

GENERAL ELECTIONS IN THE CAPE COLONY,

1898 - 1908

by

ALAN JOHN CHARRINGTON SMITH

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in History at the University of Cape Town.

April 1980.

The University of Cape Town has been given
the right to reproduce this thesis in whole
or in part. Copyright is held by the author.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The financial assistance of the Human Sciences Research Council towards the costs of this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed or conclusions reached are those of the author and are not to be regarded as a reflection of the opinions and conclusions of the Human Sciences Research Council.

In the process of research, drafting and finalising this work I have received a considerable amount of assistance, advice and encouragement from a vast number of people. To each and every one of them I should like to extend my heartiest thanks.

A very special word of thanks is due to Professor A.M. Davey, my supervisor, Miss J.M.H. Melville, Mrs. C.M.H. Smith and the late Mrs. J. Black whose sustained interest helped me to find the perseverance to overcome the many problems I encountered.

I should also like to thank Professor C. Webb, Professor B.A. le Cordeur, Dr. C.C. Saunders, Miss E.B. van Heyningen of the History Department and Dr. R. Schrire of the Political Science Department for their advice in the early stages of my labours on this thesis, while I must also express my appreciation to the staffs of the Main Jagger Library, the Leslie Extension Library, the Africana and Special Collections Department, the Menzies Library, the Cape Times Library, the Cape Archives Depot and the South African Library for their friendliness, efficiency and helpfulness.

Finally, I should like to express my gratitude to Mrs. L.J. Rumbelow and Miss A. Collins for typing my thesis.

PREFACE

A history of parliamentary general elections can be approached in a number of different ways, but this work concentrates its attention on the results of the voting in the elections. For that reason, the Corpus has been divided into two parts. The first part deals with party politics and the elections, while the second part is devoted to the systems of voting in the upper and lower house elections, the distribution of seats in the two houses of parliament, an analysis of the results of the voting in the elections and the trends in voter-support for the two major parties.

The principle aim of the thesis is to provide an insight into the birth and the initial development of two-party elections in South Africa. Although the Cape Colony was only one of four British colonies which formed the Union in 1910, it was the first to evolve a system of two-party politics, and the six parliamentary general elections in the Cape Colony between 1898 and 1908 illustrate the origin and early evolution of two-party elections in South Africa.

Considerable problems were encountered because the political parties in the Cape Colony were less rigid than their counterparts after 1910 and the systems of voting did not lend themselves readily to a yield of estimates of party support directly from the voting figures. Nevertheless, whilst an overall picture of the electoral trends during this crucial decade was relatively simple to ascertain, justification of the actual estimates of party support in each constituency was a different matter. Consequently, statistical appendices have been used to indicate the derivations of those figures.

The elections and their influence on the history of the Cape Colony have been discussed in many works; biographies of prominent men, general histories of South Africa and studies in specialised fields of Cape history; but the scope of those discussions has been very limited. This work, therefore, endeavours to present a detailed examination of the last six Cape elections as a coherent field of historical investigation in its own right.

Dr. W.A. Speck's, Tory and Whig, the Struggle in the Constituencies, 1701-1715 has indicated the value of a study of parliamentary general elections at the very beginning of the era of two-party politics in Britain and it was felt that a similar analysis for the period when two-party politics in South Africa was in its infancy was required.

Professor T.R.H. Davenport's, The Afrikaner Bond: The History of a South African Political Party, 1880 - 1911 proved to be an invaluable source of information on the Afrikaner Bond and the South African Party, while Y.P. Sank's M.A. thesis, The Origin and Development of the Cape Progressive Party (1884 - 1898) provided valuable insights into the evolution of the Progressive Party until 1898, but after that date it was necessary to collate information on that party from a wide variety of sources.

Because elections were essentially public events, contemporary newspapers and periodicals formed the primary source-material, but extreme caution was exercised when examining their comments on the elections because they were extremely partisan.

Notes on the Text

1. References to daily newspapers do not include page numbers.
2. Single inverted commas have been used, except in cases where the original quotation contained two inverted commas and in long extracts from articles in newspapers which have been indented and typed in block form.

A List of Abbreviations used in footnotes

- CA The Cape Argus, a newspaper published in Cape Town.
- CAW The Cape Argus (weekly edition).
- CGG The Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette.
- CO The records of the Colonial Secretary (Colonial Office), Cape.
- CT The Cape Times, a newspaper published in Cape Town.
- CTW The Cape Times (weekly edition).
- DD The East London Daily Despatch, a newspaper published in East London.
- EPH The Eastern Province Herald, a newspaper published in Port Elizabeth.
- HAD House of Assembly, Debates (Cape Hansard).
- LCD Legislative Council, Debates.
- MOOC The records of the Master's Office, Orphan Chamber.
- OL Ons Land, a newspaper published in Cape Town.
- SAN The South African News, a newspaper published in Cape Town.
- SAR The South African Review, a weekly periodical published in Cape Town.
- SR The Statistical Register of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope.

CONTENTS

SECTION 1

PART 1: PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS

Chapter 1	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
	General - The Origin of Two-Party Politics in the Cape Colony	
Chapter 2	<u>PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS, 1898 - 1899</u>	17
	General - The 1898 Legislative Council General Election - The 1898 Assembly General Election - The Aftermath	
Chapter 3	<u>PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS, 1900 - 1904</u>	35
	General - The 1903 Legislative Council General Election - The 1904 Assembly General Election	
Chapter 4	<u>PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS, 1904 - 1908</u>	51
	Redistribution, 1904 - The Jameson Administration - The 1908 Legislative Council General Election - The 1908 Assembly General Election	

PART 2: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT

Chapter 5	<u>VOTING SYSTEMS AND METHODS OF ASSESSING PARTY SUPPORT IN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS</u>	75
	General - Legislative Council Elections - Assembly Elections	
Chapter 6	<u>THE ELECTION IN THE WESTERN PROVINCE CONSTITUENCY, 1898</u>	85
Chapter 7	<u>THE THREE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTIONS</u>	96
	Constituencies and their representation in Parliament - Party Support - The Voting and the Estimates of Party Support 1898, 1903 and 1908	

Chapter 8	<u>PARTY SUPPORT AND THE ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1898 AND 1904</u>	111
Chapter 9	<u>PARTY SUPPORT AND THE ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION OF 1908</u>	131
Chapter 10	<u>ASSEMBLY CONSTITUENCIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT</u>	148
Chapter 11	<u>CONCLUSION</u>	163

SECTION 11 - APPENDICES

A	PRIME MINISTERS FROM JANUARY 1896 TO MAY 1910	166
B	THE NUMBER OF VOTERS REGISTERED IN EACH ELECTORAL PROVINCE IN 1898, 1903 AND 1908	167
C	MEMBERS ELECTED IN THE 1898 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THEIR CONSTITUENCIES AND THEIR PARTY POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS	168
D	ELECTION RESULTS	
	PART 1 THE 1898 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING IN SEVEN OUT OF EIGHT CONTESTED CONSTITUENCIES	169
	PART 2 THE 1898 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE OUTCOME IN CONSTITUENCIES	172
	PART 3 THE 1898 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT FOR EACH CONSTITUENCY	173
	PART 4 THE BY-ELECTIONS RESULTING FROM ACT 19 OF 1898; THE OUTCOME IN CONSTITUENCIES	199
	PART 5 THE 1903 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING IN THE SIX CONTESTED CONSTITUENCIES	200
	PART 6 THE 1904 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE OUTCOME IN CONSTITUENCIES	203
	PART 7 THE 1904 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT FOR EACH CONSTITUENCY	204
	PART 8 THE 1908 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING IN THE SEVEN CONTESTED CONSTITUENCIES	236

PART 9	THE 1908 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT FOR EACH ELECTORAL DIVISION IN THE EASTERN PROVINCE, THE SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE AND THE WESTERN PROVINCE	240
PART 10	THE 1908 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT IN BRITISH BECHUANALAND AND GRIQUALAND WEST	243
PART 11	THE 1908 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE OUTCOME IN CONSTITUENCIES, THE SEATS WON BY THE S.A.P. AND THE UNIONIST PARTY FOR THE UNCONTESTED CONSTITUENCIES AND UNIONIST LOSSES	247
PART 12	THE 1908 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT FOR CONSTITUENCIES IN THE EASTERN PROVINCE, THE SOUTH- EASTERN PROVINCE AND THE WESTERN PROVINCE	251
PART 13	THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1908; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING IN THE ELECTORAL DIVISIONS OF FORT BEAUFORT AND NAMAQUALAND	269
PART 14	THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1908; A COMPARISON OF THE ESTIMATES OF S.A.P. AND UNIONIST SUPPORT IN THE FIFTEEN ELECTORAL DIVISIONS WHERE THE TWO PARTIES CONFRONTED EACH OTHER IN BOTH ELECTIONS	272
E	THE ALLOCATION OF NEW ASSEMBLY SEATS ACCORDING TO THE RECOMMEND- ATIONS OF THE REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSION OF 1897/8	273
F	THE ALLOCATION OF NEW ASSEMBLY SEATS ACCORDING TO THE RECOMMEND- ATIONS OF SPRIGG, ROSE INNES AND FULLER	274
G	THE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSEMBLY SEATS IN TERMS OF SPRIGG'S BILL OF MAY 1898	275
	NOTES ON SOURCES	276
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	277

PART 1

PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS

PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL

The legislature of the Cape Colony consisted of a governor and two houses of parliament, the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council, or Council for short, was the upper house and the House of Assembly was the lower house. Both houses were elective with one exception, the president of the upper house. He was the chief justice acting in an ex officio capacity, but was not permitted to cast a vote in the proceedings of the Council unless there was a tie in the voting of the elected members.¹

Upper house elections were held in 1898, 1903 and 1908, and lower house elections took place in 1898, 1904 and 1908, so there were actually three pairs of Council and Assembly elections in 1898, 1903/1904 and 1908.

The Progressive Party won the 1898 Council election, the 1903 Council election and the 1904 Assembly election. The 1898 Assembly election was won by an alliance consisting of the Afrikaner Bond and a number of Independents under the joint

1. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol.1, 1652-1871, pp.496-8.

leadership of an Independent member of the House of Assembly, W.P. Schreiner. Between 1898 and 1903 this Bond-Independent alliance evolved into a new coherent party called the South African Party (S.A.P.), but the Afrikaner Bond continued to exist as a separate political entity. As such it provided the back-bone of the S.A.P. and the nucleus of S.A.P. support. In September 1907 the Progressive Party changed its name to the South African Unionist Party² (generally known as the Unionist Party), but the South African Party defeated the Unionist Party in both the Council and Assembly elections in 1908.

Council and Assembly constituencies were called electoral provinces and electoral divisions respectively. There were nine electoral provinces in the Cape Colony during the whole period under review and each province was divided into two or more electoral divisions. Each constituency returned one or more members to parliament; constituencies with more than one member have been described as 'plural-member' constituencies.

The number of votes per voter varied from constituency to constituency because each voter possessed the same number of votes as the number of members allocated to his particular constituency. For instance, the Western Province constituency returned three members to the Council in 1898, therefore each voter in this constituency was entitled to three votes in that election.

2. CT 27.9.1907.

In Council elections each voter could distribute his votes as he pleased.³ Consequently, a voter in a 'plural-member' constituency could give all his votes to one candidate and, if he did so, it was said that he had 'plumped' for that particular candidate. In Assembly elections each voter was permitted to cast only one vote for each candidate. If a voter in a 'plural-member' Assembly constituency favoured only one candidate, he could give that candidate one vote and forfeit his remaining votes.⁴ This was also called 'plumping'.

A general registration of voters was held every two years; so individuals who were registered as voters in 1897, were eligible to vote in both the Council and Assembly elections of 1898 and individuals who were registered in 1903, were eligible to vote in the 1903 Council election and the 1904 Assembly election. Similarly, those persons who were registered in 1907 were entitled to vote in the two elections of 1908. Secret voting was introduced from 1 July 1894, and therefore it applied to all six general elections under review.⁵

The right to vote in Cape elections was limited to males who occupied a dwelling worth at least seventy-five pounds or earned a minimum salary of fifty pounds per annum. Both qualifications were retro-active for twelve months prior to the date of registration. In addition, each voter had to be

3. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol.1, 1652-1871, pp.511-2.

4. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol.1, 1652-1871, p.514.

5. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol.3, 1887-1895, p.2981.

able to sign his name and write his address to prove that he was literate, but that qualification did not apply to people who had registered as voters prior to 16 August 1892 provided that they continued to reside in the same division. The registered holders of licences to dig or search for diamonds in Griqualand West for six months prior to the date of the registration of voters were also exempt from the necessity of complying with the literacy qualifications.⁶

Despite a colour-blind franchise, most of the voters were members of the white community and the two major parties represented the interests of that community, but in some constituencies the non-white voters could decide the outcome of a particular election. However, they usually voted for men whom they felt would serve their interests best rather than for representatives of a political party. As no non-white was ever elected to the Cape parliament, that group tended to fall outside the main stream of party politics. Consequently, the story of Cape elections revolved around the fortunes of two exclusively white-controlled parties and their impact on a predominantly white electorate.

THE ORIGIN OF TWO-PARTY POLITICS IN THE CAPE COLONY

The Afrikaner Bond was the older of the two parties. The first branches of the party were formed in 1880, although S.J. du Toit, its founder, had mooted the idea of forming a party dedicated to the interests of the Afrikaner community during 1879.⁷

-
6. SR 1898, p.iii summarised the provisions of the Constitution Ordinance and amendments until 1892 and J.L. McCracken, The Cape Parliament, 1854-1910, p.29 states that no change in the Cape franchise was effected after 1892.
7. Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa, Vol.1, p.185.

In 1883 the Boeren Bescherminings Vereeniging, founded by J.H. Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), merged itself with the Bond to form the nucleus from which a powerful political party would evolve.⁸

Hofmeyr had been elected to the House of Assembly as a Boeren Bescherminings Vereeniging member for Stellenbosch in 1879⁹ and from 1883 he became the dominant figure in the Bond,¹⁰ by guiding its policies and directing its tactics, but he was never chairman of the Bond.¹¹ Nevertheless he wielded considerable power in his capacity as chairman of the Bond's Commissie van Toezicht op Elekties.¹²

Davenport states that the Commissie consisted of three members and its function 'was to see that nomination meetings were properly called, to call them itself if the local chairman failed in his duty, and to take the initiative in the summoning of circle¹³ meetings to nominate candidates for the Upper House'.¹⁴ In addition, he

8. E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, p. 389; J.H. Hofmeyr, The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), pp. 149-150, 205-8.

9. T.R.H. Davenport, The Afrikaner Bond: The History of a South African Political Party, 1880-1911, p.72. The title of this work is abbreviated to 'Afrikaner Bond' in subsequent footnotes.

10. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.314, 316.

11. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, opposite p.73 there are photographs of the five chairmen of the Afrikaner Bond from 1883 to 1911. They were J.J. Janse van Rensburg (1883-1886), R.P. Botha (1886-1892), P.J. du Toit (1892-1898), T.P. Theron (1898-1908) and H.C. van Heerden (1909-1911).

12. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.314.

13. The term 'circle' was often used as a synonym for 'electoral province'.

14. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.124.

quoted two other circumstances in which it could exercise its discretion: 'first, all disputes concerning elections could be referred to it by either party [to the dispute] in any constituency, and its judgment was to be final. Secondly, if there was no chance of returning a Bondsman to Parliament and there was no properly chosen Bond candidate in the field, the Commissie was to have authority, on request by any branch, to direct members to vote for particular non-Bondsmen'.¹⁵

The Bond remained the only coherent political party until 1897, when the Progressive Party was formed. Previously, all non-Bond members of parliament were technically Independents, but they tended to form loose alliances to further their particular interests. There were liberals and conservatives, but the most usual classifications of those members was based on their support for the government of the day or their opposition to it. Hence, they were labelled as government supporters, members of the opposition or unattached members.

Although no Bond ministry was formed in those years, no prime minister could afford to offend the Bond because no ministry could survive for long without its support. Until 1898 the prime ministers were Independents, but in that year Sir J. Gordon Sprigg identified himself as a Progressive and as a result the Cape Colony entered a new era of party government.

In 1890 Cecil John Rhodes became the prime minister¹⁶ and he co-operated cordially with the Bond until the Jameson Raid.

15. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.124-5.

16. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, p.165.

Realising that the Bond would withdraw its support from him once his involvement in the Raid was discovered, he resigned the premiership on 7 January 1896, only a few days after the failure of the Raid.¹⁷

Rhodes actually served two consecutive terms as premier. His first ministry lasted from 17 July 1890 to 3 May 1893 and his second ministry dated from 4 May 1893 until 12 January 1896.¹⁸ Both his cabinets were coalitions, consisting of Bondsmen and non-Bondsmen. His first cabinet included James Rose Innes, J.X. Merriman, J.W. Sauer, Pieter Faure¹⁹ and Sir James Sivewright,²⁰ but Faure was the only one of his former ministers to be retained in his second cabinet and thereafter Rose Innes, Merriman and Sauer deserted him. In May 1894 Sauer was elected leader of the opposition.²¹

A Progressive Party was formed towards the end of 1892, but it failed to evolve into an effective political organisation before the 1894 Assembly general election.²² Nevertheless it was the embryo from which the Progressive Party of 1897 sprang.²³

17. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.166

18. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, p.165. For a list of Cape prime ministers and the dates of their ministries for the period 13 January 1896 to 30 May 1910 see Appendix A.

19. Pieter Faure was knighted in 1898.

20. Sir P. Laurence, The Life of John Xavier Merriman, p.127.

21. H.M. Wright (Ed.), Sir James Rose Innes: Selected Correspondence (1884-1902), p.104.

22. Y.P. Sank, The Origin and Development of the Cape Progressive Party (1884-1898), pp.48, 73. The title of this work is abbreviated to 'Cape Progressive Party' in subsequent footnotes.

23. Y.P.Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.156.

These two parties have been identified as the first and second Progressive Parties by some commentators, but the party of 1892 was essentially a parliamentary faction, whereas the party of 1897 enjoyed wide-spread electoral support from its inception.

During 1895 a group of liberals founded the South African Political Association (S.A.P.A.) in Cape Town with James Rose Innes being elected as its president.²⁴ The S.A.P.A. was envisaged as the nucleus of an effective opposition to Rhodes and the Bond,²⁵ and by the end of 1895 a small liberal party was beginning to emerge with Rose Innes as its leader.²⁶ Nevertheless the liberals were unable to provide an effective opposition to the Bond because there were too few liberal voters in the Cape Colony to form a strong party. Moreover, Rose Innes was not a forceful leader.²⁷

The Raid created deep distrust between Afrikaners and English-speakers throughout Southern Africa and in the Cape Colony the two language groups divided themselves into opposing political camps. The Afrikaners already had a political party to cater for their interests and at its congress in 1897 the Afrikaner Bond passed a resolution affirming that it would not grant Rhodes any further support.²⁸ Henceforth the majority

24. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, pp.91-3; H.M. Wright (Ed.), Sir James Rose Innes: Selected Correspondence (1884-1902), p.153.

25. P. Lewsen (Ed.), Selections from the Correspondence of J.X. Merriman, 1890-1898, p.176.

26. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.105.

27. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.223.

28. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.171; J.H. Hofmeyr, The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), pp.513-4.

of Bondsmen opposed Rhodes and his policies in every possible way.

By contrast, the English-speaking section of the community did not have a political party to articulate its views, so a few months after the Raid English-speaking imperialists formed a political organisation, called the South African League, in order to give voice to their political principles. The S.A. League grew rapidly and it soon became a pan-South African political movement with branches in Natal and the South African Republic.²⁹

Although the S.A. League had become an influential political pressure group, it lacked the coherence of a proper political party. This factor prompted it to adopt a resolution at its congress in Port Elizabeth during February 1897 calling on members of parliament who were also members of the League to form a parliamentary party.³⁰ The resolution was adopted on 12 February and may be regarded as the birth of the Cape Progressive Party.³¹

Sir J. Gordon Sprigg succeeded Rhodes as premier on 13 January 1896. This was his third term as prime minister; he was an Independent when he assumed the premiership, but he included three Bondsmen in his cabinet: Sir James Sivewright, Pieter Faure and Dr. Thomas Te Water.³²

29. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, pp.105-135.

30. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, pp.155,156,210.

31. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.156.

32. Sir J. Rose Innes, James Rose Innes: Chief Justice of South Africa, 1914-1927: Autobiography, p.138; E.A. Walker, W.P. Schreiner: A South African, p.75.

The Bond supported him in 1896,³³ but in 1897 most of the Bond members in the Assembly deserted him and voted against him in a division on Merriman's motion of no confidence in the government.³⁴ Nevertheless his government survived because the Progressive Party rallied to his aid³⁵ and in due course he became a Progressive.

Although Rhodes was no longer the prime minister, he remained the central figure in Cape politics and the Progressive Party was primarily a pro-Rhodes party, but he remained outwardly aloof from the mundane events of party politics until a week before the 1898 Council election. Nevertheless his personality was a dominant issue in this election.

G.M. Trevelyan has described Rhodes as 'the most practical of visionaries and the most visionary of men of business'.³⁶ Rhodes had created a diamond monopoly in the Cape Colony in the form of De Beers Consolidated Mines, become prime minister of the Cape Colony and chairman of the British South Africa Company which had opened Rhodesia to white settlers and administered the country on behalf of Britain. These were the concrete achievements of a practical man with boundless energy, but yet they formed part of his overriding dream, a vision of the expansion of British influence in Africa.

33. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.117.

34. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.164.

35. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.164. The voting resulted in a tie, but the speaker, Sir Henry Juta, used his casting vote in favour of the government.

36. British History in the Nineteenth Century and After (1782-1919), p.398.

He advocated the unification of the Cape Colony, Natal, Rhodesia, the Orange Free State and the South African Republic. This led him to promote the Jameson Raid into the Transvaal because he realised that the unification of South Africa was impossible while the Transvaal and Orange Free State remained republics. Either the republics had to forego their independence and join the British colonies in a union within the British Empire or the British colonies had to break their bonds with the empire and form a united republic together with the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Rhodes was well aware that Britain would not allow her colonies in Southern Africa to opt out of the Empire, so he concluded that the republics would have to be forced to sacrifice their independence to form a united South Africa within the Empire. The Jameson Raid was, therefore, Rhodes's drastic step in his endeavour to achieve his goal.

In 1896 a select committee of the Cape parliament established Rhodes's complicity in the Raid ³⁷ and his political career in the colony seemed to be in ruins. However, his image was partially restored after his spectacular achievement of going unarmed to persuade the leaders of the Matabele to lay down their arms and make peace with the Chartered Company which administered the crown colony of Rhodesia. ³⁸ His return from Rhodesia to Cape Town via Port Elizabeth and Kimberley was like a triumphal progress. The S.A. League arranged large crowds to welcome him along his route and organised an enormous rally for him in Cape Town before

37. J. Marlowe, Cecil Rhodes: The Anatomy of Empire, p.248; S.C. 6-'96, The Report of the Select Committee on the Jameson Raid into the Territory of the South African Republic, pp.XXIII-XXV.

38. E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, pp.459-60.

he departed for Britain to face an imperial commission of enquiry into the Jameson Raid.³⁹

After he had resigned as premier in 1896, Rhodes retained his seat for Barkly West in the House of Assembly. Many people believed that he intended to return to active political life and would attempt to become prime minister once again.

Meanwhile, Edmund Garrett, the editor of the Cape Times, took it upon himself to school Rhodes in Progressive principles in order to prepare him for a political come-back.⁴⁰

On 9 March 1898 the Cape Times published an interview with Rhodes in which he outlined his views on all the major political questions of the day; he denied that he had ulterior motives for his return to the political arena, stressing that people all over Southern Africa wanted him to take up the cudgels on their behalf in the struggle to achieve a united South Africa. Rhodes expressed his views as follows:

"Don't talk as if it was I who want your Cape politics. You want me. You can't do without me. You discuss;⁴¹ 'Ought Rhodes to do this' and 'Will Rhodes keep in the background' and so on - I am quite willing to keep out, but you have to take the feeling of the people; and the feeling of the people - you may think it egoism, but there are the facts - is that somebody is wanted to fight a certain thing for them, and there is nobody else able and willing to fight it. ..."

39. Sir T.E. Fuller, The Right Honourable Cecil John Rhodes: A Monograph and a Reminiscence, pp.203-6; Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, pp.146-8; B. Williams, Cecil Rhodes, p.278.

40. E.T. Cook, Edmund Garrett: A Memoir, p.139.

41. The punctuation is unclear in the original, but it would seem to be a semi-colon.

Although the majority of Bondsmen opposed Rhodes, a small minority of them were not prepared to condemn him outright, despite their disapproval of his involvement in the Jameson Raid.⁴² They are best described as the 'Rhodes-Bond', while the rest of the Bond could be labelled the 'Hofmeyr-Bond', because they had followed J.H. Hofmeyr in his stand against Rhodes since the Bond congress in 1897.

The 'Rhodes-Bond' included prominent Bondsmen such as Pieter Faure, the Secretary for Agriculture in Sprigg's cabinet, and S.J. du Toit, the founder of the Afrikaner Bond. Du Toit had been a member of the Commissie van Toezicht op Elekties until the Bond Congress in 1898 when Dr. J.M. Hoffman was elected in his place. As du Toit's influence in Bond circles declined rapidly after he lost his seat on the Commissie, he and his followers formed a new party called the Colonial Union on 23 April 1898.⁴³ However, the Colonial Union did not contest the subsequent Assembly election as a separate political entity, although some of its members were nominated as candidates in that election. They were generally regarded as Progressive candidates, but the Cape Times of 4 August 1898 classified most of them as Independents. Nevertheless, being closer to the Progressive party than to the Bond, they could be described as Independent-Progressive candidates.

The S.A. League and its party political arm, the Progressive Party, espoused the cause of militant British imperialism, while

42. J.H. Hofmeyr, The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), pp.513-4.

43. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.175.

the Bond began to evolve a broadly-based South African nationalism which it propagated to counter the spread of imperialism. Rhodes had become the living symbol of imperial expansion and President Kruger of the South African Republic was fast becoming the embodiment of Afrikaner nationalism. Consequently, many English-speaking voters in the Cape Colony regarded the two Cape elections of 1898 as political duels between Rhodes and Kruger. That view was superficial because the form and content of the type of nationalism espoused by the Bond was tailored to the political situation obtaining in the Cape Colony and differed radically from Kruger's idea of nationalism which was dictated by the need to preserve the independence of his country.

Rose Innes's liberal faction and the Independent members of parliament constituted the centre in Cape politics during 1896, but centrists were unable to resist the temptation to align themselves for or against Rhodes and by 1898 they had allied themselves with one or other of the two main political parties. Thus, in the absence of effective leadership the centre was unable to withstand the divisive atmosphere which pervaded Cape politics between 1896 and 1898.

Most Independents, such as J.X. Merriman, J.W. Sauer and W.P. Schreiner, allied themselves with the Bond, but Rose Innes identified himself with the Progressive Party. On 10 December 1897 Rose Innes addressed a meeting at Simonstown, in which he delineated his views on what constituted Progressive policy.

He denounced Rhodes for causing disharmony between English-speakers and Afrikaners in the Cape Colony, advising him to quit Cape politics and occupy his time with the problems of developing Rhodesia.⁴⁴ In 1898 the Progressive Party had the support of the S.A. League imperialists, Rhodes-Bondsmen and some of Rose Innes's liberal supporters, but the majority of the liberal members of parliament threw in their lot with the Bond-Independent alliance during 1897⁴⁵ because they realised that Rhodes had little sympathy for liberal principles, so the Bond-Independent alliance included liberals as well as Bondsmen and Independents.

In 1898 Rhodes became the leader of the Progressive Party. He contributed generously to Party funds and was even prepared to help individual Progressive candidates with their election expenses.⁴⁶ On the other hand, Progressive allegations that the Afrikaner Bond had received secret funds from the governments of the South African Republic and the German Empire appear to be completely unfounded.⁴⁷

The duties on meat and grains constituted an important issue in the elections of 1898. The farming community welcomed them because they protected their produce against foreign competition, but the townsmen opposed them because they inflated the prices of meat and bread in urban areas. As the Bond was a predominantly agrarian party, it supported the duties.

44. CA 11.12.1897; CT 11.12.1897.

45. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, pp.198-9.

46. Sir L. Michell, The Life of the Rt. Hon. Cecil John Rhodes, 1853-1902, Vol.2, p.222.

47. J.H. Hofmeyr, The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), pp.526-7.

However, the Progressive Party found itself in a cleft stick on the issue because it enjoyed substantial support in the towns and in the rural areas, but it reached a compromise when it adopted a policy of reducing the food duties by fifty per cent. The compromise was actually reached at the congress of the S.A. League in February 1898,⁴⁸ but the two bodies were so closely interlinked that their policies were virtually indistinguishable.

On 3 March 1898 Sir Alfred Milner,⁴⁹ the British High Commissioner and the governor of the Cape Colony, made a speech at Graaff-Reinet in which he explained how he felt Cape Afrikaners should demonstrate their loyalty to the Crown.⁵⁰ He spoke forthrightly and his speech caused a political storm because the Bond felt that he had used the occasion to identify himself with views of the Progressive Party a mere two weeks before the Legislative Council election.⁵¹

48. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.186; South Africa, 12.2.1898, p.290.

49. He was subsequently elevated to the peerage.

50. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, pp.182-3; CTW 9.3.1898, p.35.

51. E.A. Walker, W.P. Schreiner: A South African, p.104.

CHAPTER 2

PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS, 1898-1899

GENERAL

The Legislative Council was dissolved on 31 December 1897 in terms of a proclamation published in the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette on 4 January 1898 and the general election was held on 16 March.¹ Some five months later an Assembly election took place.² That election precipitated the fall of the third Sprigg ministry, but the new government under the premiership of W.P. Schreiner was in a precarious position because it obtained a majority of only two seats in the Assembly³ and the opposition controlled the upper house.

The creation of sixteen new seats in the House of Assembly in terms of the provisions of Act 19 of 1898, the unseating of the two members for Stellenbosch and the resignation of both members for Vryburg resulted in a series of Assembly by-elections between 28 March and 27 May 1899.⁴ Some of the by-elections were held in marginal constituencies, so the fate of the Schreiner

-
1. Proc. 534/1898 issued in terms of Act 9 of 1897 which provided for the dissolution of the Legislative Council without a dissolution of the House of Assembly.
 2. Polling days were spread over a period from 9 August to 5 September. (CT 4.8.1898).
 3. This figure does not include W.B. Berry, the Progressive speaker of the Assembly, because he could only use a casting vote in the event of a tie in the voting of the other members. (Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol.1, 1652-1871, p.498).
 4. CT 3.2.1899, OL 23.3.1899, OL 11.5.1899.

ministry was still in the balance during the first few months of 1899. Consequently, election fever, which had begun to mount even before the dissolution of the upper house had little chance of subsiding until after the result of the by-election in the marginal constituency of Tembuland was announced in June 1899.⁵

Both parties were in a state of flux during the first quarter of 1898. The 'Rhodes-wing' of the Afrikaner Bond continued to exist, but was fast becoming absorbed by the Progressive Party while the Sprigg government was in the process of identifying itself with the Progressive Party, although Dr. Thomas Te Water, the Colonial Secretary,⁶ supported the 'Hofmeyr-wing' of the Bond. However, the Council election caused a polarisation of public opinion because the Progressive Party and the 'Hofmeyr-Bond' used that election as a test of their relative strengths in preparation for the next Assembly election which was due to take place within less than a year. Yet, in retrospect, the 1898 Legislative Council election in the Cape Colony was the first parliamentary general election in South Africa in which two parties vied with each other for political power and it was of crucial significance because it demonstrated that the cleavage between the two parties was already based on race; English-speakers tending to vote for Progressive candidates and Afrikaners tending to support the 'Hofmeyr-Bond' candidates or Independent allies of the 'Hofmeyr-Bond'.

5. OL 3.6.1899.

6. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, p.166.
The Colonial Secretary was a member of the cabinet.

Once the excitement of the Council election began to subside, politicians turned their attention to the next Assembly election. On 10 May 1898 Sprigg raised a political storm by publishing a bill to increase the number of seats in the House of Assembly from seventy-nine to ninety-seven.⁷ Te Water resigned from the cabinet in protest against the provisions of the bill⁸ and on 19 May Dr. Thomas Smartt, a Progressive member of the Assembly for Wodehouse, was appointed to succeed him,⁹ thereby snapping the last tangible link between the ministry and the 'Hofmeyr-Bond'.

The controversy over the question of redistributing parliamentary seats actually pre-dated the Council election because a commission to investigate a revision of the representation of the voters in the Assembly and make recommendations on its findings had been appointed on 13 December 1897,¹⁰ and its report was made available to the public on 9 February 1898.¹¹ The majority of the commissioners favoured the creation of fifteen new seats,¹² but the minority submitted a report

7. CGG 8022a, 10.5.1898, pp.1-8. Sprigg stated that the bill expressed his own ideas. (HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, p.32. There were two sessions of parliament in 1898. The second one was the first session of the tenth parliament).
8. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.182.
9. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, pp.156,166.
10. G8-'98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p.1.
11. CA 9.2.1898, South Africa, 12.2.1898, p.290.
12. G8-'98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission 1897-98, p.2 and information contained in the 'Minutes of Proceedings'.

advocating the creation of eighteen new seats.¹³

Most Progressives supported the views expressed by the minority, whereas the Bond sided with the majority. Sprigg had been the chairman of the commission and had signed the minority report,¹⁴ so it was not surprising to find that his bill envisaged the creation of eighteen new seats and the provisions of the bill resembled the proposals which the minority had espoused during the last sitting of the commission. This infuriated Bondsmen because they felt that the three additional seats, which Sprigg wanted to allocate to urban constituencies would assure the Progressive Party a victory in the next Assembly election and would place too much power in the hands of the voters living in the large towns.¹⁵

Although the bill was passed at second reading in the Assembly, it did not reach the statute book because W.P. Schreiner had moved a motion of no confidence in the government and it was adopted a few days after the second reading of the bill. Whereupon Sprigg decided to go to the country in an Assembly general election without proceeding with the bill.¹⁶

Five Independent centrists, Henry Beard, William Hay, John Charles Molteno, Richard Solomon¹⁷ and Ludwig Wiener, who had

13. G8-'98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p.3.

14. G8-'98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p.3 and, 'Commission', p.iv.

15. For further information see chapter 10.

16. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.183.

17. Richard Solomon was knighted in 1900. (The Anglo-African Who's Who and Biographical Sketch Book, 1907, pp.283-4).

supported the redistribution bill, voted against the government in the division on Schreiner's motion of no confidence.¹⁸ In so doing they were responsible for precipitating the 1898 Assembly election before legislation to redistribute seats in the Assembly could be passed.¹⁹ Beard and Wiener were members for Cape Town and, had Sprigg's bill been passed before the election, their constituency would have received an additional seat.²⁰ This provoked local hostility, therefore it was not surprising that they did not stand again in this election. Nevertheless they were sincere liberals who wanted additional representation for the towns, but they were not prepared to identify themselves with the conservative policies of the Sprigg government and, true to their principles, they were forced into the political wilderness. Solomon also refrained from recontesting his seat for Kimberley because he knew that, having alienated Rhodes by voting for the motion, his chances of retaining his seat were virtually nil.²¹

18. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, pp.198-9.

19. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, pp.139,161.

20. Cape Town had four seats in the Assembly, but the bill envisaged dividing it into three constituencies with a total of five seats. East Cape Town (two seats), West Cape Town (two seats) and Sea Point (one seat). (SR 1898, p.30; CGG8022a 10.5.1898, p.3).

21. H.M.Wright (Ed.), Sir James Rose Innes: Selected Correspondence (1884-1902) p.232-3. A letter from Solomon to Innes written on 24.1.1898 indicated that Rhodes had stipulated certain conditions for continuing to support Solomon and he wrote: 'I suppose my rejection of his conditions means political extinction, as I cannot stand for Kimberley without De Beers support'. See also Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.184.

Nevertheless he was appointed Attorney-General by W.P. Schreiner on 14 October 1898²² although he did not have a seat in parliament at the time. On the other hand, Hay and Molteno stood for re-election as 'pro-Bond' Independents, but they were defeated by Progressives in their constituencies of Victoria East and Tembuland respectively.

THE 1898 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION

As the parties were still relatively fluid, the exact party political affiliations of some of the candidates were difficult to pinpoint. Nevertheless, it would appear from a detailed examination of different classifications of the victorious candidates in the contemporary press that the Progressive Party won fourteen seats and the Bond won nine, although figures of twelve and eleven seats are usually quoted.

This resulted from different classifications of candidates in the newspapers. For instance, Ons Land of 8 February 1898 published a list of all the thirty-seven candidates nominated in the election, but it only designated the party political affiliations of Bond candidates. Only seven of those Bond candidates were elected, namely: N.J. de Wet (Eastern Province constituency), A.J. Herholdt and J.F. du Toit (Midland Province constituency), D.P. van den Heever and M.J. Pretorius (North-Eastern Province constituency) and J.A. van A. Lochner and P.B. van Rhyne (North-Western Province constituency). On the other hand, the Cape Times of 28 March designated the party political affiliations of only thirty-one of the thirty-seven

22. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, p.168.

candidates; the six undesignated candidates contested the election in the South Western Province constituency. According to this classification of candidates, fourteen Progressives, eight Bondsmen and one undesignated candidate were elected. However, F.J. van Eeden, the undesignated member, was generally regarded as a potential Bond-supporter.

The following table indicates the number of seats won by the two parties for each of the nine constituencies in the Cape Colony.²³

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Number of Seats</u>	
	<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Bond</u>
British Bechuanaland	1	0
Eastern Province	2	1
Griqualand West	1	0
Midland Province	1	2
North-Eastern Province	1	2
North-Western Province	1	2
South-Eastern Province	3	0
South Western Province	2	1
Western Province	2	1
	<u>14</u>	<u>9</u>

However, on 26 March Ons Land assessed the state of the parties at twelve Bond members and eleven Progressives, but there were three discrepancies between its table of the number of seats

23. The Cape Times classification of victorious candidates has been used, except in the case of van Eeden whose seat has been counted as a Bond seat.

For the names of all the victorious candidates, their constituencies and their party political designations see Appendix C.

won by the parties and the one quoted above. The seat for British Bechuanaland was erroneously credited to the Bond, although it was actually won by a Progressive candidate. The final result for the constituency was still outstanding on 26 March and Ons Land evidently expected G.C.A. Hassforth, the Bond candidate,²⁴ to be elected instead of G.D. Smith, the Progressive candidate.

Ons Land also credited the Bond with one of the three seats in the South-Eastern Province, claiming that P.S. Bellingan was a Bondsman and not a Progressive, but, in fact, he was both. The Bond nominated him as its candidate on 28 December 1897 at a meeting in Uitenhage, but on the following day the meeting rescinded its decision and adopted J.F. Gouws as its official candidate.²⁵ Bellingan subsequently joined the Progressive ticket and stood for election as a Progressive candidate.²⁶ The Cape Times classified him as a Progressive and Ons Land refrained from designating him as a Bond candidate in its list of nominations on 8 February. Consequently, he should be regarded as a Progressive member of the upper house and all the votes cast for him should be regarded as Progressive votes. Undoubtedly, some Bond supporters voted for him because he had been a Bond member of the upper house, but the number of potential Bond votes polled for him was probably rather small

24. Although Hassforth was not listed as a Bond candidate in Ons Land's list of nominations on 8 February 1898, he was generally regarded as such.

25. CT 30.12.1897.

26. EPH 16.3.1898 (election advertisement); CT 26.10.1898.

and most of them were likely to have been cast by 'Rhodes-Bondsmen'.

The third discrepancy involved the party political affiliation of M.J. de Villiers who topped the poll in the South-Western Province. On 26 March Ons Land classified him as a Bond member, although it had not designated him as a Bond candidate on 8 February, whereas the Cape Times listed him as a Progressive candidate. Eight candidates were nominated in the South-Western Province. The election in that constituency was not a proper party contest because the personalities of the candidates and local issues were the dominant themes in the campaign.²⁷ The Cape Times classified M.J. de Villiers and A.G. de Smidt as Progressives and it left the other six candidates without any political designation. They were not even classified as Independents.

A total of 24 967 votes were polled in the South-Western Province and the final result of the voting was:²⁸

1. de Villiers, M.J.	4 762 votes	Elected
2. de Smidt, A.G.	4 635 "	"
3. van Eeden, F.J.	4 564 "	"
4. van Wyk, D.J.	4 002 "	Defeated
5. Schoeman, J.H.	3 373 "	"
6. Mulder, H.J.	3 087 "	"
7. Steyn, J.G.	300 "	"
8. Harris, V.	244 "	"

27. CT 24.3.1898; CT 26.3.1898; SAN 21.11.1903 (a comparison of the results of the voting in the 1898 and 1903 Council general elections).

28. CGG 8010, 29.3.1898, p.744.

De Villiers and de Smidt polled a total of 9 397 votes and the other six candidates obtained a total of 15 570 votes. In view of the uncertainty about de Villiers's party political affiliation, it is expedient to estimate only half his votes as Progressive votes, whereas all de Smidt's votes have been included as Progressive votes because both the Cape Times and Ons Land regarded him as a Progressive. This reduced the estimated number of Progressive votes in the constituency to 7 016, leaving a tally of 17 951 other votes.

As the Bond proved to be the dominant party in the region in the subsequent Assembly election, winning nine of the ten seats for the five electoral divisions in the area, those 17 951 other votes have been counted as potential Bond votes. However, the South African News of 21 November 1903 credited the Bond with 20 088 votes in the South-Western Province in the 1898 Council election because it only counted de Smidt's and Harris's votes as Progressive votes. Although the S.A. News acknowledged that de Villiers was a 'Rhodes-man', it classified his votes as Bond votes. Nevertheless the very fact that he was a Rhodes-man indicated that he should be classified as a Progressive, even though many of his supporters were probably not Progressives.

On 24 March the Eastern Province Herald published a table of the number of seats won by parties in each constituency, except British Bechuanaland, and it indicated that both parties had won eleven seats and that the party which won the seat for British Bechuanaland when the final result for that constituency was declared, would win the election. It counted all three

members for the South-Western Province as Bond-supporters and all three members for the South-Eastern Province as Progressives. Consequently, it could be assumed that the E.P. Herald regarded F.J. van Eeden (South-Western Province) as a Bond supporter and P.S. Bellingan (South-Eastern Province) as a Progressive member.

As the E.P. Herald was published in Port Elizabeth, the largest town in the South Eastern Province, it was in a good position to assess Bellingan's party political affiliation, so he has been classified as a Progressive candidate in this work, while F.J. van Eeden has been classified as a Bond supporter because both the E.P. Herald and Ons Land of 26 March regarded him as such.

