Villiers as special investigator on development of Bantu Areas and the proposal to establish a Bantu Finance and Development Corporation.

Prof. Hobart Houghton then discussed the future known plans for development and what had already been achieved.

1. Agriculture. This, he thought, was the most uncontroversial aspect of the Government's policy. Development, although erratic, had been stepped up and the only method of making agricultural progress was by taking 50 per cent of the families off the land and the setting up of economic farming units was a sound one. One of the main difficulties was the problem of providing an economic foundation for the rural villages established for the people who had been taken off the land.
2. Trading. The Government's announcement of its intentions had severely crippled European trading enterprise in the Reserves. Licences were being given more freely to African traders ~~and~~ but some of the ~~the~~ many difficulties facing them were lack of capital, inability to obtain credit from wholesalers and manufacturers, lack of business and bookkeeping knowledge and the problems ~~arising~~ regarding development of premises etc. created by the absence of freehold tenure.



3. Industry. Prof. Hobart Houghton considered that the decision to place industries ~~in~~ on the periphery of the reserves, i.e. in European areas, would hinder Africans from achieving the highest development. Moreover, it would result in the same situation as obtained in the present industrial areas of the Union. Likewise, their decision not to allow European capital or entrepreneurship in the Reserves would limit industrialisation to a very small scale. He also outlined the other difficulties to be taken into account in the establishment of industries, such as competition in markets and raw materials, the "place bound" nature of industries such as gold mining, access to transport, power etc. He pointed out that the establishment of industries in the peri-reserve areas would not appreciably reduce the problem of migrant labour.
4. Mining. The Government did not seem to have tackled this at all, although it was known that there were mineral resources in the Reserves.

During a lengthy discussion by members, the following points were further elaborated:

- (a) The reasons why people had accepted fairly well their removal to the rural villages and the necessity for social work in these villages.
- (b) Tenure.
- (i) The essentiality of freehold tenure in the urban areas ~~and~~ /for normal trading, and also for the attraction of capital and the development of premises? also the necessity for providing Africans with an outlet for their savings and opportunities for investment.
- (ii) the doubtful wisdom of establishing freehold tenure in the rural districts in the transitional stage from tribal tenure until there had been a major revolution in the structure of arable and pastoral ~~for~~ farming.
- (c) ~~xxxx~~ the problems in the establishment of light industries in the reserves and the tremendous <sup>scope</sup> ~~field~~ for this in the present urban areas.

The Chairman pointed out that the consensus of opinion



seemed largely to reiterate the statement made by the Institute at the conference on the report of the Tomlinson Commission held in January 1957.

The following suggestions were put forward:

- (a) that Prof. Hobart Houghton's analysis should be published as a memorandum to form the basis ~~for~~ a lengthy developmental study. ~~xxxx~~  
~~deal~~
- (b) that the Institute should stress the importance of the principle of freehold tenure and the fact that it was ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ basic to the development of commerce and industry.
- (c) that the Institute should do a development study of industries in the Reserves and make positive recommendations regarding such matters as transport, housing and the maintenance of contact between the workers and their homes.
- (c) that the Institute should encourage commercial training for Africans.

Prof. Hobart Houghton was thanked for his valuable contribution to the subject.

IT WAS AGREED

(I haven't a clue which of the above!)



1959 Council meetings.

The Director tabled RR.91/58, outlining suggestions for the 1959 Council meetings. He ~~was~~ was of the opinion that it would be stimulating for the members to have a less stereotyped conference than in the past, although the formal business of Council could take place within the conference as suggested.

IT WAS AGREED that Regions should be asked to call conferences on the lines suggested in RR.91/58 before the 1958 Council meetings.

The following items were suggested for inclusion in the Council Agenda:

1. ~~Disruption~~ Development of urban areas (suggested by G.P.C.)
2. Franchise (previously agreed at this Exec. meeting)
3. disruption of family life in urban areas and possible suggestions for improvement.
4. the recent implementations of the Group Areas Act.
5. Development of the reserves further expanded
6. A/paper by Mr. Macquarrie on the Bantu Education Act.
7. Increasing tension in Native Reserves under the implementation of the Bantu Authorities Act.

IT WAS AGREED G.P.C. to decide on Agenda and dates?

