



# **Numsa Media Monitor**

**Wednesday 20 July 2016**

**A daily compilation of local, national and international articles dealing with labour related issues**

## **Numsa/Eskom**

### **Numsa demands higher salaries at Eskom**

*Mbongeni Muthwa, SABC, 18 July 2016*

National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa (Numsa) members have protested outside Eskom's head office in Johannesburg to demand higher salaries.

The protest follows the collapse of wage talks between Eskom and the trade unions National Union of Mineworkers (NUM), Numsa, and Solidarity.

The wage negotiations deadlocked last Friday after two months of tough bargaining.

Eskom is sticking to its offer of 7%, Numsa on the other hand is demanding a 17% increase while the NUM is demanding 13%.

The matter has now been referred to the Commission for Conciliation Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA) for mediation.

It's illegal for Eskom workers to strike because the power utility is designated as an essential service. But Numsa argues that the law does allow them to strike.

Eskom maintains that strike action by the disgruntled workers is out of the question.

Meanwhile, Solidarity has broken ranks with fellow unions NUM and Numsa.

It has labelled the two unions' demands as unaffordable and has called on them to lower the demands.

Solidarity is demanding an increase of 8.75% across the board.

The date for the CCMA mediation is yet to be confirmed.

---

<http://www.sabc.co.za/news/a/bb0f10004d8a614e9d2adf6e73dd0db0/Numsa-demands-higher-salaries-at-Eskom--20160718>

## **Eskom workers legally not allowed to strike**

*SABC, 19 July 2016*

Eskom is sticking to its offer of a 7% increase, while the unions are demanding larger percentages.

Eskom says that strike action by disgruntled workers is out of the question.

This comes after the wage negotiations with trade unions NUMSA, NUM and Solidarity deadlocked last Friday.

Eskom is sticking to its offer of a 7% increase, while the unions are demanding larger percentages.

The matter has now been referred to the CCMA for mediation.

Legally, Eskom workers are not allowed to strike because the power utility is designated as an essential service.

Eskom spokesperson Khulu Phasiwe says: "We are hopeful that we will be able to resolve the matter before we go into the possible strike, all we know is that there are regulation which prohibits strikes at Eskom, like the police and military who are not supposed to go on strike. Those are rules not made by Eskom, but the country."

<http://www.sabc.co.za/news/a/cece72804d8bf19892d2de6e73dd0db0/Eskom-workers-legally-not-allowed-to-strike-20160719>

## **South African workers**

### **Exclude SMMEs from collective bargaining to create more jobs — IMF**

*Asha Speckman, Business Day, 19 July 2016*

THE IMF says excluding small and medium enterprises from crippling collective bargaining agreements will create more jobs in SA.

Addressing a lecture hosted by the Wits Business School on Tuesday, IMF first deputy managing director David Lipton said: "It is important to exempt small and medium enterprises from collective bargaining agreements to create space for hiring,"

Boosting economic and inclusive growth and tackling corruption are among key issues the International Monetary Fund (IMF) recently highlighted in its recommendations to the government after conducting a country review.

Lipton said on Tuesday that SA's falling capita per income and increases in the jobless rate, which now stands at 26.7% according to Statistics SA, was among the highest in the world. "That would spell tough times ahead given the difficulties facing the global economy," he said.

---

The IMF expected anaemic growth of 0.1% for SA for 2016 from 0.6% previously and an improvement to 1% in 2017.

Lipton said if this forecast materialised, per capita income for 2017 would effectively fall to 2010 levels.

Weak growth was "deeply problematic" when a third of the working age population was excluded from participation in the economy and reforms to remedy this had shown limited progress so far, he said.

Growth has been hampered by contraction in the Chinese economy and weaker demand for commodities. Prospects for the normalisation of US monetary policy and tighter financial conditions worldwide added to uncertainty.

SA could achieve higher growth of 2% or 2.5% over the next five years, said Lipton.

One of the issues that kept the one-third excluded was the impact of wage bargaining practices involving big business and big labour. Lipton said the present approach served the interests of both established businesses and employed workers well, but wage agreements that had been extended to bind entire sectors to what has been agreed "present a huge obstacle to small and medium enterprises, which in other countries typically employ the most people, thus suppress competition for established businesses and employed workers alike".

He said in reality these agreements kept low-skilled workers out of the work force and "and the unemployed have no say."

"Small and medium-sized enterprises, which commonly produce with less machinery and equipment thus may be justified in paying lower wages, have no place at the table, they have to live by the deals that are struck."