J.A. Faure, a Progressive member for the Western Province, was a 'Rhodes-Bondsman' and stood for election as the nominee of the Central Progressive Committee, the South African League and the Paarl district bestuur of the Bond.²⁹ He was the elder brother of Sir Pieter Faure, the Secretary for Agriculture in Sprigg's cabinet³⁰ and had been a sitting member since the previous Council election in 1891.³¹ Due to apathy in that election, the Bond had secured the uncontested return of its three candidates for the Western Province,³² but the formation of the Progressive Party in 1897 made it extremely unlikely that the Bond would win more than one of the three seats for

29. OL 13.1.1898.

30. MOOC 6/9/443, death notice 342/1902 (J.A. Faure); MOOC 6/9/751 death notice: 1222/1914 (Sir Pieter Faure); R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, p.169.

31. CGG 7268, 17.2.1891, p.301.

32. CGG 7268, 17.2.1891, p.301, CT 17.3.1898.

the constituency because the majority of the voters lived in the predominantly urban areas of the Cape Peninsula. Consequently, the Bond decided to nominate only one candidate in the coming election, but two of the sitting members, J.A. Faure and M.L. Neethling, threw their caps in the ring for the Bond nomination.³³

Neethling had represented the constituency for about three decades,³⁴ so he had a stronger claim to the nomination than Faure by virtue of seniority, but Faure enjoyed the support of the district bestuur of Paarl which represented about three-quarters of the Bondsmen in the Western Province³⁵ and this placed him in a strong position to win a nomination contest against Neethling. However, Hofmeyr was determined to prevent Faure's nomination, so he used his position as chairman of the Bond's Commissie van Toezicht op Elekties to obstruct the nomination process until it was too late to nominate an official Bond candidate for the Western Province constituency.³⁶

Although Neethling maintained that he was Independent, he acknowledged strong sympathies with the Bond, so he could be regarded as an 'Independent-Hofmeyr-Bond' candidate.³⁷ On the other hand, Faure was generally accepted as a Progressive candidate, but the South African Political Association refused

33. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.173-4.

34. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, p.132.

35. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.173.

36. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.173-4; J.H. Hofmeyr, The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), pp.519-520.

37. CT 9.3.1898.

to endorse his candidature.³⁸ James Rose Innes was the president of the S.A.P.A. and opposed Faure's nomination as a Progressive candidate very vigorously when it was first mooted during December 1897.³⁹ This was largely due to Faure's sustained opposition to Rose Innes's liquor bill in the upper house which had prevented its enactment.⁴⁰ The bill aimed at creating further restrictions on the sale of liquor especially to Africans and Faure's election manifesto published on the front page of the Cape Times of 22 January 1898 made no reference to the bill which was extremely popular among Progressives in Cape Town and its environs.

Undoubtedly, some Bondsmen voted for Faure, especially in the electoral division of Paarl, where he obtained 2 789 of the 5 462 votes polled,⁴¹ but they were probably 'Rhodes-Bondsmen' like himself and as such they could be regarded as Progressives because the 'Rhodes-Bond' was rapidly becoming absorbed into the Progressive Party. Consequently, all 8 593 votes polled for Faure in the Western Province constituency may be regarded as Progressive votes.

Despite these anomalies, the Progressive Party emerged as a powerful new force in Cape politics after the 1898 Council election and as such it entrenched the two-party system as a permanent feature in the politics of the Cape Colony, but,

38. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.172.

39. CT 4.12.1897; CT 14.12.1897.

40. LCD 1896, col. 326, LCD 1897, cols. 141,146.

41. For a discussion of the voting in this election see chapter 6.

perhaps, its victory in this election had come too easily and too quickly because it was destined to face defeat in the subsequent Assembly general election.

THE 1898 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION

There were thirty-nine electoral divisions; thirty-four were 'two-member' constituencies, three were 'single-member' constituencies, while Cape Town and Kimberley were 'four-member' constituencies.⁴²

The Bond Independent alliance won forty of the seventy-nine seats in the election, while Progressive candidates won thirty-eight seats. Victor Sampson, the junior member for Albany,⁴³ was elected as an Independent candidate, defeating J.O. Norton, a sitting member for Albany and an official Progressive candidate.⁴⁴ However, after the election, Sampson was generally regarded as a Progressive member of the Assembly, so he could be described as an 'Independent-Progressive' candidate, and counted as a Progressive member of parliament.

This gave the Progressive Party a theoretical total of thirty-nine seats - only one less than the Bond; but Cecil John Rhodes held two seats - one for Barkly West and one for Namaqualand - so there were only thirty-eight individual Progressive members in the Assembly including Sampson.⁴⁵ Rhodes resigned

42. SR 1898, p.30.

43. The terms 'senior member' and 'junior member' were used to denote the members elected with the highest and the lowest number of votes in 'plural-member' constituencies.

44. CT 4.8. 1898; OL 20.8.1898.

45. CT 16.9.1898.

his seat for Namaqualand⁴⁶ and Sir Pieter Faure was elected⁴⁷ as the thirty-ninth Progressive member in the ensuing by-election. The parliamentary session opened on 7 October with only thirty-eight Progressive members but one of them, Dr. W.B. Berry (later Sir William), the senior member for Queenstown, was chosen as the speaker⁴⁸ and as such he was deprived of his deliberative vote in parliamentary divisions, so the voting strength of the Progressive Party was reduced to thirty-seven until Faure was able to take his seat as the new member for Namaqualand. This increased the voting strength of the Progressive Party to thirty-eight, giving the Bond-Independent alliance a precarious majority of only two votes in parliamentary divisions.

Nineteen of the thirty-four 'two-member' constituencies returned two members of the Bond-Independent alliance, while the voters of Oudtshoorn and Stellenbosch elected one member of the alliance and one Progressive.⁴⁹ Aliwal North, Paarl and Wodehouse had been Progressive divisions in the previous Council election,⁵⁰ but they opted for Bondsmen and their allies in this election.⁵¹ On the other hand, Vryburg had been a Bond division in the Council election,⁵² but returned two Progressives on this occasion.⁵³

46. CT 16.9.1898.

47. OL 18.10.1898.

48. HAD 1898, First Session of the Tenth Parliament, pp.3-6.

49. See Appendix D, Part 2.

50. CO 3816 (Paarl), Letter No.6, 21.3.1898; CT 24.3.1898.

51. See Appendix D, Part 3.

52. CT 24.3.1898; OL 2.4.1898.

53. See Appendix D, Parts 2 and 3.

All the remaining seats were won by Progressives. They included the eight seats for Cape Town and Kimberley, three seats for the 'single-member' constituencies of Griqualand East, Mafeking and Tembuland and twenty-eight seats for 'two-member' constituencies. Thirteen of the latter class of constituencies returned two Progressive members apiece and the other two Progressives were elected for Oudtshoorn and Stellenbosch.⁵⁴

THE AFTERMATH

Despite the defeat of the Progressive Party in the Assembly election, Sprigg did not resign the premiership until after the opening of the new session of parliament, but before his resignation he moved a second redistribution bill, so the new government was confronted with the problem of solving the redistribution controversy during a short post-election session of parliament. Earlier in the year the Bond-Independent alliance had found it easy to unite against Sprigg's first redistribution bill because it had been in opposition and it did not bear responsibility for settling the issue. Once it was in office it was faced with the choice of rejecting the principle of redistribution outright, amending Sprigg's new bill or framing a redistribution bill of its own.

The new government needed time to settle into office and it did not want to raise a hornet's nest over a question of redistribution within less than three weeks of assuming

54. See Appendix D, Part 2.

power. Schreiner, the prime minister, therefore, moved a resolution on 31 October: "That this House resolves not to proceed with the question of the redistribution of seats during the present session, but instructs the Government to prepare and introduce early in the session of 1899 a measure dealing with the subject, and that the order for the second reading of the Parliamentary Representation Bill be accordingly discharged".⁵⁵ However, the opposition was not prepared to let the matter rest because it realised that the enactment of the bill before the house would almost certainly result in the fall of the government. Sir J. Gordon Sprigg, the leader of the opposition, went so far as to intimate that his party would use every means at its disposal to filibuster all government legislation, except matters relating to the Customs Convention and the contribution to the Royal Navy, until redistribution legislation was passed.⁵⁶

On 1 November C.D. de Waal, a Bond member for Piquetberg, responded to Sprigg's challenge by moving that the two parties should hold a meeting to discuss the issue and formulate a compromise because it was essential to break the deadlock which was delaying the enactment of other legislation during the current session.⁵⁷ However, the government remained adamant in its resolve to postpone its decision on the subject until the following year and it opposed the motion.

55. HAD 1898, First Session of the Tenth Parliament, p.146.

56. HAD 1898, First Session of the Tenth Parliament, pp.151-2.

57. HAD 1898, First Session of the Tenth Parliament, p.159.

All government members, except de Waal, voted against the motion and all opposition members voted with de Waal for the motion. This resulted in a tie, but Sir William Bisset Berry, the Progressive speaker, broke the tie by voting in favour of the motion⁵⁸ and Act 19 of 1898 was framed as a compromise between the views of the two parties. The Act created sixteen new seats and the by-elections to fill those seats were held in 1899 and, ironically, each of the parties won eight seats.⁵⁹

Nevertheless the government increased its majority in the Assembly during 1899 because it captured three seats from the Progressive Party in by-elections in Stellenbosch and Vryburg on 28 March and 7 April respectively. Those by-elections involved all four seats for the two constituencies; the Progressive Party had won three of those seats in the general election, but it lost all of them in the by-elections.

58. HAD 1898, First Session of the Tenth Parliament, p.171.

59. See Appendix D, Part 4.

CHAPTER 3

PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS, 1900-1904

GENERAL

The Anglo-Boer War lasted from October 1899 until May 1902 and it brought many changes in its wake. The South African Republic and the Orange Free State were annexed to the British Empire and were now called the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. In the Cape Colony the Schreiner ministry had fallen and it was succeeded by a Progressive government under the leadership of Sir J. Gordon Sprigg. Throughout South Africa the policy of militant imperialism seemed to be triumphant, yet beneath the surface a new spirit of South African nationalism was rising and, in time, it would replace imperialism as the dominant ideology in South African politics, but the Cape elections of 1903 and 1904 were held during a period when imperialist fervour among English-speakers in South Africa was still very strong.

The Bond had been the political mouthpiece of Cape Afrikanerdom since the early 1880's and as such it suffered greatly during the war. Its organisation was dislocated and its coffers were empty,¹ yet it was able to reconstruct itself very quickly after the war because Afrikaners realised that it was the only body which was capable of guarding their rights and defending their interests at that time.

1. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.244.

On the other hand, the war had helped to transform the Bond-Independent alliance into the South African Party. W.P. Schreiner had coined the name 'South African Party' to describe the alliance in 1898,² but it was not until 1903 that the Bond officially acknowledged the name and linked itself constitutionally to the South African Party.³

During the first phase of the war republican forces invaded the Cape Colony and virtually annexed the districts where they held sway. As most Afrikaners living in those districts sympathised with the Boer cause, many of them joined the invaders, some willingly and others under compulsion,⁴ but when the tide turned and the British forces went into the offensive, numbers of Cape rebels were captured or gave themselves up.⁵ This posed a great problem for Schreiner and his government because virtually all the rebels were supporters of the Bond-Independent alliance.

After consulting Richard Solomon, the Attorney-General, Schreiner was convinced that the penalty for rebellion under Cape law was disenfranchisement for life unless a free pardon was granted.⁶ Joseph Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for

-
2. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.189.
 3. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.317; Sir J.T. Molteno, Further South African Recollections, pp.61-2.
 4. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.211; G.H.L. Le May, British Supremacy in South Africa, 1899-1907, pp.43,47; E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, p.489.
 5. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.211-2; G.H.L. Le May, British Supremacy in South Africa, 1899-1907, pp.48,57-9.
 6. E.A. Walker, W.P. Schreiner: A South African, p.219.

the Colonies in London, indicated that the imperial government would not agree to a more lenient penalty even for rebels who acted under compulsion; harsher penalties were to be inflicted on those who had rebelled of their own free will, ringleaders, looters and perpetrators of atrocities.⁷ Nevertheless Schreiner opted for limiting the disenfranchisement of the rank and file of rebels to five years.⁸ The Cabinet was split in two on the proposal, Richard Solomon and A.J. Herholdt supporting Schreiner, while J.X. Merriman, J.W. Sauer and Dr. Thomas Te Water were totally opposed to the policy.⁹ When the caucus of the Bond-Independent alliance met on 8 and 9 June 1900, it was decided to reject Schreiner's views by twenty-nine votes to eight - cabinet ministers refraining from voting. This resulted in Schreiner's resignation as prime minister on 13 June.¹⁰

Five days later Sir J Gordon Sprigg, the leader of the opposition, became premier once again.¹¹ Although the Progressive Party did not possess a majority of seats in the Assembly, Sprigg was able to remain in office and pass legislation to disenfranchise persons convicted of rebellion because Schreiner and his small band of followers supported him.¹² However, on 24 October, a few days after the end of the parliamentary session, Schreiner resigned

7. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.217-8.

8. E.A. Walker, W.P. Schreiner: A South African, p.232.

9. E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, p.492.

10. E.A. Walker, W.P. Schreiner: A South African, pp.232-3.

11. See Appendix A.

12. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.226; Act 6 of 1900.

his seat for Malmesbury¹³ and his followers were left in the political wilderness.¹⁴

In 1901 Sprigg could not be sure of being able to muster sufficient support in the House of Assembly to remain in power, so he did not call parliament into session that year.¹⁵ He knew that this was a breach of the constitution which stipulated that twelve calendar months should not elapse between sessions of parliament¹⁶ and that parliament would have to indemnify his decision when it met again. He used the unsettled condition of the country as a pretext for his unconstitutional behaviour,¹⁷ but once the war was over he had no excuse for not summoning parliament.

After the war he had the choice of calling an Assembly election, resigning the premiership or trying to come to terms with the S.A.P. As it was uncertain whether the Progressive Party would win an Assembly general election in 1902, he dared not resign before obtaining indemnity for not calling parliament into session, so he was forced to come to terms with the S.A.P.¹⁸

13. E.A. Walker, W.P. Schreiner: A South African, pp.239-41.

14. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.226.

15. The Times History of the War in South Africa, 1899-1902, Vol.6, pp.63-4.

16. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol.1, 1652-1871, p.524.

17. J.P. Vanstone, Sir John Gordon Sprigg: A Political Biography, pp.407-412.

18. SAR 19.12.1902, p.31 alleged that there was a compact between Sprigg and the Bond (S.A.P.) and it would seem from the article that there was some unofficial agreement between Sprigg and at least one of the leaders of the S.A.P., namely J.W. Sauer.

This infuriated the majority of his party who were militant imperialists and wanted no dealings with the S.A.P.

By the end of 1902 the Progressive Party had split into two separate groups. The main body of the party consisted of militant imperialists and they called themselves 'Stalwarts', while Sprigg and his supporters were known as 'Spriggites', 'Moderates' or 'Anti-Suspensionists'. The latter name was derived from the controversy over the question of suspending the constitution of the Cape Colony as it was that issue which precipitated the split.

Milner had mooted the suspension of the constitution of the Cape Colony in the early stages of the Anglo-Boer war.¹⁹ During 1901 a spate of petitions calling for suspension were sent to the governor by groups of militant imperialists in various districts of the colony where the danger of invasion or rebellion was ever-present,²⁰ but it was not until Rhodes identified himself with the cause that a strong movement began to emerge.²¹ Although Rhodes died on 26 March 1902, the campaign gathered momentum and more than forty members of the Cape parliament signed a petition to the governor requesting suspension.²² However, some of the signatories subsequently withdrew their support.

19. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.237.

20. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.237.

21. E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, p.502.

22. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.239; E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, p.502.

Included amongst those members were J.L.M. Brown and J.D. Cartwright,²³ two of the three members of the Assembly for Cape Town,²⁴ and for that reason they earned for themselves the label of 'Mugwumps' among the 'Stalwart-Progressives.'

Sir J. Gordon Sprigg and the majority of his cabinet opposed the principle of suspension, but Thomas Smartt, the Commissioner for Public Works, supported the idea and he resigned from the cabinet in order to devote his energies to the cause.²⁵ On 30 May 1902 Arthur Douglass succeeded him as Commissioner.²⁶ Consequently, from May 1902 Smartt came to be regarded as the leader of the 'Suspensionist' - or 'Stalwart' - wing of the Progressive Party which had been left leaderless since Rhodes's death, but he was not the official leader of the Progressive Party. However, most Progressives were 'Stalwarts' and on 8 June 1903 the Progressive Party chose Dr. Jameson as its leader;²⁷ Smartt having stood aside for him.²⁸ Nevertheless

-
23. E.D. Thielscher, The Suspension Movement in the Cape Colony, and its Effects. (1901-1904), p.47.
24. Cape Town was entitled to five members in the Assembly. Four were elected in 1898 and a fifth in 1899. (See Chapter 8). However, T.E. Fuller had resigned when he was appointed as the Cape Colony's Agent-General in London and St.Leger had died. The other member was T.J. Anderson, a 'Stalwart' Progressive.
25. Sir P.Laurence, The Life of John Xavier Merriman, p.200.
26. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, p.168.
27. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, p.20; The Anglo-African Who's Who and Biographical Sketch Book, 1905, p.82.
28. The Times History of the War in South Africa, 1899-1902, Vol.6, p.192.

the 'Suspensionist' rump of the party absorbed most of the 'Spriggites' in the latter part of 1903, as the Council and Assembly elections of 1903 and 1904 approached, but Sprigg and Douglass had become unacceptable in Progressive circles and they were forced to stand as 'Independent-Progressive' candidates in the 1904 Assembly election.

Suspension was seen as a means of facilitating the incorporation of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony into the British Empire and preparing the way for a federation of British colonies in South Africa, but Joseph Chamberlain had been informed that one of the chief aims of the 'Suspensionists' was to obtain a more equitable distribution of parliamentary seats when responsible government was restored under a new constitution.²⁹ Initially, J.H. Hofmeyr had been prepared to accept the idea of suspension, but when he realised the full implications of the policy, inter alia the intention of altering the distribution of parliamentary seats, he changed his attitude and rejected suspension outright.³⁰ Consequently, the suspension issue and the redistribution issue were intertwined in the ongoing political tussle between the Progressive Party and the Bond-South African Party. However, Chamberlain had never approved of suspension and finally quashed it.³¹

29. E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, p.502.

30. J.H. Hofmeyr, The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), pp.576-7; T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.240.

31. E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, p.502.

J.D. Cartwright, one of the two 'Anti-Suspensionist' members for Cape Town, had given a series of pledges of party loyalty when he obtained the nomination of the Progressive Party in 1899. The Cape Times of 16 May 1899 commented that they were 'calculated to satisfy the most exacting Whip that had ever trod a lobby.' Indeed he went so far as to promise that, if he felt that his conscience compelled him to vote on an important matter against the wishes of his constituents, he would resign, but he would vote with his constituents before resigning.³² By opposing suspension in 1902, he had withdrawn his support from the majority of his colleagues in the Progressive Party and it was virtually certain that the majority of politically-minded voters in the Progressive stronghold of Cape Town supported suspension, yet he continued to represent Cape Town in the Assembly until the 1904 general election, when he stood for election as a Progressive candidate and was re-elected fifth in the poll.³³ J.L.M. Brown, his 'Anti-Suspensionist' colleague, also continued to represent Cape Town, but he died before the 1904 election.³⁴

The Progressive Party extracted similar pledges of loyalty from most of its candidates in the 1903 Council election and the 1904 Assembly election, and its opponents made an issue of the fact that Progressive candidates were committed to uphold the interests of their party, regardless of their personal views or the best interests of their constituents. However, Cartwright's

32. CT 16.5.1899.

33. There were five seats for Cape Town in 1904.

34. Brown died on 14 November 1903. (CA 16.11.1903).

actions in 1902 had already indicated how ineffective party pledges were in binding a member of parliament to support policies which conflict with his convictions.

In those elections the Progressive Party under the leadership of Dr. Jameson, sought power in its own right, whereas its opponents were motivated by a common desire to prevent Jameson's party from obtaining a majority of seats in both the Council and the Assembly. Consequently, the elections were actually duels between two groups; the Progressive Party and its opponents; and for that reason all the opponents of the Progressive Party have been grouped together under the general label of 'Anti-Progressives'. The opponents included S.A.P. candidates, Labour candidates, Independents and some 'Independent-Progressives'.

The Anglo-Boer War had created an artificial economic boom, but when peace returned and the imperial forces left, a depression set in.³⁵ As the finances of the Cape Colony were largely dependent on the railage of commodities to the Transvaal, the prosperity of that Colony was of the utmost importance to the Cape,³⁶ so the sooner the production of gold on the Witwatersrand reached its pre-war level the sooner the finances of the Cape Colony could be expected to recover. However, the gold mines experienced an acute shortage of labour after the war. Transkeian Africans had formed a large proportion of the labour force in the mines

35. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, pp. 4-6.

36. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, pp. 12, 18.

before the war, but they had become reluctant to work there largely on account of rumours of ill-treatment.³⁷ Faced with this problem the Transvaal Chamber of Mines mooted the idea of importing Chinese labour to perform unskilled work in order to bring gold production to its pre-war level as quickly as possible.

Although the question of importing Chinese labour was essentially a Transvaal issue, it caused wide-spread alarm in the Cape Colony because many whites and non-whites feared that Chinese immigrants would flood into the whole of Southern Africa and that this would upset the delicate balance between the racial groups in the Cape Colony in the same way that the importation of Indian labourers had complicated race relations in Natal.³⁸

The South African Party took up a definite stand against the importation of Chinese labour, whereas the Progressive Party contended that it was a Transvaal matter and was unwilling to interfere in the affairs of another colony. However, Jameson published a draft bill to prohibit Chinese immigrants settling in the Cape Colony.³⁹ Nevertheless the South African Party exploited the issue to the full by spreading alarm among white and non-white workers that their jobs would be in danger once the Chinese began to arrive. This undoubtedly cost the

37. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, p.17.

38. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, pp.17-18.

39. I. Colvin, The Life of Jameson, Vol.2, p.227; J.Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, p.21.

Progressive Party a fair number of votes in the Council election of 1903 and the Assembly election of 1904, although some Progressives such as J.W. Jagger, a newly-elected member for Cape Town,⁴⁰ were opposed to the scheme.

The Council election of 1903 and the Assembly election of 1904 were precipitated by the breakdown of the unofficial accord between Sprigg and the South African Party. Sprigg had obtained indemnity legislation in 1902 and although he administered the colony in a spirit of conciliation towards the Afrikaner community and with feeling for the interests of the S.A.P., he failed to keep his promise to appoint a commission to investigate grievances against the military authorities for actions committed by them under martial law during the Anglo-Boer War and to revise the amounts paid to colonists in reparation for losses sustained during the war.⁴¹

On 25 August 1903 Henry Burton, a young S.A.P. member for Albert, moved that the government should introduce legislation during the current session of parliament to appoint and authorise one of the judges of the Supreme Court to investigate and report on the correctness of sentences imposed under martial law and to constitute a special court to review the amounts paid to persons in compensation for losses sustained during the war.⁴² In reply Sprigg indicated that the government was entirely opposed to the proposals contained in the resolution.⁴³ However, the S.A.P.

40. Sir Lewis Michell and J.W. Jagger were elected to the Assembly for Cape Town at a by-election in November 1902.

41. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.246.

42. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.246; HAD 1903, p.656.

43. HAD 1903, p.666.

dared not oppose Burton's motion if it wanted to retain the goodwill of its supporters who had grievances about the sums of money awarded to them in compensation. When the motion was passed, Sprigg decided to request the governor to dissolve both houses of parliament in preparation for a Council election and an Assembly election, despite appeals from S.A.P. members for him to stay in office.⁴⁴

THE 1903 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION

There was general agreement in the contemporary press that twelve Progressives, ten S.A.P. members and one Independent were returned to the Legislative Council in 1903. Dr.A.H.Petersen, an Independent, was elected at the top of the poll in the Western Province constituency; he was a member of the Cape Town ward bestuur of the Afrikaner Bond,⁴⁵ and so could be grouped with the ten S.A.P. members as an 'Anti-Progressive' member of the Council.

The following table indicates how many Progressive, S.A.P. and Independent members were elected to the Council for each constituency in 1903:

44. I. Colvin, The Life of Jameson, Vol.2, pp.221-3.

45. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.249.

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Anti-Progressive</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Progressive</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independent</u>	
British Bechuanaland	1	0	0	1
Eastern Province	2	1	0	3
Griqualand West	1	0	0	1
Midland Province	1	2	0	3
North-Eastern Province	1	2	0	3
North-Western Province	1	2	0	3
South-Eastern Province	2	1	0	3
South-Western Province	1	2	0	3
Western Province	2	0	1	3
	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>23</u>

Each constituency was allocated the same number of seats as it had in 1898, but the Progressive Party won two seats less than it had obtained in the previous general election because it only secured two seats in the South-Eastern Province and one seat in the South-Western Province, compared with three seats and two seats respectively in 1898. Dr. Petersen replaced M.L. Neethling as the only 'Anti-Progressive' member for the Western Province, but this Independent gain from the S.A.P. was a technical one because the S.A.P. supported Petersen and it did not field any candidates against him. In the other six constituencies, the parties obtained the same number of seats they had won in 1898. However, in the Midland Province, G.H. Maasdorp was defeated as an Independent candidate, whereas in 1898 he had been elected as a Progressive member for that constituency. In 1903 P.D. de Villiers won the seat for the Progressive Party.

Despite an overall majority of one seat, the Progressive Party had grounds for grave consternation because T.L.Graham, a Progressive member for the Western Province, continued to sit in Sprigg's cabinet, so his loyalty to the party was open to question. After the Assembly general election and the fall of the Sprigg ministry, he continued to sit as a Progressive member of parliament for some months before resigning his seat to become a judge. Edmund Powell, the editor of the Cape Argus, was returned unopposed at the by-election to fill the vacancy for the Western Province constituency caused by Graham's resignation.

THE 1904 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION

Twenty-four members were returned unopposed in thirteen constituencies⁴⁶ and the voters in thirty-one of the thirty-three contested constituencies went to the polls on 10 February, but the voting in the constituencies of Grahamstown and Cape Town was held on 19 and 21 January respectively.⁴⁷

A total of ninety-five seats was at stake in this election and the Progressive Party won fifty of them,⁴⁸ giving it a majority of five seats, but Sir William Bisset Berry, the senior member for Queenstown, was the speaker of the Assembly, so the Progressive majority in parliamentary divisions was likely to be only four. In addition, Sir Pieter Faure, the senior member for Namaqualand, and John Frost, the junior member for Queenstown,

46. CGG 8626, 26.2.1904, pp.643-5.

47. CGG 8615, 19.1.1904, p.173; CGG 8621, 9.2.1904, p.417.

48. OL 16.2.1904.

were members of Sprigg's cabinet, and if they voted against the Progressive Party, its majority would cease to exist.⁴⁹

The forty-five 'Anti-Progressives' comprised forty-two S.A.P. members, two Independent-S.A.P. members⁵⁰ and an Independent with S.A.P. leanings, A.R. Adendorff, the junior member for Fort Beaufort.⁵¹

The Progressive Party captured eight seats and lost two. Its gains consisted of two seats for Aliwal North, one for Prieska, one for Tembuland,⁵² two for Vryburg and two for Wodehouse, while its losses included one seat for Fort Beaufort⁵³ and one seat for Oudtshoorn.⁵⁴

Although Sir J. Gordon Sprigg and Arthur Douglass were defeated by Progressives at East London and Grahamstown respectively, those Progressive victories have not been counted as Progressive gains because they had won their seats in 1898 as Progressive candidates. Similarly, the defeat of F.R. Thompson, an Independent member for Wynberg, has not been counted as a Progressive gain because he

49. OL 16.2.1904.

50. M.J. de Beer and H.D. Stiglingh were elected as Independent-S.A.P. members for Piquetberg, defeating D.J. Marais and C.D. Chiappini, the two official S.A.P. candidates.

51. SAN 15.2.1904.

52. Tembuland was a 'single-member' constituency in 1898 and a 'two-member' constituency in 1904. For further information on the representation of Tembuland in the period, 1898-1904, see Chapter 8.

53. Fort Beaufort was a 'two-member' constituency in 1898 and 1904. The Progressive Party won both seats in 1898, but in 1904 B. Niland (Progressive) and A.R. Adendorff (Independent) were elected.

54. Oudtshoorn was a 'two-member' constituency in 1898 and 1904. The Bond and the Progressive Party each won a seat in 1898, but the S.A.P. won both seats in 1904.

obtained his seat as a Progressive candidate at an uncontested by-election in 1899. In 1904 he was beaten by Sir Lewis Michell, a Progressive candidate.⁵⁵

Sprigg resigned as prime minister some days after the last results were announced and Jameson succeeded him on 22 February, but his government found itself in a precarious position as it had a majority of only one seat in the Council and five in the Assembly. This prompted the ministry to introduce redistribution legislation as soon as possible in order to enhance its majorities in both houses of parliament.

55. H. Cloete and Sir Lewis Michell were elected as the members for Wynberg and both of them were Progressives. Cloete had been returned unopposed at a by-election in 1902 and he topped the poll in 1904, but Michell had been a member for Cape Town from November 1902 until January 1904.

CHAPTER 4

PARTY POLITICS AND ELECTIONS, 1904-1908

REDISTRIBUTION, 1904

Act 5 of 1904 created three new seats in the Legislative Council and twelve new seats in the House of Assembly, increasing the total number of seats in the two houses of parliament to 26 and 107 respectively.

Each of the three Council constituencies of the Eastern Province, the South-Eastern Province and the Western Province received one new seat and the Progressive Party won all three seats in the ensuing by-elections, thereby increasing its majority in the upper house from one to four. The Progressive Party had expected to win those seats; it also expected to win nine of the twelve new Assembly seats,¹ but it won only seven of them. Inevitably, the S.A.P. did all in its power to prevent the passing of the Act, forcing two all-night sittings of the Assembly on the question,² but to no avail.

The Assembly constituencies of East London, George, Kingwilliamstown, Oudtshoorn, Paarl, Port Elizabeth, Queenstown, Uitenhage, Woodstock and Wynberg each received one new seat, whereas Cape Town was allocated two new seats. Cape Town, East London, Kingwilliamstown, Port Elizabeth, Queenstown, Uitenhage, Woodstock and Wynberg had been Progressive constituencies in the

-
1. P. Cuthbert, The Administration of Dr. Jameson as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1904-1908), p.34.
 2. P. Cuthbert, The Administration of Dr. Jameson as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1904-1908), pp.36-8.

general election, but Progressive majorities in Queenstown and Uitenhage at the previous general election had been small, so the S.A.P. had a reasonable chance of winning the two new seats for those constituencies in addition to the new seats for the safe S.A.P. constituencies of George, Oudtshoorn and Paarl.

In the subsequent by-elections the Progressive Party won the new seats for Cape Town, East London, Port Elizabeth, Uitenhage, Woodstock and Wynberg, but lost the seats for Kingwilliamstown and Queenstown in the Eastern Province. Its defeat in Kingwilliamstown was complicated by the fact that Colonel Schermbrücker, a former Progressive member for the constituency, had died shortly after the general election³ and the by-election to fill the resulting vacancy was held on the same day as the by-election to fill the new seat.⁴ Consequently, two seats had to be filled and each voter had two votes. The Progressive Party fielded two official candidates, William Ririe and Richard Pell Edmonds, and two 'Independent-Progressive' candidates, Franz Ginsberg and Colonel William Joseph Warren, opposed and defeated them.⁵ It could be said that Ginsberg captured Schermbrücker's seat from the Progressive Party and that Warren defeated the Progressive Party in the contest for the new seat, but both Ginsberg and Warren supported the Progressive government, so they could actually be regarded as Progressives.

3. The Anglo-African Who's Who and Biographical Sketch Book, 1905, p.192.

4. CGG 8660, 24.6.1904, p.2403.

5. CGG 8667, 19.7.1904, p.217; South Africa, 16.7.1904, p.218; SAN 21.6.1904.

In that case, the defeat of the official Progressive candidates could be treated as a technical matter because the Jameson government actually obtained the support of eight of the twelve new members.

The S.A.P. won the seats for George, Oudtshoorn and Paarl, while Thomas Searle standing as an Independent ⁶ was elected for Queenstown, but he was generally regarded as a South African Party member and his victory was usually counted as a South African Party gain. He faced two Progressive candidates, George Aldrich Fincham (Independent-Progressive) and James Lamont (Progressive), and together they polled 232 votes more than he did.⁷ The result of the voting appears below:⁸

SEARLE	Ind. S.A.P.	858 votes
Fincham	Ind. Prog.	606 "
Lamont	Prog.	484 "

The results of the by-elections in both Kingwilliamstown and Queenstown were significant warnings against the dangers of disunity in the ranks of the Progressive Party which began to plague it after it assumed office earlier in the year. Nevertheless the picture painted by the Assembly by-elections was not without hope for the new government because it won the new seat for the marginal constituency of Uitenhage in the South-Eastern Province, albeit by a mere eighteen votes.

6. OL 25.6.1904; South Africa, 16.7.1904, p.218.

7. CGG 8667, 19.7.1904, p.217; OL 25.6.1904; South Africa, 16.7.1904, p.218.

8. CGG 8667, 19.7.1904, p.217.

Although Act 5 of 1904 had the effect of boosting Progressive majorities in both houses of parliament, it did not solve the redistribution question because the Progressives living in the populous urban constituencies felt that they were still under-represented, the boundaries of rural constituencies were not rationalised and no provision was made for adjusting the distribution of seats in the future. It was plainly a measure to enhance Progressive strength in parliament and as such it elicited criticism from the opposition as well as from Progressives in the urban areas. Nevertheless it did fulfil the Progressive policy of granting improved representation of people in parliament⁹ in as far as it alleviated the most glaring examples of under-representation of the voters in particular constituencies,¹⁰ but the government realised that it was an inadequate piece of legislation. Consequently, it promised its urban supporters that it would appoint a commission on the subject to help it draft more thorough legislation at a later stage, but that promise was not kept.¹¹

THE JAMESON ADMINISTRATION

The Progressive government under the leadership of Dr. Jameson lasted almost four years, from 22 February 1904 until 2 February 1908. The cabinet contained talented men, but it

9. P. Cuthbert, The Administration of Dr. Jameson as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1904-1908), p.3; SAN 8.1.1904.

10. For further information see Chapter 10.

11. P. Cuthbert, The Administration of Dr. Jameson as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1904-1908), pp.39-40; J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, pp.80-1; HAD 1904, p.57; SAR 20.3.1908, p.21.

was not representative of the various interest groups in the Party¹² and was drawn exclusively from the English-speaking section of the community until the appointment of Sir Pieter Faure as Secretary for Agriculture in 1907.¹³

Dr. Smartt was the only member appointed in 1904 who had previous experience in the cabinet and Jameson had only been a member of the Cape parliament since 1900.¹⁴ He had also been an administrator of Rhodesia,¹⁵ but the task of prime minister of a self-governing colony was a very different one from that of administering a crown colony on behalf of the British South Africa Company; he was responsible to parliament for his every action as prime minister and his opponents included highly intelligent men who would examine and probe every aspect and every ramification of his policies.

When Jameson became prime minister, the morale of Afrikanerdom was shaken because most Afrikaners regarded him as their enemy. They felt that his Raid had been the main cause of the Anglo-Boer War with all its concomitant miseries and humiliations, but relations between Afrikaners and English-speakers actually improved during his premiership because he implemented a policy of conciliation.

Conciliation was essentially a policy of compromise on specific issues and a spirit of goodwill. For instance, Act 5

12. I. Colvin, The Life of Jameson, Vol.2, p.237.

13. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, pp.166-9.

14. R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, p.147.

15. E.A. Walker, A History of Southern Africa, p.430.

of 1904 granted some new seats to S.A.P. constituencies and considerable attention was paid to improving the lot of the farmer,¹⁶ most of whom were S.A.P. supporters. Unfortunately some of Jameson's opponents did not reciprocate in equal measure and they continued to vilify him for his part in the raid which bore his name.¹⁷

In December 1905 the Unionist government in Great Britain resigned and it was replaced by a Liberal administration which won the general election in January 1906 with a large majority.¹⁸ That government was less committed to imperialism than its predecessor and the new prime minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, was sympathetic to the pleas of Afrikaners in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony to grant them self-government as soon as possible.¹⁹ By the end of 1907 both colonies had obtained self-government with Afrikaner parties at the helm²⁰ and this meant that the Afrikaners of the former republics would inevitably play a decisive role in the movement to unite the British colonies in South Africa.

-
16. P. Cuthbert, The Administration of Dr. Jameson as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1904-1908), pp.74-84; J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, pp.27, 72-9, 83.
17. I. Colvin, The Life of Jameson, Vol.2, p.267.
18. The Times History of the War in South Africa, 1899-1902, Vol.6, p.177.
19. W.K. Hancock, Smuts: The Sanguine Years, 1870-1919, p.208.
20. L.M. Thompson, The Unification of South Africa, 1902-1910, pp. 28-9.

Both the Progressive Party and the S.A.P. desired a unification of British colonies in the subcontinent, but the S.A.P., being the party of Cape Afrikanerdom, found itself in a better position to co-operate with the leaders of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. English-speakers realised the necessity of co-operating with the Afrikaners in the north in order to create a united South Africa and with Afrikaners in the colony in order to ensure that the interests which they shared would be safeguarded. Thus, a new spirit of South Africanism emerged ²¹ and the S.A.P. was able to exploit it to its own advantage. Although the Progressive Party changed its name to the South African Unionist Party in 1907, its old imperialist image remained, because its leaders were the same men who had led the Progressive Party and they found themselves unable to shed their dogmatic imperialist ideals, although they had been forced to adapt those ideals to the changing times.

Despite the redistribution of seats in 1904, Progressive majorities in both houses of parliament remained small and it was racked with disunity to such an extent that it was surprising that the Jameson ministry lasted as long as it did. Initially, the Party consisted of 'Stalwarts' ('Extremists') and 'Moderates' ('Mugwumps'), but in time more deep-seated sources of dissension began to emerge. They included the clashing interests of town and country and the commercial rivalry between the large towns, especially the ports of East London and Port Elizabeth, which vied with each other to

21. E.A. Walker, W.P. Schreiner: A South African, p.275.

handle as large a share of the goods bound for the Witwatersrand.²²

The provisions of Act 5 of 1904 reflected an attempt to harmonise the conflicting interests in the Party, while granting more adequate representation to those constituencies which were extremely under-represented. Urban electoral divisions were granted six of the twelve additional seats in the Assembly; one for East London, one for Port Elizabeth and four for the peninsula divisions of Cape Town, Woodstock and Wynberg;²³ while the three new Council seats were allocated to Cape Town, East London, Port Elizabeth and their respective hinterlands.²⁴

When Jameson succumbed to pressure from rival Progressives to re-impose the duty on imported meat and increase the duties on other necessities of life, he shocked most of his urban supporters and alienated many staunch Progressives in the towns. The South African Review, which had previously been a 'Stalwart-Progressive' periodical, withdrew its support from him in 1906 because of those duties²⁵ and in the 1908 Assembly election Alfred Palmer, the editor of the S.A. Review, opposed the three Unionist candidates for Woodstock. He designated himself as an 'Independent Reform' candidate²⁶ and his policies were similar

22. I Colvin, The Life of Jameson, Vol.2 pp.235,251-2,262-3, J Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, p.57.

23. Cape Town two seats and one each for Woodstock and Wynberg.

24. The Western Province consisted of Cape Town and part of its hinterland, while the Eastern Province and the South-Eastern Province could be regarded as the hinterlands of East London and Port Elizabeth respectively.

25. SAR 24.1.1908, p.19.

26. SAR 31.1.1908, p.19; SAR 28.2.1908, p.11.

to those of the Progressive Party in 1904.²⁷ Although he was defeated, he obtained a handsome total of 1 284 votes.²⁸

During the parliamentary session of 1904 the necessity of procuring working majorities for the government in both houses of parliament overshadowed economic questions, but gradually the effects of depression worsened, and by 1907 the country faced an economic crisis. It was then that the opposition succeeded in blocking the Appropriation Bill in the upper house, thereby forcing the government to go to the polls.

In 1903 the Progressive majority in the upper house had numbered only one, but after the by-elections to fill the new seats in terms of Act 5 of 1904 it increased to four. However, by 1907 the Progressive Party and its opponents had an equal number of seats because J.D. Logan, who had been elected as a Progressive member for the Western Province in 1903, defected from the Party to become an Independent²⁹ and C.A. Owen Lewis, a Progressive member for the North-Western Province, died in November 1905 and the S.A.P. captured his seat at the ensuing by-election.³⁰

27. Palmer enunciated his policies in the SAR 20.3.1908, p.21. Although there were some differences between his policies and those appearing in Dr. Jameson's manifesto published in the SAN 8.1.1904, they reflected the change of issues during the intervening years. Nevertheless Palmer's philosophy remained that of a 'Stalwart' Progressive with a special concern for the interests of the urban working class. This was highlighted by his opposition to 'any attempt to impose duties on the necessaries of life' and his views on education, the liquor question and parliamentary representation.

28. See Appendix D, Part 12.

29. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, p.60; LCO 1905, cols. 55, 56, 58, 62, 63.

30. CT 11.11.1905; SAN 27.1.1908.

The crisis was precipitated by the economic difficulties of the time and the failure of the government to tax the profits derived from the export of diamonds, but on 10 September 1907 the Assembly passed the Income Tax Continuance and Mining Profits Tax Bill ³¹ and on 21 September it became law.³² This measure levied a tax of 10% on the profits of diamond and copper mining companies whose profits for the year ending 30 June 1907 exceeded fifty thousand pounds.³³

The Assembly passed an Appropriation Bill on 11 September and it was read a second time in the Council on the following day.³⁴ The house then went into committee on the bill. The president of the Council vacated the chair and the chairman of committees presided, but he was a Progressive member and could only vote if there was a tie in the voting of the other members.

J.D. Logan was the first to speak and he moved that the chairman leave the chair.³⁵ His motion was aimed at suspending the debate on the bill and it was carried with a majority of one.³⁶ On the following day Dr. Jameson moved that the house resume its debate in committee on the bill and A. Wilmot, a Progressive member for the South Eastern Province, seconded

31. HAD 1907, p.540.

32. Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, Acts of Parliament, Session of 1907, p.5300.

33. Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, Acts of Parliament, Session of 1907, p.5301.

34. HAD 1907, p.550; LCD 1907, col.340.

35. LCD 1907, cols. 340-1.

36. LCD 1907, col. 343.

his motion,³⁷ but J.A.C. Graaff, a South African Party member for the North-Western Province, opposed the motion because he felt that the country had lost confidence in the government's administration of the country.³⁸ The voting on the motion resulted in a tie, but the president used his casting vote on the side of the government and the house moved into committee. Whereupon Graaff moved that the chairman leave the chair and his motion was carried with a majority of one vote.³⁹ However, Jameson gave notice that he would move that the house resume the debate in committee on the following day.⁴⁰

On Saturday 14 September Wilmot moved: "That this Council, while not abandoning its abstract claim to reject a Money Bill when it feels itself warranted by the public necessities in resorting to so extreme a measure, is of the opinion that the present circumstances of the Colony by no means warrant the exercise at this time of its privileges in this respect, and considers that the supply grants which have been asked for by the House of Assembly and the principle thereof already affirmed by this Council at the second reading of the Appropriation Bill should on constitutional grounds be no longer withheld."⁴¹

37. LCD 1907, col. 344. Jameson was not a member of the Legislative Council, but cabinet ministers were permitted to address the upper house without being able to cast a vote in its proceedings.

