

ATHLONE ADVICE OFFICE

Annual Report presented to Conference

By R. V. ROBB

The number of cases interviewed during twelve months was 3,094 divided into the following categories:—

Men endorsed out	341
Women endorsed out	389
Miscellaneous cases	701
Old cases returned	1,636
Total number of interviews for year	3,094
Total number of new cases	1,458

We now have approximately 10,052 authenticated cases in our files which are available for research purposes.

1. **WORKERS:** The office is staffed by approximately 30 volunteers, one paid organiser, two paid interpreters and one interpreter loaned from the S.A. Institute of Race Relations twice weekly. We are greatly indebted to these loyal, conscientious and unselfish people without whose tireless work it would be impossible to run this office.

2. VISITORS: Local	38
Overseas	381
Total	419

We are very disappointed that so few Members of Parliament, City and Divisional Councillors, and people directly concerned with employment of Africans, have visited this office which has so much information concerning the effects of Influx Control which should be of vital interest to them.

3. Our work continues to be seriously hampered by the reluctance of officials of the Department of Bantu Administration, City and Divisional Councils to grant us interviews.

We are however grateful that we are courteously treated when we telephone these officials to ask them to interview cases in which special new information has been obtained by this office.

4. **LEGAL CASES:** Since September 1965 our attorneys have handled 47 cases of which 30 were those of men or women who have been endorsed out under circumstances which the lawyers have felt merited an appeal to the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner. We have helped these people to assemble proof of more than 15 years continuous residence in one area — a painstaking matter of collecting rent receipts, entries in Savings Bank books, hospital cards, birth

certificates of children born in the area, vaccination certificates or notices concerning vaccination, marriage certificates — anything at all which will help to complete the jigsaw puzzle which will finally prove 15 years continuous residence in one area. In many cases these appeals have failed because they should have been lodged within seven days of the endorsement out — long before we first interviewed the case. The Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner appears to decide these cases on the evidence from their records produced by the Municipal or Divisional offices concerned rather than on the affidavits and other evidence supplied by the attorney.

Appeals lodged with Chief Bantu Affairs

Commissioner	30
Appeals upheld by Chief Bantu Affairs	
Commissioner	3
Appeals dismissed by Chief Bantu Affairs	
Commissioner	19
Appeals pending by Chief Bantu Affairs	
Commissioner	8
Cases defended in court	10
Cases won in court	4
Cases lost in court	3
Cases pending in court	1

Sometimes having an African defended in court is the only way of helping him to get his papers in order. See case 1.

In 4 cases after the appeal to the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner had been dismissed the African concerned was arrested and charged with being in the area illegally. We arranged for these cases to be defended by the attorney through whom they had appealed in the first case. 3 of these cases were won or withdrawn and the defendants were allowed to remain in the area. See cases 2 and 3. However we have now been informed that, as a result of a judgment given by Justice Corbett on August 4th, 1965, in the case of HOUGHTON HLAHLANE, no African who did not register within 72 hours of 24th June, 1952 will be deemed to have resided there previous to that date. This means that even if an African can prove that he has resided in one area since 1950, residence before June 24th, 1952 is disregarded unless he registered within 72 hours of that date, and only residence after the date on which he registered is counted as legal. See case 4.

Very few women, if any, registered within 72 hours of June 24th, 1952, in fact it seems doubtful whether women were registered before 1954. There seems very little chance of any African woman being able to prove that she qualifies under Section 10(1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act — even when she can prove that she has lived here continuously for 20 years.

There have been several cases lately of Africans who have been arrested for failure to produce their reference books on demand. Their books were in order but all were found guilty and sentenced to R1 or seven days. It has several times been officially stated that Africans will be given a chance of producing their reference books within a certain period and would not be arrested unless they failed to do so. It would appear that this undertaking has not always been honoured. Two of our workers visited the Observatory court on 25th August. Several men had been arrested on the same charge — failure to produce their reference books on demand. Their books were in order but they were all found guilty and sentenced to R1 or seven days. See case 5.

5. WIVES OF QUALIFIED MEN ENDORSED OUT: We have had many cases of women who have proof of legal marriage to men who qualify under Section 10(1)(a) or (b) of the Urban Areas Act, who have been endorsed out after many years of residence with their husbands on the grounds that they have not "entered the area legally" in the first place, or that they have not "ordinarily resided" with their husbands. In one of these cases the couple were married in 1954 and lived together until 1962 when the wife was sent to Zwelitsha because her husband was not yet a qualified man. Now he is qualified but she may not remain with him for longer than a few months visit because it is said that she does not normally reside with him. In 12 years of marriage they have only been separated for three years and that because she was sent away and re-settled, alone, in Zwelitsha. See case 6.