1960 Council Meetings.

Miss Pollak reported that at a previous Executive meeting it had been decided to hold the ~~Executive~~ 1960 Council meetings in Durban to coincide with Indian revival in Natal and that subject matter would be devoted to Indian development.

IT WAS AGREED that one day should be devoted to the subject of Indian development and the other two days to other matters.



Jenedman

As system of representation is indefensible. As existing right must be defended.

- Beinart: Publication of statement by Institute should be held over until Parl. announcement. Presidents speech in pamphlet form would be invaluable.
- W. Pollak: Institute should support bill but on basis that the principle of existing legislation is entirely wrong and Institute should state what it considers franchise should be.
- v.d.Ross: Must not have appeasing statement. Must state positive policy.
- Mosaka: If Institute believes in ultimate triumph of policy of integration then must indicate are forces at work showing that myth of apartheid and baaskap is completely unattainable and in integrated society cannot delay having fuller representation for African people in Parl.
- v. Wyk. Feels Institute must face the problem of defining attitude towards the franchise and should put forward a challenge for thinking people which will be accepted if it is sincere.
- Honikman: Must acknowledge universal franchise as ultimate goal and declare opposition to present form of representation. Must endeavour to dismantle fear complex amongst the white electorate. Declare ourselves wholeheartedly opposed to abolition but also apply our minds to question of franchise.
- E. H. Statement expressing dissatisfaction with existing system, but attacking any bill to abolish present system without substituting something better, then reiterate conviction that policy of participation for all sections must be found.
- Nyte: Must be prepared with positive statement of what we believe.
- E.H. Does not think suitable for discussion in open Council - might be heated and inflammatory and not rewarding.
- Beinart: Waste of time to study different franchise proposals except in general terms.
- Russell: Must defend status quo.
- Mtimkulu. Wants statement urging extension of franchise. Present representation blinds people to fact that present representation is powerless. Must help Africans themselves to formulate their opinions which will be divided.
- McLarty: Institute should put forward a statement that will help people to think about this problem.



## NATIVE PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION.

### Molteno.

Existing parliamentary represen. is threatened. This has been in the background ever since present Govt. has come into power. From statements of Minis. of N.A., seems to indicate that he is contemplating abolition of Cape African ~~frax~~ in H. of A. Also in the Senate is indicated that African representation may go on ground that have acted in irresponsible manner.

If the Bantu Authorities system is gradually to be put into full force and if Bantu Authorities are invited(?) nominees of Minister would undermine independent African representation in the Senate because this would replace many of the voting units for the return of African senators.

In 1926 <sup>position was that</sup> ~~was thought~~ that Cape African vote in the common roll, same qualification as European and Coloured for House of Assembly and no other provisions in form of Parliamentary representation at all.

In 1926 Hertzog Govt. produced two bills:-

Native Rep. Bill and Native Council Bill. Also a Coloured Persons Bill.

① Representation Bill provided for seven members of Parliament to be allocated throughout constituencies of the Union. Cape African on the common roll was to be abolished. 7 members of H. of A. to be elected by voting colleges - these seven members not to have full rights of other M.D.'s - could not vote on anything affecting native franchise.

Native Council Bill provided for a Native Council similar to Native Representative Council with certain limited powers of legislation.

Bills were referred to Select Committee and deliberated until 1929 and then reported a new Native Representation Bill. Native Council Bill was dropped.

② New Bill provided for Senate and H. of A. representation. 2 Senators to represent Africans in the Northern Provinces other than the Cape. Cape - Cape Native voters were to retain their rights on the Common Roll, but no more to be added.

Instead  
2 Senators from the Cape to represent Africans and 3 members of H. of A. In all cases were to be Europeans. ~~Atxxxx~~

At this stage strong opposition developed amongst Africans and also by Europeans. In the Cape a certain body formed. Objects were



to resist any major difference between franchise rights of people in Cape Province. Also pressed for extension of common roll.

1929 Bills as produced by the Select Committee were ~~adopted~~ <sup>debated</sup> in Parliament at a joint sitting but Native Representation Bill failed to get two-thirds majority. Bill therefore lapsed.

At this stage (1930), joint Select Committee of both houses was appointed and considered matter further. Deliberations went on for some years, until 1935. Produced further Native Representation Bill.

4 senators to be elected to represent Africans throughout Union - two for northern provinces and two for Cape. In Cape Province two members of Provincial Council to be elected by Africans - by communal roll - all Europeans. No representation in H. of A.