38. LCD 1907, col. 344.

39. LCD 1907, cols. 347-8.

40. LCD 1907, col. 348.

41. LCD 1907, col. 352.

In response Graaff moved the following amendment: "That this House, being satisfied that the Ministers no longer possess the confidence of the country, and that an opportunity ought to be afforded to the electors to express an opinion, is prepared to pass the Appropriation Bill, conditionally that the Ministers assure the House that they will either resign or dissolve Parliament before the end of the year."⁴² The results of the voting on Wilmot's motion and Graaff's amendment were ties, but the president voted with government to break the tie on both occasions.⁴³ Nevertheless the deadlock continued on Monday 16 September and on the following day Jameson capitulated by calling elections for both houses of parliament.⁴⁴ Later in the day the opposition allowed the bill to be passed through all its stages in order to finance the administration of the country until the next meeting of parliament after the elections.

Logan was indeed a stormy petrel in Cape politics. Rhodes's first ministry had fallen in 1893 because in 1892 Sir James Sive-wright, the minister in charge of the Cape Government Railways, had awarded Logan a monopolistic contract to provide refreshment rooms on railway stations for fifteen years⁴⁵ and in September 1907 he helped to precipitate the fall of the Jameson ministry which resigned after its defeat in the Council election of 1908.

42. LCD 1907, col. 355.

43. LCD 1907, cols. 358-9. Edmund Powell (Progressive, Western Province) moved a minor amendment to Wilmot's motion and it was accepted.

44. LCD 1907, col. 372.

45. J.H. Hofmeyr, The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), p.443.

He had entered parliament in 1894 and in 1898 he was elected as a Progressive member of the upper house for the North-Western Province, but in 1903 he changed his constituency to the Western Province.⁴⁶ Early in the session of 1904 he informed Jameson of his intention to depart for Britain on urgent private business. This caused consternation in the ranks of the Progressive Party because the Party had a majority of only one seat in the Legislative Council and his departure could have caused the fall of the government before an Additional Representation Bill had been passed. As a result a group of 250 of his supporters signed a petition requesting him to stay at his post for as long as his Party required his services.⁴⁷ On 10 April 1904 he wrote a letter to W.P. Baxter, the chairman of the executive of the Cape Town Progressive Association, in which he stated that he would remain in the colony until the close of the parliamentary session, even if it lasted for 190 days.⁴⁸ He eventually sailed for Britain on 18 May⁴⁹ and the session lasted until 28 May, but the Additional Representation Bill had been passed by the upper house on 22 April.⁵⁰ This storm in a tea cup undoubtedly alienated him from the rest of his party. In 1905 he moved that a tax should be imposed on

46. The Anglo-African Who's Who and Biographical Sketch Book, 1907, p.188.

47. CAW 25.5.1904, p.22.

48. CAW 25.5.1904, p.22.

49. SAR 20.5.1904, p.21.

50. LCD 1904, col. 155.

the export of diamonds ⁵¹ and his reason for opposing the Appropriation Bill in 1907 was because he felt that the rate of 10% as contained in the Income Tax Continuance and Mining Profits Tax Bill was too small. ⁵²

Unperturbed by his many critics, Logan contested his seat for the Western Province in the ensuing Council election where he was defeated at the bottom of the poll, but nevertheless he received a respectable tally of votes in a contest against Unionist and S.A.P. candidates and this indicated that he commanded a fair amount of support in the region. However, most of his support probably consisted of disgruntled former Progressives who preferred to vote for him rather than the S.A.P. candidates to indicate their disapproval of the government's ineptitude.

Act 29 of 1906 re-enfranchised all the rebels who had been disenfranchised for treasonable acts against the British Empire during the Anglo-Boer War. About 6 000 of the 10 500 of the rebels had been disenfranchised for five years. The war had ended about four years before the Act was passed, so most of the rebels who were still alive and who still met the requirements of the Cape franchise, would have been eligible to become registered voters shortly afterwards. The Act also applied to those persons who had been disenfranchised for life and it enabled them to register as voters in 1907. This meant

51. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, p.60; LCD 1905, col. 51.

52. CT 6.1.1908.

that thousands of people who had been disenfranchised in 1903 and 1904 were able to vote in the elections of 1908.⁵³

As many as 6 150 potential S.A.P. voters had been disenfranchised in the electoral divisions of Aliwal North, Barkly West, Namaqualand, Prieska, Vryburg and Wodehouse,⁵⁴ and the Progressive Party had won all eleven seats for those divisions in the 1904 Assembly general election. Its victories in Aliwal North, Namaqualand and Prieska had been very narrow. Consequently, the re-enfranchisement of hundreds of its opponents in those divisions meant that the five seats for those three constituencies were virtual certain gains for the S.A.P. Somewhat larger Progressive majorities in Barkly West and Wodehouse were also little consolation to the Unionist Party because the number of formerly disenfranchised voters in those constituencies was far greater than the majority of votes obtained by the top Progressive candidates over the bottom 'Anti- Progressive' candidates in the 1904 election. The S.A.P. was also likely to capture the four seats for Barkly West and Wodehouse, while the two 'Progressive-Unionist' seats for Vryburg were also potential S.A.P. gains, although the S.A.P. had not contested the Vryburg division of the 1904 Assembly election because a very large proportion of its electorate had been disenfranchised before the 1904 election.⁵⁵

53. CT 16.10.1907.

54. CT 16.10.1907.

55. There were 1 468 voters in Vryburg after the 1899 general registration of voters, the last registration before the war. After the next registration in 1903 there were only 944 voters in Vryburg.

The following table indicates the number of seats allocated to Aliwal North, Barkly West, Namaqualand, Prieska, Vryburg and Wodehouse in 1904, the number of voters who had been disenfranchised and the number of votes polled for the top Progressive candidate, the top 'Anti-Progressive' candidate and the bottom 'Anti-Progressive' candidate in the general election of that year.

Electoral Divisions	No. of Seats	No. of Disenfranchised Voters ⁵⁶	Votes polled in 1904		
			Top Prog.	Top Anti-Prog.	Bottom Anti-Prog.
Aliwal North	2	800	602	549	533
Barkly West	2	1 693	849	311	239
Namaqualand	2	271	801	748	744
Prieska	1	1 027	389	335	-
Vryburg	2	721	-	-	-
Wodehouse	2	1 638	751	587	572
	<u>11</u>	<u>6 150</u>			

In 1908 the S.A.P. won all eleven seats for the six electoral divisions of Aliwal North, Barkly West, Namaqualand, Prieska, Vryburg and Wodehouse, and Pieter Gysbert Kuhn actually scored the first gain for the S.A.P. in the 1908 Assembly election when he was returned unopposed for Prieska.⁵⁷ In addition, the Unionist Party did not field any candidates in Vryburg or Wodehouse in 1908 and it nominated only one candidate in Aliwal North and one in Barkly West. Consequently, it conceded defeat in a total of seven of

56. These figures were obtained from the Cape Times of 16.10.1907, so they probably include some voters who were disenfranchised between the 1904 Assembly general election and the passing of Act 29 of 1906, but they give a rough idea of the extent to which the S.A.P. was handicapped by disenfranchisement in 1904.

57. SAN 5.3.1908.

the eleven seats for those six constituencies before the election took place.

The following table indicates the number of candidates nominated by each party or group in those constituencies in the 1908 Assembly election; 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidates have been classified under the heading 'Independents'.

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>No. of Seats</u>	<u>Candidates</u>		
		<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>	<u>Independents</u>
Aliwal North	2	2	1	1
Barkly West	2	2	1	0
Namaqualand	2	2	2	0
Prieska	1	1	0	0
Vryburg	2	2	0	1
Wodehouse	2	2	0	1
	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>

Act 29 of 1906 had formed part of Jameson's policy of conciliating his opponents and conciliation implied that an English-speaking Progressive ministry had to meet a predominantly Afrikaner opposition half-way. The government, therefore, framed legislation embodying certain concessions to S.A.P. policy, but the opposition was in a position to demand and sometimes obtain further concessions in the name of conciliation. Eventually, the combined efforts of conciliation, a demoralising depression, small majorities in parliament, declining support among the voters and a determined opposition forced the government to dilute its policies to such an extent that it was actually governing the country according to S.A.P. rather than Progressive

principles.⁵⁸ Nevertheless it was the re-enfranchisement of thousands of potential S.A.P. supporters in 1907 which made it virtually impossible for the Unionist Party to win the 1908 elections.

THE 1908 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION

Polling day was on 21 January,⁵⁹ but the election in the constituency of the Eastern Province was postponed until 21 February⁶⁰ because William Rogers, a sitting S.A.P. member for that constituency and a prospective candidate in this election, died during the campaign.⁶¹ British Bechuanaland and Griqualand West were not contested.⁶²

The final state of the parties after the elections was S.A.P. seventeen seats, Unionist Party eight seats and one Independent, J.J. Keeley (British Bechuanaland) who was generally regarded as a pro-South African Party Independent; the following table indicates how many seats were won by Unionist, S.A.P. and Independent members in each constituency.

58. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, p.79.

59. CGG 9030, 10.1.1908, pp.80-1.

60. CGG 9033, 21.1.1908, p.193.

61. CGG 9019, 3.12.1907, p.1679; CGG 9024, 20.12.1907, p.1866; CGG 9030, 10.1.1908, p.82.

62. CGG 9030, 10.1.1908, p.84.

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Unionist Seats</u>	<u>S.A.P. Seats</u>	<u>Independent Seats</u>	<u>Total Seats</u>
British Bechuanaland	0	0	1	1
Eastern Province	2	2	0	4
Griqualand West	1	0	0	1
Midland Province	0	3	0	3
North-Eastern Province	1	2	0	3
North-Western Province	0	3	0	3
South-Eastern Province	2	2	0	4
South-Western Province	0	3	0	3
Western Province	2	2	0	4
	<u>8</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>26</u>

Dr. Jameson resigned as premier on 31 January 1908⁶³ after the results of the voting in the six constituencies contested on 21 January had indicated that the Unionist Party had no chance whatsoever of obtaining a majority of seats in the upper house as he knew only too well from past experience that it would be impossible to rule the colony without possessing a majority of seats in both houses of parliament. On 3 February Merriman succeeded him, so a South African Party government was in power when the voting in the Eastern Province Council constituency and the Assembly general election took place.

Jameson could have clung to power until after the results of the Assembly general election had been declared, but he chose to saddle Merriman with the responsibility of taking office while the elections were still in progress. His reasons for resigning were quoted in a letter printed in the South African News of 5 February 1908. They included the need to

63. P. Cuthbert, The Administration of Dr. Jameson as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1904-1908), p.108.

give the new government time to prepare itself to make important decisions on questions relating to railway policy, customs and closer union which would be discussed at the forthcoming Inter-Colonial Conference, and the desirability of giving the S.A.P. an opportunity to translate its policies into deeds. However, his resignation served to embarrass the S.A.P. because it was as powerless to wave a magic wand and cure the depression as its predecessor had been. Being the government, people would tend to look to the S.A.P. to produce a solution to the colony's financial ills. Meanwhile Unionists challenged Merriman during the Assembly election campaign to detail his legislative and administrative programme. This he refused to do,⁶⁴ but he stated that he intended 'to curtail expenditure in Cape Town'⁶⁵ and some S.A.P. spokesmen were rash enough to attack the previous government for its retrenchment policy without realising that Merriman would be forced to follow the same expedient in order to balance its books before the Cape Colony entered Union in 1910.⁶⁶

Syntax!

The S.A.P. received more votes than the Unionist Party in six of the seven contested constituencies. In the Western Province the Unionist Party received 3 722 votes more than the S.A.P., but J.D. Logan, an Independent, polled 6 716 votes, so the Unionist Party actually obtained 2 994 votes less than the

64. J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, p.86.

65. CTW 25.3.1908, p.3.

66. B.K. Ross, A Study of Politics in the Cape Colony from January 1908 to May 1910, pp.5,6,21-8; J. Hatherley, The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, pp.121-2.

number of votes polled for the S.A.P. and Logan.⁶⁷ Nevertheless the S.A.P. made significant advances in this constituency as indicated by the results of the voting in the electoral divisions of Simonstown and Woodstock. Both divisions had been Progressive strongholds in the 1904 Assembly election,⁶⁸ but in this election the S.A.P. obtained sixty-two votes more than the combined total of Unionist and Independent votes, while in Woodstock the S.A.P. received 6 840 votes compared with 5 792 votes for the Unionist Party; producing a South African Party majority of 1 048 votes over the Unionist Party. However, Logan obtained 1 367 votes in Woodstock, so the combined Unionist and Independent vote exceeded the S.A.P. vote by a small margin of only 319.⁶⁹

The 1908 Council election was, therefore, a severe blow to the Unionist Party and on 27 January the South African News proclaimed that it was completely routed.⁷⁰ When the results of the voting for the Eastern Province constituency were announced towards the end of February the picture was even more gloomy for the Unionist Party and it realised that the forthcoming Assembly election would be a crucial test of its ability to survive as a viable political force.

67. See Appendix D, Part 8.

68. See Appendix D, Part 7.

69. See Appendix D, Part 9.

70. The SAN titled its article on the election results 'Progressives Completely Routed'. However, it consistently referred to the Unionist Party as the Progressive Party.

THE 1908 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION

There were forty-six constituencies in the Cape Colony, but fourteen of them were not contested; twenty-seven S.A.P. members were returned unopposed for thirteen constituencies and four Unionists were returned unopposed for Kimberley.⁷¹ Polling day in thirty of the thirty-two contested constituencies was on 31 March, but the voters in Cape Town and Grahamstown had already gone to the polls on 12 March.⁷²

The state of the parties in the Assembly after the election was S.A.P. sixty-nine members, Unionist Party thirty-three members and five Independents. However, a number of S.A.P. and Unionist members contested the election as Independents or 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidates. J.W. van Eeden and E.B. Watermeyer stood as 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidates in Swellendam and Clanwilliam, but once they were elected to the Assembly, they were counted as S.A.P. members, while the three members for Paarl and the junior member for Aliwal North, Willem Cloete, were elected as Independents and they were also counted as S.A.P. members after the election. On the other hand, the three Independents elected for Kingwilliamstown were counted as Unionists. They were George Whitaker, Franz Ginsberg and Colonel W.J. Warren. Whitaker had been returned unopposed as Progressive member for Kingwilliamstown together with Colonel F. Schermbrücker in the 1904 Assembly general election, but Warren and Ginsberg were elected as 'Independent-Progressives' at a by-election in July 1904. William Runciman, the sitting member for Simonstown, was sometimes classified as

71. See Appendix D, Part 11.

72. OL 5.3.1908; SAN 5.3.1908; SAN 12.3.1908.

an Independent and on other occasions he was regarded as a Unionist, but after the election he was counted as a Unionist member.

On 30 March Runciman stated at a public meeting in Simonstown that 'his principles were those of Sir James Rose Innes' and that he sought 'support and votes upon those principles'.⁷³ Rose Innes had retired from Cape politics in 1902 when he was appointed as chief justice of the Transvaal. Nevertheless Runciman still regarded himself as a follower of the political principles which Rose Innes had espoused when he was active in Cape politics rather than those of the newly-formed Unionist Party. On 7 February 1908 the South African Review reported that Runciman had initially announced himself as an Independent⁷⁴ and on 31 March the Cape Argus classified him as an Independent Unionist.¹

The five genuine Independents were D.M. Brown (Port Elizabeth),⁷⁵ C.R. Rennie (Griqualand East), Sir J. Gordon Sprigg (East London), W.P. Schreiner (Queenstown) and Colonel Walter Stanford (Tembuland). All of them gained their seats from the Unionist Party and that party also lost nineteen seats to the South African Party.⁷⁶ Nevertheless it scored one gain by

73. CT 31.3.1908.

74. SAR 7.2.1908, p.20.

75. Some commentators have counted Brown as a Unionist, but he contested the election as an Independent and his victory resulted in the defeat of James Wynne, one of the five official Unionist candidates and a sitting 'Progressive-Unionist' member of the Assembly for Port Elizabeth since 1898.

76. See Appendix D, Part 11.

recapturing the second seat for Fort Beaufort which it had lost to A.R. Adendorff in 1904.

This election was the last general election for members of either house of the Cape parliament, but the parties which participated in it had a profound influence on the development of party politics after Union. Dr. Jameson became the first leader of the opposition in the Union parliament and the official opposition in South Africa called itself 'Unionist Party of South Africa' at its inaugural meeting in May 1910,⁷⁷ while the governing party eventually called itself the South African Party.⁷⁸

77. The Unionist Party of South Africa was the product of a merger of the Unionist Party of the Cape Colony, the Progressive Party of the Transvaal and the Constitutionalist Party of the Orange River Colony. (L.M. Thompson, The Unification of South Africa, 1902-1910, p.461; Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa, Vol.11, p.76).

The Orange River Colony reverted to its old name, the Orange Free State, at Union.

78. The government under the leadership of General Louis Botha contested the first parliamentary election of the Union of South Africa in 1910 as three separate parties; the South African Party in the Cape Province, Het Volk in the Transvaal and the Orangia Unie in the Orange Free State; Natal did not have a clear-cut party political system, but official government candidates were nominated in eight constituencies in that province. Government supporters were generally called 'Nationalists', but in 1911 the three parties merged to form the South African National Party. In 1914 General J.B.M. Hertzog and his supporters broke away from the South African National Party to form a new National Party and henceforth the South African National Party called itself the South African Party. (T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.299-303; W.K. Hancock, Smuts: The Sanguine Years, 1870-1919, pp.271,272,358; L.M. Thompson, The Unification of South Africa, 1902-1910, pp.433,461,476).

PART 2

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT

CHAPTER 5

VOTING SYSTEMS AND METHODS OF ASSESSING PARTY SUPPORT
IN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

GENERAL

Most Council and Assembly constituencies returned more than one member to parliament and each voter in those constituencies possessed more than one vote because the number of votes allocated to each voter corresponded with the number of members for his particular constituency. This complicated my assessment of party support.

As the story of Cape elections in the period under review would be incomplete without obtaining some idea of the number of voters who supported each party in the country as a whole and in individual constituencies, it was necessary to use various methods of converting the number of votes polled for each party to estimates of the number of voters who supported it. It must be stressed that the figures obtained are estimates and as such cannot be regarded as strictly accurate reflections of party support, but without them it would be impossible to assess the electoral trends during the crucial formative decade (1898-1908).

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTIONS

The system of voting used in Council elections was known as cumulative voting and it resulted in a crude form of proportional representation which tended to give the weaker of the two major parties in a particular constituency a slight advantage over the stronger party. Unlike other forms of proportional representation, it did not allow the party to obscure the personalities of individual candidates because electors voted for individuals and not for party tickets. In fact, this system tended to synthesise party interests and the personal appeal of individual candidates, but it baffled some contemporary commentators who did not understand its ramifications.

For instance, the weaker of the two major parties in a 'three-member' constituency could be assured of winning one of the three seats for the constituency if it fielded only one candidate and if that candidate obtained the plumped support of just over 25% of the voters who went to the polls and cast valid votes.

This point is illustrated by the following theoretical example of a 'three-member' constituency, containing a hundred voters, in which the stronger party nominated three candidates in the hopes of winning all three seats for the constituency and the weaker party fielded only one candidate in an attempt to obtain one of the three seats for itself. Assuming that each voter used all his votes, a total of 300 votes would have been

recorded and, if seventy-five voters supported the stronger party and twenty-five supported the weaker party, the candidate representing the weaker party would have obtained seventy-five votes, provided that each supporter of his party plumped all their votes for him. This would have left 225 votes to be distributed among the three candidates of the stronger party. If each of the stronger party's seventy-five voters had cast one vote for each of its three candidates, each of them would have received exactly the same number of votes as the candidate of the weaker party.

Nevertheless it does not follow that the candidate of the weaker party would be defeated, if he obtained the support of less than 25% of the voters who went to the polls and cast valid votes because it was possible that one of the candidates of the stronger party could be defeated if its supporters did not distribute their votes evenly among its three candidates. In order to illustrate this let us assume that seventy-seven out of a hundred voters in a three-member constituency supported one party and twenty three supported the other party. If all the voters who supported the weaker party plumped all their votes for their candidate, he would have received a total of sixty-nine votes, while the seventy-seven supporters of the stronger party possessed a combined total of 231 votes between them. However, if seven of them plumped all their votes for one candidate and two of them plumped all their votes for a second candidate and only sixty-eight voters distributed their votes between all three candidates, then the third candidate of the stronger party would have received only sixty-eight votes,

being one less than the number of votes obtained by the candidate of the weaker party, but his running-mates would have received eighty-nine and seventy-four votes respectively.

The following table summarises the derivation of the figures quoted in the previous paragraph:

	<u>No of Votes</u>	<u>Plumpers</u>	<u>Non-Plumpers</u>	<u>No. of Supporters</u>
Weaker Party's Candidate	69	23	0	23
Stronger Party	231	9	68	77
	<u>300</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>100</u>
Stronger Party's:				
Top Candidate	89	7	68	75
Second Candidate	74	2	68	70
Third Candidate	68	0	68	68
	<u>231</u>	<u>9</u>		

Although each voter in a 'three-member' constituency possessed three votes, he could choose to use less than his allotted number of votes, but there was seldom any reason to do so because he could plump all his votes for one candidate, give one vote to each of three candidates or allocate two votes to one candidate and one vote to a second candidate. Apart from ignorance or confusion about the voting system, it would seem that the only valid motivation for a voter in a 'three-member' constituency to cast less than three votes was if he fancied two candidates absolutely equally, in which case he could give one vote to each of them and forfeit his third vote.

Most 'plural-members' constituencies were allocated three seats in parliament, but the Eastern Province, the South-Eastern Province and the Western Province were 'four-member' constituencies in 1908. In those constituencies the weaker party was assured of obtaining one seat if it enjoyed the support of just over 20% of the voters and if each of those voters plumped all their votes for its candidate. However, the weaker party was assured of winning two seats if it had the support of over 40% of the voters and if each voter gave two votes to each of its two candidates.

For instance, six candidates were nominated for the Western Province in 1908, three Unionists, two S.A.P. and one Independent. J.D. Logan, the Independent, could expect his supporters to plump all their votes for him and the S.A.P. called on its supporters to give two votes to each of its candidates,¹ but the Unionist voters were confronted with the problem of distributing their votes among three candidates. The Party organisers realised that its voters should give at least one vote to each of its candidates and that their fourth vote should be distributed among the three candidates according to a specific pattern designed to ensure as even a distribution of votes between the candidates as possible. The Unionist organisation, therefore, divided the constituency into thirteen areas, consisting of the eight districts of the electoral division of Cape Town² and the five electoral divisions of Paarl, Simonstown, Stellenbosch,

1. SAN 18.1.1908.

2. There were the six districts in the City of Cape Town as well as Green Point and Sea Point (District 7), and Robben Island (District 8).

Woodstock and Wynberg, and asked Unionist voters in those areas to distribute their votes among the Party's three candidates - J.D. Cartwright, Sir Pieter Faure and Edmund Powell - according to the following pattern:³

<u>Divisions</u>	<u>AREAS</u>		<u>VOTES</u>		
	<u>Districts</u>	<u>Cartwright</u>	<u>Faure</u>	<u>Powell</u>	
Cape Town	1	2	1	1	
"	2	2	1	1	
"	3	1	1	2	
"	4	2	1	1	
"	5	2	1	1	
"	6	1	1	2	
"	7	1	1	2	
"	8	1	2	1	
Paarl		1	2	1	
Simonstown		2	1	1	
Stellenbosch		1	2	1	
Woodstock		1	1	2	
Wynberg		1	2	1	

Despite this complicated strategy, Powell was defeated, while Cartwright and Faure were elected in third and fourth places in the poll. The S.A.P. candidates occupied the first and second places and the Independent trailed the field.

A total of 79 838 votes was polled in the election and the result of the voting in the constituency was:⁴

3. CA 14.1.1908.

4. CGG 9023, 24.1.1908, p.244; SAN 23.1.1908.

Petersen, Dr. J.	S.A.P.	17 560 votes	Elected
Graaff, D.P. de V.	S.A.P.	17 140 "	"
Cartwright, J.D.	Unionist	13 397 "	"
Faure, Sir P.	Unionist	12 651 "	"
Powell, E.	Unionist	12 374 "	Defeated
Logan, J.D.	Independent	6 716 "	"
		<u>79 838</u> "	

The Unionist candidates received a total of 38 422 votes and the two S.A.P. candidates received a total of 34 700 votes, but each voter possessed four votes, so the number of Unionist and S.A.P. votes were divided by four to obtain estimates of 9 606 Unionist voters and 8 675 S.A.P. voters. Similarly, Logan's votes represented an estimate of 1 679 Independent voters.

The author has called this method of assessing party support the 'ratio method', because it preserved the ratio between the number of votes polled for each party and the estimated number of voters who supported each party as closely as possible as it merely took the number of votes polled for the parties in a particular constituency and divided it by the number of votes per voter in that constituency. This method was used in a number of articles in the contemporary press, but the writers of those articles failed to give their method a name, so it was necessary to give it a name in order to distinguish it from the methods used to assess party support in Assembly elections. All estimates of party support in Council elections have been obtained in terms of the 'ratio method'.

The principal weakness of this method is that it presupposed that each voter gave all his votes to the candidate or candidates of his particular party, whereas a small number of voters in each constituency would have voted across party lines or used less than the number of votes allocated to them. Nevertheless the figures obtained from this method tend to produce a fair, if somewhat deflated, reflection of the relative strengths of the parties in those electoral provinces which were contested in the three Council general elections between 1898 and 1908.

ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

The fact that each voter was permitted to cast only one vote for each candidate in Assembly elections meant that the number of votes polled for a particular candidate corresponded with the number of voters who supported that candidate.

Consequently, P.J. O'Dowd, the Independent candidate for Cape Town in the 1898 election, could claim that he enjoyed the support of 547 voters in that constituency because he obtained 547 votes.⁵

The Cape Argus reported that 5 395 voters went to the polls in that election and that about sixteen ballot papers were rejected, so it could be assumed that some 5 379 voters went to the polls and recorded valid votes.⁶ As O'Dowd was the only non-Progressive candidate, his votes have been subtracted from the number of voters who cast valid votes to obtain a total of 4 832 Progressive voters.

5. CAW 17.8.1898, p.23.

6. These are not official figures, but the CAW 17.8.1898, p.23 indicated that they were 'approximately correct'. In addition to the sixteen rejected ballot papers, the article referred to 'about an equal number regarded as doubtful', but presumably they were not rejected.

The author has called this method of assessing party support the 'minority party vote method'. However, it could only be used in cases where the total number of voters who cast valid votes was known and where the dominant party in the constituency was confronted by only one opponent.

Two other methods have been used; the 'average-ratio method' and the 'highest party vote method'. The 'average-ratio method' takes the total number of votes polled for a party in a particular constituency and divides it by the number of candidates nominated by the party in that constituency, whereas the 'highest party vote method' merely takes the number of votes polled for the top candidate of each party or group in the constituency as an indicator of support for that party or group.

The result of the voting in the 'two-member' constituency of Stellenbosch in the 1898 Assembly election has been taken as an example to illustrate the two methods. A total of 2 066 votes was polled; 1 266 for the Bond-Independent alliance and 800 for the Progressive Party, but the alliance fielded two candidates and the Progressive Party nominated one candidate, so party support was estimated at 633 Bond voters and 800 Progressive voters in terms of the 'average-ratio method'.

The result of the voting in the election was:⁷

Sivewright, Sir James	Progressive	800 votes	Elected
Krige, G.J.	Bond	644 "	"
de Waal, P.	Bond	622 "	Defeated

7. CA 17.8.1898.

In terms of the 'highest party vote method', Progressive and Bond support would have been assessed at 800 and 644 votes respectively. This method was used by the Cape Times in its assessment of party support for the 1904 Assembly election,⁸ but it tended to inflate the aggregates of party support in many constituencies to an unacceptable level. For that reason, the 'average-ratio method' has been used more often than this method.

Unfortunately, Cape Town and Oudtshoorn⁹ were the only constituencies for which any indication of the number of electors who cast valid votes, could be traced in the 1898 Assembly election, but the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazettes of 26 February 1904 and 10 April 1908 quoted the number of voters who went to the polls and the number of rejected ballot papers in each constituency for the elections of 1904 and 1908 respectively, so the estimates of party support in those elections could be adjusted to ensure that they did not exceed the number of voters who cast valid votes.

8. CT 22.2.1904.

9. The derivation of party support in Oudtshoorn and an analysis of the voting appears in Appendix D, Part 3.

CHAPTER 6THE ELECTION IN THE WESTERN
PROVINCE CONSTITUENCY, 1898

Although the Council general election of 1898 marked the beginning of a new era of two-party elections, the personalities of individual candidates continued to play a decisive role in the outcome of a number of the contests and the election in the Western Province constituency illustrated the delicate interaction between party politics and personalities of the individual candidates.

The constituency was allocated three seats in the upper house and five candidates were nominated, three Progressives and two Independents, M.L. Neethling and T.J. O'Reilly. Neethling was actually an 'Independent-Hofmeyr-Bond' candidate, so his votes have been counted as Bond votes and O'Reilly labelled himself as the working man's candidate, but his views were closer to those of the Progressive Party than those of the Bond. As most of his support came from working class Progressive voters, he could be regarded as an 'Independent-Progressive' candidate and his votes have been counted as Progressive votes.

A total of 37 037 votes was cast in the election and the three Progressive candidates obtained a total of 22 841 of those votes, but O'Reilly polled 6 479 votes, bringing the total Progressive figure to 29 320, whilst the remaining 7 717 votes were cast for Neethling. Each voter possessed three votes, so

Progressive and Bond support has been estimated at 9 773 voters and 2 572 voters respectively.

The full result of the voting was: ¹

Faure, J.A.	Progressive	8 593 votes	Elected
Graham, T.L.	"	7 747 "	"
Neethling, M.L.	Independent-Hofmeyr-Bond	7 717 "	"
St. Leger, F.Y.	Progressive	6 501 "	Defeated
O'Reilly, T.J.	Independent-Progressive	6 479 "	"
		<u>37 037</u> "	

The constituency encompassed four electoral divisions and a total of 20 171 voters were registered in those divisions; 8 122 in Cape Division, ² 7 798 in Cape Town, ³ 2 619 in Paarl ⁴ and 1 632 in Stellenbosch; ⁵ but this did not mean that there were actually 20 171 persons registered as voters in the Western Province because individuals were permitted to register in each constituency where they met the requirements of the Cape franchise. It was possible for an individual to be legally registered in the Cape Division, Cape Town, Paarl and Stellenbosch, in which case he would have been counted as four voters in the total electorate

1. CGG 8009, 25.3.1898, p.724.

2. SR 1898, p.30.

3. SR 1898, p.30 indicated that there were 7 800 voters in Cape Town, but CT 14.12.1897 and the statistical appendices to G8-198, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, quoted that there were 7 798 voters in Cape Town. The latter figure appears to be the correct one and has been used in this work.

4. SR 1898, p.30.

5. SR 1898, p.30.

of the Western Province.⁶ Such individuals were permitted to vote in each electoral division where they were registered in Assembly elections because each division was a separate constituency in those elections, but in Council elections they were only permitted to vote once in each electoral province because each of those provinces was a Council constituency.

The electoral division of Cape Town encompassed the urban areas of the City, Green Point and Sea Point and all its voters were classified as urban voters,⁷ while 7 154 of the 8 122 voters in the Cape Division were classified as urban voters.⁸ These two divisions were regarded as town divisions in 1898, but Paarl and Stellenbosch were classified as country divisions, although as many as 1 500 of the 2 619 voters in Paarl were classified as urban voters. However, those voters were registered in the three separate towns of Paarl, Wellington and Franschhoek and it was clear to everybody at the time that the economic and political interests of the majority of the people living in those towns were closer to those of their rural neighbours than those of the people living in the urban areas of the Cape Peninsula.⁹

-
6. HAD 1898, The Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, p.38. Sprigg estimated that there were about 1 000 individuals registered in the two electoral divisions of Cape Town and Cape Division. (His statement was made on 1 June 1898.)
 7. G8-'98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Appendix C', p.xiii.
 8. G8-'98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Appendix C', p.xiii.
 9. G8-'98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Appendix C', p.xiv. The urban voters consisted of 917 in Paarl, 512 in Wellington and 71 in 'French Hoek' (Franschhoek).

In the electoral division of Stellenbosch only 762 of the 1 632 voters were urban voters, so there was no disputing that it was a country division.¹⁰

As the demands for increased representation for the towns and the removal of the duties on imported food played an important role in the election, there was a tendency to label candidates as town candidates or country candidates according to the particular interests which they were expected to champion, if they were elected to parliament. Graham, St. Leger and O'Reilly were labelled as town candidates, while Faure and Neethling were termed country candidates and it was very surprising that only one town candidate and two country candidates were elected to represent this predominantly urban constituency.

The results of the voting in each of the four electoral divisions are listed below:¹¹

	<u>Faure</u>	<u>Graham</u>	<u>Neethling</u>	<u>St.Leger</u>	<u>O'Reilly</u>
Cape Town	2 401	4 015	1 715	3 925	4 359
Cape Division	1 994	3 438	1 814	2 358	2 046
Paarl	2 789	47	2 557	25	44
Stellenbosch	1 409	247	1 631	193	30
Total	<u>8 593</u>	<u>7 747</u>	<u>7 717</u>	<u>6 501</u>	<u>6 479</u>

The table indicates that a total of 16 415 votes was cast in Cape Town, but each voter in the constituency was allocated

10. G8-198, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Appendix C', p.XV.

11. C0 3814 (Cape), Letter No.25, 17.3.1898; C0 3814 (Cape) Letter No.27, 18.3.1898; C0 3816 (Paarl), Letter No.6, 21.3.1898; C0 3816 (Stellenbosch), Letter No.6, 18.3.1898.

three votes, so at least 5 472 voters must have recorded valid votes in that division compared with about 5 379 in the subsequent Assembly election. ¹²

P.J. O'Dowd, the only Non-Progressive candidate in Cape Town in the Assembly election, obtained the support of 547 voters ¹³ and Neethling's support in the Council election was estimated at 572 voters, so it would seem that their support was a fair indicator of 'Anti-Progressive' or potential Bond support in Cape Town in those two elections.

The three Progressive candidates polled a total of 10 341 votes in Cape Town in the Council election, so their support was assessed at 3 447 voters, but O'Reilly's support was estimated at 1 453 voters, producing a figure of 4 900 Progressive voters in the division in this election. Progressive support in the subsequent Assembly election was estimated at 4 832 voters; ¹⁴ only sixty-eight less than the Council figure, if O'Reilly's supporters were counted as Progressive voters, and the close correlation between those two figures would seem to justify the inclusion of his votes as Progressive votes, at least in the case of the electoral division of Cape Town. However, more than two-thirds of O'Reilly's votes were cast in that division and there was nothing to suggest that the votes he obtained in the other three electoral divisions were not polled by potential Progressive voters also.

12. For the Assembly figure see Chapter 5, Assembly Elections.

13. CAW 17.8.1898, p.23.

14. See Chapter 5, Assembly Elections.

In Cape Division only 11 650 votes were cast out of a possible total of 24 366. The low poll in that division could be ascribed to the fact that most electors entitled to vote in either Cape Town or Cape Division probably voted in Cape Town because polling stations only remained open from 8.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. on election day; ¹⁵ so very few persons who worked in the city would have had sufficient time to reach the polling stations in those parts of Cape Division where they lived before they closed. Nevertheless the voting in all four electoral divisions was not very impressive, even if allowance is made for plural registrations. However, it should not be forgotten that in addition to plural registrations some voters had died or left the Western Province since the registration of voters in 1897.

Had the Western Province only consisted of Cape Town and Cape Division, Graham, O'Reilly and St.Leger would have been elected in that order, but the inclusion of Paarl and Stellenbosch caused O'Reilly and St.Leger to be defeated by Faure and Neethling. In fact, Faure and Neethling obtained 93,47% of the votes polled in those two divisions between them and Faure actually received more than half the votes cast in Paarl. This indicated that many of his supporters plumped all their votes for him instead of giving one vote to each of the three Progressive candidates as requested by the Party's organisers.

Cape Town and Cape Division had a combined total of 15 920 voters out of 109 886 in the Cape Colony, so the area warranted

15. CGG 8006, 15.3.1898, p.1406. Act 48 of 1899 extended polling hours to 6 p.m.

three of the twenty-three members of the Council. Thus, the inclusion of the two rural divisions merely served to inflate the electorate of the constituency by 4 251 voters who had little in common with the vast majority of urban voters in the rest of the constituency and, as a result, those voters had little chance of returning more than two members to the Council, but in this election they secured the election of only one town member.

O'Reilly's candidature was doomed to failure from the start because most of his support came from Cape Town and the Woodstock-Salt River area of Cape Division, but he complicated the election for the Progressive Party by asking his supporters to plump for him.¹⁶ Many perspicacious Progressives realised that this could cost the Progressive Party dearly as most of his supporters were potential Progressives and if they gave all their votes to O'Reilly, it would reduce the number of votes cast for the members of the official Party ticket. This caused considerable bitterness between O'Reilly's supporters and those of the ticket, while the Cape Times and the Cape Argus, both Progressive papers, held conflicting views about his candidature. The Cape Times supported the Progressive ticket and paid as little attention to O'Reilly as possible, whereas the Cape Argus portrayed him in as favourable a light as possible and expressed its disappointment at his eventual defeat.¹⁷

16. CA 19.1.1898; CT 16.3.1898; SAR 4.3.1898, p.11.

17. CA 20.1.1898; CA 28.2.1898; CA 18.3.1898; CA 21.3.1898.

However, O'Reilly was not the only complicating factor for the Progressive Party in this election as the Party ticket was not united on all aspects of policy. Faure was a 'Rhodes-Bond' Progressive who had consistently opposed the Innes liquor bill, but Graham and St.Leger supported the bill wholeheartedly. St.Leger took an unequivocal stand against the food duties,¹⁸ while Graham advocated the abolition of the meat duty, but only a reduction of at least 50% in the duty on wheat and flour.¹⁹ Nevertheless many people were sceptical about his true feelings on this question because he had supported the food duties when he contested an Assembly by-election at Beaufort West in 1897. He explained that he had changed his mind since then and he went as far as to suggest that an enormous meeting should be arranged to bring the sufferings caused by the duties to the notice of people living in the rural areas.²⁰

On 20 January 1898, the Cape Argus expressed its misgivings about the ticket as follows:

"The present contest is in some respects the most curious in Cape electoral history. The only approach to a "Ticket" about it is the nomination (of which no formal intimation has been made to the public) of Messrs. St.Leger, Graham, and Faure as the candidates favoured by a committee representing, we suppose, combined Rhodesian [Rhodesite] and Progressive influences. But - this is the first of several

18. CA 11.1.1898 (St.Leger's manifesto).

19. SAR 13.1.1898, p.14 (Graham's manifesto).

20. CT 25.2.1898; CT 26.2.1898.

"buts" - of these three gentlemen one is not wedded to the abolition of the duties on the necessaries of life [Graham], while the other is actually a Bondsman [Faure] - at least so we have been given to understand. Then the South African Political Association - a body whose foremost plank is this of food duties, nominates two candidates only, although half the engineering which got the Ticket of Four²¹ in would carry three candidates; and avoids Mr. O'Reilly who is sound from the Association point of view on the food question, while supporting Mr. Graham who is not."

Rose Innes did not regard Faure as a 'thorough Progressive'²² and in a letter to the Cape Times published on 14 January 1897 he indicated that there had been a very good chance of returning three 'thorough Progressives' before the Progressive Electoral Committee decided to nominate Faure as one of its candidates. However, the leading article of the Cape Times on the same day took Rose Innes to task for opposing Faure's nomination by pointing out that if three out-and-out Progressive candidates were nominated against Faure and Neethling, all five candidates would probably obtain about 7 500 votes. This left no margin of safety and could have resulted in the defeat of two of the three out-and-out Progressives. As the most important consideration for the Progressive Party was the defeat of Neethling, the choice of Faure as a Progressive candidate seemed to be the only

-
21. This ticket consisted of T.E. Fuller, L. Wiener, J.L.M. Brown and H. Beard, the four candidates elected to represent Cape Town in the 1894 Assembly general election.
22. See Chapter 2, The 1898 Legislative Council General Election.

solution. Yet despite the nomination of Faure, Graham was the only out-and-out Progressive elected.

After the election the Cape Times quoted three reasons for St.Leger's defeat.²³ Firstly, about 25% of the suburban voters did not bother to go to the polls because they believed that he was certain to be elected. Secondly, he persuaded his friends and personal supporters not to plump all their votes for him²⁴ and thirdly, many Progressives who supported the South African Political Association were confused by its injunction to voters to vote for only two candidates, St. Leger and Graham, that they cast only two votes, one for St. Leger and one for Graham, thereby forfeiting their third vote.²⁵ Although this cost the Progressive Party a fair number of votes, St.Leger was unlikely to have obtained the additional 1 217 votes he needed to beat Neethling from confused S.A.P.A. supporters. Nevertheless the Cape Times was probably correct in its overall assessment of the reasons for his defeat.

On 19 March 1898 the Diamond Fields Advertiser, a Progressive paper published in Kimberley, summarised the reasons for the Party's failure to win the three seats for the Western Province with considerable insight, stating: 'It no doubt seemed to many voters that the S.A.P.A., the S.A. League, and the Central

23. St.Leger and R.W. Murray founded the Cape Times in 1876 and St.Leger was its editor until 1895. (The Prominent Men of the Cape Colony, South Africa, p.72; South Africa 30.3.1901, p.715.)

24. This was out of loyalty to the other members of the Progressive ticket.

25. CT 18.3.1898.

Progressive Committee²⁶ were not united in the common object of returning the "ticket of three"; and, of course, the awkward invasion of the Progressive camp by Mr. O'REILLY added to the complexity of the situation.'

26. Previously called the "Rhodesite" Electoral Committee and Progressive Electoral Committee. (Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.172).

CHAPTER 7

THE THREE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTIONS

CONSTITUENCIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT

Originally, there were only two Council constituencies, the Eastern Districts and the Western Districts,¹ but in 1874 the Cape Colony was divided into the seven 'three-member' constituencies; the Eastern Province, the Midland Province, the North-Eastern Province, the North-Western Province, the South-Eastern Province, the South-Western Province and the Western Province.² This redelimitation of Council constituencies was intended to reduce the prevailing hostility between the east and the west of the country. Each sector was divided into three constituencies and allocated a total of nine members, while the three members for the new Midland Province constituency were in a position to break any deadlock which might arise from a confrontation between the representatives of the two equally-represented major sectors.