6. LEAVE IN EXCESS OF SIX MONTHS: We have had several cases in which an African employee has returned to Cape Town to work for his previous employer after a period of unpaid leave of more than six months only to be refused permission to return to his previous employer and endorsed straight back to the Transkei. Although such workers cannot legally be refused permission to return to their previous employer within 12 months, they have to obtain this permission before leaving the Transkei if they have been away for more than six months and have to be freshly recruited again on Form B.A.403.

This of course means a delay of weeks or months and we therefore urge all employers of Africans to impress upon them that although they are entitled to up to six months unpaid

leave, after which they may automatically return without permission to their previous employer, if they overstay their leave even by a few days they will lose their right to work in Cape Town other than as a contract worker — they will lose their exemption under 10(1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act and they will break their period of continuity and will never be able to qualify as a result of 10 years service with one employer or 15 years continuous service in one area. They should be urged to return within six months at all costs if they intend to return at all.

We received from Langa a circular letter which has been sent to employers of African labour. It deals with Service Contracts for Bantu Employees and draws attention to the procedure in connection with leave:—

"City of Cape Town.

Bantu Administration Branch: Langa.

Sir/Madam,

re: Service Contracts: Bantu Employees.

The procedure in connection with leave for your Bantu employees may not be quite clear to you and your attention is drawn to the following when granting leave to your Bantu employees.

(a) Bantu under contract are entitled to the statutory period of leave only, and when the contract expires, must be discharged and returned to his home. Should you desire to extend this contract, you will have to apply to this office at least one month prior to the date of expiration of the contract. An extension will only be granted once and that for a period not exceeding an additional 12 months.

No contract labourer may return to his previous employer unless application is made on Form B.A.403, obtainable at this office, which will only be effective on production of a certificate from the Department of Labour, Cape Town, certifying that no Coloured Labour is available.

Your attention is drawn to the fact that all Bantu recruited under contract must leave for their home town on expiration of such contract, failing which prosecution can be instituted against the employer.

(b) Bantu employees not under contract may be granted six (6) months leave. Your co-operation is desired in this matter and you are called upon to endorse the period of leave granted in his Reference Book and you are requested not to sign him off. You must also endorse the period of leave granted on your portion of the Service Contract Card (B.A.1004/Annexure "M") return same to this office within three (3) days. Your Bantu employee can then proceed on leave and return to you via this Department, within six (6) months, and on return he should be re-registered in your employ. Should your Bantu

employee wish to be allowed a period of leave in excess of six months, he should be discharged and informed that he cannot return to your employ unless recruited on Form B.A.403, which must be completed at this office. No deposit is required from you when a Bantu employee returns to your employ within a period of 12 months of discharge.

(c) In the case of a Bantu employee, other than those granted 6 months leave, he must report to his home town Bantu Affairs Commissioner before returning to your employ. This is to enable such Commissioner to endorse his Reference Book accordingly.

Yours faithfully,

MUNICIPAL LABOUR OFFICER."

See cases 7, 8, 9 and 10.

7. BREAKING OF CONTRACTS BY EMPLOYER: We have had several cases in which an employee has been dismissed by the firm to which he was contracted, several months before the contract was up. While investigating these we have come across the fact that engineering firms, regarding their work as "specialised" have a clause in their contracts which enables the employer or employee to break the contract at two hours notice if the work done is not satisfactory. In one case the employee states that he was injured at work and was signed off when he reported the fact, while the employer contends that the man left of his own accord. There seems to be a great need for a body who will investigate all cases of this kind on behalf of the employee. At present the latter is entirely at the mercy of his employer.

We now have had 178 cases in which the employer has apparently broken his contract with his employee who appears to have no redress. In some of these cases the employer has been persuaded to re-employ the employee until the contract has expired.

While fully realising that the employer may, in each of these 178 cases, have had very good reasons for breaking the contract with his employee, it seems to us quite wrong that the latter should have little or no chance of disputing the decision to end the contract. In all these cases the employee felt wronged by the breaking of the contract, and was not in agreement with his employer's decision to do so. It must be realised that although the employer pays R15 when he applies for a contract worker, this money and the worker's return fare are deducted from his wages, so that if he returns home before his contract is up he has paid his fare both ways and has had no chance of saving any money which was his only reason for coming to the area to work on a year's contract, renewable for a further year.

