

P.O.Box 81,
Alice, C.P.,
17-2-60.

Mr P.A. Moore, M.P.,
House of Assembly,
Cape Town.

Dear Mr Moore,

I am informed by Prof. Burrows, now at Rhodes University, that you require certain information in regard to the way in which the Government dealt with those members of staff who were dismissed and those who resigned from Fort Hare last year. It seemed to me from the information he gave me over the phone that there appeared to be a certain amount of misunderstanding as to what happened, especially in my case.

As you know those who resigned were dealt with in terms of section 3(1) of the Act, and those who were dismissed in terms of section 3(4). The practical result of that, from the point of view of the Pensions Department, was that those who had resigned were paid what stood to their credit in the Provident Fund to which they were contributing, i.e. their own contributions plus the Council's contribution plus the Government's contribution plus interest, but they had to forfeit the annuity or gratuity to which they might have been entitled if they had stayed on. In my own case, for example, I had standing to my credit in the Provident Fund an amount of £3272 which was paid to me by the Pensions Department, but as a representative of the Pensions Department explained to me, if I had ^{stayed} on for the remainder of my time at Fort Hare, namely, two years, I would have qualified for ^{an} annuity of £550 or a gratuity of £550 times 12 which is the factor which would have been applied in my case. That is what I had to forfeit because I felt I could not carry on under the Bantu Education Department.

On the other hand in the case of the dismissed people, they were paid not only what stood to their credit in the Fund, but also an annuity or gratuity depending upon what they chose to accept.

The result of course is that some of the dismissed people with a much shorter service than those who resigned did much better financially than those who resigned on grounds of conscience. We do not grudge the dismissed people the benefits which they received, but it does seem anomalous that people who had rendered meritorious service to the College for many years should be penalised in this way.

The outgoing Council made representations to the Department of Education, Arts and Science on behalf of those who had resigned, but I do not know what the results of those representations have been. Although I say so, it seems to me that in the case, at least, of a person like myself who had served the College for 24 years and was within two years of my retirement, a case can be made out for special consideration. I know that I am not persona grata with the present Government, but that is no reason why I should be denied benefits which I have actually earned.

Yours sincerely,

J. K. Mitchell