One solution, he suggested, may lie in a social bargain — to build on ongoing discussions between labour, business and government to agree on wage restraints in exchange for job retention and hiring commitments.

The introduction of a single employment contract, "The main features would be the elimination of a distinction between fixed term and open-ended jobs, along with gradual, continuous increases of rights and benefits that would accrue with tenure."

He said this approach would help the youth to get the first job and give them a foothold in the economy.

A commitment to "do no harm" approach in government policies would be important and reduce business uncertainty and make policies more consistent.

"It is clear from my conversations with your officials that they fully understand the challenge," said Lipton.

<http://www.bdlive.co.za/economy/2016/07/19/exclude-smmes-from-collective-bargaining-to-create-more-jobs--imf>

## **Nehawu shrugs off CCMA's dismissal of its bonuses complaint**

*Khulekani Magubane, Business Day, 19 July 2016*

---

The National Education Health and Allied Workers' Union (Nehawu) has shrugged off the Commission for Conciliation Mediation and Arbitration's (CCMA) dismissal of its complaint that Parliament refused to pay staff performance bonuses.

In a statement on Monday, Parliament said the CCMA found it had not committed an unfair labour practice. It ordered Nehawu to participate in a dispute resolution processes and Parliament to hear the union out.

In May, Nehawu threatened to strike if Parliament's presiding officers did not meet its demands on the payment of bonuses, and what it claimed were "unilateral" reductions in the performance ratings of some employees.

Parliament said the CCMA's ruling confirmed that the performance scores given to staff were a "fair measure" and exposed "unfairness" on the part of Nehawu's branch in Parliament.

The CCMA appeared to have accepted Parliament's argument that the review of performance scores was "done in accordance with its policies, as a result of inconsistency between the performance of the institution based on audited results by the auditor-general and the individual scores of the employees".

Parliament said the CCMA also found "no evidence that [Parliament] had acted irrationally, capriciously or arbitrarily, with bias, malice or fraud or had failed to apply its mind or unfairly discriminated against the applicants when the scores were adjusted in order to achieve the approval of the Secretary to Parliament".

Nehawu contends that Parliament acted in bad faith when it revised staff's performance scores downward, thus affecting their bonuses.

Five of its members have been charged internally by Parliament for disrupting staff meetings.

The CCMA gave Nehawu until the end of August to participate in dispute resolution processes and gave all parties until the end of September to finalise them.

Nehawu's Western Cape secretary Eric Kweleta said Parliament had got "overly excited" about the CCMA finding.

"The CCMA was merely saying the matter must go back and that the parties finalise everything by 30 September. In our eyes the ruling was that the matter must be resolved by the end of September," he said.

He said the CCMA decision did not change Nehawu's decision to hold rolling mass action, announced on Monday. Nehawu said it would mobilise its federation partners and stage regular marches to Parliament until it was heard.

"This doesn't change anything. On the 26th (of July) our members' first internal hearings will start. We will hold meetings and eventually we will have a Parliament shutdown.... We are going to go through the process to prove to the CCMA that we are dealing with people who do not recognise proper labour practice in SA," he said.

<http://www.bdlive.co.za/national/2016/07/19/nehawu-shrugs-off-ccmas-dismissal-of-its-bonuses-complaint>

---

### **340 Gupta staff face unemployment: union**

*Heidi Giokos, Independent Media, 19 July 2016*

Johannesburg - The closing of Gupta bank accounts could leave 340 people without a job, according to trade union Solidarity.

In a statement Solidarity said that Impala Platinum Mine “was threatening not to renew the contract of JIC Mining Services, which is part of the Gupta firm Oakbay Investments.

“JIC Mining has been given until October 31 to open a local bank account again, in order to prevent the termination of the 340 contract workers employed at Impala’s Rustenburg mines.

“SA’s biggest banks - Absa, FNB, Nedbank and Standard Bank - withdrew their services from the family earlier this year. The banks have pointed to concerns over breaches of local and international conventions against corruption and money laundering.”

Solidarity’s General Secretary Gideon Du Plessis said on Tuesday that it seems that JIC has “cited Impala Platinum’s ultimatum that it requires a local bank account as the sole reason for possible retrenchments.

“However, they keep silent about the fact that it was the Gupta family’s dubious financial activities that have led to the retrenchment situation.”

“It is understandable that Impala cannot pay a contractor such as JIC in cash. We therefore request that JIC and the Oakbay Group should get their affairs in order since employees now have to pay the price for these companies’ misdeeds.”