8. NEW RULING CONCERNING AMALGAMATION OF TWO FIRMS: We have been informed by a Langa official that the Department of Bantu Affairs has ruled that if two firms amalgamate, or if a firm changes hands, any service with the first firm is disregarded, i.e. a man who works eight years with a firm and two years with the new firm which has taken over the first firm, cannot be said to qualify under Section 10 (1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act. He must work 10 years with the new firm and his eight years with the old firm count for nothing. See case 11.

9. SIMON'S TOWN REMOVAL: When the Government decided to move 1,600 Africans living in Luyolo location, Simon's Town, to Guguletu township, an assurance was given that they would be moved *in toto*, as family units. This was done from September 1965 but since then we have had 18 cases of families who were given brick houses in Guguletu at that time but who have since been told to leave the house, the wife to go up country and the husband to move to bachelor quarters. This because, on further screening, the women did not qualify to remain, either because the husbands did not qualify or because the wives were said not to have "ordinarily resided" with their qualified husbands. See cases 12 and 13.

10. T.B. SCREENING: A number of men who have been treated for T.B. are being sent home. They are told they cannot be granted disability grants in Cape Town but must get them in their home district. They are offered rail warrants for themselves and their families. The grant is very small. These sick men have to return to the Transkei with their families and support them on this meagre allowance. The grants can take six to eight months to come through and in the meantime they have nothing to live on.

SANTA has limited funds and can only help those cases that are allowed to stay here. The same applies to the Board of Aid. If a man has been endorsed out, they cannot assist him.

If an African has been declared a T.B. and cannot for any *good* reason be treated here, should he not be sent to the hospital or clinic where he is to be treated under escort so that he or she does not (if infective):—

- (a) Infect others in the railway carriage or bus;
- (b) Return to his home district and there remain untreated, thereby infecting his family and many others;
- (c) Go to another Urban area and infect many people before he is again discovered?

We have had reports that all new workers arriving at Langa and Nyanga East are having chest X-rays on arrival. This is very necessary in order to ensure that they do not suffer from T.B. and so infect other people with the disease

— especially among the overcrowded conditions in the locations. It is, however, very difficult for a breadwinner who has paid his own railway fare to return after leave to his former employer. If he is found to have T.B. he is endorsed back to the Transkei. Having been on leave he has no money. On his return to the Transkei he can apply for a T.B. grant which can take up to 6-8 months to come through. In the meantime he has no support for his wife and family. Would it not be possible for all men proceeding to work to be X-rayed at their place of departure and, if found to have T.B., arrangements are then made on the spot for support of the family and for treatment? See case 14.

11. WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION: Any spare time which the workers have had, and a great deal of Mrs. Parks' free time, has been spent in trying to trace Africans who are owed money under the Workman's Compensation Act but who have disappeared. Many letters have been written to firms — out of 36 letters written to employers during March we had 21 replies. We have also written to Bantu Affairs Commissioners in the Transkei and Ciskei asking them to help us trace some of these Africans. One of these is owed R693.00 but the Bantu Affairs Commissioner concerned is unable to trace the widow concerned.

CASES

1. E.V. was born in Bellville in 1948 and started work in Nyanga in January 1965. His employer cancelled his registration as her employee, without telling him, but continued to employ him.

On 1st September 1966 he was arrested and charged under Section 10(1)(4). He was defended by an attorney and was acquitted on September 20th and it was declared that he qualified under Section 10(1)(a) of the Urban Areas Act. The attorney then wrote to the Registration office at Nyanga asking them to see that he obtained suitable employment.

This boy was living with his mother who has an exemption stamp—his father is dead—and he was on her rent card. If he had not been well defended he would have served a sentence for working in the area illegally. He had already been fined R14 or 12 days for this on 21st July, 1966, and his papers were still not in order when he was re-arrested in September, although his mother had made many attempts to see that his reference book was put in order.

2. M.S. was discharged from her job on 17th November, 1965 having worked there since 24th February, 1960 and on reporting the fact to Langa Registration Office was given R10.81 repatriation money, and told to go home. She stated that she had lived here continuously since 1945, was married by tribal custom in 1949 to

W.S. who is a qualified man with a shop in Guguletu. He, however, left her in 1957 and took another wife whom he married by civil rites.

