

AN INTERVIEW WITH TODD

Our Salisbury Correspondent, Mr. Denis Grundy, approached Sir Roy Welensky, the Federal Prime Minister, and the Hon. R. S. Garfield Todd, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia 1954-58 and present Southern Rhodesian Leader of the Central Africa Party, with the following questionnaire. Sir Roy refused to reply. The answers of Mr. Todd appear below.

1. **Does Mr. Todd consider the prospects of the Federation—three disparate States of which two are constitutionally bound to the direct rule of the British Crown as long as the majority of their inhabitants wish—more sanguine than sanguinary?**

I consider that the prospects of the Federation are hopeful rather than fearful. It is in the best interests of all the people that the Federation should succeed. Seven million people wish to lead a happy and prosperous life, and the fact that there are differences between the races and between individuals within each racial group does not make it impossible to establish a wider unity based upon a firm foundation of mutual respect. If, however, any one racial group holds that success means dominance for its group, with demands for exclusive rights in the political or economic life of the country, and pursues this attitude with sufficient strength and determination, then the Federation may well disintegrate. As we know that there are significant numbers of people from each racial group who recognize the desirability of working together, of giving honour to individuals for their qualities regardless of their colour, then there is hope.

2. **If the above position is acknowledged, what form or degree of enhanced status does Mr. Todd think the Federation is likely to achieve at the 1960 talks with the British Government?**

The Federal system allows for wide latitude in an approach to government. No two federal systems are identical, and each is designed in such a way as to make it able to deal with the problems peculiar to its own circumstances. In our case we have to concern ourselves with three States that are very different in their degree of political and constitutional advancement, in their levels of economy and in their racial structure. Under the terms of the Federal Constitution, each of the three States can look

forward to governing itself in so far as all territorial matters are concerned. By general agreement, a substantial proportion of the powers of government have been given to the Federal authority, which deals with such subjects as defence, public health, control of imports and exports, railways and meteorology, for the whole Federation. On the other hand, there are differences of attitude regarding some responsibilities, as to whether they should be Federal subjects or territorial ones. For example, while Southern Rhodesia agreed that the Federal Government should be responsible for National Parks, Northern Rhodesia was not prepared to relinquish control over her own. Under our Federal Constitution, it is possible to reconsider the divisions of responsibility and authority as between a State and the Federal Government, and the Constitution provides that, "Not less than seven or more than nine years from the date of the coming into force of this Constitution, there shall be convened a conference consisting of delegations from the Federation, from each of the three territories and from the United Kingdom, chosen by their respective governments, for the purpose of reviewing this Constitution". I hold that we should now give the most serious consideration to the desire of many Nyasaland Africans to break away from the Federation, a happening which might well lead to a similar demand from Northern Rhodesia and which could, in turn, drive Southern Rhodesia to seek admittance to the Union of South Africa.

In considering this desire for self-government for Nyasaland, it might be found desirable to restore to the State many of the functions of government which are now Federal, such changes to be made after full discussion and agreement between the Federal Government and the self-governing State of Nyasaland. At the 1960 Conference it will be necessary to consider a timetable for the grant of self-government to Northern Rhodesia and to Nyasaland within the Federation. If in 1960 it were agreed that Northern Rhodesia would become self-governing in 1965, she might be assured that at that date a full revision of the division of powers of government as between herself and the Federal Government would be made. A similar procedure would take place for Nyasaland if it were decided that she would be given self-government in, say, 1970. In suggesting the dates of 1965 and 1970 for Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland respectively, I hold that these dates will arrive before a desirable degree of maturity will be in evidence; but I am afraid that, as far as

Nyasaland is concerned, self-government will have to be granted earlier than 1970. As soon as the United Kingdom Government has assisted these two territories to their new positions as self-governing States, with agreement reached on what responsibilities of government will be transferred from the Federal sphere back to the Territorial sphere, then the United Kingdom should withdraw from this part of Africa.

If, for reasons of national pride, responsibilities of government were unwisely claimed by the new States, it would be hoped that the new Governments would soon learn by experience, and before too much harm had been done, that such responsibilities could be better shouldered by the Federal Government itself and that they would be returned. On the other hand, it might well be found that some subjects such as Public Health, which is now a Federal matter, can best be carried out by the State. Where changes of this type were to be made, appropriate financial adjustments would accompany them. A plan such as this would secure full status for the Federation and make it a self-governing nation within our Commonwealth by 1970 at the latest.

3. Should the outcome of the 1960 talks prove unsatisfactory, would Mr. Todd conceivably favour a merger between Southern Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa?

In 1923 Southern Rhodesia rejected a proposal that she should become of province of the Union of South Africa. There are far stronger reasons today why she should not wish to join a neighbour which moves towards the establishment of a republic, and which has a second official language. It is by no means sure either, that South Africa would wish to have us as a province. A large proportion of our European population would object very strongly to a move in this direction, and they would be joined in their objection by the great majority of our two and a half million Africans and our Coloured people and Asians. A Nationalist Government would ask its own terms and no one could object to that, but I cannot believe that the terms offered would satisfy more than a small percentage of our total population. In 1923 the European electorate made the decision; but if the proposal were to be made at this time, I believe that the whole population would have to be consulted and its consent obtained. In 1953 it was found desirable to broaden the economic

basis of the economy of Southern Rhodesia and a decision was made to turn to the north, not to the south, and we are now challenged to make a success of the Federation. As this question has been put to me personally, I would answer that under no circumstances would I favour a merger. If there are enough people who feel as I do, then we have no option but to make a success of 1960 and the years beyond also.

4. Bearing in mind that Her Majesty the Queen is not sovereign of the Indian Republic, does Mr. Todd consider that a unilateral declaration of a Rhodesian Republic could be made without breaking constitutional ties with the British throne and the Commonwealth?