The annexation of Griqualand West in 1880 and British Bechuanaland in 1895 resulted in the creation of two new 'single-member' constituencies to grant parliamentary representation to those regions. The Transkeian Territories were added to the Eastern Province constituency in 1887.

-
1. Cape of Good Hope, Acts of Parliament, Sessions of 1854 and 1855, pp.vii-viii.
 2. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol.2, 1872-1886, pp.1340-1343.

The Legislative Council was often called the Cape's House of Lords; members of this august body had to be thirty years of age and own at least £2 000 worth of unmortgaged landed property.³ The accent, therefore, fell on the election of members of the Cape's landed gentry to its upper house and as such the delimitation of Council constituencies was biased in favour of the rural areas. This in itself would have been quite acceptable to both parties, had the urban areas been granted more adequate representation in the lower house and for that reason, the redistribution controversy of 1898 was limited to Assembly constituencies and their representation. Nevertheless it was clear that both the delimitation and the representation of voters in the various Council constituencies were at odds with the evolution of the system of two-party elections.

Although some alterations were made to the boundaries and the representation of some constituencies between 1898 and 1908, the disparities in the representation of the voters in the different constituencies remained an important factor in Council elections throughout the period. The alterations in the boundaries of electoral provinces resulted from changes in the delimitation of certain electoral divisions in terms of Act 19 of 1898, and Act 5 of 1904 granted additional representation to some existing electoral provinces.

3. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol.1, 1652-1871, p.509; CGG 10.12.1907, p.1734. An exception was made for owners of mortgaged property of that value, if they possessed movable or immovable property to the value of not less than £4 000.

There were twenty-three members of the upper house in 1898 and 1903, and the total electorate of the Cape Colony in those years numbered 109 886 and 135 177 voters respectively, so each member of the Council represented an average of approximately 4 778 voters in 1898 and approximately 5 877 in 1903, but in 1904 the number of members was increased to twenty-six and this reduced the average number of voters per member to 5 199.⁴ However, in 1908 there were 152 134 voters and twenty-six members of the Council, so the average increased once again to 5 851.

Griqualand West was the most under-represented constituency in 1898 and 1908, but the Western Province was the most under-represented constituency in 1903. On the other hand, British Bechuanaland was the most over-represented constituency in 1898, 1903 and 1908. As the Progressive Party was the dominant party in British Bechuanaland, Griqualand West, the Eastern Province, the South-Eastern Province and the Western Province in the elections of 1898 and 1903, its members represented constituencies at both ends of the spectrum. However, all Progressive constituencies, except British Bechuanaland, had more voters per member than the national average in both elections, and in 1908 the two Unionist constituencies of Griqualand West and the Western Province were by far the most under-represented constituencies in the country.

4. The registration of voters conducted in 1903 was still applicable in 1904, so there was no change in the number of voters between 1903 and 1904.

The following table lists the number of voters per member in each of the nine constituencies in 1898, 1903 and 1908 as well as the national averages: ⁵

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>No. of Voters per Member</u>		
	<u>1898</u>	<u>1903</u>	<u>1908</u>
British Bechuanaland	3 159	1 702	2 146
Eastern Province	5 658	6 839	6 278
Griqualand West	8 539	8 357	11 619
Midland Province	3 461	3 275	3 816
North-Eastern Province	3 516	3 918	4 165
North-Western Province	3 810	3 795	4 635
South-Eastern Province	5 272	7 338	5 310
South-Western Province	4 289	4 815	5 757
Western Province	6 724	11 727	9 225
<u>National Average:</u>	<u>4 778</u>	<u>5 877</u>	<u>5 851</u>

Victor Sampson, the Attorney-General and the minister responsible for piloting the redistribution bill of 1904 through parliament, stated that he had taken the figure of 5 000 voters per member as his yard-stick for granting additional representation and all constituencies which had more than 5 000 voters per member were granted one new seat, except Griqualand West. ⁶ However, the Western Province had approximately 11 727 voters per member and its electorate of 35 180 actually warranted seven members, or an increase of four members instead of one, as provided by the bill.

5. For the number of voters registered in each electoral province in 1898, 1903 and 1908 see Appendix B.

6. HAD 1904, p.61, LCD 1904, col.110.

Consequently, J.D. Logan, the forthright Progressive member for that constituency, protested very strongly about the inadequate increase in the representation of his constituents,⁷ especially as he, like most Progressive candidates in the election campaigns of 1903 and 1904 had campaigned for a redistribution of seats which took due cognisance of the number of voters registered in the various constituencies. This contributed to the strained relations between him and the Progressive Party which led to his becoming an Independent member of the Council.

Although the creation of one additional seat for the Western Province in terms of this Act reduced the number of voters per member for that constituency to 8 795, it remained the most under-represented electoral province closely followed by Griqualand West. On the other hand, the creation of the new seats for the Eastern Province and the South-Eastern Province reduced their number of voters per member to 5 129 and 5 404 respectively, but they remained less adequately represented than the S.A.P. constituencies of Midland Province, North-Eastern Province, North-Western Province and South-Western Province as well as the grossly over-represented Progressive constituency of British Bechuanaland.

Griqualand West remained a 'single-member' constituency, although it had 8 357 voters, while the Midland Province with 9 826 voters remained a 'three-member' constituency and this disparity in the representation of the two electoral provinces

7. LCD 1904, cols.130-1.

reached absurd proportions by 1908 when the Midland Province, with an electorate of 11 449 voters returned three members to the upper house, while Griqualand West with 11 619 voters was represented by only one member of that house.

Griqualand West's problem in 1904 was that its electorate justified more than one member, but that it fell short of Sampson's quota for a second member. If it had been granted an additional seat, the Progressive Party would have scored a temporary advantage by winning the new seat in the ensuing by-election, but the S.A.P. or some 'Anti-Progressive' Independent candidate would have needed to obtain the support of just over one-third of the voters to win one of the two seats in the next Council general election because of the operation of cumulative voting. This anomaly could have been remedied by a special provision to use the Assembly system of voting in Griqualand West in view of the fact that the system of cumulative voting was not suited to 'two-member' constituencies, but that would have given added weight to S.A.P. allegations that the redistribution legislation of 1904 was designed purely to entrench the Progressive Party in power and it would have caused confusion by having two different systems of voting in Council elections.

PARTY SUPPORT

The Council elections of 1898, 1903 and 1908 provide an excellent barometer of support for the 'Bond-S.A.P.' and the Progressive-Unionist' groupings during the period under review as the following table shows:

<u>General Elections</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Voters</u>		<u>No. of Registered Voters</u>
	<u>Bond/S.A.P.</u>	<u>Progressive/Unionist</u>	
1898	25 185	37 570	109 886
1903	38 242	42 559	135 177
1908	62 823	36 466	152 134

While the total electorate of the Cape Colony increased by 38,45% during the period, it will be seen that the 'Bond-S.A.P.' had a much larger proportionate growth and that by 1908 it had more than doubled its voting strength. On the other hand, 'Progressive-Unionist' backing remained relatively constant, with a modest advance in 1903 that turned into a marked decline by 1908.

THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT

(i) 1898

In eight contested constituencies a total of 168 744 votes was polled; the Griqualand West 'single-member' constituency was an uncontested victory for the Progressive Party. Of the votes recorded, 24 967 were cast in the problematical South-Western Province constituency where 7 016 of those votes could be regarded as Progressive votes and the remaining 17 951 could be counted as Bond votes.⁸ In the other seven contested constituencies there were thirteen Progressive candidates, thirteen Bond candidates and two Independents, T.J. O'Reilly (Western Province) and J.J. Joubert (North-Western Province). The Progressive candidates obtained 85 035

8. See Chapter 2, The 1898 Legislative Council General Election.

votes compared with 50 646 for the Bond candidates, 6 479 for O'Reilly and 1 617 for Joubert.⁹

The following table indicates the measure of Progressive and Bond support in each constituency. The votes accruing to O'Reilly and Joubert have been counted as Progressive and Bond respectively because their support tended to come from adherents of those persuasions.¹⁰

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Votes</u>		<u>No. of Votes per Voter</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Voters</u>	
	<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Bond</u>		<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Bond</u>
British Bechuanaland	788	504	1	788	504
Eastern Province	20 965	7 059	3	6 988	2 353
Griqualand West	-	-	-	4 202	1 445
Midland Province	6 138	10 606	3	2 046	3 535
North-Eastern Province	7 127	10 708	3	2 376	3 569
North-Western Province	7 378	12 194	3	2 459	4 065
South-Eastern Province	19 798	3 475	3	6 599	1 158
South-Western Province	7 016	17 951	3	2 339	5 984
Western Province	29 320	7 717	3	9 773	2 572
	<u>98 530</u>	<u>70 214</u>		<u>37 570</u>	<u>25 185</u>

Estimates of Progressive and Bond support in the uncontested constituency of Griqualand West have been derived from the results of the voting in the electoral divisions of Kimberley and Barkly West in the subsequent Assembly election because they provided the only reliable guide to the relative strengths of the two parties in this electoral province during 1898.¹¹

9. For the results of the voting in the 1898 Council election see Appendix D, Part 1.

10. This corresponds with the views of the SAN 21.11.1903 in its discussion of the voting in the 1898 Council election.

11. See Appendix D, Part 3.

(ii) 1903

Only six of the nine constituencies were contested in this election and a total of 197 448 votes was polled; 105 633 for the Progressive Party, 74 652 for the S.A.P. and 17 163 for the two Independent candidates, Dr. A.H. Petersen (Western Province) and G.H. Maasdorp (Midland Province).¹² As the Independents were opponents of the Progressive Party and the S.A.P. did not oppose them,¹³ their votes have been counted as S.A.P. votes in the assessment of party support.

Reflected below are the number of votes polled for the two parties in each of the six constituencies as well as the estimates of Progressive and S.A.P. support for each of the nine constituencies in the country:

-
12. For the results of the voting in the 1903 Council election see Appendix D, Part 5.
 13. The S.A.P. only nominated two candidates for the 'three-member' constituency of Midland Province, leaving the third seat for Maasdorp, and it did not nominate any candidates for the Western Province in order to secure Petersen's election. Petersen was elected and Maasdorp was defeated.

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Votes</u>		<u>No. of Votes per Voter</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Voters</u>	
	<u>Progressive</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u> ¹⁴		<u>Progressive</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>
British Bechuanaland	-	-	-	800	275
Eastern Province	23 614	11 433	3	7 871	3 811
Griqualand West	-	-	-	3 389	1 828
Midland Province	5 181	12 546	3	1 727	4 182
North-Eastern Province	-	-	-	3 158	5 534
North-Western Province	6 230	18 566	3	2 077	6 189
South-Eastern Province	25 646	11 436	3	8 549	3 812
South-Western Province	7 481	22 296	3	2 494	7 432
Western Province	37 481	15 538	3	12 494	5 179
	<u>105 633</u>	<u>91 815</u>		<u>42 559</u>	<u>38 242</u>

The three unopposed constituencies consisted of ten electoral divisions; Mafeking and Vryburg in British Bechuanaland, Barkly West and Kimberley in Griqualand West, and Albert, Colesberg, Cradock, Fort Beaufort, Middelburg and Somerset East in the North-Eastern Province. Barkly West, Kimberley, Albert, Colesberg, Fort Beaufort and Somerset East were contested in the 1904 Assembly election and party support in those divisions in the 1903 election were derived from the results of the voting in that election; the votes polled for 'Anti-Progressive' Independents being counted as potential S.A.P. votes.¹⁵ However, the estimates for Mafeking, Vryburg, Cradock and Middelburg in both the 1903 Council election and the 1904 Assembly election had to be derived by other means. As there were no voting figures for these constituencies, it was necessary to seek clues regarding the relative strengths of the

14. These figures include the votes polled for the Independents, G.H. Maasdorp (Midland Province) and Dr. A.H. Petersen (Western Province).

15. See Appendix D, Part 7.

parties. In Vryburg the Progressive Party held a poll towards the end of 1903 to choose its two candidates for the Assembly election. More than 500 persons participated in the poll,¹⁶ so it could be assumed that there were about 500 Progressive voters in Vryburg, but this figure seemed a little high in view of the fact that there were only 944 voters registered in the constituency, so a more conservative figure of 450 was chosen. S.A.P. support was estimated at 225 voters; being exactly half the number credited to the dominant party in the division in 1903 and 1904.

Progressive and S.A.P. support in the neighbouring division of Mafeking was estimated at 350 and 50 voters respectively. In the 1898 Council election Progressive and Bond support had been 349 and 18 voters¹⁷ but the electorate had increased from 605 in 1898 to 758 in 1903 and the 1898 election was the last time the two parties contested each other in Mafeking, so the figures for 1903 were based on those of 1898 rounded to the nearest fifty.

An addition of the estimates for Vryburg and Mafeking suggests that there were some 800 Progressive voters and 275 S.A.P. voters in British Bechuanaland. However, the South African News, a S.A.P.-supporting newspaper, improvised voting

16. CA 11.1.1904 quoted the result of the poll as follows: W. Rubidge 292 votes, W. Crosbie 285 votes, F. Flynn 268 votes and W.A. Fincham 194 votes. A total of 1 039 votes were cast and each voter was allocated two votes, so at least 520 voters participated in the poll.

17. These were the actual voting figures for G.D. Smith and G.C.A. Hassforth (OL 24.3.1898). As each voter possessed only one vote, these figures reflected the number of voters who supported each party.

figures for the unopposed constituencies in its issue of 21 November 1903 and credited the Progressive Party with 408 voters and the S.A.P. with 272 in British Bechuanaland, implying that there were 408 potential Progressive voters in that 'single-member' constituency. Although the S.A.P. figure was a reasonable one, the Progressive one was far too low, especially in view of the increase in the number of voters registered in the safe Progressive electoral division of Mafeking, where the Progressive candidate had polled 349 votes in 1898 and where the memory of the siege was still strong and would tend to sustain local enthusiasm for the militant imperialist-wing of the Progressive Party. Then too there was the electoral division of Vryburg, where the top Progressive candidate in the 1899 Assembly by-election had obtained as many as 421 votes and furthermore the S.A.P. had not bothered to field any candidates there in the 1904 Assembly election.

There were no clues as to the relative strengths of the parties in Cradock and Middelburg, so the figures for those electoral divisions were based on the assumption that there were four times as many S.A.P. voters as Progressives and that 75% of the electorate in those constituencies would have voted if there had been a contest between the two parties in 1903 and 1904 because 75% of the voters in the other four divisions in the North-Eastern Province went to the polls and cast valid votes in the 1904 election.

(iii) 1908

Only seven of the constituencies were contested, including

the election in the Eastern Province constituency on 21 February which was actually a by-election. Nevertheless it has been grouped together with the elections in the other six contested constituencies where the voters went to the polls on 21 January, and a total of 324 444 votes was polled on those two dates. The South African Party obtained 200 982 votes, J.D. Logan, the Independent candidate for the Western Province, received 6 716 votes and the remaining 116 746 votes have been counted as Unionist votes.¹⁸ However, A.I. Vintcent, the defeated candidate in the 'three-member' constituency of the South-Western Province, was classified as an Independent in the Cape Argus¹⁹ and as a 'Progressive' candidate in the South African News,²⁰ so he could be regarded as an 'Independent-Unionist' candidate, most of his supporters being undoubtedly Unionists because the South African Party fielded a full slate of three candidates and Vintcent was the only 'Non-S.A.P.' candidate in the contest.

The number of S.A.P. and Unionist votes polled in each of the seven contested constituencies as well as the estimates of party support in all nine constituencies are given hereunder:²¹

-
18. For the results of the voting in the 1908 Council election see Appendix D, Part 8.
19. CA 24.1.1908.
20. SAN 27.1.1908.
21. Vintcent's votes have been counted as Unionist votes, but Logan's votes have been ignored because his supporters could not be regarded as S.A.P. or Unionist voters.

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		<u>No of Votes per Voter</u>	<u>Estimated</u> 22 <u>Number of Voters</u>	
	<u>Unionist</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>		<u>Unionist</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>
British Bechuanaland	-	-	-	600	900
Eastern Province	26 628	30 504	4	6 657	7 626
Griqualand West	-	-	-	4 500	3 000
Midland Province	3 867	21 898	3	1 289	7 299
North-Eastern Province	7 211	20 825	3	2 404	6 942
North-Western Province	6 284	27 911	3	2 095	9 304
South-Eastern Province	25 558	31 655	4	6 390	7 914
South-Western Province	8 776	33 489	3	2 925	11 163
Western Province	38 422	34 700	4	9 606	8 675
	<u>116 746</u>	<u>200 982</u>		<u>36 466</u>	<u>62 823</u>

S.A.P. support throughout the country increased dramatically between 1903 and 1908, but its most spectacular gains were in the formerly Progressive-dominated regions of the Eastern Province and the South-Eastern Province. On the other hand, Unionist support in most electoral provinces was not only less than the Progressive figure in 1903 but also less than its figure in 1898. However, Griqualand West and the South-Western Province were exceptions, but it should be remembered that Griqualand West's figures in all three Council elections are conjectural because the constituency was not contested in any of those elections, while the use of Vincent's figures to derive potential Unionist support in the South-Western Province probably inflated the Unionist figure because a fair number of Independent voters may have voted for him. Nevertheless, those Independent voters were opponents of the S.A.P.

22. The derivation of the estimates of party support in the unopposed constituencies of British Bechuanaland and Griqualand West are discussed in Appendix D, Part 10.

Despite the disproportionate representation of the voters registered in the various constituencies, the cumulative system of voting produced a close correlation between voter-support for the parties and their representation in parliament, especially in the Council elections of 1898 and 1903.²³

However, the same cannot be said for the system of voting in Assembly elections.

23. The estimates of Progressive and Bond support in 1898 were 37 570 and 25 185 voters and the two parties obtained 14 and 9 seats respectively. In 1903 Progressive support was measured at 42 559 voters and it won 12 seats, while there were about 38 242 'Anti-Progressive' voters and they returned 10 S.A.P. members and an 'Anti-Progressive' Independent.

CHAPTER 8

PARTY SUPPORT AND THE ASSEMBLY
GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1898 AND 1904

Although the Bond-Independent alliance won the 1898 Assembly election, it obtained appreciably less support than the Progressive Party and its allies. In 1904 the Progressive Party was victorious, but it received approximately the same amount of support as its opponents; the South African Party and a variety of Independent and Labour candidates.

Various estimates of party support were made by contemporaries, but the validity of methods used was open to question as the figures did not correspond.¹ For instance, Sir Alfred Milner estimated that there were some 44 403 Progressives and some 37 901 Bond supporters in the Cape Colony at the 1898 Assembly election,² whereas Rhodes claimed that there were about 50 000 Progressives and 36 000 Bond supporters.³

-
1. Two interesting, but contradictory, estimates of party support in the 1904 Assembly general election appear in the SAN 15.2.1904 (a letter to the editor written by W.B. Melville on 13.2.1904) and the CT 22.2.1904. Melville used the 'average-ratio method' and the CT used the 'highest party vote method' (See Chapter 5 for a discussion of these methods). Melville's letter included a list of individual estimates for the thirty constituencies whose results were at hand when he put pen to paper. The main defect in his assessment was his method of assessing party support in unopposed constituencies, but there are also strong objections to some of his figures for contested constituencies. For example, he credited the Progressive Party with no support at all in the constituency of Queenstown because he regarded the two victorious candidates as Independents, whereas they should be regarded as Progressives or 'Independent-Progressives'.
 2. C. Headlam (Ed.), The Milner Papers, South Africa, 1897-1899, p.275.
 3. Vindex (Pseud.), Cecil Rhodes: His Political Life and Speeches, 1881-1900, pp.600, 614, 615.

Hence, it was necessary to assess party support in each constituency for both the 1898 and the 1904 elections in order to obtain as acceptable a set of figures as possible. The following table reflects the aggregate of party support according to my figures; the Bond figure indicates the support enjoyed by the 'Bond-Independent' alliance in 1898 and the 'Anti-Progressive' figure represents the combined support for all the various 'Anti-Progressive' groups in 1904:

	<u>Estimated No. of Voters</u>	
	<u>1898</u>	<u>1904</u>
Progressive Party	42 293	42 009
Bond	32 265	-
'Anti-Progressives' (S.A.P., Labour and 'Anti-Progressive' Independents ⁴)	-	41 792
	<u>74 558</u>	<u>83 801</u>

Detailed results of the voting and estimates of party support for each constituency at both elections appear in Appendix D⁵, therefore only the most significant results and the most unusual contests are discussed in this chapter.

The result for Stellenbosch in 1898 seems to have been crucial. The Progressive Party gained one seat there, but the indications are that it could have gained a second seat. As only one nomination was made, the Progressive Party forfeited

4. These included some candidates who labelled themselves 'Independent-Progressives'.

5. Parts 3 and 7.

a seat, but seemingly in the process lost the election through this default at Stellenbosch on nomination day.

In the previous Council election the three official Progressive candidates obtained 1 849 of the 3 510 votes cast in Stellenbosch.⁶ J.H. Hofmeyr had represented the constituency in the Assembly from 1879 until his retirement from parliament in 1895⁷ and it was felt that his influence in the constituency was still very strong in 1898.⁸ Consequently, the Progressive Party decided to field only one candidate, Sir James Sivewright, the Commissioner of Public Works in Sprigg's cabinet, because it hoped that his personal prestige would ensure him a victory. Sir James was elected at the top of the poll, but the Bond-Independent alliance won the second seat.⁹

Early in 1899 the two members for Stellenbosch were unseated because of malpractices on the part of certain of their agents, but they were not debarred from standing for re-election¹⁰. Both parties fielded two candidates at the ensuing by-election and the Bond candidates were victorious.¹¹ In 1904 two S.A.P. candidates were elected with majorities of forty-four and thirty-two votes over the top Progressive candidate.¹²

6. See Chapter 6.

7. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, pp.157-159,419.

8. CT 18.8.1898.

9. For the result of the voting see Appendix D, Part 3.

10. Cape Law Reports, Cape Supreme Court, 1899, pp.30-63, 64-89; OL 21.1.1899; OL 2.2.1899.

11. For the result of the voting in the by-election see Appendix D, Part 3.

12. For the result of the voting see Appendix D, Part 7.

In the neighbouring constituency of Paarl the Progressive Party lost a seat in 1898 because Dr. J.M. Hoffman (Bond) defeated Sir Pieter Faure. Faure and J.S. Marais had been elected for the constituency in the 1894 Assembly election,¹³ but in 1898 Sir Pieter stood as a Progressive candidate and Marais supported the Bond. Hoffman was elected at the top of the poll and Marais came second.¹⁴

On 30 September 1900 Marais died and P.J. Cillie retained his seat for the Bond at the ensuing by-election when he defeated J.I. de Villiers, an Independent, by 1 078 votes to 943.¹⁵ In 1904 Hoffman and Cillie were elected as S.A.P. members for Paarl.¹⁶

Vryburg was the last contest in the 1898 Assembly election and two Progressives were elected.¹⁷ The constituency was extremely marginal as the Bond had obtained a majority of only forty-seven votes in the previous Council election,¹⁸ but in this election D.J. Haarhoff, the top Progressive candidate, obtained a majority of 135 votes over the top Bond candidate and A.W. Fincham, the second Progressive candidate, polled only six votes less than Haarhoff.

13. SAR 23.2.1894, p.14.

14. For the result of the voting see Appendix D, Part 3.

15. CT 21.12.1900; SAN 2.10.1900; SAN 20.12.1900; SAN 21.12.1900.

16. For the result of the voting see Appendix D, Part 7.

17. Polling day in Vryburg was on 5 September 1898. For the result of the voting see Appendix D, Part 3.

18. The result of the voting in Vryburg in the 1898 Council election was: G.C.A. Hassforther (Independent-Bond) 486 votes and G.D. Smith (Progressive) 439 votes (OL 2.4.1898). Each voter was allocated one vote in this election.

Both Haarhoff and Fincham resigned their seats in December 1898 while facing a petition to the Supreme Court to have them unseated,¹⁹ but neither of them was debarred from contesting the ensuing by-election. Each party nominated two candidates in the by-election and the Bond candidates were elected.²⁰

A total of 2 554 voters was registered in Vryburg in 1898 and a considerable number of those voters consisted of men from other parts of the Colony who had volunteered to quell the Langeberg rebellion in 1897. About three or four hundred of them returned to the constituency to cast their votes in the 1898 Assembly general election and the 1899 by-election.²¹ Most of them were Progressives and it was generally agreed that the Progressive Party would not have won the seats for Vryburg in the 1898 election, had it not been for the volunteer vote, but it would seem that only about one hundred volunteers actually voted in the by-election,²² although 340 of them were reported to be aboard a special train when it left Kimberley.²³ The train reached its destination in time for them to reach their polling stations, but it would appear that most of the men were

19. E.A. Walker, Lord de Villiers and his Times, South Africa, 1842-1914, p.325; CT 19.12.1898.

20. For the result of the voting see Appendix D, Part 3.

21. Different sources quoted different figures.

22. CT 15.4.1899.

23. CT 15.4.1899; CTW 12.4.1899, p.3 mentions that some of the passengers on the train were voters permanently resident in Vryburg who had been in Cape Town on holiday or on business.

too tired to drag themselves off to vote immediately after their long and uncomfortable journey.²⁴

After the election Bond supporters raised the question of the legality of the volunteer vote and the judgment in the test case, *Sonnenberg vs Pennell*, indicated that the volunteers had no right to be registered in Vryburg, but the Supreme Court felt that it should refrain from ordering that their names should be expunged from the list of voters.²⁵ Pennell had been registered in Vryburg and in Cape Town, but the Cape Times indicated that very few of the volunteers had been registered in any other constituency except Vryburg.²⁶ Nevertheless it should be remembered that they were on active service and were unable to return home to ensure that they were registered in the electoral divisions where they owned a dwelling or received their salaries²⁷ when the registration took place, so they allowed themselves to be registered in terms of the salary qualification in the electoral division where they were stationed.²⁸ Had they not done so, they stood a good chance of being disenfranchised until the next registration of voters

24. The actual reasons why the majority of volunteers did not record their votes in the by-election seems to have been a mystery. For the story of the journey see the CTW 12.4.1899, p.3. See also CT 10.4.1899 for Sauer's explanation of his part in the proceedings.

25. Cape Law Reports, Cape Supreme Court, 1899, p.121-8.

26. CT 16.8.1898.

27. For the provisions of the Cape franchise see Chapter 1.

28. The Constitution Ordinance did not stipulate that a voter had to be resident in the electoral division where he was registered in terms of the salary qualification.

scheduled for 1899. This would have meant that many of them might have been deprived of their right to vote in the 1898 Council election and Assembly election because they had volunteered to serve their country.

In the 1903 Council election the Progressive candidate for British Bechuanaland was returned unopposed, so there was no voting in Vryburg in that election and in the 1904 Assembly election two Progressives, W. Crosbie and W. Rubidge, were returned unopposed. This represented two gains for the Progressive Party, but the electorate had changed radically since the by-election in 1899. Firstly, the volunteers were no longer registered in Vryburg and, secondly, hundreds of potential S.A.P. supporters had been disenfranchised during and after the Anglo-Boer War.

Aliwal North and Wodehouse were marginal constituencies in 1898 and 1904. The Progressive Party had obtained more votes than the Bond in both constituencies at the 1898 Council election,²⁹ but in the Assembly election the Bond-Independent alliance won all four seats for the two constituencies. In the 1904 Assembly election the Progressive Party captured those four seats from the S.A.P.

In the 1898 Assembly election three candidates were nominated in Aliwal North and five in Wodehouse. J.W. Sauer and J.N.P. Botha were elected for Aliwal North with 796 and 600 votes respectively, while C.P. Crewe,³⁰ the Progressive

29. CA 25.3.1898; CT 28.3.1898.

30. Subsequently Sir Charles Crewe.

candidate, obtained 598 votes. In Wodehouse J.X. Merriman and P.J. de Wet were elected with 1 082 and 1 078 votes, the two Progressive candidates, Dr. Thomas Smartt and J.K. Stretton, received 964 and 948 votes respectively and H.E. Halse, an Independent, polled eighteen votes.

In the 1904 Assembly election the Progressive Party and the S.A.P. each nominated two candidates in Aliwal North and Wodehouse. C.P. Crewe topped the poll with 602 votes, four more than the number he had obtained in 1898, whereas J.W. Sauer, the top S.A.P. candidate, received 549 votes, 247 less than the number he had obtained in 1898. In Wodehouse F.W. Powrie and G.E. Dugmore were elected with 164 and 144 votes more than Merriman, the top S.A.P. candidate. In normal circumstances the defeat of Merriman and Sauer, the two most prominent leaders of the S.A.P., would have indicated a large swing away from their Party, but Wodehouse and Aliwal North were not typical constituencies in 1904 because of the widespread disenfranchisement of potential S.A.P. voters. This was reflected in substantial decreases in the size of their electorates between 1898 and 1904. There had been 2 592 registered voters in Wodehouse in 1898, but the number fell to 2 001 in 1904, whilst Aliwal North had 1 759 registered voters in 1898 and 1 452 in 1904.

Tembuland had been a 'single-member' constituency in 1898 and A.J. Fuller (Progressive) was elected with 752 votes, defeating J.C. Molteno (Independent-Bond) who polled 616 votes,³¹ but the constituency was granted an additional seat

31. See Appendix D, Part 3.

in terms of Act 19 of 1898 and the by-election to fill the new seat was held on 27 May 1899.³² The Act also included Western Pondoland and a part of Port St. John's into the constituency,³³ swelling its electorate from 2 110 voters to 2 230.³⁴

The Bond fielded Richard Solomon, the Attorney-General in Schreiner's cabinet,³⁵ and he was elected by a narrow margin of 811 to 749 votes over Sir J. Gordon Sprigg³⁶ who had resigned his seat for East London to present as strong a challenge as possible to Solomon. A second by-election was held in 1902 after Solomon's resignation from parliament and C.C. Silberbauer, an Independent, was returned unopposed.³⁷ Cape politics had become very unsettled in 1902 because of the split in the Progressive Party and as Tembuland was a marginal constituency, it would appear that neither the 'Stalwart-wing' of the Progressive Party nor the S.A.P. wanted to pit their strengths against each other in a direct confrontation.

On 19 December 1902 the South African Review published a copy and a transcript of a letter from T.L. Graham to J.W.

32. OL 11.5.1899.

33. Pondoland and Port St. John's were not represented in the Cape parliament prior to the passing of this Act. Eastern Pondoland and the remainder of Port St. John's were included in the constituency of Griqualand East.

34. SR 1898, pp. iii, 30.

35. Solomon did not have a seat in parliament at the time.

36. OL 3.6.1899.

37. CGG 8486, 24.10.1902, p.1225.

Sauer and it would seem from the contents of the letter that Silberbauer might have been a joint-nominee of the 'Sprigg-wing' of the Progressive Party and the S.A.P. The authenticity of the letter is virtually impossible to establish, but it is quoted below merely as a clue to the possible reason why Silberbauer was not opposed by an official Progressive candidate.

Attorney-General's Office,

Cape Town,

26/9.

Dear Sauer,

Thanks for your note. I was sorry to miss you. I believe the Smartt Syndicate³⁸ are furious with the speech I made yesterday - such as it was.

The Lord help this country if Smartt gets into power next year.

I understand you are still prepared to accept Silberbauer for Tembuland. I want to ask Sprigg to give him some letters, but the old man has an idea you are going to run Cronwright Schreiner.

Just send me a word in reply to this query before 11.30, when Silberbauer is coming to see me on his way to Sprigg's office.

Yours,

(Signed) T. LYNEDOCH GRAHAM.

In 1904 two Progressives, A.J. Fuller and T.L. Schreiner, were elected for Tembuland.³⁹ Fuller retained the seat he had won in 1898, but Schreiner gained his seat at the expense of Silberbauer.

38. The 'Smartt Syndicate' refers to the 'Stalwart-wing' of the Progressive Party.

39. For the result of the voting see Appendix D, Part 7.

The Progressive Party also scored a gain in Prieska in 1904. This constituency was created in terms of Act 19 of 1898 and it was allocated one seat. Ds. C.W.H. Schröder (Bond) was elected with a good majority over two other candidates at the ensuing by-election held on 18 April 1899,⁴⁰ but he was unseated as a result of his co-operation with invading forces during the Anglo-Boer War.⁴¹ The resultant by-election was held in 1903 and P.S. Cilliers (S.A.P.) was elected with a majority of only seven votes,⁴² but in the 1903 Council election the Progressive Party obtained a majority of eighty-eight votes over two S.A.P. candidates and an 'Anti-Progressive' Independent.⁴³ In the 1904 Assembly election R.N.M. Orpen captured the seat for the Progressive Party with a majority of fifty-four votes over F.A. de Meillon, the S.A.P. candidate.⁴⁴

The Progressive Party won all four seats for Cape Town in 1898, obtaining a total of 18 500 of the 19 047 votes polled,⁴⁵ but there were five Progressive candidates in the contest because the South African League and the South African Political Association could not agree on a joint list of nominations.

40. OL 23.3.1899; OL 25.4.1899.

41. CGG 8510, 16.1.1903, p.169.

42. The result of the voting in the 1903 by-election was: P.S. Cilliers (S.A.P.) 222 votes and R.N.M. Orpen (Progressive) 215 votes. (CGG 8534, 10.4.1903, p.1364). However, Cilliers was unseated on 13 June 1903. (HAD 1903, unnumbered page, titled 'Members of the House of Assembly').

43. The Progressive candidate obtained 745 votes, the two S.A.P. candidates received 414 votes and 200 votes, while G.H. Maasdorp (Independent) polled 43 votes. (CA 20.11.1903).

44. See Appendix D, Part 7.

45. See Appendix D, Part 3.

F.Y. St.Leger, T.E. Fuller, J.L.M. Brown and T.J. Anderson were nominated by the S.A. League, while St.Leger, Fuller, Brown and J.W. Jagger were the nominees of the S.A. Political Association ⁴⁶ and in view of the paucity of support for the only Non-Progressive candidate, P.J. O'Dowd, the real contest was between Anderson of the S.A. League and Jagger of the S.A. Political Association.

St.Leger topped the poll with 4 546 votes, pushing Fuller, who had previously been a senior member for Cape Town, into second place in the poll with 4 302 votes. St.Leger's success could be ascribed to the fact that many working class Progressives who had plumped for O'Reilly in the previous Council election regretted that they had not voted for him, so they made a special point of voting for St.Leger in the Assembly election. Brown was a sitting member for Cape Town and occupied the third place in the poll with 3 950 votes. Anderson came fourth with 3 908 votes, 2 114 more than Jagger. This result indicated just how little support the S.A. Political Association enjoyed in comparison with that of the S.A. League in the metropolitan constituency. Nevertheless James Rose Innes, the president of the S.A.P.A., was returned unopposed as a Progressive candidate for the neighbouring constituency of Cape Division. ⁴⁷

Act 19 of 1898 abolished Cape Division and subdivided it into three new constituencies; Woodstock, Wynberg and Simonstown. Woodstock and Wynberg were each allocated two seats, but Simonstown was granted one seat.

46. Y.P. Sank, Cape Progressive Party, p.201.

47. CA 3.8.1898; CT 4.8.1898.

Cape Division was represented by James Rose Innes and Dr. C.P. Smuts, but the Act did not unseat them when it abolished their constituency. Instead, it provided that only one member would be elected to represent each of the new 'two-member' constituencies of Woodstock and Wynberg in the by-elections to fill the new seats. This had the effect of increasing the representation of the Cape Division constituency from two members to five, two for Cape Division, one for Woodstock, one for Wynberg and one for Simonstown. The Act also provided that, if one of the members elected for Cape Division were to vacate his seat, the ensuing by-election would be held in the new constituency of Wynberg and, if the other member for Cape Division were to vacate his seat, the second by-election would be held in Woodstock constituency, thereby eliminating the representation of the former constituency of Cape Division and bringing the representation of Woodstock and Wynberg to their correct strength.

Two Progressives, Amos Bailey and William Runciman, were elected as members for the new constituencies of Woodstock and Simonstown, defeating Gerald Anderson, an Independent, and H.L. Currey, a supporter of the Bond-Independent alliance. The result of the voting in those two by-elections appears below:

<u>WOODSTOCK</u> ⁴⁸		<u>SIMONSTOWN</u> ⁴⁹	
Bailey, A.	1 421 votes	Runciman, W.	562 votes
Anderson, G.	302 "	Currey, H.L.	163 "
	<u>1 723</u> "		<u>725</u> "

No. of registered voters-3 808⁵⁰

No. of registered voters-1 044⁵¹

48. OL 13.4.1899.

49. CT 7.4.1899; OL 8.4.1899.

50. SR 1898, p.iii.

51. SR 1898, p.iii.

F.R. Thompson was returned unopposed for Wynberg in 1899⁵² and in 1902 H. Cloete, another Progressive, was returned unopposed for Wynberg at the by-election resulting from the resignation of James Rose Innes.⁵³

Cape Town received one new seat and the by-election to fill the vacancy was held on 16 May 1899.⁵⁴ J.D. Cartwright, the Progressive candidate, was elected, defeating Thomas Harris by 1 862 votes to 561.⁵⁵ Harris stood as an 'Independent-Progressive' candidate, but he had been a champion of the urban working classes and on occasions he was labelled a 'labour candidate',⁵⁶ so he could be regarded as an 'Independent-Progressive-Labour' candidate.

The size of the poll was extremely small when compared with that of the 1898 Assembly general election. Although Harris obtained fourteen votes more than O'Dowd, the Independent candidate in the general election, Cartwright polled less than half the number of votes received by Anderson, the fourth Progressive candidate in 1898. The enormous decrease in Progressive support indicated a decline in Progressive morale after its defeat in the previous general election and its subsequent losses at the by-elections in Stellenbosch and Vryburg.

52. OL 23.3.1899.

53. CGG 8482, 10.10.1902, p.1051; CGG 8486, 24.10.1902, p.1225.

54. OL 11.5.1899.

55. OL 18.5.1899.

56. SAN 4.5.1899; SAN 16.5.1899.

Owing to the death of F.Y. St.Leger and the resignation of T.E. Fuller, another by-election was held in Cape Town in November 1902. Sir Lewis Michell and J.W. Jagger were elected as Progressive members with 2 257 and 2 239 votes respectively, while Dr. A.E. Seller, a 'quasi-labour nominee',⁵⁷ obtained 681 votes.⁵⁸

In 1904 all four peninsula constituencies of Cape Town, Simonstown, Woodstock and Wynberg were contested and the Progressive Party won all ten seats for those constituencies.⁵⁹ As S.A.P. did not field any candidates in this region, the contests were rather unusual.

Nine candidates were nominated in the 'five-member' constituency of Cape Town. They included an official ticket of five Progressives, two 'Independent-Progressives' and two Labour candidates. All five members of the Progressive ticket were elected and Captain Pieter Bam,⁶⁰ an 'Independent-Progressive' candidate, posed the only threat to them.⁶¹ Thomas Harris, the other 'Independent-Progressive' obtained just over a third of the number of votes polled by J.D. Cartwright, the official Progressive candidate with the lowest number of votes. Isaac Powell and C.J. Craig were generally regarded as Labour candidates, but there was a significant difference between them.

57. D. Tickin, The Origins of the South African Labour Party, 1888-1910, p.314.

58. CGG 8491, 11.11.1902, p.1450.

59. Cape Town (five seats), Simonstown (one seat), Woodstock (two seats) and Wynberg (two seats).

60. Subsequently Sir Pieter Bam.

61. A total of 7 565 voters cast valid votes and Bam obtained 3 771 votes, 446 less than J.D. Cartwright, the member of the official Progressive ticket with the smallest number of votes. (CGG 8626, 26.2.1904, p.643).

Craig was the official nominee of the Political Labour League,⁶² whereas Purcell was nominated by the District Six Working-Men's Union,⁶³ but during the campaign the Political Labour League was prepared to recognise Purcell as an Independent-Labour candidate.⁶⁴

The five victorious candidates were all nominees of the Cape Town Progressive Association. This Association had 2 700 members and it held a poll in December 1903 to choose the Progressive for the metropolitan constituency. A total of 1 233 of its members participated in the poll and the result of the voting was as follows:⁶⁵

J. Garlick	1 148	votes	Successful
W. Thorne	821	"	"
T.J. Anderson	800	"	"
J.D. Cartwright	777	"	"
J.W. Jagger	695	"	"
E. Powell	615	"	Unsuccessful
H. Liberman	599	"	"
V. Thomas	499	"	"
Advocate Wilkinson	227	"	"
	<u>6 181</u>	" 66	

-
62. The Political Labour League was the first genuine labour party in the Cape Colony. (D. Ticktin, The Origins of the South African Labour Party, 1888-1910, p.315)
63. D. Ticktin, The Origins of the South African Labour Party, 1888-1910, p.321. Purcell was the chairman of this Union.
64. D. Ticktin, The Origins of the South African Labour Party, 1888-1910, p.322.
65. CA 28.12. 1903.
66. Each of the 1 233 participants in the poll was allocated five votes, so a maximum of 6 165 votes should have been recorded and the fact that sixteen more than that number were actually recorded caused some consternation among Progressives who did not support the Association. (SAR 1.1.1904, p. 19).

The South African Review had been hostile to the Cape Town Progressive Association since its inception early in 1903 because it felt that the Association was controlled by 'Mugwumps'.⁶⁷ Consequently, it supported Bam's candidature.⁶⁸ Bam regarded himself as a Progressive candidate, although he had not submitted his name to the Cape Town Progressive Association for selection as an official Progressive candidate, but he sent Dr. Jameson a pledge of loyalty to the Party.⁶⁹ Shortly after this election Bam contested the Victoria West by-election as a Progressive candidate.⁷⁰ Later in the same year he was elected to the Assembly as a Progressive member for Cape Town at the by-election caused by the creation of two new seats for the constituency in terms of Act 5 of 1904. The result of the voting in this by-election was:⁷¹

Bam, Capt. P.C., van B.	Progressive	4 552 votes	Elected
Abrahamson, L.	"	4 104 "	"
Lieberman, H.	Independent	2 018 "	Defeated

Although Thomas Harris stood for election as an 'Independent-Progressive', he was best described as an 'Independent-Progressive-Labour' candidate. The South African Review labelled him a

67. SAR 16.1.1903, p.23; SAR 30.1.1903, p.37; SAR 20.2.1903, p.23; SAR 25.9.1903, p.34; SAR 23.10.1903, p.21; SAR 6.11.1903, p.21; SAR 1.1.1904, p.19; SAR 8.1.1904, p.26.

68. SAR 1.1.1904, p.19.

69. CA 14.1.1904.

70. The by-election was caused by the resignation of A.G. Visser. He resigned in order to facilitate Merriman's return to parliament after his defeat in the 1904 Assembly general election. The result of the voting in the by-election was: Merriman 1 240 votes and Bam 214 votes. (CGG 8645, 3.5.1904, p.1717).

