

British ships. His opponent concentrated his defence on competition from abroad, and on restrictive practices. He appealed to the unions to behave in a way more in line with contemporary conditions, but that did not inhibit Mr Hill from making a moving speech about the "hungry thirties."

Mr W. J. Carron of the Amalgamated Engineering Union spoke for the engineering unions: his case, weaker than Mr Hill's, was put with more ingenuity. He claimed that last year's low profits and production in engineering were due to Government policy rather than to any real fall in demand; and that the employers' federation wanted to keep wages down to protect its less efficient members, although higher wages are a stimulus to greater managerial efficiency. Mr Macarty, the employers' spokesman, said that this theory needed a whole court of enquiry to itself.

The inquiry ended discouragingly. The unions refused to agree that the employers should submit as evidence documents prepared by the unions about restrictive practices in shipbuilding; and the employers poured cold water on a suggestion by the unions that a central joint council should be set up to settle disputes and promote efficiency. Their spokesman said that their federation (like the unions' confederation) had only advisory functions. But at least the chairman, Professor Jack, coaxed both sides into abandoning their prepared briefs and engaging in free discussion. That was a step, perhaps, towards abandoning rigid attitudes—even if a small one.

RAILWAY PAY

Wisdom or Weakness?

THE British Transport Commission, which gave a 5 per cent increase in wages to the National Union of Railwaymen in return for certain undertakings about productivity, has decided to give the same increase to members of the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, even though their leaders refused to give the mild general assurances that were required. Was this wisdom or yet another familiar selling of the pass?

The commission at first said that it would withhold the increase from all the footplatemen, including those in the NUR, until the undertaking was given. But that, of course, brought them a visit from Mr Campbell of the NUR, who no doubt warned them of the fury that would have broken over his head if that had happened; about a quarter of the footplatemen belong to his union. There is also some suggestion that the commission was doubtful whether, having agreed to pay all members of the NUR 5 per cent, it was legally able to withhold the increase from some of them. Finally, the commission must certainly have wished to co-operate with Mr Campbell, who is emerging as a progressive man. In an article in *The Railway Review* he has just told his members

Our future depends in large degree on the contribution we make, both individually and collectively, to improving efficiency. What we put in is every bit as important as what we take out.

It would have been a pity to undermine the position of so enlightened a union leader. But was the only course to withhold the increase from the NUR as well?

Two courses suggest themselves, and both were apparently considered. One was to pay the increase to members of the NUR only. The main argument against this

course is that it would have set one union violently against the other. Their relations have often been bad, but this would have meant war—and the commission's hope of ever getting co-operation from ASLEF might have been the first casualty. The second possible course was to make an individual approach to the men, by putting the document promising co-operation about productivity in every pay packet, and paying the increase to all who would sign it. This course holds out evident attractions, especially to those who think that it would be a good thing to try to split the members of ASLEF from their present restrictively-minded leaders. But the men's loyalty to their union is probably strong.

So, in pursuit of better relations, the commission has given way; but not, the commission's apologists insist, in response to the bullying of ASLEF. It was Mr Campbell who won the ASLEF men their 5 per cent, and the commission is hoping that, remembering this fact, they will follow the practices of their mates in the NUR. The outsider can only say, very dubiously: "May the gamble come off."

SOUTH AFRICA

Apartheid in Practice

EVEN some of its supporters are wincing as apartheid is carried through to its logical conclusions. The two measures which the South African parliament is now in process of making law are both intended to minimise contact between the races, and both have caused disquiet in the country. The university bill which will eventually debar black or coloured students from Witwatersrand and Cape Town is being pushed through despite almost unanimous opposition from both universities. It provides that the new non-European colleges will be completely under the thumb of the minister of native affairs, Dr Verwoerd, who will vet the list of entrants and will appoint the teaching and administrative staff.

The other measure is the Native Laws Amendment Bill, a blanket stifling of free discussion between the races. In its original form the bill made it an offence to hold, without the minister's express consent, a mixed meeting in any church, club or institution erected after 1938. The church clause went a bit too far. The Anglican and Roman Catholic churches were up in arms threatening defiance, and even the Dutch Reformed Church (which has held that the untimely expression of Christian unity would harm the Kingdom of God) was disturbed. To keep the support of the Dutch church, the minister watered down his bill in such a manner that the responsibility for obedience falls on the African, not on the bishops. As amended the bill gives the minister and the local authority power to forbid a non-European to attend any gathering where his presence is considered a nuisance.

Although the church clause has caused the greatest furore in the country and in parliament, there are in fact not a great many churches built since 1938 where all races worship together. But the threat hanging over all mixed gatherings may cripple the few remaining liberal organisations in South Africa. The Institute of Race Relations may be debarred from using the hall it has just built in Johannesburg for inter-racial conferences, while the Liberal party, led by Mr Alan Paton, is wondering whether it can continue to exist. Black and white South African may soon find it impossible to meet as equals at all: in the words