If the Federal Government, by unilateral action, declared itself a republic, it would set itself against Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and would be refusing Her Majesty the Queen the right to continue to carry out her responsibilities in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Such action would be condemned by the whole Commonwealth, with perhaps one exception, and I believe that our defiance of Her Majesty's Government and our refusal to permit Her Majesty to carry out her responsibilities to about four millions of her subjects would mean that we would be excluded from the Commonwealth. The self-governing countries of the Commonwealth are today most seriously concerned with the situation in Central Africa for, with only one exception, they believe that racial policies are not in harmony with the spirit of the Commonwealth.

5. Does Mr. Todd endorse the political principle that "government should be with the consent of the governed"?

I believe that government should not only be with the consent of the governed, but that eventually it *must be* with the consent of the governed. This consent may be a consent of acquiescence, as it has been in Southern Rhodesia for many years; but those who believe that as long as Europeans control the Federal elections and therefore the government and the army, they will remain happily in control of the situation, are deluding themselves. If seven million African people, although they have no vote, decide that they will not be governed by a European

government, then the situation could be made quite untenable and the resolving of it would only be a matter of time. I believe that in the case of our Federation, taking world influences into consideration, the time would be short.

6. Would Mr. Todd care to comment on the published views of the Dean of Salisbury that the blame for the emergency must be laid firmly at the feet of the Europeans?

I would rather say that the responsibility today lies with the European, for we have the power in government and as a people we have provided most of the leaders so far. The situation today calls for wise and sympathetic leadership, and the challenge is for us to provide it. If we allow the Federation to fail, then we are blameworthy. Of course we are to blame to a large extent for the mistakes of the past five years, for we have not succeeded in implementing the policy of partnership, simply because we have refused to face its implications.

7. In contrast with those of Southern and Northern Rhodesia, the Federal franchise at present virtually excludes the African from casting a vote in an ordinary constituency. Does Mr. Todd consider this inequitable?

I made my protest against the provisions of the Federal Electoral Act at the time it was considered in Parliament. It is true that there are African representatives in the Federal House, but it is also true that such special representation is not considered satisfactory by the African people themselves. Although it is estimated that 80,000 Africans could have registered on the "B" roll, fewer than 800 had done so at the time of the Federal election last year. In Northern Rhodesia the new electoral law has been gladly received by the African people, and 8,000 people registered in a short space of time. In Southern Rhodesia the response has been much less satisfactory, but the main difference between the two situations is that the Northern Rhodesia Government used its influence to encourage people to enrol, while in Southern Rhodesia no such encouragement is given. The Federal Government did try, by quite widespread propaganda, to persuade Africans to register on the "B" roll, but the "B" vote is recognized by Africans as being so inferior in

value to the "A" vote that they are not prepared to exercise their rights in this regard. I believe that the Federal franchise law is the largest single road-block on the way to partnership. It is a great pity that the Federal Government did not tackle its franchise problem in the light of the Tredgold Report, for it will now almost certainly be an item on the agenda at the 1960 talks and I do not believe that it is best considered at such a Conference.

8. At the Northern Rhodesia elections last March the African vote for candidates of the United Federal Party was almost negligible. What significance does Mr. Todd attach to this?

The United Federal Party, largely because of its Federal section, has become synonymous, in the minds of Africans, with a doctrine of European supremacy. The last Federal election was simply a call by the United Federal Party for support for a Government which promised to secure dominion status on the present almost entirely European Federal franchise. The Federal Party had already shown that it could persuade Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to accept a Federal franchise law which was quite unacceptable to Africans. This law discriminated against Africans who were educated and responsible citizens and who wished to exercise their influence in government but who did not qualify on economic grounds. A large proportion of these people felt doubly aggrieved because, as teachers, medical orderlies, agricultural demonstrators, they were employees of one Government or another and their salaries were too small to allow them to qualify for the vote which they believed they were entitled to exercise. No Government which takes such action is likely to gain the confidence of this, the most important political group amongst the African people. The influence of this group is widespread and very great; and as the Northern and Southern Rhodesian sections of the Federal Party are so closely linked to the Federal section of the Party, they both share in the lack of confidence by the African people.

9. In furthering the advancement of the African in public services and private industry, does Mr. Todd think that the principle of the "rate for the job" should be rigorously applied?

There is no doubt that when the "rate for the job" can be applied rigorously, the Federation will be in a very much sounder position economically than it is today. Wealth cannot be created by legislation, however, and the economic growth of the country and the improvement of pay and conditions will have to march hand in hand. I believe that the conditions of pay and service which have been won by European craftsmen should be rigorously maintained, and that as other jobs can be shown to be worth higher rates of pay, these should be given. Now that the Industrial Conciliation Act has been passed, all workers will be able to concern themselves with the widest interests of labour. The last employer which will be able to come into line will be government itself. In Southern Rhodesia, if the present European rates of pay were applied to African school teachers, grade for grade, the wages bill would probably exceed £7,000,000 per annum, and with other costs in education the total account for African education would consume almost half of the total annual revenue. There will have to be a much greater domestic output before the principle of the rate for the job can be rigorously applied. It is to be hoped that the period of adjustment will be as short as possible, and during that time the present rates as applied to Europeans should be given to people of any race when they come to the same bench, desk or footplate.

10. Would Mr. Todd favour legislation, Territorial or Federal, that enabled local authorities to set aside areas for unfettered non-racial occupation, residential, industrial and commercial?

I would favour legislation to free the whole of the commercial and industrial areas of towns from racially restrictive clauses immediately, and I believe that it would be a sound policy to set aside "open" residential areas, but with sound town-planning policies including minimum-value building clauses.