71. CGG 8664, 8.7.1904, p.63.

'Progressive-Labour' candidate, whereas it classified Purcell and Craig as 'Bond-Labour' candidates.⁷²

A total of 32 362 votes were polled in Cape Town; 24 459 for the five official Progressives, 5 264 for the 'Independent-Progressives', Bam and Harris, and 2 639 for the two Labour candidates, Purcell and Craig.⁷³ As Bam regarded himself as a Progressive candidate, his votes have been added to those of the five official candidates to produce a total of 28 230 Progressive votes and the remaining 4 132 votes could be regarded as 'Anti-Progressive' votes. Progressive support, therefore, could be estimated at 5 646 voters as each voter was allocated five votes and 'Anti-Progressive' support could be estimated at 1 377 voters, being the average of the number of votes cast for Harris, Purcell and Craig.

In the 1903 Council election the Progressive Party obtained 18 339 votes in Cape Town and Dr. Petersen, the 'Anti-Progressive' Independent candidate, received 4 921 votes.⁷⁴ Each voter possessed three votes, so Progressive and 'Anti-Progressive' support was estimated at 6 113 and 1 640 voters respectively in that election, therefore the estimate of 5 646 Progressive voters and 1 377 'Anti-Progressive' voters in this election represented a fair assessment of party support in the constituency on 21 January 1904, two months and

72. SAR 8.1.1904, p.19.

73. See Appendix D, Part 7.

74. The result of the voting in Cape Town in the 1903 Council election was: J.D. Logan (Progressive) 6 212 votes, T.L. Graham (Progressive) 6 118 votes, J. Garlick (Progressive) 6 009 votes and Dr. A.H. Petersen (Independent) 4 921 votes. (SAN 21.11.1903).

eleven days after the Council election.

The contest in Simonstown was a straight fight between a Progressive and an Independent. The Progressive candidate, William Runciman, was elected with 675 votes and Carl Jeppe, an Independent, obtained 349 votes. In the 1903 Council election the Progressive Party had obtained 1 964 votes and Dr. A.H. Petersen polled 739 votes, producing estimates of 655 Progressive voters and 246 'Anti-Progressives'.⁷⁵ These figures indicated a swing of about 6,78% away from the Progressive Party between the two elections.

Arthur Douglass, the Commissioner of Public Works in Sprigg's cabinet, contested Woodstock as an 'Independent-Progressive' after being defeated by Dr. Jameson and R.H. Wood in his constituency of Grahamstown. Prior to his nomination, the Political Labour League had fielded two candidates, Andrew Corley and Thomas Gibson, but the League asked Gibson to withdraw in favour of Douglass so as to avoid splitting the 'Anti-Progressive' vote between three candidates. Gibson refused to comply and he was accused of 'ratting' to the Progressives,⁷⁶ but his refusal was understandable as Douglass had not been noted for his sympathy towards the urban working man.

Four candidates contested Wynberg and two Progressives, H. Cloete and Sir Lewis Michell, were elected. Cloete had been a member for the constituency since 1902, but Michell

75. OL 19.11.1903; SAN 21.11.1903.

76. D. Ticktin, The Origins of the South African Labour Party, 1888-1910, p.325.

had represented Cape Town. Sir Lewis was the chairman of De Beers⁷⁷ and he defeated F.R. Thompson, a sitting member for Wynberg and a former associate of Rhodes. Failing to obtain the Progressive nomination in this election, Thompson stood as an Independent and obtained 449 votes compared with 1 587 for Cloete and 1 500 for Michell. T.A. Louw, another Independent, came third in the poll with 505 votes.

The Progressive Party's successes in all four constituencies on the Cape Peninsula indicated that a 'two-party' system had become deeply entrenched in Cape politics by 1904 and that the time was not ripe for the rise of a powerful Labour Party in the Cape Town-Woodstock area. In fact, an examination of the results for the whole of the Cape Colony in 1904 revealed that most of the votes obtained by Labour and 'Anti-Progressive' Independents came from S.A.P. supporters.

77. Dictionary of South African Biography, Vol. 1, p.543.

CHAPTER 9

PARTY SUPPORT AND THE ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION OF 1908

The two major parties confronted each other in only seventeen of the forty-six electoral divisions in the Cape Colony,¹ so it was impossible to obtain estimates of party support from a constituency by constituency analysis as was done for the two previous Assembly elections. Nevertheless an estimate of about sixty thousand S.A.P. voters and forty thousand Unionists was obtained from the estimate for the previous Council election² rounded to the nearest ten thousand in order to allow for a small swing to the Unionist Party between the two elections.³

In 1904 the Progressive Party had been the dominant party in five of the nine electoral provinces,⁴ but in this election the Unionist Party could claim more support than the Bond in only three electoral provinces; Griqualand West,

-
1. Those divisions were Albany, Aliwal North, Barkly West, Cape Town, Cathcart, Fort Beaufort, Grahamstown, Griqualand East, Mafeking, Namaqualand, Port Elizabeth, Stellenbosch, Tembuland, Uitenhage, Victoria East, Woodstock and Wynberg.
 2. The estimates of S.A.P. and Unionist support in the 1908 Council election were 62 823 and 36 466 voters respectively.
 3. This swing was obtained from a comparison of the estimates of party support in the fifteen electoral divisions where the two major parties confronted each other in both the Council and Assembly elections of 1908. See Appendix D, Part 14.
 4. British Bechuanaland, Griqualand West, the Eastern Province, the South-Eastern Province and the Western Province.

the South-Eastern Province and the Western Province.⁵ Griqualand West consisted of the electoral divisions of Barkly West and Kimberley. The Progressive Party had won all six seats for those divisions in 1904, but in this election the S.A.P. captured the two seats for Barkly West and four Unionists were returned unopposed for Kimberley.⁶

The seven electoral divisions of the South-Eastern Province were allocated a total of seventeen seats in the Assembly; five for Port Elizabeth, three for Uitenhage, one for Humansdorp and two each for Albany, Grahamstown, Jansenville and Victoria East. The S.A.P. won nine of those seats, whereas the Unionist Party obtained seven and an Independent was elected for Port Elizabeth.

Three S.A.P. members for Humansdorp and Jansenville were returned unopposed, so only five constituencies were contested. Grahamstown elected two Unionists, Victoria East returned two S.A.P. members and Albany split its representation between the two parties. Four of the five members for Port Elizabeth were Unionists and the S.A.P. won all three seats for Uitenhage.

A total of 42 960 votes were cast in the contested constituencies; 23 410 for the Unionist Party, 12 707 for the S.A.P., 5 090 for Independents and 1 483 for a Labour candidate;⁷ and an overall swing of 9,17% to the Unionist

5. See Appendix D, Parts 10 and 12.

6. See Appendix D, Part 10.

7. See Appendix D, Part 12.

Party since the 1908 Council election emerged from a comparison of the estimates of party support in the two elections. The following table lists the estimates for each contested electoral division in both elections and the size of the swings to the Unionist Party between the two elections:

Electoral Divisions	Estd. No. of Voters				Estimated Percentage Swing to Unionist Party (Assembly Election)
	Council Election ⁸		Assembly Election ⁹		
	Unionist Party	S.A.P.	Unionist Party	S.A.P.	
Albany	655	779	795	747	5,88
Grahamstown	578	444	785	430	8,05
Port Elizabeth	3 475	2 674	3 694	1 504	14,56
Uitenhage	1 009	1 486	1 108	1 363	4,40
Victoria East	269	325	360	384	3,10
	<u>5 986</u>	<u>5 708</u>	<u>6 742</u>	<u>4 428</u>	<u>9,17</u>

As figures were not obtainable for the uncontested constituencies of Humansdorp and Jansenville in the Assembly election, Council figures have been used to obtain an estimate of 7 147 Unionists and 6 634 S.A.P. voters for the whole of the South-Eastern Province in this election.¹⁰

The estimate for the Council election was 7 914 S.A.P. voters and 6 390 Unionists.¹¹

The S.A.P. scored gains in Albany, Uitenhage and Victoria East. Victor Sampson, Jameson's Attorney-General, was defeated

8. For the results of the voting and the estimates of party support in the 1908 Council election see Appendix D, Part 9.

9. For the results of the voting and the estimates of party support in the 1908 Assembly election see Appendix D, Part 12.

10. See Appendix D, Part 12.

11. These figures are derived from the total number of votes polled for each candidate in the whole of the South-Eastern Province. However, if party support in each electoral division is calculated separately, an estimate of 6 391 Unionist voters is obtained. (See Appendix D, Part 9).

by F.W. Douglass in Albany, but William Thomas, a Unionist, headed the poll with thirteen votes more than Douglass. In Uitenhage the three S.A.P. candidates, R.H. Lundie, Professor H.E.S. Fremantle and L.J. van Vuuren, obtained 1 410, 1 356, and 1 336 votes respectively, while Harry Ward, the only Unionist candidate, received 1 108 votes. Two Independents, A.H.B. Wright and P.R. de Klerk, secured 999 and 841 votes respectively.

Two Progressives had been elected to represent Uitenhage at the 1904 Assembly general election¹² and a third Progressive was returned at a by-election in July 1904,¹³ but the S.A.P. captured two of the three seats for Uitenhage at by-elections in 1906 and 1907. The results of the voting at those three by-elections provide an excellent barometer of the relative strengths of the two major parties during the premiership of Dr. Jameson as will appear from the figures quoted in the following table:

12. See Appendix D, Part 7.

13. This by-election resulted from the creation of an additional seat for the constituency in terms of Act 5 of 1904.

	<u>Estimates of Party Support</u>			<u>Percentage of S.A.P. Support</u>
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Progressive- Unionist</u>	<u>Total</u>	
1904 Assembly general election ¹⁴	1 026	1 147	2 173	47,22
1904 Assembly by-election ¹⁵	1 068	1 086	2 154	49,58
1906 Assembly by-election ¹⁶	1 577	1 033	2 610	60,42
1907 Assembly by-election ¹⁷	1 388	817	2 205	62,95
1908 Council general election ¹⁸	1 486	1 009	2 495	59,56
1908 Assembly by-election ¹⁹	1 363	1 108	2 471	55,16

From these figures it will be noticed that there was a swing of about 7,94% to the S.A.P. between the Assembly general elections of 1904 and 1908 and that the S.A.P. attained its highest voting figure in 1906. Conversely, the Progressive Party reached its nadir in 1907. Although the trend was in favour of the S.A.P. at all three by-elections, the 1908 Council general election marked a turn in the electoral tide because a swing of approximately 3,39% to the Unionist Party since the 1907 Assembly by-election was recorded. This trend was repeated at the Assembly general election when the swing to the Unionist Party increased by a further 4,40%. Thus, it would seem that the trend in favour

14. See Appendix D, Part 7.

15. CGG 8667, 19.7.1904, p.217.

16. CGG 8858, 18.5.1906, p.1858.

17. CGG 8975, 2.7.1907, p.8.

18. See Appendix D, Part 9.

19. See Appendix D, Part 12.

of the Unionist Party between the Council and Assembly elections of 1908 might well have begun some time before the Council election.

In Victoria East A.H. Murray and A. Liesenberg of the S.A.P. were elected, defeating two Unionists narrowly.²⁰ Two Progressives had been elected in 1904 with majorities of fifty-one and thirty-nine over an 'Anti-Progressive' Independent,²¹ but the S.A.P. obtained 1 300 out of a total of 2 374 votes in the 1908 Council election.²²

All six constituencies in the Western Province were contested, but the two major parties confronted each other in four of those constituencies. In Simonstown W. Runciman, an Independent-Unionist, defeated C.W.B. Molteno, a South African Party candidate, while in Paarl three Independents²³ defeated three S.A.P. candidates.²⁴

The Unionist Party and the S.A.P. opposed each other in Cape Town, Stellenbosch, Woodstock and Wynberg. Cape Town was allocated seven seats, Stellenbosch two, Woodstock three and Wynberg three. The Unionist Party won the seven seats for Cape Town, the three seats for Wynberg and two of the three seats for Woodstock, while the S.A.P. retained its two seats for Stellenbosch and scored a gain from the Unionist Party in Woodstock.

20. See Appendix D, Part 12.

21. See Appendix D, Part 7.

22. See Appendix D, Part 9.

23. These Independents could be regarded as 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidates because they were counted as S.A.P. members after the election.

24. For the result of the voting and the estimates of potential S.A.P. and Unionist support in Paarl see Appendix D, Part 12.

Fourteen candidates were nominated in Cape Town and they included seven Unionists, three S.A.P. candidates, two Independents, a Labour candidate and a Socialist. Sir Pieter Bam²⁵ topped the poll with a total of 6 802 votes and Sir William Thorne, the bottom Unionist, obtained 4 312 votes, 136 votes more than Hyman Liberman, an Independent. Thomas Maginess, the Labour candidate, came ninth in the poll and the three S.A.P. candidates came tenth, eleventh and twelfth followed by William Hay, an Independent, and James Henry Howard, the Socialist.²⁶

The seven Unionist candidates obtained a total of 39 305 votes, so Unionist support would have been assessed at 5 615 voters in terms of the 'average-ratio method',²⁷ but J.W. Jagger, the fourth Unionist candidate, polled 5 675 votes and that figure has been taken as the measure of Unionist support in Cape Town because his voting figure was the closest of the seven Unionist candidates to the estimate of Unionist support quoted above. The three S.A.P. candidates obtained a total of 7 251 votes, so S.A.P. support would have been estimated at 2 417 voters in terms of the 'average-ratio method',²⁸ but F.J. Centlivres, the second S.A.P. candidate, polled 2 457 votes and that figure was used to estimate S.A.P. support because it was very close to the estimate quoted above. However, the estimates of

25. Formerly Captain Bam.

26. For the full result see Appendix D, Part 12.

27. See Appendix D, Part 12.

28. For a discussion of the methods of estimating party support see Chapter 5.

Unionist and S.A.P. support add up to 8 132 voters, but 9 548 voters actually recorded valid votes in the election, so the remaining 1 416 voters could be regarded as the number of Independent, Labour and Socialist voters in the constituency. In the previous Council election Unionist and S.A.P. support was estimated at 5 262 and 2 857 voters respectively,²⁹ so the swing to the Unionist Party in Cape Town was calculated at 4,98% between the two elections, if Independent, Labour and Socialist voters are ignored.

The question of free trade versus protection of local manufactures dominated the campaign in the city. In 1898 and 1904 the Progressive Party had advocated free trade in order to ensure cheap food, but in 1906 the Jameson government was forced to re-impose a duty on imported meat and it began to abandon free trade in favour of a policy of protecting local manufactures so as to stimulate the ailing economy. This caused dissension in the ranks of the party and J.W. Jagger, a member of the Assembly for Cape Town, continued to champion the cause of free trade in opposition to the majority of his party. This issue became so divisive that three separate Unionist tickets were formed in Cape Town and the South African News labelled them the free trade ticket, the moderate protection ticket and the full protectionist ticket, but the three tickets subsequently merged into a single Unionist ticket.³⁰

29. See Appendix D, Part 9.

30. CTW 4.3.1908, p.20; SAN 12.3.1908.

As each voter was allocated seven votes and the S.A.P. fielded only three candidates, each S.A.P. voter possessed four additional votes, which he could allocate to any of the eleven non-S.A.P. candidates, if he felt so inclined. The local branch of the Afrikaner Bond, having resolved not to nominate any official candidates, decided to support those candidates whom it felt would give Merriman's ministry a fair trial.³¹ They included the three S.A.P. candidates and the two 'Independents', William Hay and Hyman Liberman. However, if Bondsmen and Bond sympathisers wanted to cast their full quota of seven votes, they were advised to consider giving their additional votes to two of the following three candidates; Thomas Maginess (Labour), Sir Pieter Bam (Unionist) and Edmund Powell (Unionist).³²

Eight candidates were nominated in the neighbouring constituency of Woodstock. Two Unionists led the field, but the third Unionist came sixth in the poll, while the three S.A.P. candidates came third, fourth and seventh. Alfred Palmer, standing as an 'Independent Reform' candidate, came fifth and Edward Henry McNamara, an 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidate, trailed the field.³³ The estimates of S.A.P. and Unionist support in the Council election numbered about 1 710 and 1 448 voters respectively, whereas about 342 voters had supported the Independent, J.D. Logan,³⁴ so the

31. SAN 5.3.1908.

32. SAN 5.3.1908. Bam and Powell were virtually assured of victory, so a few extra Bond votes for them would merely inflate their voting figures.

33. For the full result see Appendix D, Part 12.

34. See Appendix D, Part 9.

Assembly contest was wide open.

As Palmer drew most of his votes from working men, who had previously supported the Progressive Party and who had become disillusioned with the policies of Jameson's government,³⁵ the Unionist Party realised that his candidature could possibly jeopardise its chances of winning any of the three seats for Woodstock, especially as he asked his supporters to plump for him.³⁶ The S.A.P. was equally worried about McNamara's influence on its fortunes. As it transpired, Palmer obtained 1 284 votes compared with 386 for McNamara, so it would seem that Palmer may have caused the Unionist Party to lose the third seat for Woodstock. Nevertheless Palmer obtained one vote more than Richard Stuttaford, the third Unionist candidate.

In Wynberg both parties fielded three candidates and William Templar Buissinné stood as an 'Independent-Unionist' candidate. In the previous Council election Unionist and S.A.P. support was estimated at 1 073 and 812 voters. Thus, the Unionist Party was well placed to win the three seats for the constituency if all its supporters gave one vote to each of its three candidates, but Buissinné's candidature threatened to split the Unionist vote to such an extent that the three S.A.P. candidates might be elected.³⁷ He asked his supporters to plump for him and obtained 649 votes, but the three

35. Palmer's political position has already been mentioned. See pp.58-9.

36. SAR 27.3.1908, p.11.

37. CA 26.3.1908 discussed the question from a statistical point of view.

Unionists were elected with 1 454, 1 364 and 1 158 votes compared with 1 027, 787 and 752 votes for the three S.A.P. candidates.

The S.A.P. won the two seats for Stellenbosch and it obtained 2 229 votes compared with 1 855 for the Unionist Party. However, in 1904 the S.A.P. had also won the two seats for the constituency and polled 1 836 votes compared with 1 717 for the two Progressive candidates; this indicated that both S.A.P. and 'Progressive-Unionist' support in Stellenbosch had increased since 1904, but that the increase in S.A.P. support was considerably greater than that of the Unionist Party.³⁸ Nevertheless Stellenbosch could be regarded as a marginal S.A.P. constituency in both the Assembly elections of 1904 and 1908.

The Eastern Province consisted of eight electoral divisions; Aliwal North, Cathcart, East London, Griqualand East, Kingwilliamstown, Queenstown, Tembuland and Wodehouse. All eight were contested in this election, but the two major parties confronted each other in only four of those divisions. In East London two Unionists and four Independents vied with each other for three seats, whilst in Kingwilliamstown, Queenstown and Wodehouse S.A.P. candidates were opposed by a variety of Independents.

A total of eleven Independents were nominated and eight of them were elected; three for Kingwilliamstown and one for each of the five constituencies of Aliwal North, East London, Griqualand East, Queenstown and Tembuland. Aliwal North, Griqualand East and Tembuland were 'two-member' constituencies and four candidates were nominated in each

38. See Appendix D, Parts 7 and 12.

of them, two S.A.P., one Independent and one Unionist. The South African Party candidate topped the poll in each constituency, but the second S.A.P. candidate came bottom of the poll in each contest. Independents were elected in second place in the poll,³⁹ while the Unionists were defeated in the third place in the poll.

In 1904 all six seats for those constituencies were won by the Progressive Party, but in 1908 the Unionist Party did not win any of them. C.E. Tod, who had been returned unopposed as a Progressive member for Griqualand East in 1904, defected to the S.A.P. and was elected as a South African Party member in this election. His victory has been regarded as a South African Party gain in 1908.

In the Council election the S.A.P. obtained more votes than the Unionist Party in Aliwal North and Tembuland, but the Unionist Party obtained more votes than the S.A.P. in Griqualand East. There was a large swing to the S.A.P. in Griqualand East between the two elections, but the trend in Aliwal North and Tembuland was in the opposite direction.⁴⁰

Cathcart was a 'single-member' constituency and the contest was a straight fight between the two major parties. The Unionist candidate was elected, defeating the S.A.P. candidate by 471 votes to 352. In the previous Council election Unionist and S.A.P. support was estimated at 502 and 343 voters respectively, indicating a swing of about 2,18% to the S.A.P. between the two elections.

39. Willem Cloete, the Independent member for Aliwal North, could be regarded as an 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidate.

40. The swings to the Unionist Party in Aliwal North and Tembuland were measured at 12,35% and 0,33% respectively.

East London, Kingwilliamstown and Queenstown were 'three-member' constituencies; East London elected two Unionists and an Independent, Kingwilliamstown returned three Independents and Queenstown returned two S.A.P. members and an Independent. The election in Kingwilliamstown was a contest between Independents and S.A.P. candidates, but the victorious Independents were generally counted as as Unionists, so they could be regarded as 'Independent-Unionists'. However, the Independent members for East London and Queenstown were genuine Independents; Sir J. Gordon Sprigg, an Independent, topped the poll in East London, while W.P. Schreiner, an Independent, came second in the poll in Queenstown.

The S.A.P. nominated three candidates in Queenstown and the Unionist Party did not field any candidates in that constituency, but W.P. Schreiner, the former prime minister, and Sir W.B. Berry, the speaker of the House of Assembly, stood as Independents. Schreiner was elected and Berry was defeated.⁴¹ In East London Sir J. Gordon Sprigg obtained 1 033 votes more than his closest rival and only 259 of the 3 067 voters who cast valid votes did not support him. However, only 49,56% of the total electorate in the division went to the polls and cast valid votes. Nevertheless the result represented a triumphant come-back for the former prime minister after his humiliating defeat at the hands of the voters of East

41. For the result of the voting and an estimate of potential S.A.P. and Unionist support see Appendix D, Part 12.

London in the 1904 general election.

J.G. Hellier and C.P. Crewe,⁴² the two Unionist candidates in East London, obtained 1 775 and 1 694 votes respectively, while W. Medefindt, the pro-S.A.P. Independent, was defeated in the fourth place in the poll with a tally of 1 252 votes. Unionist and S.A.P. support in the previous Council election has been estimated at 1 824 and 906 voters respectively, indicating that Sprigg obtained the support of most Unionist and S.A.P. voters in the constituency and that there was a substantial swing to the S.A.P. in the division.

Two S.A.P. members were elected for Wodehouse with 1 548 and 1 448 votes and they defeated W.T. Clark, the Independent, who polled 878 votes. In the previous Assembly election two Progressives had been elected for Wodehouse and they had obtained 1 482 of the 2 641 votes polled, but in the 1908 Council election the Unionist Party received only 1 984 of the total of 8 408 votes, so the Unionist Party realised that it did not stand a chance of winning a seat for Wodehouse in the 1908 Assembly general election, hence it did not field a candidate.

Only two of the six constituencies in the North-Eastern Province were contested, the S.A.P. winning the eight seats for Albert, Cradock, Colesberg and Somerset East without having to face a contest. It also won the seat

42. Subsequently Sir Charles Crewe. He had been a minister in Jameson's cabinet.

for the 'single-member' constituency of Middelburg in a straight contest against an Independent,⁴³ but the Unionist Party won the two seats for Fort Beaufort.⁴⁴

In the North-Western Province all five constituencies were contested, but the S.A.P. and the Unionist Party opposed each other in only one constituency, Namaqualand, where the S.A.P. captured both its seats from the Unionist Party.⁴⁵ The elections in the other four constituencies - Clanwilliam, Malmesbury, Piquetberg and Worcester - were contests between the S.A.P. and Independent or 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidates. The S.A.P. won all the seats for those constituencies, although E.B. Watermeyer (Clanwilliam) stood as an 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidate. Clanwilliam, Malmesbury and Piquetberg were 'two-member' constituencies, while Worcester was a 'three-member' constituency.

British Bechuanaland consisted of two electoral divisions; Mafeking and Vryburg. The Unionist Party retained its seat for the 'single-member' constituency of Mafeking, but it lost its two seats for Vryburg. John William de Kock (Unionist) defeated an Independent in Mafeking and the S.A.P. candidate came third in the poll, while D.H.M. Wessels and Dr. F. Murray of the S.A.P. defeated J.F. Pentz (Independent-S.A.P.) in Vryburg; the Unionist Party conceded defeat to

43. The result of the voting in Middelburg was: A.C.A. van Rooy (S.A.P.) 708 votes and J.F. Bennie (Independent) 473 votes.

44. For the result of the voting in Fort Beaufort see Appendix D, Part 13.

45. For the result of the voting in Namaqualand see Appendix D, Part 13.

the S.A.P. by not nominating any candidates, although two Progressives had been returned unopposed for Vryburg in 1904.

The Unionist Party did not contest any of the ten electoral divisions in the Midland Province and the South-Western Province. Sixteen S.A.P. members were returned unopposed for seven of those divisions; Caledon (two), George (four), Graaff-Reinet (two), Oudtshoorn (three), Prieska (one), Richmond (two) and Victoria West (two); but in Beaufort West, Riversdale and Swellendam official S.A.P. candidates vied for election with 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidates. The S.A.P. won all the seats for those divisions,⁴⁶ although J.W. van Eeden, the junior member for Swellendam, had stood as an 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidate.

While this election was a triumph for the S.A.P., ominous portents could be detected. Firstly, the success of 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidates indicated widespread dissatisfaction in the ranks of the party. Secondly, the swing to the Unionist Party since the Council election did not augur well for a new government which would have to adopt stern and unpopular measures in order to put the economy on a sound footing and, thirdly, if the prevailing trend were to continue, the S.A.P. could have found itself hard put to win the next Assembly election as nineteen of its seats could be regarded as marginal. However, this was the

46. Beaufort West, Riversdale and Swellendam were 'two-member' constituencies.

last general election before the advent of Union.

The first parliamentary general election of the Union of South Africa and the first Cape provincial council general election were held on 15 September 1910 and the results of the voting in those elections indicated that the trend in favour of the Unionist Party had not abated.⁴⁷ Perhaps, the most impressive performance by the Unionist Party in 1910 was in the Stellenbosch provincial council contest.⁴⁸ In 1908 the S.A.P. had won both seats for Stellenbosch; its top candidate polling 171 votes more than the top Unionist candidate;⁴⁹ but in 1910 the Unionist candidate for the Cape provincial council defeated his S.A.P. opponent by a margin of 1 218 votes to 878;⁵⁰ the total electorate having increased from 2 528 voters in 1908 to 2 864 in 1910.

47. The results of the voting in these two elections appear in OL 22.9.1910.

48. The Unionist Party did not contest the Stellenbosch parliamentary election. Two S.A.P. candidates were nominated and J.H. Marais defeated W.A. Krige by 1 134 votes to 976. (OL 22.9.1910).

49. See Appendix D, Part 12.

50. OL 22.9.1910.

CHAPTER 10

ASSEMBLY CONSTITUENCIES AND THEIR
REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT

When the Cape Colony was granted representative government in 1854, it was divided into twenty-two electoral divisions and they returned a total of forty-six members to the House of Assembly.¹ The boundaries of the electoral divisions corresponded with those of the existing fiscal divisions of the colony, but the urban areas of Cape Town-Green Point and Grahamstown were excluded from the electoral divisions of the Cape (i.e. Cape Division) and Albany respectively and given separate representation.² The Cape Town-Green Point constituency (usually called Cape Town) was allocated four members, while each of the other constituencies was allocated two members.³ By 1908 there were forty-six electoral divisions and 107 members of the Assembly,⁴ but the increase in the number of constituencies and the size of the lower house did not indicate any substantial improvement in the representation of the voters of the colony, although Acts 19 of 1898 and 5 of 1904 made some slight improvements.

When the government appointed the redistribution of seats commission in December 1898, there was a total of 109 886 registered voters and seventy-nine members of the Assembly.

1. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol. 1, 1652-1871, pp.497-8.

2. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol. 1, 1652-1871, p.498.

3. Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1895, Vol. 1, 1652-1871, p.514.

4. SR 1908, pp.11-13.

Each member, therefore, represented an average of about 1 391 voters, but Cape Division had 8 122 registered voters and Victoria East had only 782.⁵ Both constituencies were represented by two members, so each member for Cape Division represented 4 061 voters, whereas each member for Victoria East represented 391 voters. Thus, the value of the individual's vote in Victoria East was approximately ten times greater than in Cape Division.

Although Cape Division and Victoria East represented the opposite ends of the spectrum of under-representation and over-representation, large discrepancies in the number of voters per member in constituencies were to be found throughout the country and densely-populated urban centres tended to receive far from adequate representation when compared with the number of voters per member in most rural constituencies. Actually, most towns, except Cape Town and Grahamstown, did not have separate representation, and in most constituencies rural voters could outvote townsmen. Nevertheless there were some exceptions, such as Cape Division, East London, Kimberley and Port Elizabeth, where the residents of the principal urban centres could outvote the rural community in the constituency.⁶

This pattern had not changed by 1908 when there were 152 134 registered voters and each of the 107 members of the

5. SR 1898, p.30, G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Appendix C', p.xiii-xvi.

6. Mafeking had 605 voters in 1898 and 440 of them were classified as urban voters, 412 in the town and 28 in 'Native Reserves'. (G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Appendix C', p.xvi). Consequently, Mafeking was strictly-speaking a predominantly urban constituency, but it has not been counted as such because the town was rather small and it was situated far away from any of the large urban complexes.

Assembly represented an average of approximately 1 422 voters. Woodstock and Victoria East had 8 074 and 890 voters respectively and each member represented about 2 691 voters in Woodstock and 445 in Victoria East.⁷ Woodstock was a predominantly urban constituency whereas Victoria East was a rural constituency.

The redistribution commission sat from 16 December 1897 until 27 January 1898⁸ and submitted a report advocating the creation of fifteen new seats in the Assembly.⁹ Had this been implemented, the number of seats in the Assembly would have been increased to ninety-four, but one of the new seats was to be reserved for graduates of the University of the Cape of Good Hope who were resident in the Cape Colony,¹⁰ so the member for the University constituency was to represent a special electorate of its own. Consequently, only ninety-three of the ninety-four members would have represented the ordinary electorate numbering 109 886 voters; thus the average number of voters per member of the House of Assembly would have been about 1 182.

The seven commissioners were all members of the House of Assembly and they included Sir J. Gordon Sprigg (M.L.A., East London, the prime minister and the chairman of the commission), T.P. Theron (M.L.A., Richmond), I.J. van der Walt (M.L.A., Colesberg), A.S. du Plessis (M.L.A., Albert), James Rose Innes (M.L.A., Cape Division), T.E. Fuller (M.L.A., Cape Town) and

-
7. SR 1908, pp. 11-13. Woodstock was allocated three members and Victoria East two members.
 8. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, Minutes of Proceedings, pp. i-viii.
 9. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p. 2; See also Appendix E for the allocation of new Assembly seats according to the recommendations of the report.
 10. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p.2. The report also recommended voting by proxy in the election for the University member

Arthur Douglass (M.L.A., Grahamstown).¹¹ The prime minister was still an Independent, Theron, van der Walt and du Plessis represented the Bond,¹² while Rose Innes, Fuller and Douglass were Progressives, so Sprigg was theoretically in a position to break any deadlock which might arise from purely party political considerations. However, the three Progressives represented different factions within their party. Fuller was the spokesman of his party's dominant imperialist-wing, Rose Innes represented urban liberalism and Douglass represented the interests of rural Progressives, although he represented an exclusively urban constituency. Douglass was actually a farmer¹³ and tended to throw in his lot with the Bondsmen when the commission voted on specific proposals.

All seven members of the commission signed the report,¹⁴ but Sprigg, Rose Innes and Fuller submitted a minority report which read as follows:

Though we have signed the foregoing Report, being in accordance with it so far as it goes, we are of opinion that an increase of 15 members, to be allocated in the manner proposed in the Report, is not sufficient to admit of giving full effect to the object sought to be

11. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p.2; R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, pp.143, 144, 145, 156, 157, 158.

12. T.R.H. Davenport, Afrikaner Bond, p.182.

13. The Prominent Men of the Cape Colony, South Africa, p.50.

14. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p.2.

attained, and that an increase of 18 members will give better practical expression to the true principles of Parliamentary representation.¹⁵

No proposals for the allocation of new seats were contained in the minority report, but Sprigg, Rose Innes and Fuller voted for a set of proposals to create seventeen new seats during the last sitting of the commission on 27 January 1898.¹⁶ These seventeen new seats, together with the proposed new seat for graduates of the University of the Cape of Good Hope,¹⁷ have, therefore, been taken as the proposals favoured by Sprigg, Rose Innes and Fuller, and they differed very slightly from the recommendations of the report.¹⁸ Cape Division was to receive four new seats instead of two and East London was to receive one new seat, whereas the report did not recommend any new seat for that constituency. In addition it recommended the creation of a new 'single-member' constituency consisting of the fiscal divisions of Cathcart, Stutterheim and Komgha.¹⁹ Part of the fiscal division of Komgha was situated in the electoral division of East London and it contained 153 voters,²⁰ so the electorate of East London would have been decreased from

-
15. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p.3.
16. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Minutes of Proceedings', pp.vii-viii.
17. Rose Innes gave notice of a motion to recommend the creation of a new seat for the graduates of the University on 21 December 1897 and his recommendation was accepted by four votes to three on 21 January 1898. (G8 - '98, The Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Minutes of Proceeding', pp.iii, vi).)
18. See Appendix F for the recommended allocation of new seats according to the proposals supported by Rose Innes, Sprigg and Fuller.
19. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, p.2.
20. SR 1898, p.34.

3 081 voters²¹ to 2928 voters, if Komgha had been removed from East London and included in a new constituency. This would have reduced the number of voters per member to 1 464 in East London which was a relatively acceptable figure.

On the other hand, Sprigg, Rose Innes and Fuller wanted to leave East London intact and increase its representation from two members to three members which would have resulted in an average of 1 027 voters per member for that constituency. The remainder of the fiscal division of Komgha was situated in the electoral division of Kingwilliamstown and they were prepared to let it remain part of that constituency, but they felt that the fiscal division of Cathcart and Stutterheim, which formed part of the electoral divisions of Kingwilliamstown and Queenstown, should be constituted as a 'single-member' constituency. The new constituency of Cathcart and Stutterheim, as recommended by the report would have contained 1 323 voters, while the Cathcart-Stutterheim constituency, as envisaged by Sprigg, Rose Innes and Fuller, would have had an electorate of 1 068 voters.²²

On 10 May 1898 Sprigg published his redistribution bill which aimed at increasing the number of seats in the Assembly from seventy-nine to ninety-seven, including one seat for graduates of the University and ninety-six seats for ordinary voters.²³ Apart from the seat for the University member, there were to be forty 'two-member' constituencies, twelve 'single-member' constituencies

21. SR 1898, p.34.

22. Calculated from figures quoted in SR 1898, p.34.

23. CGG 8022 a, 10.5.1898, pp.1-8.

and one 'four-member' constituency.²⁴ The existing constituencies of Cape Division, Cape Town and Port Elizabeth were to be abolished, eighteen new constituencies were to be created²⁵ and the two existing constituencies Griqualand East and Tembuland were to have their representation increased from one seat to two seats.

J.P. Vanstone, in his political biography of Sprigg, stated that the bill was based on two cardinal principles: 'one man one vote; and representation should be on the basis of one member for every thousand country votes and one member for every fifteen hundred town votes'.²⁶ During the second reading debate on the bill, Sprigg acknowledged the principle of one man one vote,²⁷ by which he meant that every enfranchised person's vote should have an equal value no matter where he was registered. It certainly did not imply that all adult males, regardless of wealth or literacy, should be enfranchised. As regards the representation of individual constituencies, he stated that he had taken the principle of one member for one thousand voters and two members for two thousand voters, while constituencies with 3 000 voters or more were to be divided into smaller ones.²⁸ Consequently, Cape Town with 7 798

24. For a list of constituencies and the number of seats allocated to them see Appendix G.

25. Cathcart, Ceres, East Cape Town, Humansdorp, Jansenville, Koeberg, Komgha, Middelburg, North Port Elizabeth, Prieska, Sea Point, Simonstown, South Port Elizabeth, Uniondale, the University of the Cape of Good Hope, West Cape Town, Woodstock and Wynberg. East Cape Town, North Port Elizabeth, South Port Elizabeth, West Cape Town, Woodstock and Wynberg were to be allocated two members, but the others were to be 'single-member' constituencies.

26. Sir John Gordon Sprigg: A Political Biography, p.369.

27. HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, p.38.

28. HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, pp. 35-6.

voters was to be divided into three constituencies - East Cape Town (two members), Sea Point (one member), and West Cape Town (two members)--Port Elizabeth with 6 560 voters was to be split into two constituencies - North Port Elizabeth (two members) and South Port Elizabeth (two members) - and Cape Division with 8 122 voters was to be replaced by four constituencies - Koeberg (one member), Simonstown (one member), Woodstock (two members) and Wynberg (two members). However, the proposed new constituency of Koeberg was to include the field cornetcies of Mosselbank River, Paardenberg, Achter Riebeeks Kasteel and Honing Bay in the electoral division of Malmesbury as well as the field cornetcies of Koeberg No. 1, Koeberg No. 2, Blaauwberg, Palen and Riet Vley, Durbanville and Tygerberg in Cape Division.²⁹ On the other hand, the 'four-member' constituency of Kimberley with 5 674 voters was left untouched and a number of constituencies with more than 3 000 voters were to be reduced in size so as to bring them below the 3 000 mark. Nevertheless some of the proposed new urban constituencies, such as West Cape Town, Woodstock and Wynberg, would have had electorates of more than 3 000 voters,³⁰ so the average number of voters per member in each of those constituencies exceeded 1 500. This indicated that Sprigg differentiated between urban and rural constituencies in his allocation of seats and that he used the principle of about fifteen hundred voters per seat for urban constituencies, while rural constituencies were to receive one seat for every thousand

29. CGG 8022 a, 10.5.1898, p.1.

30. HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, p.36.

voters with the proviso that no constituency would have its representation reduced no matter how over-represented it might have been.³¹ Consequently, Victoria East was to retain its two seats, although it had only 782 voters. Sprigg made special mention of this particular anomaly, but he justified his decision on the grounds that Africans formed a substantial minority of the electorate in that constituency and that as such it would in all likelihood return members who would be spokesmen of the interests of the African community.³²

The main objections to the bill were that it gave too much power to the towns and that it was destined to entrench the Progressive Party in power for the foreseeable future, but the fact that the towns were grossly under-represented in the Assembly was ignored by its opponents. Instead, they stressed the importance of representing the different interests in parliament and, being connected with the agricultural sector of the economy, they did not appreciate the multiplicity of differing urban interests to the same extent that they appreciated the various agrarian interests. In short, they regarded the redistribution issue as a conflict between town and country, between English-speakers and Afrikaners and between British imperialism and South African nationalism. However, Cape Town and Grahamstown were the only exclusively urban constituencies in 1898³³ and they returned six of the seventy-nine members of the Assembly. To these could be added the four constituencies of

31. Some of the proposed new rural constituencies, such as Koeberg and Kamgha, were to have less than 1 000 voters. (HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, pp.33,34).

32. HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, p.37.

33. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Appendix C', pp.xiii-xvi.

Cape Division, East London, Kimberley and Port Elizabeth which contained large urban complexes, but they returned a total of ten members, bringing the total number of members to sixteen out of seventy-nine. According to Sprigg's bill there would have been ten exclusively or predominantly urban constituencies; East Cape Town, East London, Kimberley, North Port Elizabeth, Sea Point, South Port Elizabeth, Uitenhage, West Cape Town, Woodstock and Wynberg; and they would have been represented by a total of twenty-one out of ninety-seven seats.

There was some doubt about the classification of Simonstown. Sprigg felt that it should be regarded as a rural constituency as it would contain 709 rural voters and 546 urban voters,³⁴ but Sauer disagreed with him.³⁵ However, there was no doubt that Koeberg would be a rural constituency.³⁶ It was proposed in conformity with the resolution of the redistribution commission at its sitting on 21 January 1898 that Cape Division should be allocated six seats subject to the proviso 'that one representative be allotted to a new Electoral Division' consisting of the field-cornetcies of Koeberg Nos. 1 and 2, Blaauwberg, Palen and Riet Vley, Durbanville and Tygerberg 'with such Field Cornetcies at present belonging to the Electoral Division of Malmesbury as shall be deemed convenient'.³⁷

34. HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, p.35. Simonstown was to consist of the field-cornetcies of Simonstown Nos. 1 and 2, Wildschutsbrand, Elsjes River, Noordhoek, Kalk Bay, Diep River, Constantia and Downs Nos. 1 and 2. (CGG 8022 a, 10.5.1898, p.3).

35. HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, p.72.

36. Sprigg stated that it would contain 781 country voters and 72 town voters. (HAD 1898, Fifth Session of the Ninth Parliament, p.33).

37. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Minutes of Proceedings', p.v.

Simonstown, Woodstock and Wynberg were to receive a total of five seats and the seat for Koeberg represented the sixth seat for Cape Division. Nevertheless the resolution of 21 January was superseded by the final set of proposals adopted on 27 January.³⁸

The bill also envisaged the creation of two new 'single-member' constituencies of Komgha and Cathcart in the Eastern Province. The new constituency of Komgha was to include the fiscal divisions of Komgha and the field-cornetcies of East London Nos. 5, 6 and 7 and Kingwilliamstown Nos. 10, 11, 12 and 13, while Cathcart was to include the fiscal divisions of Cathcart and Stutterheim.³⁹ East London was to remain a 'two-member' constituency, but the new seat for Komgha could be regarded as a substitute for an increase in the representation of East London.

On the other hand, the allegation that the provisions of the bill would entrench the Progressive Party in power were justified because the Progressive Party was the stronger of the two parties in 1898 and any measure which brought a closer correlation between the distribution of voters and parliamentary seats would inevitably be to the advantage of the Progressive Party. This explains why the Bond and its allies took such an uncompromising attitude to the bill and why any form of redistribution eventually became an anathema to most opponents of the Progressive Party, despite the fact that the Bond had initially supported redistribution as a means of rationalising the delimitation of certain rural constituencies whose representation had become anachronistic and at odds with the boundaries of newly-created fiscal divisions. Had Sprigg's bill

38. G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98, 'Minutes of Proceedings', p.vii.

39. CGG 8022 a, 10.5.1898, p.1.

been enacted before the 1898 Assembly general election the Progressive Party would almost certainly have been returned to office with a working majority, but an even more significant fact was that the Progressive Party would probably have been victorious, albeit by a small majority, if the recommendations of the majority of the redistribution commission had been enacted, and this alienated most members of the Bond-Independent alliance from the cause of redistribution. The Progressive Party was equally determined to obtain some form of improved representation and finally Act 19 of 1898 was passed as a compromise. The Act created sixteen new seats instead of the eighteen as contained in Sprigg's bill of May 1898.⁴⁰ Eight new constituencies were created⁴¹ and six existing constituencies were granted additional representation,⁴² while one constituency was abolished,⁴³ but the inadequacies of the Act were revealed once the figures for the 1899 registration of voters were disclosed. For instance, Woodstock had 5 316 voters and only two members, producing an average of 2 658 voters per member compared with a national average of 1 261, while thirteen constituencies had less than 1 000 voters per member.