Meanwhile, Solidarity will request Impala to give JIC more time to get things in order.

The union added that it will object against a provision in the company’s retrenchment notice which said that transfers of “potentially affect employees” to other JIC workplaces, would be done in line with the company’s employment equity plan.

“[These] transfers, therefore, are unlawfully based on race. The latter is contrary to several court rulings in this regard.”

<http://www.iol.co.za/business/companies/340-gupta-staff-face-unemployment-union-2047106>

### **How to deal with health issues in the work place**

*City Press, 19 July 2016*

The 21st International AIDS Conference begins today in Durban and runs until Friday, July 22.

One of the questions that arises around the conference is whether the workplace is a friendlier place for those living with HIV and AIDS today, than it was 21 years ago?

---

Having a life altering illness is a daunting adjustment for anyone to make and even as you come to terms with your own new challenges you cannot control how others respond to you – especially in the work place.

We spend about 30% of our lives at our places of work therefore it should be a place that you feel comfortable. Ignorance breeds discontent and when colleagues and superiors do not understand your health problems or believe untrue stereotypes about it, it fosters an uncomfortable environment.

Article 09 of the South African Constitution and the Employment Equity Act prohibits employers from discriminating on the basis of, among other things, disability or on the HIV status of the employee.

Which means that acts of discrimination against such employees is illegal and businesses that are seen being discriminatory to people with various health problems could face legal action.

Moving from discrimination to inclusion

It is important to disclose your health status to your employer so that they are aware if there are any emergencies.

However regardless of this if you find yourself constantly in instances where you are being discriminated against, document every situation, file complaints when you feel that you are being unfairly treated and make sure that you know your rights.

If you are an employer who has an employee suffering from a health problem such as HIV or TB, you need to put in place a human rights based work place policy. Collaborating with a knowledgeable trade union is also a good idea, for example for the past 18 years, the South African Clothing and Textile Workers Union (SACTWU) Worker Health Program has been collaborating with employers to, not only ensure that policies for HIV, Aids and TB were initiated, but also through sharing key research findings as assimilated by them from the various Donor and International stakeholders they partner with.

The discourse has moved from “adversarial” to “collaboration”.

SACTWU’s Work Health Program (SWHP), offers HIV, AIDS and TB prevention programmes such as those which focus on sexual health education, access to condoms, counselling and testing.

Having built their advocacy reputation by active involvement in these interventions, SWHP in 2016 delivers close to a quarter of all Voluntary Medical Male Circumcisions procedures linked to the broader government programme.

Their role is thus not only to encourage companies to implement wellness programmes in partnership with the Department of Health, but to actively facilitate their implementation.

An inclusive work place is a result of input by both the employers and the employees as the company needs to work together in order to make sure all people are cared for appropriately.

---

Using methods outlined and headlined by trade unions like SACTWU, businesses can make a positive impact on how those with illnesses are treated in social and professional situations.

<http://city-press.news24.com/Advertorial/how-to-deal-with-health-issues-in-the-work-place-20160718>

## **South Africa**

### **Independent councillors will get no municipal budgets - ANC leader**

*Tom Nkosi, News24, 19 July 2016*

Mbombela - An African National Congress leader in Mpumalanga has admitted that it was his voice on a recording on which he can be heard saying no money will be allocated to a municipal ward won by an independent candidate.

The ANC leader, Majaheni Nyalunga, who is a serving councillor in Mbombela's Ward 35, issued the warning, which was secretly recorded by a community member, last Tuesday.

"If there's one person who is [an independent] councillor, against 100 [ANC] people, where will she ask for the budget? Because she has to ask for it from us, and then we will [decide if we] give it to her. If she is not part of us, we definitely will not give it to her. If she is voted for and wins here, she will stay for five years and not a thing will happen here. That's the truth that we cannot dispute," Nyalunga is heard saying in the audio.

The main contenders for Ward 35 are the ANC's Reina Seepsop and independent candidate Elizabeth Mndawe. Both candidates are branch executive committee (BEC) members of the ANC.

The ANC leaders in the province, however, opted for Seepsop while the community favoured Mndawe in a bizarre nomination process where voters were asked to whistle. The candidate who received the loudest whistles won the contest.

Nyalunga confirmed that it was his voice on the tape and that he knew who had recorded him.

He said there was nothing unusual about what he did and accused Mndawe of saying unsavoury things about the governing ANC.