Various proposals - less and less representation. Native Select Committee produced a proposal for ~~all~~ Native Representative Council, 12 elected by communal roll, 4 Africans nominated by Government and 12 European officials.

In 1936, the Institute while regarding it as outside its ~~provincex~~ scope to pronounce on these proposals, called a multi-racial conference (which was predominantly European) to discuss these proposals. Conference rejected them and pronounced in favour of retention of Cape franchise. Appointed Committee to oppose.

On the other side was another body formed to express united feelings of African peoples and condemned proposal to abolish Cape African franchise. Made demand in favour of ~~rest~~ retention of franchise and extension to rest of Union on civilisation test. Also appointed ~~deputation~~ to Prime Minister.

In the early part of 1936 Continuation Comm. of Institute did what it could Co-operation between Continuation Committee and deputation from All African Convention. Deputation met P.M. and invited M.P.'s for Eastern Cape. It was sounded by Cape members as to whether it would be prepared to compromise to the extent that individual (?) Cape African vote should be retained, but not on the common roll, but should elect their individual (?) members, three members for H. of A.

Deputation conferred with whole Exec. of African Convention who conferred with various people. Exec. rejected compromise proposal but was also compromise within the ranks of United Party, i.e. Govt. upheld (?) this.



In terms of new proposal, the Cape Africans would be transferred to separate roll and elect as their members(?)

This bill was finally introduced:

1. Removal of Cape African voters ~~xx~~ off common roll for election of three members to H. of A.

Bill was passed. Included a chapter establishing purely advisory Native Representative Council.

All African Convention met again and decided to make what use of them they could. Exec. asked a no. of people to stand as candidates.; Made similar nominations for Senate.

Nat. Represen. Council functioned and no notice was taken at all, and finally in 1946 adjourned indefinitely in protest against the ignoring of their requests and in 1951 was abolished.

System of representation itself has been quite ineffective to influence the course of policy at all. Certain amount of useful propaganda has been made but too much is dependent on individual people. Have varied very much indeed. Did certain amount to make representations on behalf of communities or individuals. No significant achievement can be attributed to that form of representation. ~~xxx~~ As the years passed there came a ?? of frustration amongst the African people at this form of representation. All-African Convention became a smaller and smaller body. A.N.C. has taken its place and A.A.C. decided to boycott elections for this form of representation.- officially remains policy of A.N.C. to-day to boycott these Acts.

Institute should take into account~~w~~ what attitude of A.N.C. would be to-day.

Thinks any disenfranchisement is bad thing. Cape African still has certain exemptions because his is a voter and feels should be retained rather than abolished altogether. Rank and file do not vote. Feels if proposal is brought forward to abolish altogether it should be made clear that Cape franchise should be restored and extension to other areas. Should make it clear at same time that we are not satisfied with this system ~~and that~~ <sup>although</sup> we do not wish it to be abolished. Institute might well consider whether it should make any statement in this matter at all. Originally Institute did not make any statements, even to the abolition of the Cape franchise and was much criticism. Policy has changed over the years.



Friedman. As a system of representation it is indefensible but as an existing right must be defended. Basic objective is that it makes race or colour the basis. System of separate representation is effective device for turning a racial group into permanent political minority. Should be replaced by something better but must be defended against any attempted abolition. Parl. is still supremem platform in the land. Can still tell the whole country ~~that~~ <sup>what</sup> ~~there~~ their case is, although cannot influence policy. Parl. is too good a platform and sounding board for Dr. Verwoerd to want to retain the representation.

As far as H. of A. is con erned have been the most outspoken and uncompromising opponents of apartheid. This has been regarded as the cause and not the effect of African fesentment. Repeated attacks on native repés. are designed to discredit them. Bantu Authorities system would mean government by hirelings.

H. Pollak. Would like to suggest inclusion of President's remarks in Journal. Present generation does not know of whittling of Native Representation.

Halpern. Wants fact paper in time for Bill coming up.

Mrs. Srusell. Wants to include statement in Hansard made at the time.

Molteno. Also amended ?? Act to perpetuate this form of representation.

Beinart. Thinks publication of statement should be held over until Parl. announces what it is going to do. Govt. faces opposition from S.B.B.R.A. and overseas. Feels should be fully documented pamphlet on history as outlined by President. Would have great propaganda value if there is any suggestion of abolition. Statement must be well-timed.