40. This was Sprigg's first redistribution bill. However, his second one, which was published in October 1898, differed slightly from this one.

41. Cathcart, which included the fiscal divisions of Cathcart and Stutterheim (one seat), Humansdorp (one seat), Jansenville (two seats), Middelburg (one seat), Prieska (one seat), Simons-town (one seat), Woodstock (two seats) and Wynberg (two seats).

42. Cape Town (one new seat), George (one new seat), Griqualand East (one new seat), Port Elizabeth (two new seats), Tembuland (one new seat) and Worcester (one new seat).

43. Cape Division.

The next registration of voters was held in 1903 and it indicated even greater discrepancies than in 1899. In Woodstock, for example, the number of voters per member had increased from 2 658 in 1899 to 3 221 in 1903,⁴⁴ whereas the national average increased from 1 261 to 1 423 during the same period,⁴⁵ while thousands of voters in certain rural constituencies had been disenfranchised. This tended to exaggerate the under-representation of the urban constituencies, where there had been a large increase in population, so there was a pressing need for another revision of the distribution of Assembly seats, and in the following year twelve new Assembly seats were created in terms of Act 5 of 1904, producing an average of 1 263 voters per member.

Victor Sampson, the Attorney-General, piloted the measure through parliament and he indicated that it would result in one member for every two thousand voters in urban constituencies and for every thousand voters in rural constituencies.⁴⁶ Cape Town had 17 131 voters⁴⁷ and its representation was increased from five members to seven, whereas it should have been allocated eight seats, while the rural constituencies of Paarl and Kingwilliamstown had less than 3 000 voters, but their representation increased from two members to three.⁴⁸ Consequently, it would appear that he gave

44. There were 6 442 voters in Woodstock in 1903. (SR 1903, p.32).

45. There were 135 177 voters in the Cape Colony. (SR 1903, p.32).

46. HAD 1904, p.61.

47. SR 1904, p.36R.

48. Kingwilliamstown had 2 800 voters and Paarl had 2 864 voters.

the rural Progressive constituency of Kingwilliamstown one of the new seats which ought to have been allocated to Cape Town.⁴⁹ As the S.A.P. constituency of Paarl had more voters than Kingwilliamstown, it was necessary to grant that constituency an additional seat in order to avoid being blatantly selective in his allocation of new seats.

East London, Kimberley and Wynberg posed a problem because they were predominantly urban constituencies with some rural areas included in them. East London and Wynberg had 4 697 and 4 914 voters respectively and each of those constituencies had their representation increased from two to three members, while Kimberley with 6 404 voters was to have its representation left unchanged at four members. Thus, it would seem that those constituencies were allocated one member for every 1 500 voters. However, Port Elizabeth and Woodstock with 10 951 and 6 442 voters could also have been placed in this category because they included rural areas. In that case, Port Elizabeth and Woodstock would have been entitled to seven members and four members respectively instead of five and three.⁵⁰

By 1908 the distribution of seats had become outdated once again, but no revision was made until Union when the Cape Province was divided into fifty-one 'single-member' constituencies. Since then the distribution of seats in all four provinces of the Union of South Africa was revised regularly by delimitation commissions

49. According to Sampson's figures quoted above eleven new seats should have been created - three for Cape Town and one for each of the eight electoral divisions of East London, George, Oudtshoorn, Port Elizabeth, Queenstown, Uitenhage, Woodstock and Wynberg - but Act 5 of 1904 actually created twelve new seats - two for Cape Town and one for each of the ten divisions of East London, George, Kingwilliamstown, Oudtshoorn, Paarl, Port Elizabeth, Queenstown, Uitenhage, Woodstock and Wynberg.

50. Port Elizabeth and Woodstock had been allocated four members and two members.

consisting of judges. It was indeed a great pity that the Constitution Ordinance of the Cape Colony did not contain a similar provision for an independent judicial commission to review the delimitation of constituencies and the distribution of seats from time to time. This might have prevented the question becoming such a divisive and inflammatory issue in Cape politics.

In the ultimate analysis the distribution of Assembly seats had a profound influence on the evolution of party politics in the Cape Colony, placing a disproportionate amount of power in the hands of the rural voter. The defeat of the Progressive Party in the 1898 Assembly election and the vacillations of the Jameson government were largely due to the inflated representation of the rural voters, while the needs of the residents of the large towns tended to be overlooked.

CHAPTER 11

CONCLUSION

The Afrikaner Bond, after its merger with the Boeran Bescherminings Vereeniging in 1883, became the first coherent political party in the Cape Colony. Nevertheless a system of party government began to establish itself only after the formation of the Progressive Party in 1897; consequently the 1898 Legislative Council election was the first party political general election.

During 1897 and the early part of 1898 the Sprigg government gradually transformed itself into a Progressive administration and the defeat of the Progressive Party in the 1898 Assembly election caused its fall. The Schreiner government, which took office on 14 October 1898, was generally regarded as the first Bond ministry in Cape history, although the prime minister and the majority of the cabinet were not members of the Bond. This ministry lasted for just over twenty months and during this period the anti-Rhodes alliance of Bondsmen and Independents had succeeded in laying the foundations of the South African Party which would eventually triumph over the successor of the Progressive Party in 1908.

When the Schreiner ministry fell in June 1900, the Progressive Party returned to power under the premiership of Sir J. Gordon Sprigg, but the Progressive Party split into two factions after the resignation of Dr. Smartt from the cabinet in May 1902. As the majority of Progressive

members of parliament supported Smartt's 'Stalwart' faction, the remainder of Sprigg's fourth term of office (May 1902 to 21 February 1904) could be described as an 'Independent-Progressive' ministry.

The Jameson government was ostensibly an orthodox Progressive administration, but it was a weak government and found itself forced to adopt certain aspects of S.A.P. policy because of conflicting interests in the Party, the effects of a harsh depression and a desire to conciliate its opponents. After the defeat of the Jameson government in the 1908 Council election, the 'Progressive-Unionist' Party resigned and it was replaced by a South African Party ministry which lasted until Union.

As the Bond formed the nucleus of the S.A.P., its victories in the Council and Assembly elections of 1908 represented a final triumph for the Bond over the 'Progressive-Unionist' movement. This was largely because the Progressive Party was essentially a product of late Victorian imperialism and its leaders had been unable to adapt themselves to the new ideology of South Africanism in the years which followed the Anglo-Boer War.

Ironically, the Progressive Party had stood for a union of South Africa under the British flag since its inception and its main problem in 1897 and 1898 had been how to persuade the Afrikaners in the republics to accept British hegemony; but once the republics were annexed by the British Empire after the war the Progressive Party found itself unable to achieve union because Afrikaner leaders in the former republics distrusted Jameson. Thus, the people of South Africa had

to wait until after the defeat of Jameson's 'Progressive-Unionist' government in order to fulfil the Progressive Party's main objective, a united South Africa.

The allocation of Assembly seats in 1898 had prevented the Progressive Party from winning the Assembly election of that year, despite its large majority in voter-support, and the Progressive Party never really recovered from the shock of losing that election. The alterations in the distribution of Assembly seats in terms of Act 19 of 1898 and Act 5 of 1904 did not abolish the disadvantages suffered by the Progressive Party, especially in its urban strongholds, so the morale of its most loyal supporters dwindled as the decade progressed and by 1908 it had lost most of its seats outside the large urban centres and some of its seats for the large urban centres as well. Its victory in 1904 had resulted from widespread disenfranchisement of potential S.A.P. voters in Aliwal North, Prieska, Vryburg and Wodehouse and a regeneration of Progressive morale in Tembuland, but its success was ephemeral. In 1908 it found itself in the doldrums of defeat once again, but this time with far less chance of recovery than it had after its defeat in the 1898 Assembly election.

APPENDIX APRIME MINISTERSFROM JANUARY 1896 TO MAY 1910⁽¹⁾

Sir J. Gordon Sprigg (Third Ministry)	-	13 January 1896 - 13 October 1898
W.P. Schreiner	-	14 October 1898 - 17 June 1900
Sir J. Gordon Sprigg (Fourth Ministry)	-	18 June 1900 - 21 February 1904
Dr. L.S. Jameson	-	22 February 1904 - 2 February 1908
J.X. Merriman	-	3 February 1908 - 30 May 1910

(1) R. Kilpin, The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, pp.165-6.

APPENDIX BTHE NUMBER OF VOTERS REGISTERED IN EACH ELECTORAL PROVINCE
IN 1898, 1903 AND 1908.

<u>Electoral Province</u>	<u>No. of Registered Voters</u>			<u>Number of Members of the Legislative Council</u>	
	<u>1898</u>	<u>1903</u>	<u>1908</u>	<u>1898 and 1903</u>	<u>1908</u>
British Bechuanaland	3 159	1 702	2 146	1	1
Eastern Province	16 974	20 516	25 113	3	4
Griqualand West	8 539	8 357	11 619	1	1
Midland Province	10 383	9 826	11 449	3	3
North-Eastern Province	10 549	11 753	12 495	3	3
North-Western Province	11 429	11 384	13 904	3	3
South-Eastern Province	15 815	22 015	21 239	3	4
South-Western Province	12 867	14 444	17 271	3	3
Western Province	20 171	35 180	36 898	3	4
	<u>109 886</u>	<u>135 177</u>	<u>152 134</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>26</u>

APPENDIX CMEMBERS ELECTED IN THE 1898 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION;
THEIR CONSTITUENCIES AND THEIR PARTY POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS.

<u>Members</u>	<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Parties</u>
Bayly, Z.S.	Eastern Province	Progressive
Bellingan, P.S.	South-Eastern Province	Progressive
Bradfield, J.L.	Eastern Province	Progressive
de Smidt, A.G.	South-Western Province	Progressive
de Villiers, M.J.	South-Western Province	Progressive
de Wet, N.J.	Eastern Province	Bond
Dolley, J.F.	South- Eastern Province	Progressive
du Toit, J.F.	Midland Province	Bond
Faure, J.A.	Western Province	Progressive
Graham, T.L.	Western Province	Progressive
Herholdt, A.J.	Midland Province	Bond
Lochner, J.A. van A.	North-Western Province	Bond
Logan, J.D.	North-Western Province	Progressive
Maasdorp, G.H.	Midland Province	Progressive
Neethling, M.L.	Western Province	Bond
Pretorius, M.J.	North-Eastern Province	Bond
Ross, W.	Griqualand West	Progressive
Smith, G.D.	British Bechuanaland	Progressive
Stockenström, Sir G.H.	North-Eastern Province	Progressive
van den Heever, D.P.	North-Eastern Province	Bond
van Eeden, F.J.	South-Western Province	Bond
van Rhyn, P.B.	North-Western Province	Bond
Wilmot, A.	South-Eastern Province	Progressive

APPENDIX DELECTION RESULTSPART 1THE 1898 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING IN SEVEN OUT OF EIGHT CONTESTED CONSTITUENCIES.

1. The result of the voting in the South-Western Province constituency is quoted in chapter 2 and has not been included below.
2. The results of the voting were obtained from the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazettes.
3. The party political affiliations of candidates were obtained from the Cape Times of 28 March 1898.
4. The names of victorious candidates are in capitals.

Constituency: BRITISH BECHUANALAND

No. of Registered Voters: 3 159

No. of Votes per Voter: 1

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Bond</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	SMITH, G.D.	788	-	-
2	Hassforth, G.C.A.	-	504	-
		788	504	-

Constituency: EASTERN PROVINCE

No. of Registered Voters: 16 974

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Bond</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	BRADFIELD, J.L.	7 252	-	-
2	BAYLY, Z.S.	7 068	-	-
3	DE WET, N.J.	-	7 059	-
4	Peacock, J.M.	6 645	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		20 965	7 059	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Constituency: MIDLAND PROVINCE

No. of Registered Voters: 10 383

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>			
		1	MAASDORP, G.H.	6 138
2	HERHOLDT, A.J.	-	3 819	-
3	DU TOIT, J.F.	-	3 595	-
4	Viljoen, D.J.	-	3 192	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		6 138	10 606	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Constituency: NORTH-EASTERN PROVINCE

No. of Registered Voters: 10 549

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>			
		1	STOCKENSTROM, Sir G.H.	7 127
2	VAN DEN HEEVER, D.P.	-	4 472	-
3	PRETORIUS, M.J.	-	4 199	-
4	Wienand, F.F.	-	2 037	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		7 127	10 708	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Constituency: NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCE

No. of Registered Voters: 11 429

No. of Voter per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Bond</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	LOGAN, J.D.	7 378	-	-
2	LOCHNER, J.A. van A.	-	3 859	-
3	VAN RHYN, P.B.	-	3 610	-
4	Rabie, D. de V.	-	3 108	-
5	Joubert, J.J.	-	-	1 617
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		7 378	10 577	1 617

Constituency: SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE

No. of Registered Voters: 15 815

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>			
1	DOLLEY, J.F.	6 760	-	-
2	BELLINGAN, P.S.	6 519	-	-
3	WILMOT, A.	6 519	-	-
4	Gouws, J.F.	-	3 475	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		19 798	3 475	-

Constituency: WESTERN PROVINCE

No. of Registered Voters: 20 171

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>			
1	FAURE, J.A.	8 593	-	-
2	GRAHAM, T.L.	7 747	-	-
3	NEETHLING, M.L.	-	7 717	-
4	St. Leger, F.Y.	6 501	-	-
5	O'Reilly, T.J.	-	-	6 479
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		22 841	7 717	6 479
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	GRAND TOTAL	85 035	50 646	8 096

APPENDIX DPART 2THE 1898 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE OUTCOME IN CONSTITUENCIES

<u>Bond and Allies</u>		<u>Progressive Party</u>	
<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Seats</u>	<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Seats</u>
Albert	2	Albany	2
Aliwal North	2	Barkly West	2
Beaufort West	2	Cape Division	2
Caledon	2	Cape Town	4
Clanwilliam	2	East London	2
Colesberg	2	Fort Beaufort	2
Cradock	2	Grahamstown	2
George	2	Griqualand East	1
Graaff-Reinet	2	Kimberley	4
Malmesbury	2	Kingwilliamstown	2
Paarl	2	Mafeking	1
Piquetberg	2	Namaqualand	2
Richmond	2	Port Elizabeth	2
Riversdale	2	Queenstown	2
Somerset East	2	Tembuland	1
Swellendam	2	Uitenhage	2
Victoria West	2	Victoria East	2
Wodehouse	2	Vryburg	2
Worcester	2		
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	38		37
	<hr/>		<hr/>

SPLIT-REPRESENTATION

Oudtshoorn	1	Oudtshoorn	1
Stellenbosch	1	Stellenbosch	1
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	40		39
	<hr/>		<hr/>

APPENDIX DPART 3THE 1898 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT FOR EACH CONSTITUENCY.

- 1 The electoral divisions are listed alphabetically under the electoral provinces in which they fell.
- 2 The party political designations of the candidates have been derived from articles in the contemporary press and the lists of nominations in the Cape Times of 4 August 1898 and Ons Land of 6 and 11 August were especially useful in this regard.
- 3 Some technically 'Independent' candidates are labelled as 'Independent-Progressive' or 'Independent-Bond' because they received most of their support from voters who supported one or other of the two major parties.
- 4 As no official list of election results were traced the voting figures were compiled from articles in the Cape Argus, the Cape Times, Ons Land and the Victoria West Messenger, but some of the figures quoted by those papers conflicted with each other. However, the Statistical Register of 1898 reflected the total number of valid votes cast in each constituency, so it was possible to obtain correct voting figures for most constituencies by checking them against the totals in the Statistical Register, but Worcester

proved to be the only exception and the derivation of the voting figures for Worcester are annotated under the appropriate heading. The best set of voting figures appeared in a photograph of people looking at a board with election results posted on it which was published in an addendum to the weekly edition of the Cape Times of 21 September 1898.

- 5 The dates of the election were obtained from the Cape Times of 4 August 1898 and Ons Land of 11 August 1898 and the number of voters registered in each electoral division were obtained from the Statistical Register of 1898.
- 6 The results of the voting in the Vryburg and Stellenbosch by-elections of 28 March and 7 April 1899 are also included under the appropriate headings.
- 7 Estimates of Progressive and Bond support in uncontested constituencies and constituencies where the results of the voting could not be used to assess the potential support enjoyed by the two parties, have been derived from the estimates of voting in the previous Council general election.
- 8 The 'average-ratio method' has been used to estimate potential Progressive and Bond support from the actual voting figures for most electoral divisions, and departures from that method are mentioned under the relevant headings.

9 The names of victorious candidates are in capitals.

AN ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF ELECTORAL DIVISIONS AND THE ELECTORAL PROVINCES IN WHICH THEY WERE SITUATED

The names of the electoral provinces have been abbreviated, e.g.

'BB' stands for British Bechuanaland and 'NE' stands for the North-Eastern Province.

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Electoral Provinces</u>	<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Electoral Provinces</u>
Albany	SE	Malmesbury	NW
Albert	NE	Namaqualand	NW
Aliwal North	EP	Oudtshoorn	SW
Barkly West	GW	Paarl	WP
Beaufort West	MP	Piquetberg	NW
Caledon	SW	Port Elizabeth	SE
Cape Division	WP	Queenstown	EP
Cape Town	WP	Richmond	MP
Cianwilliam	NW	Riversdale	SW
Colesberg	NE	Somerset East	NE
Cradock	NE	Stellenbosch	WP
East London	EP	Swellendam	SW
Fort Beaufort	NE	Tembuland	EP
Goerge	SW	Uitenhage	SE
Graaff-Reinet	MP	Victoria East	SE
Grahamstown	SE	Victoria West	MP
Griqualand East	EP	Vryburg	BB
Kimberley	GW	Wodehouse	EP
Kingwilliamstown	EP	Worcester	NW
Mafeking	BB		

THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND BOND SUPPORT IN EACH ELECTORAL DIVISION

BRITISH BECHUANALAND (2 constituencies)

I MAFEKING (1 member)

WEIL, J.	Progressive	Unopposed
No. of registered voters		605 votes

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party		349 voters
Bond		18 "
		<u>367</u> "

These figures were derived from the estimates of party support in the division in the previous Council election.¹

II VRYBURG (2 members)

1 HAARHOFF, D.J.	Progressive	822 votes
2 FINCHAM, A.W.	Progressive	816 "
3 de Villiers, J.E.	Bond	687 "
4 Sonnenberg, C.	Bond	681 "
		<u>3 006</u> "

Date of election		5 September
------------------	--	-------------

No. of registered voters		2 554
--------------------------	--	-------

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party		819 voters
Bond		684 "
		<u>1 503</u> "

1. CT 28.3.1898; G.D. Smith (Progressive Party) 349 votes, G.C.A. Hassforther (Bond) 18 votes. Each voter in Mafeking was allocated only one vote because it formed part of the 'single-member' constituency of British Bechuanaland.

THE 1899 BY-ELECTION

No. of members to be elected	2
No. of registered voters	2 175

The fiscal division of Gordonia with 379 registered voters was removed from the electoral division of Vryburg and included in the new electoral division of Prieska in terms of Act 19 of 1898 which was passed after the general election of 1898 and before the by-election.

The result of the voting in this by-election was:²

1	SONNENBERG, C.	Bond	567	votes
2	WESSELS, D.H.W.	Bond	563	"
3	Fincham, A.W.	Progressive	421	"
4	Haarhoff, D.J.	Progressive	408	"
			<u>1 959</u>	"

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	565	voters
Progressive Party	415	"
	<u>980</u>	"

EASTERN PROVINCE (7 constituencies)I ALIWAL NORTH (2 member).

1	SAUER, J.W.	Bond	796	votes
2	BOTHA, J.N.P.	Bond	600	"
3	Crewe, C.P.	Progressive	598	"
			<u>1 994</u>	"

Date of election 24 August

No. of registered voters 1 759

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	698	voters
Progressive Party	598	"
	<u>1 296</u>	"

2. OL 23.3.1899; UL 15.4.1899.

11 EAST LONDON (2 members)

1 SPRIGG, Sir J. Gordon	Progressive	Unopposed
2 BRABANT, E.Y.	Progressive	Unopposed
No. of registered voters		3 081

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party		1 527 voters
Bond		<u>68</u> "
		<u>1 595</u> "

These figures were derived from the results of the voting in East London in the previous Council elections:³

1 BAYLY, Z.S.	Progressive	1 615 votes
2 BRADFIELD, J.L.	Progressive	1 491 "
3 Peacock, J.M.	Progressive	1 475 "
4 DE WET, N.J.	Bond	<u>203</u> "
		<u>4 784</u> "

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

111 GRIQUALAND EAST (1 member)

1 ZIETSMAN, L.F.	Progressive	693 votes
2 Tod, C.E.	Independent-Progressive	132 "
3 Strachan, D.	Independent-Progressive	<u>2</u> "
		<u>827</u> "

Date of election 24 August

No. of registered voters 1 333

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party		693 voters
Bond		<u>132</u> "
		<u>825</u> "

Although all three candidates were classified as Progressive candidates in the Cape Times, Tod and Strachan have been labelled as 'Independent-Progressives' because Zietsman was the official Progressive candidate. Progressive support in the

3. CA 25.3.1898; CT 28.3.1898; SR 1898, p.30.

constituency was based on the number of votes cast for him, while potential Bond support was derived from the number of votes polled for Tod because he was the main opponent of the official Progressive candidate.

In the previous Council election the result of the voting in Griqualand East was:⁴

1	BAYLY, Z.S.	Progressive	661	votes
2	BRADFIELD, J.L.	Progressive	652	"
3	Peacock, J.M.	Progressive	482	"
4	DE WET, N.J.	Bond	299	"
			<u>2 094</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes, so Progressive and Bond support in that election was estimated at 598 and 100 voters respectively, so the estimates for the Assembly election seem to represent a reasonable reflection of party support some five months later.

IV. KINGWILLIAMSTOWN (2 members)

1	SCHERMBRUCKER, F.	Progressive	1 649	votes
2	WARREN, W.J.	Progressive	1 427	"
3	Duckles, T.E.	Independent	600	"
			<u>3 676</u>	"

Date of election 24 August

No. of registered voters 2 999

The votes polled for the Independent candidate have been taken as potential Bond votes as there was no Bond candidate in the election.

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	1 538	voters
Bond	600	"
	<u>2 138</u>	"

4. CA 25.3.1898; SR 1898, p.30.

V. QUEENSTOWN (2 members)

1	BERRY, Sir, W.B.	Progressive	1 607	votes
2	FROST, J.	Progressive	1 473	"
3	du Plessis, M.J.	Bond	677	"
			<u>3 757</u>	"

Date of election 20 August
 No. of registered voters 3 100

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	1 540	voters
Bond	677	"
	<u>2 217</u>	"

VI. TEMBULAND (1 member)

1	FULLER, A.J.	Progressive	752	votes
2	Molteno, J.C.	Independent-Bond	616	"
			<u>1 368</u>	"

Date of election 20 August
 No. of registered voters 2 110

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	752	voters
Bond	616	"
	<u>1 368</u>	"

VII. WODEHOUSE (2 members)

1	MERRIMAN, J.X.	Bond	1 082	votes
2	DE WET, P.J.	Bond	1 078	"
3	Smartt, Dr. T.	Progressive	964	"
4	Stretton, J.K.	Progressive	948	"
5	Halse, H.E.	Independent	18	"
			<u>4 090</u>	"

Date of election 24 August
 No. of registered voters 2 592

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	1 080	voters
Progressive Party	956	"
	<u>2 036</u>	"

The eighteen votes polled for the Independent candidate have been ignored when assessing party support.

GRIQUALAND WEST (2 constituencies)I BARKLY WEST (2 members)

1	RHODES, C.J.	Progressive	1 405	voters
2	HILL, J.A.	Progressive	1 358	"
3	Burton, H.	Bond	844	"
4	Stiglingh, H.D.	Bond	768	"
			<u>4 375</u>	"

Date of election 27 August
No. of registered voters 2 865

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	1 382	voters
Bond	806	"
	<u>2 188</u>	"

II KIMBERLEY (4 members)

1	LAWRENCE, J.	Progressive	2 997	voters
2	HARRIS, COL. D.	Progressive	2 930	"
3	HARRIS, Dr. F.R.	Progressive	2 759	"
4	STEAD, A.	Progressive	2 594	"
5	Watkins, Dr. A.H.	Independent	1 180	"
6	Michau, J.J.	Bond	639	"
			<u>13 099</u>	"

Date of Election 17 August
No. of registered voters 5 674

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	2 820	voters
Bond	639	"
	<u>3 459</u>	"

Dr. Watkins's votes have been ignored in the assessment of party support.

MIDLAND PROVINCE (4 constituencies)I BEAUFORT WEST (2 members)

1	OOSTHUIZEN, O.A.	Bond	1 198	voters
2	WEEBER, P.J.	Bond	1 094	"
3	Jackson, J.R.	Progressive	828	"
4	Luttig, J.R.G.	Independent	565	"
			<u>3 685</u>	"

Date of election 24 August

No. of registered voters 2 727

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	1 146	voters
Progressive Party	828	"
	<u>1 974</u>	"

II GRAAFF-REINET (2 members)

1	TE WATER, T.N.G.	Bond	1 289	voters
2	SMITH, J.H.	Bond	1 250	"
3	Neser, C.A.	Independent-Progressive	506	"
			<u>3 045</u>	"

Date of election 17 August

No. of registered voters 2 283

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	1 270	voters
Progressive Party	506	"
	<u>1 776</u>	"

III RICHMOND (2 members)

1	THERON, T.P.	Bond	1 067	votes
2	DU TOIT, P.J.	Bond	1 046	"
3	du Toit, S.J.	Independent-Progressive	646	"
4	de Villiers, A.T.	Independent-Progressive	643	"
			<u>3 402</u>	"

Date of election 22 August

No. of registered voters 2 360

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	1 057	voters
Progressive Party	645	"
	<u>1 702</u>	"

IV VICTORIA WEST (2 members)

1	KUHN, P.G.	Bond	1 566	votes
2	IMMELMAN, D.W.	Bond	1 424	"
3	le Roex, A.S.	Independent-Progressive	474	"
			<u>3 464</u>	"

Date of election 23 August

No. of registered voters 3 013

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	1 495	voters
Progressive Party	474	"
	<u>1 969</u>	"

NORTH-EASTERN PROVINCE (5 constituencies)

I ALBERT (2 members)

1	DU PLESSIS, A.S.	Bond	Unopposed
2	JOUBERT, J.J.	Bond	Unopposed

No. of registered voters 2 028

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	817	voters
Progressive Party	280	"
	<u>1 097</u>	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Albert in the previous Council election:⁵

1	VAN DEN HEEVER, D.P.	Bond	1 435	votes
2	PRETORIUS, M.J.	Bond	895	"
3	STOCKENSTROM, Sir G.H.	Progressive	840	"
4	Wienand, F.F.	Bond	122	"
			<u>3 292</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

II COLESBERG (2 members)

1	VAN DER WALT, T.J.	Bond	1 055	votes
2	DE WAAL, N.F.	Bond	958	"
3	Venter, M.M.	Independent-Progressive	606	"
			<u>2 619</u>	"

Date of election 24 August

No. of registered voters 2 075

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	1 007	voters
Progressive Party	606	"
	<u>1 613</u>	"

III CRADOCK (2 members)

1	DU PLESSIS, M.J.	Bond	Unopposed
2	VAN DEN HEEVER, H.C.	Bond	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		2 384

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	803	voters
Progressive Party	412	"
	<u>1 215</u>	"

5. CA 25.3.1898; CT 28.3.1898; SR 1898, p.30.

These figures were derived from the result of the voting in Cradock in the previous Council election:⁶

1	STOCKENSTROM, Sir G.H.	Progressive	1 236	voters
2	PRETORIUS, M.J.	Bond	1 192	"
3	VAN DEN HEEVER, D.P.	Bond	965	"
4	Wienand, F.F.	Bond	252	"
			<u>3 645</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

IV FORT BEAUFORT (2 members)

1	LAING, J.	Progressive	798	votes
2	HOCKLY, W.H.	Progressive	669	"
3	Brown, W.	Independent	373	"
			<u>1 840</u>	"

Date of election 24 August

No. of registered voters 1 416

The votes polled for the Independent candidate have been taken as potential Bond votes as there was no Bond candidate in the election.

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	734	voters
Bond	373	"
	<u>1 107</u>	"

V SOMERSET EAST (2 members)

1	WIENAND, F.F.	Bond	1 110	votes
2	MOLTENO, J.T.	Bond	1 076	"
3	Palmer, G.M.	Progressive	1 066	"
4	Abrahamson, L.	Progressive	1 000	"
			<u>4 252</u>	"

6. CA 25.3.1898; CT 28.3.1898; SR 1898, p.30.

Date of election	19 August
No. of registered voters	2 646
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>	
Bond	1 093 voters
Progressive Party	1 033 "
	<u>2 126 "</u>

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCE (5 constituencies)

I CLANWILLIAM (2 members)

1	VAN DER MERWE, F.J.	Bond	1 132	votes
2	VAN ZYL, D.J.A.	Bond	1 032	"
3	Wege, P.G.	Independent-Progressive	339	"
			<u>2 503</u>	"

Date of election	24 August
No. of registered voters	2 209
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>	
Bond	1 082 voters
Progressive Party	339 "
	<u>1 421 "</u>

II MALMESBURY (2 members)

1	SCHREINER, W.P.	Bond	1 449	votes
2	SMUTS, J.A.	Bond	1 349	"
3	Louw, T.A.J.	Independent-Progressive	729	"
4	Basson, J.A.	Independent-Progressive	654	"
			<u>4 181</u>	"

Date of election	15 August
No. of registered voters	2 508
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>	
Bond	1 399 voters
Progressive Party	692 "
	<u>2 091 "</u>

III NAMAQUALAND (2 members)

1	RHODES, C.J.	Progressive	774	votes
2	OATS, F.	Progressive	769	"
3	Genis, G	Bond	346	"
4	van Rhyn, G.	Bond	320	"
			<u>2 209</u>	"

Date of election 17 August

No. of registered voters 1 479

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	772	voters
Bond	333	"
	<u>1 105</u>	"

IV PIQUETBERG (2 members)

1	DE WAAL, D.C.	Bond	778	votes
2	MARAIS, D.J.	Bond	646	"
3	Brink, D.J.	Independent-Bond	387	"
			<u>1 811</u>	"

Date of election 15 August

No. of registered voters 1 481

The Cape Times classified all three candidates as Bond candidates and Ons Land classified De Waal and Marais as Bond candidates, but it left Brink without a party political designation, so he has been classified as an Independent-Bond candidate.

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	712	voters
Progressive Party	150	"
	<u>862</u>	"

Bond support was derived from the voting figures polled for D.C. de Waal and D.J. Marais, while Progressive support was obtained from the number of votes polled for J.D. Logan in Namaqualand in the previous Council election. He received 450 votes, but each voter possessed three votes in that election.⁷

V WORCESTER (2 members)⁸

1	GRAAFF, J.A.	Bond	1 882	votes
2	RABIE, D. de V.	Bond	1 875	"
3	de Villiers, J.I.	Progressive	1 106	"
4	Bosman, P.	Progressive	1 068	"
			<u>5 931</u>	"
	Date of election		24 August	
	No. of registered voters		3 752	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>			
	Bond		1 879	votes
	Progressive Party		1 087	"
			<u>2 966</u>	"

7. CA 25.3.1898.

8. Most sources quoted that Graaff obtained 1 872 votes, and Rabie polled 1 865 votes, but those figures would have produced a total of 5 911 votes instead of 5 931 which was quoted as the total in the Statistical Register. However, the Cape Times of 30.8.1898 indicated that Graaff received 1 882 votes and that Rabie obtained 1 876 votes. Graaff's figure has been derived from the Cape Times and Rabie's figure has been taken to have been 1 875 votes; one less than the figure in the Cape Times and ten more than the usual figure; in order to balance the full result with the total in the Statistical Register.

SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE (5 constituencies)1 ALBANY (2 members)

1	CROSBIE, R.	Progressive	604	votes
2	SAMPSON, V.	Independent-Progressive ⁹	592	"
3	Norton, J.O.	Progressive	<u>489</u>	"
			<u>1 685</u>	"

Date of election 17 August

No. of registered voters 1 441

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	616	voters
Bond	<u>124</u>	"
	<u>740</u>	"

These figures are derived from the result of the voting in Albany in the previous Council election.¹⁰

1	WILMOT, A.	Progressive	685	votes
2	BELLINGAN, P.S.	Progressive	593	"
3	DOLLEY, J.F.	Progressive	570	"
4	Gouws, J.F.	Bond	<u>372</u>	"
			<u>2 220</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

11 GRAHAMSTOWN (2 members)

1	DOUGLASS, A.	Progressive	735	votes
2	WOOD, J.E.	Progressive	700	"
3	Preddy, A.	Independent	<u>283</u>	"
			<u>1 718</u>	"

Date of election 12 August

No. of registered voters 1 695

9. See Chapter 2, The 1898 Assembly General Election.

10. CA 25.3.1898; SR 1898, p.30.

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	718	voters
Bond	15	"
	<u>733</u>	"

The estimate of Bond support in the previous Council election has been used.

The result of the voting in Grahamstown in the Council election was:¹¹

1	WILMOT, A.	Progressive	945	votes
2	DOLLEY, J.F.	Progressive	701	"
3	BELLINGAN, P.S.	Progressive	674	"
4	Gouws, J.F.	Bond	44	"
			<u>2 364</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

III PORT ELIZABETH (2 members)

1	WALTON, E.H.	Progressive	2 793	votes
2	WYNNE, J.	Progressive	2 686	"
3	Jones, C.T.	Independent-Progressive	1 110	"
4	Hammond, W.T.	Independent	148	"
			<u>6 737</u>	"

Date of election 18 August

No. of registered voters 6 560

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	3 295	voters
Bond	148	"
	<u>3 443</u>	"

11. CA 25.3.1898; SR 1898, p.30

Walton and Wynne were 'Rhodes-Progressives', while Jones was an 'Innes-Progressive', so Progressive support was estimated in terms of the number of votes cast for all three candidates and divided by two because each voter had two votes in this election. Hammond's votes have been taken as the measure of Bond support because he was the only 'Anti-Progressive' candidate. In the previous Council election, J.F. Gouws obtained 187 votes in that electoral division.¹² Each voter had three votes, so Bond support was estimated at only sixty-two voters in that election.

IV UITENHAGE (2 members)

1	LEE, C.	Progressive	2 118	votes
2	VANES, Dr. A.B.	Progressive	2 118	"
3	de Villiers, A.P.	Bond	1 839	"
4	Gouws, J.F.	Bond	1 812	"
			<u>7 887</u>	"
	Date of election		30 August	
	No. of registered voters		5 337	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>			
	Progressive Party		2 118	voters
	Bond		1 826	"
			<u>3 944</u>	"

V VICTORIA EAST (2 members)

1	TAMPLIN, H.T.	Progressive	387	votes
2	GARRETT, F.E.	Progressive	383	"
3	Hay, W.	Independent-Bond	226	"
			<u>996</u>	"

Date of election	24 August
No. of registered voters	782
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>	
Progressive Party	385 voters
Bond	226 "
	<u>611</u> "

SOUTH-WESTERN PROVINCE (5 constituencies)

I CALEDON (2 members)

1 BEYERS, H.P.	Bond	1 097	votes
2 DEMPERS, H.J.	Bond	1 054	"
3 Kleyn, W.H.F.	Independent	716	"
4 van Breda, H.H.	Progressive	558	"
		<u>3 425</u>	"

Date of election	23 August
No. of registered voters	2 074
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>	
Bond	1 076 voters
Progressive Party	558 "
	<u>1 634</u> "

II GEORGE (2 members)

1 SEARLE, C.	Bond	1 710	votes
2 RAUBENHEIMER, H.J.	Bond	1 703	"
3 Robertson, A.G.	Progressive	1 158	"
		<u>4 571</u>	"

Date of election	17 August
No. of registered voters	3 519
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>	
Bond	1 707 voters
Progressive Party	1 158 "
	<u>2 865</u> "

III OUTSHOORN (2 members)

1	SCHOEMAN, J.H.	Bond	1 236	voters
2	OLIVIER, G.C.	Progressive	1 216	"
3	Juta, Sir Henry	Independent (The Speaker)	1 196	"
			<u>3 648</u>	"
	Date of election		16 August	
	No. of registered voters		2 855	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>			
	Bond		1 236	voters
	Progressive Party		1 216	"
			<u>2 452</u>	"

An analysis of the distribution of votes was published in the Cape Times (weekly edition) of 31 August 1898 and the figures quoted in the article appear below:

	<u>SCHOEMAN</u> (Bond)	<u>OLIVIER</u> (Prog)	<u>JUTA</u> (Ind)	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>VOTERS</u>
Plumpers	936	36	16	988
Schoeman and Olivier	150	150	-	150
Schoeman and Juta	150	-	150	150
Olivier and Juta	-	1 030	1 030	1 030
	<u>1 236</u>	<u>1 216</u>	<u>1 196</u>	<u>2 318</u>

According to these figures 2 318 voters went to the polls and cast valid votes, but the aggregate of the estimates of Bond and Progressive support numbered as many as 2 452 voters. Nevertheless, the use of Schoeman's votes as the measure of the Bond support and Olivier's votes as the

measure of Progressive support was the only realistic gauge of party support in the constituency because 150 electors voted for Schoeman and Olivier and 16 voters plumped for Juta.

IV RIVERSDALE (2 members)

1	VAN WYK, D.J.	Bond	1 099	votes
2	VAN DER VYVER, I.W.J.	Bond	1 060	"
3	Louwrens, C.P.A.	Independent-Progressive	685	"
4	van Wyk, G.J.	Independent-Progressive	465	"
			<u>3 309</u>	"

Date of election 24 August

No. of registered voters 2 047

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	1 080	votes
Progressive Party	575	"
	<u>1 655</u>	"

V SWELLENDAM (2 members)

1	WOLFAARDT, G.S.	Bond	1 382	votes
2	JOUBERT, J.P.W.	Bond	968	"
3	Gildenhuys, H.J.	Independent-Bond	846	"
			<u>3 196</u>	"

Date of election 24 August

No. of registered voters 2 372

Gildenhuys has been designated as an 'Independent-Bond' candidate because he was classified as a Bond candidate in Ons Land and as an Independent candidate in the Cape Times.

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	1 409	voters
Progressive Party	179	"
	<u>1 588</u>	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Swellendam in the previous Council election:¹³

1	VAN EEDEN, F.J.	2 546	votes
2	DE VILLIERS, M.J.	856	"
3	Mulder, H.J.	720	"
4	Steyn, J.G.	210	"
5	van Wyk, D.J.	135	"
6	DE SMIDT, A.G.	108	"
7	Harris, V.	95	"
8	Schoeman, J.H.	92	"
		<u>4 762</u>	"

All of de Smidt's votes and half of de Villiers's votes were counted as Progressive votes, while the remaining 4 226 votes were counted as Bond votes. (See Chapter 2, The 1898 Legislative Council General Election) Each voter was allocated three votes.

WESTERN PROVINCE (4 constituencies)I. CAPE DIVISION (2 members)

1	ROSE INNES, J.	Progressive	Unopposed
2	SMUTS, Dr. C.P.	Progressive	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		8 122

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	3 279	voters
Bond	605	"
	<u>3 884</u>	"

13. CA 25.3.1898; SR 1898, p.30.

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Cape Division in the previous Council election. The three Progressive candidates obtained a total of 7 790 votes in that election, but O'Reilly's 2 046 votes have also been counted as Progressive votes, making a total of 9 836 Progressive votes, while Neethling's votes were counted as Bond votes.

Each voter had three votes in the Council election and the full result of the voting in this electoral division is quoted in Chapter 6.

II CAPE TOWN (4 members)

1	ST. LEGER, F.Y.	Progressive	4 546	votes
2	FULLER, T.E.	Progressive	4 302	"
3	BROWN, J.L.M.	Progressive	3 950	"
4	ANDERSON, T.J.	Progressive	3 908	"
5	Jagger, J.W.	Progressive-Independent	1 794	"
6	O'Dowd, P.J.	Independent-Bond	547	"
			<hr/>	
			19 047	"
			<hr/>	
	Date of election		9 August	
	No. of registered voters		7 798	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>			
	Progressive Party		4 832	voters
	Bond		547	"
			<hr/>	
			5 379	"
			<hr/>	

The derivation of these figures is discussed in Chapter 5 'Assembly Elections'.

III PAARL (2 members)

1	HOFFMAN, Dr. J.M.	Bond	1 177	votes
2	MARAIS, J.S.	Bond	1 121	"
3	Faure, Sir P.H.	Progressive	1 047	"
4	Eksteen, J.P.	Progressive	1 017	"
			<hr/>	
			4 362	"
			<hr/>	

Date of election	16 August
No. of registered voters	2 619
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>	
Bond	1 149 voters
Progressive Party	1 032 "
	<u>2 181</u> "

IV STELLENBOSCH (2 members)

1 SIVEWRIGHT, Sir J.	Progressive	800	voters
2 KRIGE, G.J.	Bond	644	"
3 de Waal, P.	Bond	622	"
		<u>2 066</u>	"

Date of election	16 August
No. of registered voters	1 632
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>	
Progressive Party	800 voters
Bond	633 "
	<u>1 433</u> "

THE 1899 BY-ELECTION

No. of seats available	2
No. of registered voters	1 632

There was no alteration in the delimitation of Stellenbosch between the 1898 general election and this by-election and the result of the voting in the by-election was:¹⁴

1 MARAIS, J.H.	Bond	738	voters
2 KRIGE, G.J.	Bond	707	"
3 Sivewright, Sir J.	Progressive	639	"
4 Cloete, H.	Progressive	560	"
		<u>2 644</u>	"

14. OL 23.3.1899; OL 30.3.1899.

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Bond	723	voters
Progressive Party	600	"
	<u>1 323</u>	"

A SUMMARY OF THE ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND BOND SUPPORT IN EACH ELECTORAL PROVINCE

<u>Electoral Provinces</u>	<u>Estimated No. of Voters</u>	
	<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Bond</u>
British Bechuanaland	1 168	702
Eastern Province	7 604	3 871
Griqualand West	4 202	1 445
Midland Province	2 453	4 968
North-Eastern Province	3 065	4 093
North-Western Province	3 040	5 405
South-Eastern Province	7 132	2 339
South-Western Province	3 686	6 508
Western Province	9 943	2 934
	<u>42 293</u>	<u>32 265</u>

APPENDIX DPART 4THE BY-ELECTIONS RESULTING FROM ACT 19 of 1898; THE OUTCOME
IN CONSTITUENCIES. 1

<u>Existing Constituencies</u>	<u>Number of New Seats</u>		<u>The date of the by-election in contested Constituencies</u>
	<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Bond</u>	
Cape Town	1	0	16.5.1899
George	0	1	19.4.1899
Griqualand East	1	0	27.5.1899
Port Elizabeth	2	0	14.4.1899
Tembuland	0	1	27.5.1899
Worcester	0	1	Not contested
 <u>New Constituencies</u>			
Cathcart	1	0	Not contested
Humansdorp	0	1	14.4.1899
Jansenville	0	2	13.4.1899
Middelburg	0	1	Not contested
Prieska	0	1	18.4.1899
Simonstown	1	0	5.4.1899
Woodstock	1	0	11.4.1899
Wynberg	1	0	Not contested
	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	

1. OL 23.3.1899; OL 8.4.1899; OL 13.4.1899; OL 18.4.1899;
OL 20.4.1899; OL 25.4.1899; OL 11.5.1899; OL 1.6.1899;
OL 3.6.1899.