"We are going to elections. It's war. She also said the ANC was a skeleton - a body without meat, [anytime] it can die. I was also responding," said Nyalunga.

Mndawe, who cried foul at the latest incident, said that she had confronted Nyalunga, but he denied the allegations.

'We are in charge, chief'

"I phoned and asked him about his statements, but he denied them, so I'm left with no choice but to report him to the IEC," she said.

---

She also disclosed that there was another recording of Nyalunga and that she had reported it to the Electoral Commission (IEC) because of its contents. Nyalunga was allegedly recorded telling people that Mndawe, who runs a home-based care programme for people living with HIV, was handing out rotten food and dead people's clothes to the needy.

When approached for comment on whether the ruling party would not be punishing the community for electing an independent candidate by withdrawing the budget, he was unwavering.

"We are in charge, chief. Indeed, where is she going to get the budget? I was telling the people the frustrations that she will encounter, so I didn't want her to take the people to frustrate them with her. She will be lonely," said Nyalunga.

ANC regional secretary, Phazamisa Mathe, condemned those who recorded Nyalunga.

"Comrades should counsel each other if another is doing things that do not assist the organisation, instead of recording them and taking the recording everywhere, meanwhile on the other side they are the members of the ANC. I don't want to work with people who are holding aces against me."

He requested to be given more time to respond as he said he was busy with an ANC programme.

<http://www.news24.com/elections/news/independent-councillors-will-get-no-municipal-budgets-anc-leader-20160718>

## **SABC**

### **Criticism mounts over 'draconian' SABC sackings**

*TimesLive, 19 July 2016*

Criticism is pouring in for the SABC's "draconian" axing of seven journalists, with the SA Communist Party (SACP) expressing solidarity with them, and at least two lobby groups calling for a government investigation.

The national broadcaster fired Foeta Krige, Suna Venter, Krivani Pillay and Jacques Steenkamp on Monday, while Thandeka Gqubule, Busisiwe Ntuli and Lukhanyo Calata got their marching orders on Tuesday.

□ Over R84,000 raised so far by friends of sacked SABC journalists

Contributing editor Vuyo Mvoko, the most senior of the so-called SABC8 was still waiting to hear his fate by early Tuesday evening. The SACP, in a statement, slammed the dismissals as a "draconian editorial decree by the bosses without regard to due democratic public consultation".

The party pledged to find ways to, "actively express its solidarity with the affected workers and deepen the struggle to save the SABC" although it didn't mention any specific steps it intended to take.

---

The Organisation Against Tax Abuse (Outa) called for an urgent investigation by Minister of Communication Faith Muthambi into the conduct of leadership at the public broadcaster.

“By dismissing these journalists, the SABC’s autocratic leadership will simply engender more fear and cause less inclusiveness to critical internal discussion and debate,” said Outa chairman Wayne Duvenage. He suggested that the ministerial investigation also probe the SABC’s finances.

“We want to know why the SABC has placed its treasurer, Arrie Thomas and chief financial controller Petra Campher, on ‘special leave’ after they had warned the organisation was facing severe financial problems and will be out of cash by November 2016, failing some degree of external intervention,” said Duvenage.

The Council for the Advancement of the South African Constitution (Casac) on Tuesday reiterated its earlier call for National Assembly Speaker Baleka Mbete to convene an urgent meeting of the Portfolio Committee on Communications to deal with the "crisis" at the SABC.

“Parliament is once again failing to exercise its constitutional responsibilities to hold the executive and the SABC board to account. The rebuke the National Assembly recently received from the Constitutional Court ruling in the Nkandla matter appears to have fallen on deaf ears,” the council said in a statement.

<http://www.timeslive.co.za/local/2016/07/19/Criticism-mounts-over-draconian-SABC-sackings>

## **Landmark ruling provides legal clarity for women’s right to tenure on farms**

*Marianne Thamm, Daily Maverick, 20 July 2016*

The devastating impact on the family of a worker who had lived on a Citrusdal farm for almost 40 years before he was dismissed and evicted, potentially leaving his wife, children and grandchildren destitute, was highlighted in a landmark Constitutional Court ruling on 14 July. A majority judgment found that the man’s wife was entitled to security of tenure in her own right. The ruling has provided legal clarity on an issue that affects some of the most vulnerable workers in the country, women on farms who were, until the ruling, regarded as spouses rather than as individuals.

For 38 years, Jan Klaase worked as a general labourer on Noordhoek Farm in the Citrusdal District in the Western Cape. It was 1972 when he, like his father before him, began working on the farm and at first Klaase Jr shared a house with his father.