Through her attorney she appealed to the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner against her endorsement out on the grounds that she had lived in the area legally since 1945. She collected birth certificates of children born in Cape Town, Post Office Savings books containing evidence of deposits made in most of the years between 1947 and 1965, and a notification addressed to her by the District Registrar of Births requiring her to have her child vaccinated in November 1950. This appeal was not successful.

When she was later arrested and charged with being in the area illegally she was defended by an attorney who, with the aid of all these documents, was able to prove that she had resided legally in this area since 1950, and therefore qualifies under Section 10(1)(b) to remain here. She is now the proud possessor of a stamp to this effect in her reference book.

This case emphasises how important it is to produce documentary evidence in support of verbal evidence — in the end the case hinged on the production of the notice date November 1950 requiring her child to be vaccinated.

3. M.T. was born in Kensington on 4th June, 1927 but left the area in 1940 and went to live at Queenstown, and only returned in 1962, since when she has been here legally on endless extensions although endorsed out on 13th November, 1963. She was married to M.S. in November 1964 in the United Mission Church of S.A. in Nyanga.

Her husband came here on October 10th, 1939 and had worked here ever since and therefore qualifies under Section 10(1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act (Act 25 of 1945).

Through an attorney she appealed to the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner against her endorsement out on the grounds that she is the legal wife of a qualified man with whom she lives, with permission, and has done so since her marriage on 1st October, 1964.

This appeal was turned down. She was later charged under Section 10(4) of the Urban Areas Act but was acquitted as the State was unable to show that she had not normally resided with her legal husband who, it transpired, qualified under Section 10(1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act. We are hoping that she will now be allowed to remain with her husband and be given a house as at present there are 15 living in the house where they lodge.

4. M.D. was born in Touws River in 1947 and entered Cape Town with her parents in 1959 when her father, who works for the S.A.R., was transferred to Cape Town. She has never left the area since.

In 1961 she married A.D. in the Moravian Church, Langa. They have had three children, all born at the Somerset Hospital — Regina born 5th October, 1963; Mabel born 29th September, 1962; and Joyce who died 15th February 1966. (Birth certificates and Joyce's death certificate, seen).

Her husband entered the Cape Town area in 1949 and has references from January 1951 to 1958 during which period he worked for the X Hotel. His current Reference book shows the rest of the residence in this area to be legal and his employment continuous.

This unfortunate husband has never been allowed to live with his wife — he lived in the Zones and she with her parents in Guguletu in a "pondok". M's father is a S.A.R. & H. pensioner now and is to be re-settled and the Department of Bantu Affairs have decided that M. must be re-settled with him.

An appeal against this decision was lodged with the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner through an attorney, but this was dismissed on the grounds that M. does not qualify under Section 10(1) of the Urban Areas Act. She was arrested and charged with being illegally in the Cape Town area. She was ably defended but the case was lost because her husband A. — although he was able to prove that he was legally employed by the X Hotel from 1951 — did not register within 72 hours of June 24th, 1952. (Promulgation of Section 10, Act 25 of 1945). Therefore she was not the legal wife of a qualified man.

This case hinges on a judgment given by Justice Corbett on 4th August, 1965 in the case of Houghton Hlahlane i.e. proof of continuous residence in one area, prior to 24th June, 1952, is of no legal significance, unless the African has registered within 72 hours of that date. His period of continuous legal residence dates from the date he registered, which in this case was 1954. He was too young to register when he arrived in 1949 but should have done so within 72 hours of 24th June, 1952 in which case his previous residence since 1949 would have been accepted as legal.

5. S.M. was arrested on 10th August, 1966 in Guguletu for not being in possession of a reference book. This arrest was reported to us, and we telephoned the station commander at Guguletu and asked whether S. was not to be allowed time in which to produce his reference book. He replied that he would have ordered S's immediate release, but that he had already been charged and would have to appear in court the next day. He thought that if he appeared with his reference book, and it was in order, he would probably be found not guilty. S. was found guilty and fined R4 or 15 days (despite the fact that his reference book was in order, and he produced it in court).

6. V.S. was born in Adelaide and first entered Cape Town in 1950. She married G.S. on 3rd April, 1954 in Langa Congregational Church. Her husband had entered the area in 1948 and has worked at the Y Hospital since 21st February, 1955. (He therefore qualifies under Section 10(1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act, having worked for 10 years for one employer).

They lived together with permission, from their marriage in 1954 until September 1962, when V. was re-settled in Zwelitsha because at that time G. was not yet a qualified man.