APPENDIX DPART 5THE 1903 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING IN THE SIX CONTESTED CONSTITUENCIES.

1. Each voter had three votes in each of the six contested constituencies.
2. The voting figures were obtained from the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazettes and the party political affiliations of the candidates were obtained from a variety of articles in the contemporary press.
3. The names of victorious candidates are in capitals.

Constituency: EASTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 20 516

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Progressive</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	ROGERS, W.	-	11 433	-
2	BAYLY, Z.S.	8 096	-	-
3	BARRABLE, D.S.	7 961	-	-
4	Hughes, E.	7 557	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		23 614	11 433	-

Constituency: MIDLAND PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 9 826

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Progressive</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	CLAASSENS, H.J.H.	-	5 520	-
2	DU TOIT, J.F.	-	5 401	-
3	DE VILLIERS, P.D.	5 181	-	-
4	Maasdorp, G.H.	-	-	1 625
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		5 181	10 921	1 625
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Constituency: NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 11 384

	<u>Candidates</u>			
1	VAN ZYL, I.J.	-	6 403	-
2	OWEN LEWIS, C.A.	6 230	-	-
3	GRAAFF, J.A.C.	-	6 115	-
4	de Villiers, J.N.P.	-	6 048	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		6 230	18 566	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Constituency: SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 22 015

	<u>Candidates</u>			
1	BELLINGAN, P.S.	-	11 436	-
2	PYOTT, J.	8 665	-	-
3	WILMOT, A.	8 576	-	-
4	Hurndall, R.F.	8 405	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		25 646	11 436	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Constituency: SOUTH-WESTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 14 444

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Progressive</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	DEMPERS, H.J.	-	8 220	-
2	VAN ZYL, H.C.	-	7 671	-
3	DE SMIDT, A.G.	7 481	-	-
4	Searle, C.	-	6 405	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		7 481	22 296	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Constituency: WESTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 35 180

	<u>Candidates</u>			
		1	PETERSEN, Dr. A.H.	-
2	GRAHAM, T.L.	12 530	-	-
3	LOGAN, J.D.	12 513	-	-
4	Garlick, J.	12 438	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		37 481	-	15 538
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	GRAND TOTAL	105 633	74 652	17 163
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

APPENDIX DPART 6THE 1904 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE OUTCOME IN CONSTITUENCIES.

Anti-Progressive seats include all the seats won by S.A.P.,
Independent-S.A.P. and Independent candidates.

<u>Progressive Party</u>		<u>Anti-Progressives</u>	
<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Seats</u>	<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Seats</u>
Albany	2	Albert	2
Aliwal North	2	Beaufort West	2
Barkly West	2	Caledon	2
Cape Town	5	Clanwilliam	2
Cathcart	1	Colesberg	2
East London	2	Cradock	2
Grahamstown	2	George	3
Griqualand East	2	Graaff-Reinet	2
Kimberley	4	Humansdorp	1
Kingwilliamstown	2	Jansenville	2
Mafeking	1	Malmesbury	2
Namaqualand	2	Middelburg	1
Port Elizabeth	4	Oudtshoorn	2
Prieska	1	Paarl	2
Queenstown	2	Piquetberg	2
Simonstown	1	Richmond	2
Tembuland	2	Riversdale	2
Uitenhage	2	Somerset East	2
Victoria East	2	Stellenbosch	2
Vryburg	2	Swellendam	2
Wodehouse	2	Victoria West	2
Woodstock	2	Worcester	3
Wynberg	2		
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	49		44

SPLIT-REPRESENTATION

Fort Beaufort	1	Fort Beaufort	1
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	50		45
	<hr/> <hr/>		<hr/> <hr/>

APPENDIX DPART 7THE 1904 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT FOR EACH CONSTITUENCY.

1. The electoral divisions are listed alphabetically under the electoral provinces in which they fell.
2. The party political designations of candidates were derived from the contemporary press.
3. The results of the voting were obtained from the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazettes of 19 and 26 February 1904.
4. 'Anti-Progressive' support consisted of the estimates of the number of voters who supported S.A.P., Labour and 'Anti-Progressive' Independent candidates. Some 'Anti-Progressive' Independent candidates, including the prime minister, Sir, J. Gordon Sprigg, stood as 'Independent-Progressives', but they have been listed as Independents.
5. The number of voters registered in each constituency was obtained from the Statistical Register of 1904.
6. Polling day in all the contested constituencies except Cape Town and Grahamstown was on 10 February.
7. The names of the victorious candidates are in capitals.

AN ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF ELECTORAL DIVISIONS AND THE
ELECTORAL PROVINCES IN WHICH THEY WERE SITUATED.

The names of the electoral provinces have been abbreviated, e.g. 'BB' stands for British Bechuanaland and 'NE' stands for North-Eastern Province.

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Electoral Provinces</u>	<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Electoral Provinces</u>
Albany	SE	Middelburg	NE
Albert	NE	Namaqualand	NW
Aliwal North	EP	Oudtshoorn	SW
Barkly West	GW	Paarl	WP
Beaufort West	MP	Piquetberg	NW
Caledon	SW	Port Elizabeth	SE
Cape Town	WP	Prieska	MP
Cathcart	EP	Queenstown	EP
Clanwilliam	NW	Richmond	MP
Colesberg	NE	Riversdale	SW
Cradock	NE	Simonstown	WP
East London	EP	Somerset East	NE
Fort Beaufort	NE	Stellenbosch	WP
George	SW	Swellendam	SW
Graaff-Reinet	MP	Tembuland	EP
Grahamstown	SE	Uitenhage	SE
Griqualand East	EP	Victoria East	SE
Humansdorp	SE	Victoria West	MP
Jansenville	SE	Vryburg	BB
Kimberley	GW	Wodehouse	EP
Kingwilliamstown	EP	Woodstock	WP
Mafeking	BB	Worcester	NW
Malmesbury	NW	Wynberg	WP

THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE
AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT IN EACH ELECTORAL DIVISION

BRITISH BECHUANALAND (2 constituencies)

I MAFEKING (1 member)

1 DE KOCK, J.W.	Progressive	Unopposed
No. of registered voters		758

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	350	voters
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	50	"
	<hr/>	
	400	"
	<hr/>	

The electoral province of British Bechuanaland was not contested in the 1903 Council election and the derivation of estimates of potential Progressive and S.A.P. support in its two electoral divisions of Mafeking and Vryburg in that election are discussed in Chapter 7. Those estimates have been used for this election as well as for the Council election.

II VRYBURG (2 members)

1 CROSBIE, W.	Progressive	Unopposed
2 RUBIDGE, W.	Progressive	Unopposed
No. of registered voters		944

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	450	voters
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	225	"
	<hr/>	
	675	"
	<hr/>	

For the derivation of these figures see the note under 'Mafeking'.

EASTERN PROVINCE (8 constituencies)I ALIWAL NORTH (2 members)

1	CREWE, Col. C.P.	Progressive	602	votes
2	ORSMOND, W.C.	Progressive	580	"
3	Sauer, J.W.	S.A.P.	549	"
4	Hook, D.B.	S.A.P.	533	"
			<u>2 264</u>	"

No. of registered voters 1 452

No. of voters who went to the polls 1 148

No. of rejected ballot papers 7

No. of voters who cast valid votes 1 141

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	591	voters
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	541	"
	<u>1 132</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

II CATHCART (1 member)

1	BLAINE, G.	Progressive	463	votes
2	Stephen, T.A.	Progressive	334	"
			<u>797</u>	"

No. of registered voters 1 171

No. of voters who went to the polls 814

No. of rejected ballot papers 17

No. of voters who cast valid votes 797

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	459	voters
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	254	"
	<u>713</u>	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Cathcart in the 1903 Council election: ¹

1. CA 17.11.1903; SAN 21.11.1903.

1	ROGERS, W.	S.A.P.	761	votes
2	BARRABLE, D.S.	Progressive	467	"
3	BAYLY, Z.S.	Progressive	458	"
4	Hughes, E.	Progressive	452	"
			<u>2 138</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

III EAST LONDON (2 members)

1	SMARTT, Dr. T.	Progressive	2 015	votes
2	HELLIER, J.G.	Progressive	1 906	"
3	Sprigg, Sir J. Gordon	Independent ²	1 061	"
			<u>4 982</u>	"

No. of registered voters	4 967
No. of voters who went to the polls	3 036
No. of rejected ballot papers	54
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 982

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	1 921	votes
Anti-Progressives (Independent)	1 061	"
	<u>2 982</u>	"

The 'mincrity party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

IV GRIQUALAND EAST (2 members)

1	Tod, C.E.	Progressive	Unopposed
2	ZIETSMAN, L.F.	Progressive	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		1 989

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	869	votes
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	307	"
	<u>1 176</u>	"

2. Sprigg actually stood as an 'Independent-Progressive' candidate.

These figures are derived from the result of the voting in Griqualand East in the 1903 Council election:³

1	BAYLY, Z.S.	Progressive	938	votes
2	ROGERS, W.	S.A.P.	922	"
3	BARRABLE, D.S.	Progressive	841	"
4	Hughes, E.	Progressive	329	"
			<u>3 530</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

V KINGWILLIAMSTOWN (2 members)

1	SCHERMBRUCKER, Col. F.	Progressive	Unopposed
2	WHITAKER, G.	Progressive	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		2 800

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	1 253	votes
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	674	"
	<u>1 927</u>	"

These figures are derived from the result of the voting in Kingwilliamstown in the 1903 Council election:⁴

1	ROGERS, W.	S.A.P.	2 023	votes
2	BAYLY, Z.S.	Progressive	1 298	"
3	BARRABLE, D.S.	Progressive	1 251	"
4	Hughes, E.	Progressive	1 209	"
			<u>5 781</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

3. CA 17.11.1903, SAN 21.11.1903.

4. CA 17.11.1903; SAN 21.11.1903.

VI QUEENSTOWN (2 members)

1	BERRY, Sir W.B.	Progressive (Speaker)	1 466	votes
2	FROST, J.	Progressive	1 080	"
3	Greef, H.J.	S.A.P.	925	"
			<u>3 471</u>	"

No. of registered voters 3 617

No. of voters who went to the polls 2 064

No. of rejected ballot papers 62

No. of voters who cast valid votes 2 002

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	1 077	votes
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	925	"
	<u>2 002</u>	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

VII TEMBULAND (2 members)

1	FULLER, A.J.	Progressive	1 124	votes
2	SCHREINER, T.L.	Progressive	1 068	"
3	Silberbauer, C.C.	Independent	939	"
4	Molteno, J.C.	S.A.P.	923	"
			<u>4 054</u>	"

No. of registered voters 2 789

No. of voters who went to the polls 2 072

No. of rejected ballot papers 25

No. of voters who cast valid votes 2 047

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	1 096	votes
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P. and Independent)	931	"
	<u>2 027</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

VIII WODEHOUSE (2 members)

1	POWRIE, F.W.	Progressive	751	votes
2	DUGMORE, G.E.	Progressive	731	"
3	Merriman, J.X.	S.A.P.	587	"
4	Nevill, H.M.	S.A.P.	572	"
			<u>2 641</u>	"

No. of registered voters 2 001

No. of voters who went to the polls 1 368

No. of rejected ballot papers 22

No. of voters who cast valid votes 1 346

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	741	voters
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	580	"
	<u>1 321</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

GRIQUALAND WEST (2 constituencies)I BARKLY WEST (2 members)⁵

1	BAILEY, A.	Progressive	849	votes
2	HARRIS, Col. D.	Progressive	812	"
3	Donovan, J.G.	Independent	311	"
4	Ricketts, G.J.	Independent	239	"
			<u>2 211</u>	"

No. of registered voters 1 953

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	831	voters
Anti-Progressives (Independent)	275	"
	<u>1 106</u>	"

5. The Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette of 26 February 1904 stated that 1 135 voters went to the polls and that thirty-five ballot papers were rejected, but those figures must be wrong because that would leave a total of only 1 100 voters who cast valid votes. However, 2 211 votes were polled and each voter was allocated two votes, so at least 1 106 voters must have cast valid votes.

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

II KIMBERLEY (4 members)

1	LAWRENCE, J.	Progressive	2 703	votes
2	OLIVER, H.A.	Progressive	2 652	"
3	HAARHOFF, D.J.	Progressive	2 490	"
4	STEAD, A.	Progressive	2 352	"
5	Lezard, L.F.	Independent	1 553	"
6	Henderson, R.H.	Independent-Progressive	887	"
			<hr/>	
			12 637	"

No. of registered voters	6 404
No. of voters who went to the polls	4 157
No. of rejected ballot papers	46
No. of voters who cast valid votes	4 111

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	2 558	voters
Anti-Progressives (Independent)	1 553	"
	<hr/>	
	4 111	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

MIDLAND PROVINCE (5 constituencies)

I BEAUFORT WEST (2 members)

1	WEEBER, P.J.	S.A.P.	1 088	votes
2	CRONWRIGHT-SCHREINER, S.C.	S.A.P.	981	"
3	Jackson, J.R.	Progressive	611	"
			<hr/>	
			2 680	"

No. of registered voters	2 124
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 610
No. of rejected ballot papers	16
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 594

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	983	voters
Progressive Party	611	"
	<u>1 594</u>	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

II GRAAFF-REINET (2 members)

1	MAASDORP, G.H.	S.A.P.	1 102	voters
2	DAVEL, F.R.	S.A.P.	831	"
3	du Toit, C.A.	S.A.P.	781	"
			<u>2 714</u>	"

All three candidates stood as S.A.P. candidates, but Davel and du Toit were the nominees of the Afrikaner Bond.

No. of registered voters	2 417
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 665
No. of rejected ballot papers	13
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 652

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 316	voters
Progressive Party	432	"
	<u>1 748</u>	"

These figures are derived from the result of the voting in Graaff-Reinet in the 1903 Council election:⁶

1	DU TOIT, J.F.	S.A.P.	1 586	voters
2	DE VILLIERS, P.D.	Progressive	1 297	"
3	Maasdorp, G.H.	Independent	1 182	"
4	CLAASSENS, H.J.H.	S.A.P.	1 181	"
			<u>5 246</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election and Anti-Progressive (S.A.P.) support was estimated in terms of the number of votes polled for du Toit, Maasdorp and Claassens.

6. CTW 25.11.1903, p.2.

III PRIESKA (1 member)

1	ORPEN, R.N.M.	Progressive	389	votes
2	de Meillon, F.A.	S.A.P.	335	"
			<u>724</u>	"

No. of registered voters	1 029
No. of voters who went to the polls	736
No. of rejected ballot papers	12
No. of voters who cast valid votes	724

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	389	voters
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	335	"
	<u>724</u>	"

IV RICHMOND (2 members)

1	THERON, T.P.	S.A.P.	828	votes
2	SIEBERHAGEN, W.G.	S.A.P.	776	"
3	Wright, J.W.	Independent	355	"
			<u>1 959</u>	"

No. of registered voters	1 922
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 161
No. of rejected ballot papers	18
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 143

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	828	voters
Progressive Party	251	"
	<u>1 079</u>	"

The number of votes polled for the top S.A.P. candidate has been taken as the measure of S.A.P. support in the constituency and 251 of the remaining 315 voters have been taken as the estimate of potential Progressive support because the Progressive candidate in the 1903 Council election obtained 754 votes in Richmond and each voter possessed three votes in that election.⁷

7. CTW 25.11.1903, p.2.

V VICTORIA WEST (2 members)

1	KUHN, P.G.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
2	VISSER, A.G.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
No. of registered voters			2 334
<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>			
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)			1 050 voters
Progressive Party			216 "
			<u>1 266</u> "

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Victoria West in the 1903 Council election:⁸

1	CLAASSENS, H.J.H.	S.A.P.	2 067	votes
2	DU TOIT, J.F.	S.A.P.	1 004	"
3	DE VILLIERS, P.D.	Progressive	648	"
4	Maasdorp, G.H.	Independent	79	"
			<u>3 798</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election and Anti-Progressive support was estimated in terms of the number of votes polled for Claassens, du Toit and Maasdorp.

NORTH-EASTERN PROVINCE (6 constituencies)

I ALBERT (2 members)

1	BURTON, H.	S.A.P.	762	votes
2	DU PLESSIS, A.S.	S.A.P.	757	"
3	Hopley, W.M.	Progressive	404	"
4	Kruger, J.A.	Progressive	373	"
			<u>2 296</u>	"
No. of registered voters			1 824	
No. of voters who went to the polls			1 217	
No. of rejected ballot papers			28	
No. of voters who cast valid votes			1 189	

8. CTW 25.11.1903, p.2.

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	760	voters
Progressive Party	389	"
	<u>1 149</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' has been used to obtain the figures quoted above.

II COLESBERG (2 members)

1	DE WAAL, N.F.	S.A.P.	939	votes
2	VENTER, M.M.	S.A.P.	921	"
3	Macfarlane, J.	Progressive	625	"
4	Robertson, A.	Progressive	565	"
			<u>3 050</u>	"

No. of registered voters	2 184
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 563
No. of rejected ballot papers	12
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 551

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	930	voters
Progressive Party	595	"
	<u>1 525</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' has been used to obtain the figures quoted above.

III CRADOCK (2 members)

1	DU PLESSIS, M.J.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
2	VAN HEERDEN, H.C.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		2 025

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 216	voters
Progressive Party	304	"
	<u>1 520</u>	"

As Cradock was not contested in this election or in the 1903 Council election, the estimates were based on the assumption that 75,06% of the total number of registered voters would cast valid votes, had there been a contest between the two parties⁹, and that S.A.P. supporters would have outnumbered Progressives by four to one.

IV FORT BEAUFORT (2 members)

1	NILAND, B.	Progressive	649	voters
2	ADENDORFF, A.R.	Independent	645	"
3	Hockly, W.H.	Progressive	618	"
4	Yates, J.J.	Independent	578	"
			<u>2 490</u>	"
	No. of registered voters		1 659	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		1 314	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		26	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		1 288	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>			
	Progressive Party		634	voters
	Anti-Progressives (Independent)		612	"
			<u>1 246</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

V MIDDELBURG (1 member)

1	DU PLESSIS, D.J.	S.A.P.	Unopposed	
	No. of registered voters		1 484	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>			
	Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)		892	voters
	Progressive Party		223	"
			<u>1 115</u>	"

9. In Albert, Colesberg, Fort Beaufort and Somerset East - the four contested constituencies in the North-Eastern Province - an average of 75% of the registered voters cast valid votes.

As Middelburg was not contested in this election or in the 1903 Council election, the estimates were based on the assumption that 75,13% of the number of registered voters would have cast valid votes, had there been a contest between the two parties and that S.A.P. supporters would have outnumbered Progressives by four to one.¹⁰

VI SOMERSET EAST (2 members)

1	MOLTENO, J.T.	S.A.P.	1 126	votes
2	VOSLOO, J.A.	S.A.P.	1 122	"
3	Scott, Q.H.	Progressive	1 040	"
4	Hall, T.C.J.	Progressive	985	"
			<u>4 273</u>	"
	No. of registered voters		2 577	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		2 182	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		27	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		2 155	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>			
	Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)		1 124	votes
	Progressive Party		1 013	"
			<u>2 137</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

NORTH WESTERN PROVINCE (5 constituencies)

I CLANWILLIAM (2 members)

1	VAN ZYL, D.J.A.	S.A.P.	Unopposed	
2	VAN DER MERWE, F.J.	S.A.P.	Unopposed	
	No. of registered voters		1 713	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>			
	Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)		1 071	votes
	Progressive Party		188	"
			<u>1 259</u>	"

10. See footnote 9.

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Clanwilliam in the 1903 Council election:¹¹

1	VAN ZYL, I.J.	S.A.P.	1 191	votes
2	de Villiers, J.N.P.	S.A.P.	1 016	"
3	GRAAFF, J.A.C.	S.A.P.	1 007	"
4	OWEN LEWIS, C.A.	Progressive	564	"
			<u>3 778</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

II MALMESBURY (2 members)

1	MALAN, F.S.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
2	SMUTS, J.A.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		2 443
<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>			
	Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)		1 490 voters
	Progressive Party		359 "
			<u>1 849</u> "

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Malmesbury in the 1903 Council election:¹²

1	de Villiers, J.N.P.	S.A.P.	1 508	votes
2	GRAAFF, J.A.C.	S.A.P.	1 491	"
3	VAN ZYL, I.J.	S.A.P.	1 472	"
4	OWEN LEWIS, C.A.	Progressive	1 078	"
			<u>5 549</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

11. CTW 18.11.1903, p.2.

12. CTW 18.11.1903, p.2.

III NAMAQUALAND (2 members)

1	OATS, F.	Progressive	801	votes
2	FAURE, Sir P.H.	Progressive	788	"
3	van Zyl, S.	S.A.P.	748	"
4	Volimer, F.T.	S.A.P.	744	"
			<u>3 081</u>	"
	No. of registered voters		2 016	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		1 609	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		52	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		1 557	

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	795	voters
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	746	"
	<u>1 541</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

IV PIQUETBERG (2 members)

1	DE BEER, M.J.	Ind-S.A.P.	652	votes
2	STIGLINGH, H.D.	Ind-S.A.P.	613	"
3	Marais, D.J.	S.A.P.	535	"
4	Chiappini, C.D.	S.A.P.	519	"
			<u>2 319</u>	"
	No. of registered voters		1 582	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		1 196	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		13	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		1 183	

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	911	voters
Progressive Party	129	"
	<u>1 040</u>	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Piquetberg in the 1903 Council election:¹³

1	de Villiers, J.N.P.	S.A.P.	918	votes
2	VAN ZYL, I.J.	S.A.P.	916	"
3	GRAAFF, J.A.C.	S.A.P.	898	"
4	OWEN LEWIS, C.A.	Progressive	388	"
			<u>3 120</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

V WORCESTER (3 members)

1	BECK, Dr. J.H.M.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
2	GRAAFF, J.J.A.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
3	RABIE, D. de V.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		3 630

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	2 008	voters
Progressive Party	621	"
	<u>2 629</u>	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Worcester in the 1903 Council election:¹⁴

1	GRAAFF, J.A.C.	S.A.P.	2 085	votes
2	de Villiers, J.N.P.	S.A.P.	2 000	"
3	VAN ZYL, I.J.	S.A.P.	1 938	"
4	OWEN LEWIS, C.A.	Progressive	1 863	"
			<u>7 886</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE (7 constituencies)

I ALBANY (2 members)

1	SAMPSON, V.	Progressive	996	votes
2	THOMAS, W.	Progressive	985	"
3	Lombard, J.F.	S.A.P.	555	"
4	Grobbelaar, A.L.	S.A.P.	541	"
			<u>3 077</u>	"

No. of registered voters	2 036
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 576
No. of rejected ballot papers	14
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 562

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	991	votes
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	548	"
	<u>1 539</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

II GRAHAMSTOWN (2 members)

1 JAMESON, Dr. L.S.	Progressive	707	votes
2 WOOD, H.R.	Progressive	696	"
3 Douglass, A.	Independent	403	"
		<u>1 806</u>	"

Date of election	19 January
No. of registered voters	1 837
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 098
No. of rejected ballot papers	28
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 070

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	667	voters
Anti-Progressives (Independent)	403	"
	<u>1 070</u>	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above, but they tend to exaggerate 'Anti-Progressive' support because Douglass actually stood as an 'Independent-Progressive' candidate and as such he obtained some of his votes from Progressive voters. Had Jameson's support been taken as the measure of Progressive support, the estimate would have read:

Progressive Party	707	voters
Anti-Progressives	363	"
	<u>1 070</u>	"

However, the former set of figures has been used to compile the gross national figures in this election in order to offset any short-falls in the estimates of 'Anti-Progressives' in uncontested S.A.P. constituencies and other constituencies where Anti-Progressive support was based on the voting in the 1903 Council election.

III HUMANSDORP (1 member)

1 RADEMEYER, J.M.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
No. of registered voters		1 395
<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>		
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)		741 voters
Progressive Party		298 "
		<u>1 039</u> "

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Humansdorp in the 1903 Council election:¹⁵

1 BELLINGAN, P.S.	S.A.P.	2 223	votes
2 PYOTT, J.	Progressive	311	"
3 Hurndall, R.F.	Progressive	297	"
4 WILMOT, A.	Progressive	286	"
		<u>3 117</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

IV JANSEVILLE (2 members)

1 LOTTER, C.J.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
2 OOSTHUIZEN, O.A.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
No. of registered voters		1 937

15. SAN 21.11.1903.

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 016	voters
Progressive Party	319	"
	<u>1 335</u>	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Jansenville in the 1903 Council election;¹⁶

1	BELLINGAN, P.S.	S.A.P.	3 048	votes
2	WILMOT, A.	Progressive	330	"
3	Hurndall, R.F.	Progressive	330	"
4	PYOTT, J.	Progressive	297	"
			<u>4 005</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

V PORT ELIZABETH (4 members)

1	SEARLE, J.	Progressive	4 054	votes
2	WALTON, E.H.	Progressive	3 961	"
3	JUTA, Sir H.	Progressive	3 949	"
4	WYNNE, J.	Progressive	3 826	"
5	Urie, W.A.	Labour	707	"
			<u>16 497</u>	"

No. of registered voters	10 951
No. of voters who went to the polls	4 732
No. of rejected ballot papers	161
No. of voters who cast valid votes	4 571

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	3 864	voters
Anti-Progressives (Labour)	707	"
	<u>4 571</u>	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

VI UITENHAGE (2 members)

1	LEE, C.	Progressive	1 284	votes
2	VANES, Dr. A.B.	Progressive	1 163	"
3	Freemantle, Prof. H.E.S.	S.A.P.	1 026	"
			<hr/>	
			3 473	"

No. of registered voters 3 080

No. of voters who went to the polls 2 209

No. of rejected ballot papers 36

No. of voters who cast valid votes 2 173

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	1 147	voters
Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 026	"
	<hr/>	
	2 173	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

VII VICTORIA EAST (2 members)

1	KING, T.B.	Progressive	363	votes
2	SLATER, J.	Progressive	351	"
3	Searle, T.	Independent	312	"
			<hr/>	
			1 026	"

No. of registered voters 779

No. of voters who went to the polls 664

No. of rejected ballot papers 3

No. of voters who cast valid votes 661

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	349	voters
Anti-Progressives (Independent)	312	"
	<hr/>	
	661	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

SOUTH WESTERN PROVINCE (5 constituencies)I CALEDON (2 members)

1	KRIGE, C.J.	S.A.P.	1 392	votes
2	VILJOEN, Dr. A.G.	S.A.P.	1 344	"
3	Schreiner, W.P.	Independent	675	"
			<u>3 411</u>	"

No. of registered voters 2 478

No. of voters who went to the polls 2 054

No. of rejected ballot papers 58

No. of voters who cast valid votes 1 996

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 347	votes
Progressive Party	393	"
	<u>1 740</u>	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Caledon in the 1903 Council election:¹⁷

1	DEMPERS, H.J.	S.A.P.	2 303	votes
2	DE SMIDT, A.G.	Progressive	1 178	"
3	VAN ZYL, H.C.	S.A.P.	1 177	"
4	Searle, C.	S.A.P.	562	"
			<u>5 220</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

II GEORGE (3 members)

1	SEARLE, C.	S.A.P.	2 071	votes
2	RAUBENHEIMER, H.J.	S.A.P.	2 059	"
3	CURRY, H.L.	S.A.P.	2 005	"
4	Vincent, A.I.	Progressive	1 329	"
			<u>7 464</u>	"

No. of registered voters	4 002
No. of voters who went to the polls	3 373
No. of rejected ballot papers	81
No. of voters who cast valid votes	3 292

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 963	voters
Progressive Party	1 329	"
	<hr/>	
	3 292	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

III OUDTSHOORN (2 members)

1 FOSTER, J.A.	S.A.P.	1 721	votes
2 SCHOEMAN, J.H.	S.A.P.	1 711	"
3 Wallis, G.	Progressive	843	"
		<hr/>	
		4 275	"

No. of registered voters	3 060
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 557
No. of rejected ballot papers	38
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 519

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 676	voters
Progressive Party	843	"
	<hr/>	
	2 519	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

IV RIVERSDALE (2 members)

1 BADENHORST, J.F.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
2 MICHAU, J.J.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
No. of registered voters	2 209	

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 266	voters
Progressive Party	189	"
	<hr/>	
	1 455	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Riversdale in the 1903 Council election:¹⁸

1	VAN ZYL, H.C.	S.A.P.	1 363	votes
2	DEMPERS, H.J.	S.A.P.	1 255	"
3	Searle, C.	S.A.P.	1 180	"
4	DE SMIDT, A.G.	Progressive	566	"
			<u>4 364</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

V SWELLENDAM (2 members)

1	WOLFAARDT, G.S.	S.A.P.	1 477	votes
2	BADENHORST, F.H.	S.A.P.	1 338	"
3	van Zyl, J.H.	S.A.P.	698	"
			<u>3 513</u>	"

No. of registered voters	2 695
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 010
No. of rejected ballot papers	92
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 918

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	1 602	voters
Progressive Party	261	"
	<u>1 863</u>	"

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Swellendam in the 1903 Council election:¹⁹

1	VAN ZYL, H.C.	S.A.P.	1 904	votes
2	DEMPERS, H.J.	S.A.P.	1 532	"
3	Searle, C.	S.A.P.	1 369	"
4	DE SMIDT, A.G.	Progressive	783	"
			<u>5 588</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes in the Council election.

18. SAN 21.11.1903.

19. SAN 21.11.1903.

WESTERN PROVINCE (6 constituencies)I CAPE TOWN (5 members)

1	GARLICK, J.	Progressive	5 496	votes
2	ANDERSON, T.J.	Progressive	5 336	"
3	THORNE, W.	Progressive	5 045	"
4	JAGGER, J.W.	Progressive	4 365	"
5	CARTWRIGHT, J.D.	Progressive	4 217	"
6	Bam, Capt.P.	Independent- Progressive	3 771	"
7	Harris, T.	Independent- Progressive - Labour	1 493	"
8	Purcell, I.	Labour - (District Six Working Men's Union)	1 393	"
9	Craig, C.J.	Labour - (Political Labour League)	1 246	"
			<hr/>	
			32 362	"
			<hr/>	

Date of election	21 January
No. of registered voters	17 131
No. of voters who went to the polls	7 610
No. of rejected ballot papers	45
No. of voters who cast valid votes	7 565

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	5 646	voters
Anti-Progressives (Labour and Others)	1 377	"
	<hr/>	
	7 023	"
	<hr/>	

Captain Bam actually supported the Progressive Party and gave Dr. Jameson a pledge of loyalty to the Party before the election, so his votes have been counted as Progressive votes. Bam's votes and those of the five official Progressive candidates numbered 28 230 votes. That figure has been divided by five to obtain the estimate of Progressive support because each voter in the constituency possessed five votes.

Anti-Progressive support was calculated in terms of the average number of votes cast for each of the three other candidates.

II PAARL (2 members)

1	HOFFMAN, Dr. J.M.	S.A.P.	1 279	votes
2	CILLIE, P.J.	S.A.P.	1 261	"
3	Abrahamson, L.	Progressive	1 104	"
4	Myburgh, P.A.	Progressive	1 096	"
			<hr/>	
			4 740	"
			<hr/>	
	No. of registered voters		2 864	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		2 435	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		52	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		2 383	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>			
	Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)		1 279	votes
	Progressive Party		1 104	"
			<hr/>	
			2 383	"
			<hr/>	

The 'highest party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

On 16 February 1904 Oms Land published an analysis of the distribution of the votes polled in the Paarl election, but it was of no real help in assessing the relative strengths of the S.A.P. and the Progressive Party because as many as 110 voters voted across party lines and twenty-six voters plumped for only one candidate. Nevertheless it did indicate that there were 1 210 voters who voted for both S.A.P. candidates and 1 037 voters who voted for both Progressive candidates.

The following table details the distribution of votes in this election:

<u>Voting Combinations</u>	<u>Votes</u>			
	<u>Hoffman (S.A.P.)</u>	<u>Cillie (S.A.P.)</u>	<u>Abrahamson (P.P.)</u>	<u>Myburgh (P.P.)</u>
Solid S.A.P. voters (2 votes to S.A.P. candidates)	1 210	1 210	-	-
Solid P.P. voters (2 votes to P.P. candidates)	-	-	1 037	1 037
Plumpers	5	5	10	6
Hoffman and Abrahamson	23	-	23	-
Hoffman and Myburgh	41	-	-	41
Cillie and Abrahamson	-	34	34	-
Cillie and Myburgh	-	12	-	12
	<u>1 279</u>	<u>1 261</u>	<u>1 104</u>	<u>1 096</u>

III SIMONSTOWN (1 member)

1	RUNCIMAN, W.	Progressive	675	votes
2	Jeppe, C.	Independent	349	"
			<u>1 024</u>	"
	No. of registered voters		1 634	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		1 104	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		80	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		1 024	

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	675	voters
Anti-Progressives (Independent)	349	"
	<u>1 024</u>	"

IV STELLENBOSCH (2 members)

1	MARAIS, J.H.	S.A.P.	924	votes
2	KRIGE, G.J.	S.A.P.	912	"
3	Upington, B.	Progressive	880	"
4	Walton, E.H.	Progressive	837	"
			<u>3 553</u>	"

No. of registered voters	2 195
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 798
No. of rejected ballot papers	6
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 792

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Anti-Progressives (S.A.P.)	918	voters
Progressive Party	859	"
	<u>1 777</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

V WOODSTOCK (2 members)

1	BAILEY, A.	Progressive	2 396	votes
2	HEWAT, Dr. J.	Progressive	2 182	"
3	Douglass, A.	Independent ²⁰	1 005	"
4	Corley, A.	Labour	388	"
5	Gibson, T.	Labour	82	"
			<u>6 053</u>	"

No. of registered voters	6 442
No. of voters who went to the polls	3 313
No. of rejected ballot papers	40
No. of voters who cast valid votes	3 273

ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:

Progressive Party	2 186	voters
Anti-Progressives (Independent and Labour)	1 087	"
	<u>3 273</u>	"

When Arthur Douglass entered the contest, the Political Labour League asked Gibson to withdraw in favour of Douglass, but he refused to do so, so 'Anti-Progressive' support was estimated in terms of Douglass's and Gibson's supporters, and the other 2 186 voters were counted as Progressives.

20. Douglass actually stood as an 'Independent-Progressive'.

It has been presumed that most of Corley's Labour supporters gave their second vote to either Douglass or Gibson. However, some of Douglass's supporters were undoubtedly Progressives and most of them probably gave their second vote to Bailey.

VI WYNBERG (2 members)

1	CLOETE, H.	Progressive	1 587	votes
2	MICHELL, Sir L.L.	Progressive	1 500	"
3	Louw, T.	Independent	505	"
4	Thompson, F.R.	Independent	449	"
			<hr/>	
			4 041	"
			<hr/>	
	No. of registered voters		4 914	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		2 254	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		38	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		2 216	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT:</u>			
	Progressive Party		1 544	voters
	Anti-Progressives (Independents)		527	"
			<hr/>	
			2 071	"
			<hr/>	

The two Independents were sometimes classified as 'Independent-Progressives'. F.R. Thompson had been the sitting Progressive member for Wynberg since the by-election in 1899 to fill the new seat for the constituency after its creation in terms of Act 19 of 1898, but he failed to obtain the Progressive nomination in this election.

On 12 February 1904 the Cape Argus published an analysis of the distribution of votes in the election and 'Anti-Progressive' (Independent) support was derived by adding the number of voters who voted for both Louw and Thompson to the number of voters who plumped for either of them.

Progressive support was estimated in terms of the average number of votes for the two Progressive candidates, although only 1 398 voters voted for both of them and thirty-three voters plumped for one of them, but it could be assumed that most of the 136 voters who voted for Thompson and one of the two Progressive candidates, were actually Progressive supporters who remained loyal to their sitting Progressive member even though he was not standing as an official Progressive candidate.

The following table details the distribution of votes in this election:

<u>Voting Combinations</u>	<u>Progressives</u>		<u>Anti-Progressives</u>	
	<u>Cloete</u>	<u>Michell</u>	<u>Louw</u>	<u>Thompson</u>
Solid Progressive voters	1 398	1 398	-	-
Solid Anti-Progressive voters	-	-	169	169
Plumpers	22	11	214	144
	<u>1 420</u>	<u>1 409</u>	<u>383</u>	<u>313</u>
Cross-voters:				
Cloete and Louw	73	-	73	-
Cloete and Thompson	94	-	-	94
Michell and Louw	-	49	49	-
Michell and Thompson	-	42	-	42
	<u>1 587</u>	<u>1 500</u>	<u>505</u>	<u>449</u>

A SUMMARY OF THE ESTIMATES OF PROGRESSIVE AND ANTI-PROGRESSIVE
SUPPORT IN EACH ELECTORAL PROVINCE

<u>Electoral Provinces</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Voters</u>	
	<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Anti- Progressive</u>
British Bechuanaland	800	275
Eastern Province	8 007	5 273
Griqualand West	3 389	1 828
Midland Province	1 899	4 512
North-Eastern Province	3 158	5 534
North-Western Province	2 092	6 226
South-Eastern Province	7 635	4 753
South-Western Province	3 015	7 854
Western Province	12 014	5 537
	<u>42 009</u>	<u>41 792</u>

APPENDIX DPART 8THE 1908 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING IN THE SEVEN CONTESTED CONSTITUENCIES.

1. The Eastern Province constituency was contested on 21 February 1908; exactly a month after the elections in the other six constituencies.
2. The voting figures were obtained from the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazettes and the party political affiliations of the candidates were derived from articles in the contemporary press.
3. The names of the victorious candidates are in capitals.

Constituency: EASTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 25 113

No. of Votes per Voter: 4

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Unionist</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	DE WET, N.J.	-	15 498	-
2	SCHWEIZER, C.A.	-	15 006	-
3	FULLER, A.J.	10 954	-	-
4	BAYLY, Z.S.	7 956	-	-
5	Frost, Sir J.	7 718	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		26 628	30 504	-

Constituency: MIDLAND PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 11 449

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Unionist</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	WEEBER, P.J.	-	7 410	-
2	JOUBERT, C.G.	-	7 251	-
3	CLAASSENS, H.J.H.	-	7 237	-
4	de Villiers, P.D.	3 867	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		3 867	21 898	-

Constituency: NORTH-EASTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 12 495

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>			
1	MICHAU, P.W.	-	7 247	-
2	STOCKENSTROM. Sir G.H.	7 211	-	-
3	PRETORIUS, M.J.	-	6 830	-
4	van Rooy, A.C.A.	-	6 748	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		7 211	20 825	-

Constituency: NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 13 904

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>			
1	GRAAFF, J.A.C.	-	9 505	-
2	DE VILLIERS, J.N.P.	-	9 344	-
3	VAN ZYL, I.J.	-	9 062	-
4	Orpen, R.N.M.	6 284	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		6 284	27 911	-

Constituency: SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 21 239

No. of Votes per Voter: 4

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Unionist</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	DAVERIN, J.	-	16 070	-
2	LOMBARD, J.F.	-	15 585	-
3	HURNDALL, R.F.	8 807	-	-
4	WILMOT, A.	8 494	-	-
5	Pyott, J.	8 257	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		25 558	31 655	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Constituency: SOUTH-WESTERN PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 17 271

No. of Votes per Voter: 3

	<u>Candidates</u>			
		<u>Unionist</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	RAUBENHEIMER, H.P.	-	11 474	-
2	VAN ZYL, H.C.	-	11 118	-
3	DEMPERS, H.J.	-	10 897	-
4	Vincent, A.I. ¹	8 776	-	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		8 776	33 489	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

1. See Chapter 7, The Voting and the Estimates of Party Support (iii) 1908.

Constituency: WESTERN-PROVINCE

No. of registered Voters: 36 898

No. of Votes per Voter: 4

	<u>Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
		<u>Unionist</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
1	PETERSEN, Dr. Julius	-	17 560	-
2	GRAAFF, D.P. de V.	-	17 140	-
3	CARTWRIGHT, J.D.	13 397	-	-
4	FAURE, Sir P.H.	12 651	-	-
5	Powell, E.	12 374	-	-
6	Logan, J.D.	-	-	6 716
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		38 422	34 700	6 716
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	GRAND TOTAL	116 746	200 982	6 716
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

APPENDIX DPART 9

THE 1908 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT FOR EACH ELECTORAL DIVISION IN THE EASTERN PROVINCE, THE SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE AND THE WESTERN PROVINCE.

1. The results of the voting and the party political affiliations of the candidates have been obtained from articles in the contemporary press.
2. Each voter in all three electoral provinces was allocated four votes.