Then Jan Klaase met Elsie, she fell pregnant and after the birth of their first child, Elsie moved into her father-in-law’s house. Mr Klaase Sr later built a small cottage on the premises for his son and new family. The Klaase couple formally married in 1988 and continued to live on the farm for more than 30 years – a lifetime. Elsie, like so many women in the region, became a seasonal farmworker.

By the time they were finally evicted in 2014, three generations of the Klaase family lived on Noordhoek farm. Things had begun to go pear-shaped four years earlier, in

2010, when Jan Klaase had been dismissed by farm owner, Jozia Johannes van der Merwe.

Klaase had been charged with absconding from work and had opted for a settlement agreement. He also undertook, according to court papers, to vacate the house he had lived in most of his life by 30 June 2010. When he had not done so by the due date, Van der Merwe wrote to Klaase demanding that he move out within 30 days. Jan Klaase and his family stayed put – there was nowhere for them to go.

Unsurprisingly, the matter then ended up in the courts. First stop was the Clanwilliam Magistrate's Court where only Jan Klaase was named as a respondent in the eviction proceedings. But the Van der Merwes wanted Klaase as well as everyone else who occupied the house "through him" to be evicted as well. That is how it had always been done.

In that instance a probation officer had recommended that the family remain on the farm until alternative accommodation had been found. At this point Jan Klaase had indicated he had been willing to pay R60 a week in rent. However, he continued to live on the farm at no cost while working elsewhere.

At a later meeting with the Municipality in 2012 "the parties agreed that there was no possibility of Mr Klaase getting alternative accommodation in the foreseeable future due to the housing shortage in the district".

The Klaase family were now caught in a bureaucratic and legal nightmare. Poor, homeless and sporadically employed and vulnerable. Like thousands of others.

In 2014 the Magistrate's court granted the order evicting Jan Klaase "and all those occupying through him, including Mrs Klaase" from the farm. The court held that Mr Klaase's right of occupation arose from his employment on the farm. Once he had lost his job, that was it.

The court also found that provisions of the Extension of Security of Tenure Act (ESTA) had been complied with and that "it was not necessary to provide Mr Klaase with alternative accommodation as no alternative accommodation was available".

The matter then ended up in the Land Claims Court which confirmed the eviction order of the Magistrate's court.

Enter Mrs Klaase, who sought an order to be joined as the second respondent in the eviction application. She also asked for the suspension of further proceedings, including the execution of the eviction order, pending the determination of her rights in terms of ESTA.

"Mrs Klaase asserted that she continuously resided on the farm for many years in her own right as a general farm employee and with the consent of the owner. She contended that it was an essential term of her oral employment contract that she be entitled to housing on the farm."

The owners of the farm had argued that "Mrs Klaase, like many of the spouses and other family members of permanent employees on the farm, worked on a seasonal basis. They maintained that her right of residence on the farm derived from her

marriage to Mr Klaase, and that it continued only until his right of residence was lawfully terminated in terms of section 8 of ESTA.”

The owners said that they needed the Klaase family to vacate the house to make it available for permanent employees.

And so it was that Case CCT 23/15 found its way to the Constitutional Court where it was heard in September last year. Here in a majority judgment by Judge A J Matojane (with judges Cameron, Madlanga, Nkabinde and Wallis concurring) and handed down on 14 July, it was held that ESTA was enacted to give effect to section 26(3) of the Constitution and to provide security of tenure to people living on farmland whose tenure was insecure as a result of past racially discriminatory legislation or practices.

The judges found that the eviction of an individual on the basis of the conduct of a spouse or partner had “a significant impact on security of tenure not only for Mrs Klaase but also other similarly situated persons”.

The ConCourt found that Mrs Klaase had “a direct and substantial interest in the eviction order granted against Mr Klaase and should have been joined to the proceedings”. Because the farm owners had not objected to Mrs Klaase living on the farm “for decades” and had never taken steps to evict her, they had consented to her occupancy. Mrs Klaase, the court ruled, fell into the “first class of occupiers being an ‘occupier’ for purposes of ESTA”.

The Klaase family, the court maintained, had the right to live in the house on the farm.

In this case the Women’s Legal Centre represented the Women on Farms Project and was admitted as a friend of the court. In a statement Hoodah Abrahams-Fayker, an attorney at the Women’s Legal Centre, welcomed the judgment, saying the Land Claim Court’s finding that Mrs Klaase occupied the premises “under her husband” subordinated her rights to those of Mr Klaase and that this “demeaned her rights to equality and human dignity”.