W. Pollak. This faces the Institute with a decision on most important question in S.A., i.e. franchise. If you look at Survey of R.R., will appreciate that all the legislation stems fundamentally from one principle, that it is right and proper to differentiate between human beings simply on basis of race and colour.

Seems is not sufficient for Institute to take up purely negative attitude, to defend what is indefensible, namesly separate representation of vast majority of people of this country. Unless one faces up to what the franchise should be , one is dodging real question in S.A. All other questions, e.g. tenure etc. untill we have a proper franchise in S.A. As long as the vast ~~majority~~ majority of the people of S.A. have no say in Govt. of country, so long will the politicians disregard their interest or place their interests behind those of the people who happend

*in the franchise electorate*



If the present policy for some reason or other comes to an end, how are we going to replace it. Attempts have been made in the Fed. Started off with franchise which had no relation to race or colour - in a short period have introduced a different form of franchise.

If Institute comes out with statement, assuming Govt. comes out with Bill, it is not sufficient ~~to say~~ for us to say we oppose the Bill. Institute should support Bill but on the basis that ~~is~~ the principle of the existing legislation is entirely wrong and to state what the Institute should ~~be~~ put in its place.

Will the Institute not be faced with the ? of saying something more than that we would not like to see this so-called right taken away. Must we not say what we really want.

Van der Ross. Agrees that important on the quality of men who have been African M.P.'s. Coloured Section of the population no longer regards Parl. as platform, no longer sees in Parl. what Western civilisation sees in Parl. Might be used as argument against them, and be said that they are not ready for Parl. representation. Of course very reason is that whole Parl. system has been abused ~~very~~ so much that the Coloured man to-day "couldn't care less", notwithstanding quality of man who may represent him.

If non-white people no longer regard Parl. as body which governs country, it explains disregard of matters to which people should be paying attention. In the Cape, finds increasingly that this attitude is prevalent. Are faced with question of what we are defending. Parl. is going to consist of people who ~~will~~ <sup>put</sup> ~~forward~~ views of people who put them there. Where do people such as his stand? If follow Mr. Pollak's suggestion, will enter into a field which many people feel is outside the scope of this Institute. Cannot do it effectively unless prepared to state positive policy. That would crystallise strength in way that S. A. B. R. A. has been able to do.

Can we enter into a statement which will say what we want. Can we do it without further estranging ourselves from the majority of the people. Are we prepared to become more unpopular and will it lead to denial of Institut. in present function. Exec. cannot decide in one morning what it will do.



The Non- White people will watch to see if Institute will ~~defend~~ defend something which it ~~is~~<sup>knows</sup> wrong and then when something is put in its place, to have to defend that against something even less that will be put in its place.

Such a statement will be important and must know clearly what we are about. What we do may be construed as appeasing. Even what we say is of less value than what other people think we say.

Mosaka. Underlines v.d. Ross's remarks. Remembers arguments Hertzog made in favour of discriminatory legislation. Must take significance of situation since 1936. Hertzog promised development for African people now ~~and white~~<sup>that</sup> future of whites secured. Forces have conspired against progress of African people and the whole country.

abolished  
When the Native Rep. Council was ?? the members of the N. R. C. themselves were prepared to see it abolished. Were in favour of whole of Nat. rep. in H. of A. and Senate.?? Remarkable ~~that~~<sup>is</sup> thing that at the end of 1948 were much less secure as result of this type of representation than before representation came into being.

Should the Institute pronounce in favour of or against impending abolition of Nat rep. in Parl.? Have we a right to defend it. - Africans have no real right to defend it. The present repres. in Parl. is really token representation. Do the African people want to see this token rep. continuing. African people would not be unanimous if they were asked if they wished to preserve this vote. Vast majority would say does not matter whether they have it. From point of view of having token repres., is not even better to have it? If is to be even token repres. then the represen. must be Africans.

Attitude of Inst. - come against serious difficulty. If Institute believes in ultimate triumph of policy of integration, then has no choice. Is therefore a point which the Inst. should raise, that the forces at work are indicating that the myth of apartheid is completely unattainable. If people in integrated society, can no longer delay having fuller rep. of African in Parl.

From 1936 have not set out to achieve what we wish to achieve - \$policy failed completely. It is therefore time to re-assess values of segregation & apartheid.