She has twice returned to Cape Town on a visit with permission, and since her second visit in March 1966 endless efforts have been made by them without success, to obtain permission to live together in Cape Town. This has not been granted because V. is said not to have "normally resided" with him, despite the fact that in 12 years of marriage they have only lived apart for three years and this was because she was sent away and re-settled, alone with her four children, in Zwelitsha. She had eight months in a hospital here in 1957 and several months in Kingwilliamstown, during which time she lost her house in Zwelitsha.

7. W.M. first entered the area in 1950 and had worked here continuously ever since, only leaving it for short periods of leave.

He was granted seven months leave late in 1965 and on returning within this period earlier this year he was refused permission to return to his job. Because the period of leave granted exceeded six months, he had lost the automatic right to return to his previous employer within one year — which right existed in 1965. His employers were most anxious to re-employ him and after enormous effort on their part the Bantu Affairs Department finally permitted him to return to his previous job because he was able to prove continuous residence in this area since 1950.

8. J.T. first entered the Cape Town area in 1940 and has worked for the same firm ever since then, leaving the area for short periods of leave. On 14th September, 1965 he was granted eight months leave and reported back on June 1st, 1966 — two weeks over his eight months. On reporting back to the authorities he was endorsed out. While he was away new legislation had been enforced limiting leave to six months, and although he was qualified under Section 10(1)(b) he should have been applied for under a fresh contract. Permission to return would not have been refused because he had not been away for 12 months, but he would have come back as a contract worker, and lost all his rights as a qualified man. J. was therefore told by the Bantu Affairs Department that he would have to go home and return on contract — if his firm still wished to re-employ him. He first approached us on 1st June, 1966 and after 16 days involving

telephone calls, many interviews and letters etc. and a great deal of help from his employer, J. was allowed to return to his previous job and has not lost his precious qualification under Section 10(1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act.

9. V.N. born 1929. First entered Cape Town 1948. (No concrete evidence of being a qualified man). 1 year break in 1955.

On October 1st, 1965 he went home on six month's leave with permission from his firm. He returned on 11th April, 1966 reported to Langa and returned to his previous employer. It was only when he went to Langa on 31st August, 1966 to apply for his wife to visit him, that he was told he was now a contract worker. Without his realising it his book had been stamped "12.4.66 service contract valid until 11.10.66". He had returned eleven days over his six months, unaware of the new regulation.

10. M.C. first entered Cape Town in 1954. This man was granted 11 months leave by his employer, endorsed in his book and dated 2nd September, 1965. He returned to Cape Town with permission from Umtata dated 25.7.66. Reported to Langa on 11th August, 1966 and was endorsed out. His employer appealed to Langa and the Department of Bantu Affairs on his behalf with no success. M. has now been sent home by his former employer, who has filled in all the papers for him to come down on contract.

11. Mr. and Mrs. R. Mrs. R. was born in Kimberley in 1929 and first entered the Cape Town area on October 15th, 1950. Officials now at Langa confirm this. She was married to Mr. R. in 1957 and has four children all born in Cape Town.

Mr. R., who was born in Thabanchu, had worked in Cape Town since 1952 for a steel firm, for eight years when it was taken over by another firm who continued to employ him for a further four years.

They lived in a temporary house at Guguletu from 1959 and when they applied for a permanent brick house in February 1965 Mrs. R. was told she must return to Thabanchu, where she had never even been.

When this case first came to our notice in October 1965, Mr. R's employer had already appealed on their behalf to the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner on the grounds that he had worked for the same firm for more than ten years and therefore qualified under Section 10(1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act and was therefore entitled to permanent housing with his legal wife and family. It was decided that because this firm had only taken over the other firm four years ago Mr. R's previous eight years service with the firm were discounted.

An appeal was then made on Mrs. R's behalf

on the grounds that she qualified under Section 10(1)(b) of the Urban Areas Act as she had lived here continuously since 1950. This appeal was dismissed because she had not registered within 72 hours of June 24th, 1952, so her previous residence in Cape Town, though confirmed by Langa, was discounted. Mrs. R. and her four children are now living in Thabanchu where she had never been before, and Mr. R. is living in "bachelor" quarters at Langa, and is still working for his firm.