<u>EASTERN PROVINCE</u>				<u>Estd. No. of S.A.P. Voters</u>
<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>S.A.P. Votes</u>			
	<u>De Wet</u>	<u>Schweizer</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Aliwal North	2 070	1 928	3 998	1 000
Cathcart	696	674	1 370	343
East London	1 850	1 774	3 624	906
Griqualand East	977	948	1 925	481
Kingwilliamstown	2 071	2 019	4 090	1 023
Queenstown	2 546	2 434	4 980	1 245
Tembuland	2 064	2 029	4 093	1 023
Wodehouse	3 224	3 200	6 424	1 606
	<u>15 498</u>	<u>15 006</u>	<u>30 504</u>	<u>7 627</u>

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Unionist Votes</u>				<u>Estd. No. of Unionist Voters</u>
	<u>Fuller</u>	<u>Bayly</u>	<u>Frost</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Aliwal North	516	498	869	1 883	471
Cathcart	1 352	228	429	2 009	502
East London	1 776	3 742	1 779	7 297	1 824
Griqualand East	1 422	708	679	2 809	702
Kingwilliamstown	1 820	749	724	3 293	823
Queenstown	1 015	920	1 746	3 681	920
Tembuland	2 413	642	617	3 672	918
Wodehouse	640	469	875	1 984	496
	<u>10 954</u>	<u>7 956</u>	<u>7 718</u>	<u>26 628</u>	<u>6 656</u>

SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>S.A.P. Votes</u>			<u>Estd. No. of S.A.P. Voters</u>
	<u>Daverin</u>	<u>Lombard</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Albany	1 485	1 629	3 114	779
Grahamstown	847	927	1 774	444
Humansdorp	1 894	1 894	3 788	947
Jansenville	2 523	2 514	5 037	1 259
Port Elizabeth	5 691	5 006	10 697	2 674
Uitenhage	2 974	2 971	5 945	1 486
Victoria East	656	644	1 300	325
	<u>16 070</u>	<u>15 585</u>	<u>31 655</u>	<u>7 914</u>

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Unionist Votes</u>				<u>Estd. No. of Unionist Voters</u>
	<u>Hurndall</u>	<u>Wilmot</u>	<u>Pyott</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Albany	692	1 295	633	2 620	655
Grahamstown	555	1 196	562	2 313	578
Humansdorp	328	229	180	737	184
Jansenville	501	203	178	882	221
Port Elizabeth	4 182	4 137	5 579	13 898	3 475
Uitenhage	2 270	915	849	4 034	1 009
Victoria East	279	519	276	1 074	269
	<u>8 807</u>	<u>8 494</u>	<u>8 257</u>	<u>25 558</u>	<u>6 391</u>

WESTERN PROVINCES.A.P Votes

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Petersen</u>	<u>Graaff</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Estd. No. of S.A.P. Voters</u>
Cape Town	5 882	5 544	11 426	2 857
Paarl	3 242	3 283	6 525	1 631
Simonstown	1 126	1 097	2 223	556
Stellenbosch	2 200	2 237	4 437	1 109
Woodstock	3 459	3 381	6 840	1 710
Wynberg	<u>1 651</u>	<u>1 598</u>	<u>3 249</u>	<u>812</u>
	<u>17 560</u>	<u>17 140</u>	<u>34 700</u>	<u>8 675</u>

Unionist Votes

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Cartwright</u>	<u>Faure</u>	<u>Powell</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Estd. No. of Unionist Voters</u>
Cape Town	8 234	5 719	7 093	21 046	5 262
Paarl	574	1 494	477	2 545	636
Simonstown	798	453	431	1 682	421
Stellenbosch	799	1 555	710	3 064	766
Woodstock	1 727	1 576	2 489	5 792	1 448
Wynberg	<u>1 265</u>	<u>1 854</u>	<u>1 174</u>	<u>4 293</u>	<u>1 073</u>
	<u>13 397</u>	<u>12 651</u>	<u>12 374</u>	<u>38 422</u>	<u>9 606</u>

Independent Votes

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Logan</u>	<u>Estd. No. of Voters</u>
Cape Town	3 708	927
Paarl	277	69
Simonstown	479	120
Stellenbosch	210	53
Woodstock	1 367	342
Wynberg	<u>675</u>	<u>169</u>
	<u>6 716</u>	<u>1 680</u>

APPENDIX DPART 10THE 1908 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GENERAL ELECTION; THE DERIVATION OF THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT IN BRITISH BECHUANALAND AND GRIQUALAND WEST.

There were 2 146 voters registered in British Bechuanaland and 11 619 in Griqualand West. British Bechuanaland consisted of the electoral divisions of Mafeking with 587 voters and Vryburg with 1 559 voters, while Griqualand West comprised the electoral divisions of Barkly West with 2 945 voters and Kimberley with 8 674 voters.

J.J. Keeley and W. Ross were returned unopposed for British Bechuanaland and Griqualand West respectively. Keeley was a pro-S.A.P. Independent and Ross was a Unionist. My estimate of party support in British Bechuanaland was 900 S.A.P. voters and 600 Unionists. This represented 69,90% of the total electorate.

In the 1908 Assembly election Mafeking and Vryburg were contested. Mafeking was a 'single-member' constituency and three candidates were nominated, J.W. de Kock (Unionist Party), J. Gerrans (Independent) and F.R. Thompson (S.A.P.). Vryburg was a 'two-member' constituency and three candidates were nominated, two official S.A.P. candidates and an 'Independent-S.A.P.' candidate. The results of the voting appear below:

MAFEKING

1	DE KOCK, J.W.	Unionist	191	votes
2	Gerrans, J.	Independent	178	"
3	Thompson, F.R.	S.A.P.	64	"

433 "

No. of voters who went to the polls 437

No. of rejected ballot papers 4

No. of voters who recorded valid votes 433

VRYBURG

1	WESSELS, D.H.W.	S.A.P.	845	votes
2	MURRAY, Dr. F.	S.A.P.	662	"
3	Pentz, J.F.	Independent-S.A.P.	396	"

1 903 "

No. of voters who went to the polls 1 068

No. of rejected ballot papers 17

No. of voters who recorded valid votes 1 051

As the top official S.A.P. candidate in Vryburg obtained 845 votes and the only S.A.P. candidate in Mafeking received sixty-four votes, it would seem that there were about 900 S.A.P. voters in British Bechuanaland in 1908, but no estimate of Unionist support for this electoral province could be ascertained from the figures quoted above because the Party did not field any candidates in Vryburg.

My estimate of party support in Griqualand West was 4 500 Unionists and 3 000 S.A.P. voters.

In the 1908 Assembly election there was a contest in Barkly West, but the four Unionist candidates for Kimberley were returned unopposed. The result of the voting in Barkly West appears below:

1	AUCAMP, H.L.	S.A.P.	1 120	votes
2	DONOVAN, L.B.	S.A.P.	1 062	"
3	Cumming, A.W.	Unionist	853	"
			<hr/>	
			3 035	"
			<hr/>	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		1 973	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		64	
	No. of voters who recorded valid votes		1 909	

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 056	voters
Unionist	853	"
	<hr/>	
	1 909	"
	<hr/>	

However, the potential Unionist majority in its stronghold of Kimberley undoubtedly counteracted the small S.A.P. majority in Barkly West, making Griqualand West a Unionist region in 1908. This was illustrated by the fact that the S.A.P. refrained from opposing Ross in the Council election.

In the absence of any voting figures for Kimberley in either the Council or Assembly election, I have assumed that about 7 500 of the 11 619 voters in Griqualand West would have cast valid votes in a contest between the two major parties. This represented a potential poll of 64,55% of the electorate,

slightly less than the percentage poll in Barkly West in the Assembly election.¹ It has also been assumed that 60% of those voters, who cast valid votes, would have supported the Unionist Party and that the remaining 40% would have supported the S.A.P. These percentages have been based on the view that the S.A.P. would not have refrained from contesting the seat for Griqualand West in the Council election, if the Party believed that it had a chance of obtaining the support of more than 40% of the potential vote. Consequently, my figures represent optimum support for the S.A.P.

My estimate of Unionist support in British Bechuanaland was based on the one for Griqualand West in as far as it was assumed that the Unionist Party would have obtained 40% of a potential poll in a contest between the two major parties. As S.A.P. support was estimated at 900 voters, Unionist support would have numbered 600 voters. This figure may be too generous to the Unionist Party, but then my estimate of 3 000 S.A.P. voters in Griqualand West may also have been too generous. If individual estimates in British Bechuanaland and Griqualand West err in either direction, the aggregated figures of about 5 100 Unionists and 3 900 S.A.P. voters in the two electoral provinces could at least be regarded as a fair reflection of the relative strengths of the two parties in the two unopposed constituencies in the 1908 Council election.

1. The percentage poll in Barkly West was 66,99 and 64,82% of the total electorate cast valid votes.

APPENDIX DPART 11THE 1908 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE OUTCOME IN CONSTITUENCIES,
THE SEATS WON BY THE S.A.P. AND THE UNIONIST PARTY FOR THE UNCONTESTED
CONSTITUENCIES AND UNIONIST LOSSESTHE OUTCOME IN CONSTITUENCIES

1. The seats won by Independent-S.A.P. candidates and pro-S.A.P. Independents have been classified as S.A.P. seats, while the seats won by pro-Unionist Independents for Kingwilliamstown and Simonstown have been classified as Unionist seats.
2. The names of constituencies with marginal S.A.P. seats are marked with an asterisk.
3. The names of the electoral provinces have been abbreviated, e.g. BB stands for British Bechuanaland, EP for Eastern Province and SE for South-Eastern Province.

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Provinces</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>	<u>Independents</u>
* Albany	SE	1	1	0
Albert	NE	2	0	0
* Aliwal North	EP	2	0	0
* Barkly West	GW	2	0	0
Beaufort West	MP	2	0	0
Caledon	SW	2	0	0
Cape Town	WP	0	7	0
Cathcart	EP	0	1	0
Clanwilliam	NW	2	0	0
Colesberg	NE	2	0	0
Cradock	NE	2	0	0
East London	EP	0	2	1
Fort Beaufort	NE	0	2	0
carried forward		17	13	1

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Provinces</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>	<u>Independents</u>
brought forward		17	13	1
George	SW	4	0	0
Graaff-Reinet	MP	2	0	0
Grahamstown	SE	0	2	0
* Griqualand East	EP	1	0	1
Humansdorp	SE	1	0	0
Jansenville	SE	2	0	0
Kimberley	GW	0	4	0
Kingwilliamstown	EP	0	3	0
Mafeking	BB	0	1	0
Malinesbury	NW	2	0	0
Middelburg	NE	1	0	0
* Namaqualand	NW	2	0	0
Oudtshoorn	SW	3	0	0
Paarl	WP	3	0	0
Piquetberg	NW	2	0	0
Port Elizabeth	SE	0	4	1
Prieska	MP	1	0	0
* Queenstown	EP	2	0	1
Richmond	MP	2	0	0
Riversdale	SW	2	0	0
Simonstown	WP	0	1	0
Somerset East	NE	2	0	0
* Stellenbosch	WP	2	0	0
Swellendam	SW	2	0	0
* Tembuland	EP	1	0	1
* Uitenhage	SE	3	0	0
* Victoria East	SE	2	0	0
Victoria West	MP	2	0	0
Vryburg	BB	2	0	0
* Woodstock	WP	1	2	0
Wodehouse	EP	2	0	0
Worcester	NW	3	0	0
Wynberg	WP	0	3	0
		<hr/> 69	<hr/> 33	<hr/> 5

THE SEATS WON BY THE S.A.P. AND THE UNIONIST PARTY FOR UNCONTESTED CONSTITUENCIES.

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Number of Seats</u>	
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>
Albert	2	-
Caledon	2	-
Colesberg	2	-
Cradock	2	-
George	4	-
Graaff-Reinet	2	-
Humansdorp	1	-
Jansenville	2	-
Kimberley	-	4
Oudtshoorn	3	-
Prieska	1	-
Richmond	2	-
Somerset East	2	-
Victoria West	2	-
	<u>27</u>	<u>4</u>

UNIONIST LOSSES

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>Seats lost to:</u>	
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Independents</u>
Albany ¹	1	0
Aliwal North ²	2	0
Barkly West	2	0
East London ³	0	1
Griqualand East	1	1
Namaqualand	2	0
Port Elizabeth ⁴	0	1
Prieska	1	0
Queenstown ⁵	1	1
Tembuland	1	1
Uitenhage ⁶	1	0
Vryburg	2	0
Wodehouse	2	0
Woodstock ⁷	1	0
Victoria East	2	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	19	5
	<hr/>	<hr/>

1. Albany had two seats, but the Unionist Party retained one seat.
2. One of the two members had stood as an Independent, but he was subsequently counted as a South African Party member.
3. East London had three seats, but the Unionist Party retained the other two seats.
4. Port Elizabeth had five seats, but the Unionist Party retained the other four seats.
5. Queenstown had three seats, but the Progressive Party only held two of them before the election.
6. Uitenhage had three seats, but the Progressive Party had already lost two seats in by-elections.
7. Woodstock had three seats, but the Unionist Party retained the other two seats.

APPENDIX DPART 12THE 1908 ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTION; THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING AND THE ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT FOR CONSTITUENCIES IN THE EASTERN PROVINCE, THE SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE AND THE WESTERN PROVINCE.

1. The results of the voting have been obtained from the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette of 10 April 1908 and the party political designations of candidates have been derived from articles in the contemporary press.
2. The number of registered voters in each constituency was obtained from the Statistical Register of 1908.
3. The names of victorious candidates are in capitals.

EASTERN PROVINCE (8 constituencies)I ALIWAL NORTH (2 members)

1	SAUER, J.W.	S.A.P.	987	votes
2	CLOETE, W.	Independent	828	"
3	Orsmond, W.C.	Unionist	774	"
4	Sephton, C.A.	S.A.P.	753	"
			<u>3 342</u>	"
	No. of registered voters		2 273	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		1 778	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		31	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		1 747	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>			
	S.A.P.		973	voters
	Unionist Party		774	"
			<u>1 747</u>	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above and the votes polled for the Independent candidate have been ignored.

II CATHCART (1 member)

1	BLAINE, G.	Unionist	471	votes
2	Hart, J.R.	S.A.P.	352	"
			<u>823</u>	"

No. of registered voters 1 194

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	471	voters
S.A.P.	352	"
	<u>823</u>	"

The number of voters who went to the polls, the number of rejected ballot papers and the number of voters who cast valid votes have been omitted because they do not balance with the number of votes polled for Blaine and Hart in this constituency where each voter possessed only one vote.

III EAST LONDON (3 members)

1	SPRIGG, Sir, J. Gordon	Independent	2 808	votes
2	HELLIER, J.G.	Unionist	1 775	"
3	CREWE, C.P.	Unionist	1 694	"
4	Medefindt, W.	Independent	1 252	"
5	Willetts, H.N.	Independent	1 125	"
6	Ries, H.M.	Independent	65	"
			<u>8 719</u>	"

No. of registered voters 6 188

No. of voters who went to the polls 3 082

No. of rejected ballot papers 15

No. of voters who cast valid votes 3 067

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	1 775	voters
S.A.P.	1 252	"
	<u>3 027</u>	"

Medefindt was a pro-S.A.P. Independent ¹ and his votes were taken as the measure of potential S.A.P. support, but that figure possibly inflated the S.A.P. figure slightly as he probably received support from Independent voters, so it was decided to use Hellier's figure to assess ~~potential~~ Unionist support, although he received eighty-one votes more than his Unionist running-mate.

IV GRIQUALAND EAST (2 members)

1	TOD, C.E.	S.A.P.	861	votes
2	RENNIE, C.R.	Independent	724	"
3	Zietsman, L.F.	Unionist	643	"
4	de Lange, P.A.	S.A.P.	536	"
			<u>2 764</u>	"
	No. of registered voters		2 440	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		1 620	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		24	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		1 596	
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>			
	S.A.P.		861	voters
	Unionist Party		643	"
			<u>1 504</u>	"

The 'highest party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above and the votes polled for the Independent have been ignored.

V KINGWILLIAMSTOWN (3 members)

1	WHITAKER, G.	Independent-Unionist	1 392	votes
2	GINSBERG, P.	Independent-Unionist	1 339	"
3	WARREN, W.J.	Independent-Unionist	1 311	"
4	Goldschmidt, J.A.	S.A.P.	759	"
5	Hook, D.B.	S.A.P.	635	"
			<u>5 436</u>	"

1. DD 25.2.1908.

No. of registered voters	2 999
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 039
No. of rejected ballot papers	17
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 022

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	1 325	voters
S.A.P.	697	"
	<hr/>	
	2 022	"
	<hr/>	

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the estimate of S.A.P. support and the remaining voters who cast valid votes have been regarded as potential Unionists.

VI QUEENSTOWN (3 members)

1	SEARLE, T.	S.A.P.	1 531	votes
2	SCHREINER, W.P.	Independent	1 254	"
3	BROWN, W	S.A.P.	1 191	"
4	Greeff, H.J.	S.A.P.	1 151	"
5	Berry, Sir W.B.	Independent	1 140	"
			<hr/>	
			6 267	"

No. of registered voters	3 346
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 341
No. of rejected ballot papers	13
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 328

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 291	voters
Unionist Party	1 037	"
	<hr/>	
	2 328	"
	<hr/>	

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the estimate of S.A.P. support and the remaining voters who cast valid votes were regarded as potential Unionists.

VII TEMBULAND (2 members)

1	LEVEY, C.J.	S.A.P.	1 141	votes
2	STANFORD, W.E.M.	Independent	998	"
3	Schreiner, T.L.	Unionist	994	"
4	Schweizer, F.J.	S.A.P.	844	"
			<hr/>	
			3 977	"

No. of registered voters	3 308
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 101
No. of rejected ballot papers	14
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 087

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 093	voters
Unionist Party	994	"
	<hr/>	
	2 087	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above and the votes polled for the independent candidate have been ignored. If the 'average-ratio' method had been used, S.A.P. support would have been assessed at 993 voters, one less than the number for the Unionist candidate, but that would be ridiculous because the top S.A.P. candidate polled 147 votes more than the Unionist candidate.

VIII WODEHOUSE (2 members)

1	VERMOOTEN, O.S.	S.A.P.	1 548	votes
2	VENTER, J.A.	S.A.P.	1 448	"
3	Clark, W.T.	Independent	878	"
			<hr/>	
			3 874	"

No. of registered voters	3 365
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 381
No. of rejected ballot papers	103
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 278

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 498	voters
Unionist Party	780	"
	<u>2 278</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain S.A.P. support and the remaining voters, who cast valid votes, were regarded as potential Unionists.

SUMMARY OF VOTES

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist Party</u>	<u>Independents</u>
Aliwal North	1 740	774	828
Cathcart	352	471	0
East London	0	3 469	5 250
Griqualand East	1 397	643	724
Kingwilliamstown	1 394	0	4 042
Queenstown	3 873	0	2 394
Tembuland	1 985	994	998
Wodehouse	2 996	0	878
	<u>13 737</u>	<u>6 351</u>	<u>15 114</u>

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Voters</u>	
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>
Aliwal North	973	774
Cathcart	352	471
East London	1 252	1 775
Griqualand East	861	643
Kingwilliamstown	697	1 325
Queenstown	1 291	1 037
Tembuland	1 093	994
Wodehouse	1 498	780
	<u>8 017</u>	<u>7 799</u>

SOUTH-EASTERN PROVINCE (7 constituencies)I ALBANY (2 members)

1	THOMAS, W.	Unionist	808	votes
2	DOUGLASS, F.W.	S.A.P.	795	"
3	Sampson, V.	Unionist	782	"
4	Grobbelaar, A.L.	S.A.P.	699	"
			<u>3 084</u>	"

No. of registered voters	2 144
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 616
No. of rejected ballot papers	56
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 560

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	795	voters
S.A.P.	747	"
	<u>1 542</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

II GRAHAMSTOWN (2 members)

1	FITCHAT, H.	Unionist	822	votes
2	JAMESON, Dr. L.S.	Unionist	785	"
3	Hemming, J.	S.A.P.	465	"
			<u>2 072</u>	"

No. of registered voters	1 829
No. of voters who went to the polls	1 231
No. of rejected ballot papers	16
No. of voters who cast valid votes	1 215

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	785	voters
S.A.P.	430	"
	<u>1 215</u>	"

The Unionist figure was based on the number of voters who supported Dr. Jameson and all the other voters who cast valid votes were regarded as S.A.P. voters. In 1904 707 voters supported Dr. Jameson and 1 837 were registered in the constituency at the time, so Dr. Jameson's personal support in his own constituency increased from 38,49% of the total electorate in 1904 to 42,92% in 1908, despite the fact that he topped the poll in 1904 and came second in the poll in 1908.

III HUMANSDORP (1 member)

1	RADEMEYER, J.M.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		1 672
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>		
	S.A.P.		947 voters
	Unionist Party		184 "
			<hr/> 1 131 "

These figures are derived from the results of the voting in Humansdorp in the 1908 Council election (See Appendix D, Part 9).

IV JANSENVILLE (2 members)

1	MOLTENO, J.C.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
2	OOSTHUIZEN, O.A.	S.A.P.	Unopposed
	No. of registered voters		2 086
	<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>		
	S.A.P.		1 259 voters
	Unionist Party		221 "
			<hr/> 1 480 "

These figures are derived from the result of the voting in Jansenville in the 1908 Council election (See Appendix D, Part 9).

V PORT ELIZABETH (5 members)

1	MACINTOSH, W.	Unionist	4 053	votes
2	SEARLE, J.	Unionist	3 862	"
3	BROOKES, A.H.	Unionist	3 788	"
4	WALTON, E.H.	Unionist	3 694	"
5	BROWN, D.M.	Independent	3 250	"
6	Wynne, J.	Unionist	2 988	"
7	Lee, C.G.	S.A.P.	2 024	"
8	Fremantle, Prof. H.E.S.	S.A.P.	1 504	"
9	Williams, L.T.	Labour	1 483	"
10	Schroder, W.E.	S.A.P.	1 220	"
11	Neylan, J.N.	S.A.P.	1 131	"
			<hr/>	
			28 997	"

No. of registered voters 9 208

No. of voters who went to the polls 6 543

No. of rejected ballot papers 211

No. of voters who cast valid votes 6 332

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	3 694	voters
S.A.P.	1 504	"
	<hr/>	
	5 198	"

The 'average-ratio method' produced estimates of 3 677 Unionist voters and 1 470 S.A.P. voters, so it was decided to use the actual number of votes for the Unionist candidate and the S.A.P. candidate closest to these figures as the measure of their party's support.

VI UITENHAGE (3 members)

1	LUNDIE, R.H.	S.A.P.	1 410	votes
2	FREMANTLE, Prof. H.E.S.	S.A.P.	1 356	"
3	VAN VUUREN, L.J.	S.A.P.	1 336	"
4	Ward, H.	Unionist	1 108	"
5	Wright, A.H.B.	Independent	999	"
6	de Klerk, P.R.	Independent	841	"
			<hr/>	
			7 050	"

No. of registered voters	3 410
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 487
No. of rejected ballot papers	16
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 471

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 363	voters
Unionist Party	1 108	"
	<u>2 471</u>	"

The 'minority party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above and the votes polled for the two Independents were ignored.

VII VICTORIA EAST (2 members)

1	MURRAY, A.H.	S.A.P.	385	votes
2	LIESENBERG, A.	S.A.P.	382	"
3	Powrie, F.W.	Unionist	374	"
4	Collins, H.	Unionist	346	"
			<u>1 487</u>	"

No. of registered voters	890
No. of voters who went to the polls	759
No. of rejected ballot papers	10
No. of voters who cast valid votes	749

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	384	voters
Unionist Party	360	"
	<u>744</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

SUMMARY OF VOTES

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist Party</u>	<u>Others</u>
Albany	1 494	1 590	0
Grahamstown	465	1 607	0
Humansdorp	-	-	-
Jansenville	-	-	-
Port Elizabeth	5 879	18 385	4 733
Uitenhage	4 102	1 108	1 840
Victoria East	767	720	-
	<u>12 707</u>	<u>23 410</u>	<u>6 573</u>

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Voters</u>	
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>
Albany	747	795
Grahamstown	430	785
Humansdorp	947	184
Jansenville	1 259	221
Port Elizabeth	1 504	3 694
Uitenhage	1 363	1 108
Victoria East	384	360
	<u>6 634</u>	<u>7 147</u>

WESTERN PROVINCE (6 constituencies)I CAPE TOWN (7 members)

1	BAM, Sir P.	Unionist	6 802	votes
2	POWELL, E.	Unionist	6 115	"
3	UPINGTON, B.	Unionist	6 035	"
4	JAGGER, J.W.	Unionist	5 675	"
5	BAXTER, W.D.	Unionist	5 339	"
6	ALEXANDER, M.	Unionist	5 027	"
7	THORNE, Sir W.	Unionist	4 312	"
8	Liberman, H.	Independent	4 176	"
9	Maginess, T.	Labour	2 882	"
10	Forsyth, Dr. R.	S.A.P.	2 541	"
11	Centlivres, F.J.	S.A.P.	2 457	"
12	Benning, A.F.J.	S.A.P.	2 253	"
13	Hay, W.	Independent	1 429	"
14	Howard, J.H.	Socialist	1 298	"
			<u>56 341</u>	"

No. of registered voters 15 368

No. of voters who went to the polls 9 597

No. of rejected ballot papers 49

No. of voters who cast valid votes 9 548

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	5 675	voters
S.A.P.	2 457	"
	<u>8 132</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' produced estimates of 5 615 Unionist voters and 2 417 S.A.P. voters, so it was decided to use the actual number of votes polled for Unionist and S.A.P. candidates closest to these figures as the measure of their party's support.

II PAARL (3 members)

1	DE VILLIERS, S.P.N.	Independent	1 397	votes
2	RETIEF, D.	Independent	1 389	"
3	JOUBERT, F.J.	Independent	1 339	"
4	Cillie, P.J.	S.A.P.	1 155	"
5	de Jager, Dr. A.L.	S.A.P.	1 112	"
6	Roux, P.	S.A.P.	1 102	"
			<u>7 494</u>	"

No. of registered voters	3 099
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 582
No. of rejected ballot papers	59
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 533

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 640	voters
Unionist Party	771	"
	<u>2 411</u>	"

These figures were derived from the estimates for the Council election with adjustments to allow for the swing to the Unionist Party between the Council election and the Assembly election.

The estimates of party support in the Council election were:²

S.A.P.	1 631	voters
Unionist Party	636	"
Independent	69	"
	<u>2 336</u>	"

The adjustments to these figures were based on the percentage increases in the estimates of party support in the neighbouring constituency of Stellenbosch between the Council and Assembly elections of 1908.

2. See Appendix D, Part 9.

The estimate of S.A.P. support in Stellenbosch was 1 109 voters in the Council election and 1 115 voters in the Assembly election; an increase of 0,54%

The estimate of Unionist support in Stellenbosch was 766 voters in the Council election and 928 voters in the Assembly election; an increase of 21,15%

Consequently, the estimates of party support in Paarl in the Assembly election were calculated as follows:

S.A.P. support	=	1 631 x 100,54%	=	1 640	voters
Unionist support	=	636 x 121,15%	=	771	"

It is quite clear from the figures quoted above that the Unionist Party had no chance of winning any of the three seats for Paarl, while the Independents would not have been successful if most of the local Unionists had not supported them. Nevertheless about 500-600 potential S.A.P. voters supported the Independents.

III SIMONSTOWN (1 member)

1	RUNCIMAN, W.	Independent - Unionist	712	votes
2	Molteno, C.W.B.	S.A.P.	538	"
			<hr/>	
			1 250	"
			<hr/>	
	No. of registered voters		2 042	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		1 284	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		34	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		1 250	

Each voter possessed one vote.

The Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette of 10 April 1908 quoted 711 votes for Runciman and if that figure had been used a total of 1 249 votes would have been cast by a total of 1 250 voters. However, the Cape Argus quoted 712 votes for Runciman and that figure balanced the number of votes

polled with the number of voters who went to the polls and cast valid votes, so the Cape Argus figure has been used, although all other newspapers consulted quoted the same figures as the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette.

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	712	voters
S.A.P.	538	"
	<hr/>	
	1 250	"
	<hr/>	

All Runciman's supporters have been counted as potential Unionists.

IV STELLENBOSCH (2 members)

1	MARAIS, J.H.	S.A.P.	1 129	votes
2	KRIGE, G.J.	S.A.P.	1 100	"
3	Faure, J.C.	Unionist	958	"
4	Micklem, T.	Unionist	897	"
			<hr/>	
			4 084	"
			<hr/>	
	No. of registered voters		2 528	
	No. of voters who went to the polls		2 074	
	No. of rejected ballot papers		16	
	No. of voters who cast valid votes		2 058	

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 115	voters
Unionist Party	928	"
	<hr/>	
	2 043	"
	<hr/>	

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

V WOODSTOCK (3 members)

1	HEWAT, Dr. J.	Unionist	1 898	votes
2	LONG, B.K.	Unionist	1 490	"
3	GREER, J.A.	S.A.P.	1 419	"
4	Kelly, J.W.	S.A.P.	1 329	"
5	Palmer, A.	Independent-Reform	1 284	"
6	Stuttaford, R.	Unionist	1 283	"
7	van der Byl, V.A.	S.A.P.	1 153	"
8	McNamara, E.H.	Independent-S.A.P.	386	"
			<hr/>	
			10 242	"

No. of registered voters	8 074
No. of voters who went to the polls	3 873
No. of rejected ballot papers	30
No. of voters who cast valid votes	3 843

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	1 898	voters
S.A.P.	1 419	"
	<hr/>	
	3 317	"

The 'highest party vote method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above because many potential Unionists voted for Palmer and some S.A.P. voters supported McNamara.

VI WYNBERG (3 members)

1	CLOETE, H.	Unionist	1 454	votes
2	WITHINSHAW, G.S.	Unionist	1 364	"
3	STRUBEN, C.F.W.	Unionist	1 158	"
4	Murray, Dr. C.F.K.	S.A.P.	1 027	"
5	Tregidga, J.	S.A.P.	787	"
6	Vollmer, F.T.	S.A.P.	752	"
7	Buissinné, W.T.	Independent	649	"
			<hr/>	
			7 191	"

No. of registered voters	5 792	
No. of voters who went to the polls	2 562	
No. of rejected ballot papers	37	
No. of voters who cast valid votes	2 525	
<u>ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:</u>		
Unionist Party	1 325	voters
S.A.P.	855	"
	<hr/>	
	2 180	"
	<hr/>	

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above because it produced a close correlation between the estimates of S.A.P. support in this election and the previous Council election; 812 voters. (See Appendix D, Part 9.)

SUMMARY OF VOTES

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>		
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist Party</u>	<u>Others</u>
Cape Town	7 251	39 305	9 785
Paarl	3 369	0	4 125
Simonstown	538	0	712
Stellenbosch	2 229	1 855	0
Woodstock	3 901	4 671	1 670
Wynberg	2 566	3 976	649
	<u>19 854</u>	<u>49 807</u>	<u>16 941</u>

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Voters</u>	
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>
Cape Town	2 457	5 675
Paarl	1 640	771
Simonstown	538	712
Stellenbosch	1 115	928
Woodstock	1 419	1 898
Wynberg	855	1 325
	<u>8 024</u>	<u>11 309</u>

APPENDIX DPART 13THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1908;
THE RESULTS OF THE VOTING IN THE ELECTORAL DIVISIONS OF FORT
BEAUFORT AND NAMAQUALAND.

1. The results of the voting and the party political designations of candidates in the Legislative Council election have been obtained from the Cape Argus of 24 January 1908 and the South African News of 27 January 1908.
2. The results of the voting in the Assembly election have been obtained from the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette of 10 April 1908 and the party political designations of candidates have been derived from articles in the contemporary press.
3. The names of victorious candidates are in capitals.

I FORT BEAUFORT: (North-Eastern Province)The Legislative Council Election

1	STOCKENSTROM, Sir G.H.	Unionist	2 483	votes
2	PRETORIUS, M.J.	S.A.P.	616	"
3	MICHAU, P.W.	S.A.P.	603	"
4	van Rooy, A.C.A.	S.A.P.	574	"
			<u>4 276</u>	"

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	828	voters
S.A.P.	598	"
	<u>1 426</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes.

The Assembly Election

1	NILAND, B	Unionist	835	votes
2	SMARTT, Dr. T.W.	Unionist	780	"
3	Hendrikz, H.W.	S.A.P.	675	"
4	van Wyk, M.R.	S.A.P.	611	"
			<u>2 901</u>	"

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

Unionist Party	808	voters
S.A.P.	643	"
	<u>1 451</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

II NAMAQUALAND: (North-Western Province)The Legislative Election

1	Orpen, R.N.M.	Unionist	2 657	votes
2	GRAAFF, J.A.C.	S.A.P.	1 224	"
3	VAN ZYL, I.J.	S.A.P.	1 068	"
4	DE VILLIERS, J.N.P.	S.A.P.	1 058	"
			<u>6 007</u>	"

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 117	voters
Unionist Party	886	"
	<u>2 003</u>	"

Each voter was allocated three votes.

The Assembly Election

1	VAN ZYL, H.S.	S.A.P.	1 037	votes
2	STUDER, J	S.A.P.	994	"
3	Duncan, J.D.	Unionist	857	"
4	Oats, F.	Unionist	840	"
			<u>3 728</u>	"

ESTIMATES OF PARTY SUPPORT:

S.A.P.	1 016	voters
Unionist Party	849	"
	<u>1 865</u>	"

The 'average-ratio method' was used to obtain the figures quoted above.

APPENDIX DPART 14

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND ASSEMBLY GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1908;
A COMPARISON OF THE ESTIMATES OF S.A.P. AND UNIONIST SUPPORT
IN THE FIFTEEN ELECTORAL DIVISIONS WHERE THE TWO PARTIES
CONFRONTED EACH OTHER IN BOTH ELECTIONS.

<u>Electoral Divisions</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Voters</u>			
	<u>Council Election</u>		<u>Assembly Election</u>	
	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>	<u>S.A.P.</u>	<u>Unionist</u>
Albany	779	655	747	795
Aliwal North	1 000	471	973	774
Cape Town	2 857	5 262	2 457	5 675
Cathcart	343	502	352	471
Fort Beaufort	598	828	643	808
Grahamstown	444	578	430	785
Griqualand East	481	702	861	643
Namaqualand	1 117	886	1 016	849
Port Elizabeth	2 674	3 475	1 504	3 694
Stellenbosch	1 109	766	1 115	928
Tembuland	1 023	918	1 093	994
Uitenhage	1 486	1 009	1 363	1 108
Victoria East	325	269	384	360
Woodstock	1 710	1 448	1 419	1 898
Wynberg	812	1 073	855	1 325
	<u>16 758</u>	<u>18 842</u>	<u>15 212</u>	<u>21 107</u>

Estimated percentage swing to the Unionist Party
between the two elections 5,19

Estimated percentage decrease in S.A.P. support
between the two elections 9,23

Estimated percentage increase in Unionist support
between the two elections 12,02

APPENDIX ETHE ALLOCATION OF NEW ASSEMBLY SEATS ACCORDING TO THE
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSION OF 1897/8

New constituencies are indicated by an asterisk before their names.

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>No. of seats in 1897/8</u>	<u>No. of new seats</u>	<u>Total No. of seats envisaged</u>
Cape Division	2	2	4
Cape Town	4	1	5
*Cathcart, Stutterheim and Komgha	0	1	1
George	2	1	3
Griqualand East	1	1	2
*Middelburg	0	1	1
Port Elizabeth	2	2	4
Tembuland	1	1	2
Uitenhage	2	2	4
*University	0	1	1
Victoria West	2	1	3
Worcester	2	1	3
		<u>15</u>	

APPENDIX FTHE ALLOCATION OF NEW ASSEMBLY SEATS ACCORDING TO THE
RECOMMENDATIONS OF SPRIGG, ROSE INNES AND FULLER

New constituencies are indicated by an asterisk before their names.

<u>Constituencies</u>	<u>No. of seats in 1897/8</u>	<u>No. of new seats</u>	<u>Total No. of seats envisaged</u>
Cape Division ¹	2	4	6
Cape Town ¹	4	1	5
*Cathcart and Stutterheim	0	1	1
East London	2	1	3
George	2	1	3
Griqualand East	1	1	2
*Middelburg	0	1	1
Port Elizabeth	2	2	4
Tembuland	1	1	2
Uitenhage	2	2	4
*University	0	1	1
Victoria West	2	1	3
Worcester	2	1	3
		<u>18</u>	

-
1. The set of proposals supported by Sprigg, Rose Innes and Fuller on 27 January on which the figures were based, grouped Cape Division and Cape Town together and allocated a total of five seats to the two of them, but the commission had already decided on 21 January to recommend the allocation of four new seats to Cape Division and one new seat to Cape Town. As Sprigg, Rose Innes and Fuller had supported these decisions, they have been included in the table above.

APPENDIX GTHE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSEMBLY SEATS
IN TERMS OF SPRIGG'S BILL OF MAY 1898Single-member constituencies:-

Cathcart, Ceres, Humansdorp, Jansenville, Koeberg, Komgha,
Mafeking, Middelburg, Prieska, Sea Point, Simonstown,
Uniondale and University.

Two-member constituencies:-

Albany, Albert, Aliwal North, Barkly West, Beaufort West,
Caledon, Clanwilliam, Colesberg, Cradock, East Cape Town,
East London, Fort Beaufort, George, Graaff-Reinet,
Grahamstown, Griqualand East, Kingwilliamstown, Malmesbury,
Namaqualand, North Port Elizabeth, Oudtshoorn, Paarl,
Queenstown, Piquetberg, Richmond, Riversdale, Somerset East,
South Port Elizabeth, Stellenbosch, Swellendam, Tembuland,
Uitenhage, Victoria East, Victoria West, Vryburg, West Cape
Town, Wodehouse, Woodstock, Worcester and Wynberg.

Four-member constituency:- Kimberley.

NOTES ON SOURCES

Contemporary newspapers and periodicals recaptured the period, 1898-1908, and as such they formed the most valuable source. They brought to life the political controversies, examined the elections before and after they had taken place and quoted valuable facts and figures. Yet, it was necessary to consult general works on South African history to obtain a focus on the main themes of electoral and political history of the Cape Colony, while biographies of prominent men and theses on specialised topics sharpened my insight into the most important issues at stake in the elections. Unfortunately, private papers and unpublished government records were of little help, but official and semi-official publications, such as the Cape of Good Hope Government Gazettes, the Statistical Register of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope and the House of Assembly Debates were of immense value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Only sources quoted in footnotes or which had an influence on the opinions of the author are mentioned below:

1. Unpublished Government Records

The records of the Colonial Secretary (Colonial Office), Cape

The records of the Master's Office, Orphan Chamber, (Death Notices)

2. Official and Semi-Official Publications

Cape Law Reports, Cape Supreme Court, 1899

Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette, 1891, 1898-1908

G8 - '98, The Report of the Redistribution of Seats Commission, 1897-98

House of Assembly, Debates, 1898-1907

Legislative Council, Debates, 1896-1907

S.C. 6 - '96, The Report of the Select Committee on the Jameson Raid into the Territory of the South African Republic

Statistical Register of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, 1897-1909

Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1900, 4 vols. and Acts of Parliament, Sessions 1854 and 1855, 1900, 1902-1907

3. Newspapers and Periodicals

Where dates are shown full files were usually consulted, but in some cases occasional references were selected.

Bechuanaland News (Vryburg) 1904, 1907

Cape Argus 1897-1899, 1901-1908

<u>Cape Argus (Weekly Edition)</u>	1898, 1903, 1904, 1908
<u>Cape Times</u>	1894-1908
<u>Cape Times (Weekly Edition)</u>	1898, 1899, 1903, 1904, 1908
<u>Diamond Fields Advertiser</u>	1898, 1904
<u>Eastern Province Herald</u>	1898, 1903, 1904, 1908
<u>East London Daily Despatch</u>	1898, 1903, 1904, 1908
<u>Het Dagblad (Paarl)</u>	1897
<u>Ons Land</u>	1897-1908, 1910
<u>South Africa (London)</u>	1898, 1904
<u>South African News</u>	1899-1908
<u>South African Review</u>	1894-1908
<u>Victoria West Messenger</u>	1898

4. Books and Theses

The Anglo-African Who's Who and Biographical Sketch Book, 1905

The Anglo-African Who's Who and Biographical Sketch Book, 1907

Colvin, I.: The Life of Jameson, Vol.2, London, 1922

Cook, E.T.: Edmund Garrett: A Memoir, London, 1909

Cuthbert, P.: The Administration of Dr. Jameson as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1904-1908), M.A. thesis, U.C.T., 1950

Davenport, T.R.H.: The Afrikaner Bond: The History of a South African Political Party, 1880-1911, Cape Town, 1966

De Kock, W.J.(Ed.): Dictionary of South African Biography, Vol.1

- Fuller, Sir T.E.: The Right Honourable Cecil John Rhodes: A Monograph and a Reminiscence, London, 1910
- Hancock, W.K.: Smuts: The Sanguine Years, 1870-1919, Cambridge, 1962
- Hatherley, J.: The Effects of the Depression after the Anglo-Boer War on Cape Politics, 1902-1910, M.A. thesis, U.C.T., 1953
- Headlam, C.(Ed.): The Milner Papers: South Africa, 1897-1899, London, 1931
- Headlam, C.(Ed.): The Milner Papers: South Africa, 1899-1905, London, 1933
- Heard, K.A.: General Elections in South Africa, 1943-1970, London, 1974
- Hofmeyr, J.H.: The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), Cape Town, 1913
- Kilpin, R.: The Romance of a Colonial Parliament, London, 1930
- Kruger, D.W.: South African Parties and Policies, 1910-1960: A Selected Source Book, Cape Town, 1960
- Laurence, Sir P.: The Life of John Xavier Merriman, London, 1930
- Le May, G.H.L.: British Supremacy in South Africa, 1899-1907, Oxford, 1965
- Lewsen, P.(Ed.): Selections from the Correspondence of John X. Merriman, 1890-1898, V.R.S.44, Cape Town, 1963
- Marlowe, J.: Cecil Rhodes: The Anatomy of Empire, London, 1972
- McCracken, J.L.: The Cape Parliament, 1854-1910, Oxford, 1967

- Michell, Sir L.: The Life of the Rt. Hon. Cecil John Rhodes, 1853-1902, Vol.2, London, 1910
- Molteno, Sir J.T.: The Dominion of Afrikanerdom: Recollections Pleasant and Otherwise, London, 1923
- Molteno, Sir J.T.: Further South African Recollections, London, 1926
- The Prominent Men of the Cape Colony, South Africa, Portland, Maine, U.S.A., 1902
- Rose Innes, Sir J.: James Rose Innes; Chief Justice of South Africa, 1914-1927: Autobiography, Cape Town, 1949
- Ross, B.K.: A Study of Politics in the Cape Colony from January 1908 to May 1910, M.A. thesis, U.C.T., 1950
- Sank, Y.P.: The Origin and Development of the Cape Progressive Party (1884-1898), M.A. thesis, U.C.T., 1955
- Skillicorn, A.: The Role of the Black Voter in the 1908 Cape General Election, B.A. Honours research essay, U.C.T., 1975
- Shaw, G.: Some Beginnings: The Cape Times (1876-1910), Cape Town, 1975
- Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa, Vols. 1 and 11
- Thielscher, E.D.: The Suspension Movement in the Cape Colony, and its Effects (1901-1904), B.A. Honours research essay, U.C.T., 1962
- Thompson, L.M.: The Unification of South Africa, 1902-1910, London, 1961
- Ticktin, D.: The Origins of the South African Labour Party, 1888-1910, Ph.D. thesis, U.C.T., 1973
- The Times History of the War in South Africa, 1899-1902, Vol.6, London, 1909
- Trapido, S.: White Conflict and Non-white Participation in the Politics of the Cape of Good Hope, 1853-1910, Ph.D. thesis, London, 1970

- Trevelyan, G.M.: British History in the Nineteenth Century and After (1782-1914), Pelican, Harmondsworth, U.K., 1965
- Vanstone, J.P.: Sir John Gordon Sprigg: A Political Biography, Ph.D. thesis, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, 1974
- Vindex (Pseud.): Cecil Rhodes: His Political Life and Speeches, 1881-1900, London, 1900
- Walker, E.A.: A History of Southern Africa, London, 1965
- Walker, E.A.: Lord De Villiers and his Times, South Africa, 1842-1914, London, 1925
- Walker, E.A.: W.P. Schreiner: A South African, London, 1937
- Williams, B.: Cecil Rhodes, London, 1921
- Wright, H.M. (Ed.): Sir James Rose Innes: Selected Correspondence (1884-1902), Cape Town, 1972