F.V.W.

In January paper stressed urgency that Institute should face this issue - no longer can avoid this responsibility. Institute has made efforts in the past to consider political formula. In his opinion if we should put a sincere and honest ideas that we believe. We will not become more unpopular but would become more ?. When he stated what he thought Institute believed - when ~~exhibit~~ challenged by Nats. & S.A.B.R.A. - they did not express surprise, thought it should be so. Would offer challenge~~s~~ to whole thinking of people like Prof. du Plessis. More and more people are inclined to think are wrong in their thinking. Whole question of franchise must be faced and cannot achieve respect by running away from it. Realise all the difficulties - will be differences in Institute itself. Even if do not get support of African people, if the formula is in the right direction they will agree with us.

Feels that it will not come up at this session because of opposition from many quarters.

Molteno. Does Asst. Director feel Inst. should make statement on this question apart from abolition of present system.

Hoernle Is this a suitable topic for next Council meeting.

Honikman. Acknowledge importance of good timing. Item on agenda is limited and suggests we<sup>are</sup> faced either that progress, retrogression or statnation in regard to franchise and feels even most ardent exponent of apartheid must admit that hand in hand with progress comes idea of extension of franchise.

Feels Inst. could not do less than acknowledge universal franchise as ultimate goal and feels therefore must declare our ~~positim~~ opposition to abolition of present form of repression. Must also acknowledge presence of fear among the white electorate.

Feels Inst. must apply its mind to this fear complex and endeavour to dismantle this fear and therefore bring to minds of white electorate in this country that there is ultimately nothing to fear in concept of universal suffrage - will not be too difficult to persuade white people that this is as much in their own interests.

*Must declare ourselves wholeheartedly opposed to abolition but also apply our minds to ques. of franchise*



E.H.

Feels discussion falls into two sections:

1. Item on the agenda and when this comes about might be an indication to it. Assuming no indication from Govt. that they will proceed with abolition between now and next Council meeting what do we do. Seems that majority feel we must not simply oppose abolition. Does not think this Exec. can enunciate any specific proposals for franchise without endorsement from Council. Therefore feels Institute should frame statement which falls into three parts:
  - (a) real dissatisfaction with existing system
  - (b) attack any bill to abolish native representation without substituting anything better.
  - (c) re-iterate our conviction (we have Council resolution) putting on record Institute conviction that must have a policy where participation of all sections must be found.

Suggests that statement framed on these lines would meet the present situation if it arises.

Nye. Has been asking himself whether the Inst. is purely fact-finding or whether has more positive function. If latter feels grateful to Mr. Pollak for bringing us to reality. Feels E.H.'s recommendations will lead us to nothing if this issue does not come up before Parl. Must be prepared to state what we believe. Criticise SABRA for unrealistic policies of apartheid. Hopes will be more positive than in the past.

E.H. Had only dealt with abolition of Nat. Represen.

Second is - ~~There is~~ Concerns further definition of Inst. attitude Can only state ? what the Inst. really is. More and more bodies rely on Inst. to do fact finding analysis for them.

Question facing us is what do we do about the whole question of franchise. We <sup>are committed</sup> in general terms to the ? that there must be rights of citizenship given to all who qualify regardless of colour. Must settle down to the whole ? of what qualifications. Question has been raised as to question of protection of white minority. Therefore Research Committee has come back to study of government in multi-racial societies.

Would it be wise to take up one aspect, political only, and



presen it to Council meetings in Jan. Can we not set this on Exec. agenda in January ? Would you have this discussion debated in open Council ~~when~~ with members pressing. People have to speak to their constituents and may have ~~infix~~ inflammatory discussion.

Halpern. No mention of ~~infix~~ this topic in speech from throne.

Beinart. Institute has never issued positive statement.

Found Institute policy mainly in "Go forward in faith". Only point has been raised this morning is just what sort of franchise. Has taken part for some years in discussion on such a thing and it has all been pretty futile. Very difficult to formulate a franchise policy at this stage when you do not know what your society will be like. Has come to conclusion that it is a waste of time to study different franchise proposals. Can only state it in general terms. Would appeal to members of Institute to pay attention to matter on the Agenda i.e. abolition of representation and to pay attention to larger question at next Council meetings.