12. O.N. was born in 1929 in Mount Frere and her husband in the same place in 1927.

She first entered Cape Town in 1959 to join her husband who had come here in 1948. He has been employed by Simon's Town Dockyard continuously since April 1952. They lived at Luyolo location Simon's Town from 1959 until they were moved to Guguletu in 1965, where they were given a permanent brick house. The blow came in January 1964 when O. was ordered to leave Guguletu because she had originally come on a visit in 1959.

Her parents and his are all dead. He has land in Mount Frere but no home. His five children were all born in Cape Town. Through an attorney she appealed to the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner against her endorsement out on the grounds that she is the legal wife of a qualified man, who has lived with him with permission since 1959.

Her appeal has been dismissed, and although she has been granted several extensions while the appeal was pending, she has now been told that no further extensions will be granted.

13. D.T. and her husband W.T. were residing in Luyolo location, Simon's Town. She had a visitor's permit having come to Simon's Town in March 1964. They were moved to Guguletu, given a brick house and her permit to remain was extended to 31st January, 1966. W.T. has been in Simon's Town since 1955 and has worked at the Docks since 10th May, 1955 with a break of seven months in 1956 when he worked for another employer. He, therefore, does not qualify under the law to have his wife with him, or to have a house. However, a promise had been made that all Simon's Town families would be given housing and so they were housed.

On 1st October, 1965 she was called to the Registering Officer, Langa, and her permit to reside until 31st January, 1966 was cancelled and she was told to leave the area by 20th November, 1965. She appealed for an extension as her husband was ill and is only doing light duty. This was refused. On 2nd December, 1965 she was arrested. She appeared in court on 3rd December, 1965 and was fined R15 for being in the area illegally. The rent for the house in Guguletu has been paid up to 31st December, 1965.

14. J.S. has been in Cape Town since 1955. He was admitted to Brooklyn Chest Hospital in November 1964. He then left the hospital as he wanted to work to support his family. His T.B. flared up again and he is now being treated at the Clinic. He was, at last, on 28th October, 1965 awarded a disability grant and paid R10 in November but was told he would be repatriated to the Transkei. His reference book was stamped "awaiting repatriation" and valid until 30th December, 1965.

He applied for an extension but was refused. He was then arrested, locked up over the weekend and appeared in court on 6th December, 1965. He was found guilty of being in the area without permission and fined R15.

He was referred to the Department of Bantu Affairs where he was told that he was to be repatriated, but nothing has been done about extending his pass, to give him and his wife and child time to pack up and go. His grant will have to be transferred — which probably means a delay before he gets paid again.

CONTEMPT FOR HUMANITY?

There is a very real danger of our drifting into an attitude of contempt for humanity. We know full well that it would be very wrong, and that it would lead to the most sterile relation with our fellow men. Perhaps the following considerations will save us from this temptation. The trouble about it is that it lands us into the worst mistake of our enemies. The man who despises others can never hope to do anything with them. The faults we despise in others are always, to some extent at least, our own too. How often have we expected from others more than we are prepared to do ourselves! Why have we until now held such lofty views about human nature? Why have we not recognised its frailty and liability to temptation? We must form our estimate of men less from their achievements and failures, and more from their sufferings. The only profitable relationship to others — and especially to our weaker brethren — is one of love, that is the will to hold fellowship with them. Even God did not despise humanity, but became Man for man's sake.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer — *Letters and Paper from Prison.*

ALBERT VAN DE SANDT CENTLIVRES

It is with a deep sadness and a sense of irretrievable loss that the Black Sash records the death of ex-Chief Justice Albert van de Sandt Centlivres. In the annals of the Law he will long be remembered for his beliefs, oft stated, in the rule of law.

He was a man of great integrity, courage and sincerity, who never hesitated to give public expression to what he believed was right. He was a constant source of inspiration to all those who took courage from the example he set, and he will be sorely missed. Leo Marquard said of him, "He looked as if he was carved out of the living rock, and one felt that here was everything that was sane and civilised." He was, indeed, a pillar of society — steadfast, reliable and consistent in a world of wavering values.

His passing leaves us all the poorer, but we shall remember him and all that he stood for.

MARGARET JENKINS

The Black Sash records with deep sorrow the death of Margaret Jenkins. She was a foundation member of the Black Sash and an invaluable member of the Transvaal Regional committee for many years.

She was ill for some years but continued to come to meetings and to participate in our activities until a few weeks before her death.

She gave of herself generously. Her great courage, quiet sense of humour, incisive mind and wide experience were an inspiration to us all and of great value to all who were privileged to work with her.

We mourn her as a personal friend of many of us, and as a vital member of the Black Sash.