She said that the Women’s Legal Centre had intervened as a friend of the court on behalf of Women on Farms Project “because of the potential it has to affect female farmworkers and their children. Female farmworkers are typically un-unionised, seasonal workers who face a variety of difficulties, such as a lack of knowledge about their rights and economic dependence on their partners. This often results in economic and social marginalisation.”

The current interpretation of the law reinforced the notion that women’s access to secure tenure and housing on farmland is embodied by a male occupier (who is usually the head of the household).

“It makes it virtually impossible for women to establish independent occupier status, even where they also work on the farm, and thus impacts negatively on their protection against arbitrary eviction. The court was called upon to come to the aid of female farmworkers who are reliant on their spouses and who find themselves without a home if their spouse’s job is jeopardised. The current dispute over the interpretation of ESTA should be of concern due to the vulnerability that it brings to a

rather significant portion of our society, such as those that live on other people's land or property," said Abrahams-Fayker.

In his judgment Judge Matojane highlighted that "most people who are occupiers of farmland are a vulnerable group in our society" and that this included women who were frequently evicted because of actions of their partners or spouses. This ruling is a breakthrough for women, providing legal certainty for independent security and a right to tenure, thus ending centuries of arbitrary abuse of women who were regarded, along with other possessions, as extensions of their male partners.

<http://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2016-07-20-landmark-ruling-provides-legal-clarity-for-womens-right-to-tenure-on-farms/#.V48LXk3lrIU>

## **International**

### **Labour membership deadline: How to join the party and vote**

*The Week [UK], 19 July 2016*

Not all members can have their say in the leadership election – but there are other ways to make your point

---

The Labour Party has seen its membership surge to record levels in the wake of the EU referendum and the challenge to Jeremy Corbyn's leadership.

However, there was a huge outcry among those who'd just joined after the party's National Executive Committee (NEC) changed the rules so only those who have been members for at least six months can vote in the leadership contest.

Why are so many people joining?

Corbyn's leadership is under threat after most of his shadow cabinet stood down and he lost a vote of no confidence. However, he has refused to resign, citing his huge support among grassroots members.

Angela Eagle triggered the leadership contest last week with her campaign to head the party. She and rival Owen Smith are now reportedly battling it out to decide who will stand in the contest, with the final contender due to be announced tomorrow.

It is thought many of the new members have joined with the "express intention" of defying MPs and supporting Corbyn, says The Independent.

This is backed up by a new YouGov poll of party members showing Corbyn has a lead of more than 20 points over both his rivals and that his net approval rating has gone up in the last three weeks.

The veteran politician is widely expected to win a majority of the vote among rank-and-file members.

"If this happened, his success and the 100,000 membership surge would mirror the events of [last] September's leadership election," the Independent reports.

Who can vote in the leadership election?

- Labour members who joined the party on or before 12 January
- Anyone who becomes a "registered supporter" by making a one-off payment of £25. There is only a 48-hour window to do this - which opened at 5pm on Monday 18 July and closes at 5pm on Wednesday 20 July. You can register here.
- Members of affiliated trade unions and other organisations who have been a member of that organisation on or before the 12 January 2016 and signed up as an "affiliated supporter" before 8 August 2016.

Who can apply to become a party member?

Anyone who has British or Irish citizenship or who has lived in the UK for at least one year and is not a member of any other political party.

How do I join?

There are several ways: you can do so by telephone, online or by post. To join over the phone, call 0345 092 2299 and follow the steps. A membership form can also be filled in and submitted on the Labour Party website or printed out here and posted to Freepost RSJK-BART-AYRZ, Labour Party Membership, Cramlington NE23 1BB.

How much is it and where does the money go?

The cost varies from as little as £1 a month for students and young people to a standard rate of £3.92 a month. Discounts are also given to pensioners, the unemployed and trade union members affiliated to the party.

"Unlike the Tories, we don't rely on a small number of super-wealthy donors," says the party. "We rely on funds from our dedicated members and your membership fee would provide a vital boost to our campaigning efforts."

What does membership achieve?

You receive a membership pack, regular newsletters and invitations to local events and meetings. Crucially, you will be able to vote in future leadership elections and on party policy, as well as stand as a candidate yourself.

<http://www.theweek.co.uk/74255/labour-membership-deadline-how-to-join-the-party-and-vote>