Mrs. Russell. Strongly in favour of stating that in default of what is better is prepared to accept status quo. Has been unfortunate thing for native people that they failed to take advantage of the second part of the Bill. Would have given them a status in the Provincial Council and helped them. In 1958 are worse off than would have been. If even unsatisfactory represen. taken away, Africans will find themselves even further back than before.

Mtimkulu. Believes situation of last 20 years has proved that African people really do not get anything and therefore statement that this representation will be better than nothing is not really true. Feels we have gone back ever since 1936.

Would be in favour of a statement, if it is issued urging extension of franchise. Would be better for the whole world to know that the Africans are not any better ~~than~~ off with this representation than without any representation at all. It is very fact that there is some representation that blinds people to the true fact of the situation that they have no impact at all on Govt. policy. Therefore if statement is made, would be simpler to indicate these facts ~~and~~ Should indicate that we do not represent African opinion which will be very divided. Those groups which have had something to gain will certainly not back the opinion of the Institute. Institute should not worry about



opinion. It should help Africans themselves to form their own opinions because it has necessary experience, background and training. Feels is best contribution Inst. can make.

McLarty Does not want Institute to be jockeyed into making a statement at wrong time or even a statement. Our attitude should be reformulated. Does not agree that present represen. is not benefitting African people at all. Although representatives of African people in Parl. have no ? in Parliament, have unremittingly put forward point of view of the public and have put it before the legislators

Feels more people are thinking bout this problem and more people and Inst. could help them. Should produce facts and information and formulate for discussion for their thinking. Should not tie ourselves to any one formula but should be a statement to show the African that ~~we~~ <sup>are</sup> thinking and put something before people of this country.

Statement in Go forward in faith. Resolution of Council in 1950.

Chairman. General agreement no statement now. Statement only issued if and when proposal is put forward regarding abolition & modification of present African political rights.

Apart from this two different points of view:

1. Existing form of repres. is useless & mischievous - gives wrong impression outside country. So I.R.R. should support abolition, but couple with it a statement system unsatisfactory & ineffective and demanding effective Non-European representation.
2. To deprive people of their rights without so much as a by your leave ..... and they and the Institute should not acquiesce in it and therefore for that reason it becomes necessary to make statement. The bill proposing to abolish this form of rep. should be ~~passed~~ <sup>opposed</sup> but at the same time should be made clear that Institute does not regard this as satisfactory form of ~~rep~~ representation.

In addition to second <sup>school</sup> ? of thought, is thought that Institute could now formulate and clarify its ? to political representation of non-European peoples generally. Is not directly on a point of whether we should issue a statement.

~~AGREED~~ NO STATEMENT UNLESS SITUATION ARISES BUT GPC MUST KNOW WHAT TO DO.

Those who indicate support for the view taking away present rights but statement unsatisfactory syst *em*.



AGREED STATEMENT SHOULD BE MADE OPPOSING IF NECESSARY.

Russell. Should also be statement on History.

AGREED MOLTENO SHOULD DO.

Next question: Should the Institute proceed to a formulation of policy of all groups.

Wollehim. Molteno wrote excellent article in Cape Times. Should form basis of discussion. Is also valuable suggestion that we should examine various forms of franchise which exist. ~~Sugx~~ Valuable report by Tredgold. Suggests G.P.C. should put up something for Exec. Committee at its next meeting.

Molteno. Means matter when Institute's franchise & constitutional policy should be referred to a sub-committee to be set up by G.P.C. and G.P.C. to decide whether there findings should be discussed at Council.

Question of the Institute's policy on the franchise construction(?) of S.A. be referred to sub-committee to be nominated by G.P.C., such Committee to report at the next meeting of the Exec. That the question of whether this subject be placed on the Agenda ~~wxxx~~ of the Council would be left to the G.P.C.

A.W.H. Feels it will be time to issue re-iteration of our policy of "Go Forward in faith" at the next Council meeting.

Mr. Wollehims suggestion AGREED TO.

AGREED THAT IN ANY EVENT, COUNCIL MEETING SHOULD BE ASKED TO REAFFIRM INSTITUTE POLICY AS OUTLINED IN PAMPHLET GO FORWARD IN FAITH.



**Collection Number: AD1715**

**SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS (SAIRR), 1892-1974**

**PUBLISHER:**

*Collection Funder:- Atlantic Philanthropies Foundation*

*Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive*

*Location:- Johannesburg*

©2013

**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 the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.