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MESSRS. CURREN AND CORRIGALL.

NATIVE ECONOMIC COMMISSION.

LADYSMITH, OCTOBER 15th, 1930, 9:30 a.m.

THIRTY-FIFTH PUBLIC SITTING.

PRESENT:

Dr. J.R. Holloway (Chairman),
Major R.W. Anderson,
Mr. F.A.M. Lucas, K.C.,
Mr. A.M. Mostert.

Dr. A.W. Roberts.
Senator P.W. de Roux van Necker.
Dr. H.C.M. Fourie.

Mr. C. Faye (Secretary).

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

MR. BERNARD HERCULAS CURREN, Town Clerk.

Mr. James Corrigan, called and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand you represent the Town Council?—(Mr. Curren): I am Town Clerk and I have been asked to appear before this Commission to answer any questions which you may care to put to me.

You have no urban location, I understand?—No, we have not.

Is there any need for one?—Yes, there is.

Have any steps been taken to get one?—Steps have been taken. We have passed certain regulations and they have been submitted to the Native Affairs Department, and the Department have returned those regulations to us with certain queries and we have made the amendments necessary and have again returned them to the Department. That must be about a month or six weeks ago.

In the meantime, how are the natives here housed?—They are generally housed at the back of business premises, where they...
work. Some have erected huts on the town lands without permission. Some have rooms attached to the dwelling houses where they work - they are domestic servants, but whenever they can get on to the commonage they go there.

Are there any families living here? - Yes, the natives have their families with them in some cases, and some have to live with their families in one room as best they can.

So the living conditions at present are very unsatisfactory? - That is so.

Now, about the wages of natives, I take it that you have a number of natives employed by the Municipality here? - Yes. The natives get 35/- per month as a general wage. There are one or two who get a little more, and then we have one native boy who has been with us a long time, he gets still more. And then we allow them certain things, half a bag of meal, 4 lbs. of meat, and 1 bag of coal. The allowances come to about 9/- per month over and above the 35/- which they get.

And what do the Municipality do about housing these natives? - If our natives require a room, we have certain bags. They cannot have a room to themselves, but two or more are put together and we provide accommodation free in all cases. That is, if we require their services and they need such accommodation, and also if rooms are available.

You have not got rooms available for all your staff? - No, we could not go to that, but we go as far as we possibly can.

Now, natives working in town, say as domestic servants, what do they get in the way of wages? - I do not know what the general rate is, and I can only give you my own case.
Mr. Cuthbert Ward Wright, called and examined:

The Chairman: I understand you represent the Elandslaagte Farmers' Association?—Yes, I represent that Association, of which I am the President. Our Association consists of ninety rural members, of which about 35 are registered owners of farms. I have been asked to appear before you today to point out to you that our area is a European one. In this area we have three native-owned farms, two of which are adjoining, and one is an isolated farm at a distance of about eleven miles from the first two. The names of these farms are: Matewane's Kop, approximately 8,000 acres, the farm adjoining is Jonoma —approximately 1,000 acres, and the isolated farm is Trekboer, or Grammond, which is approximately
1,500 acres. Now these farms were bought by native syndicates some years ago. They are owned by these Syndicates and in the case of the big farm the chief Umbegwa Shabelala, who appeared before you yesterday, is the Induna, and it is the custom of these syndicates to take on a number of tenants who live on the farm and pay rents. They exercise little or no control over these tenants, and they are a source of great trouble to the adjoining European owners. They do not apparently care who comes to them as tenants, so long as they pay the rent. The consequence is that they gather together on these farms natives of a most undesirable character. They very frequently steal from the adjoining European farmers, and we as an Association say that they are an absolute pest and a plague to this district. I wish particularly to express that we are not complaining of the land being owned by natives, but our complaint is that the native owners exercise no control whatever over their tenants.

DR. ROBERTS: The Syndicate, is that an European Syndicate?—No, it is a native syndicate.

THE CHAIRMAN: They must have bought those farms before the Land Act was passed?—Yes, they were bought before the Land Act was passed. We are told by the police why they cannot trace crimes committed outside these farms—on the farms of the neighbouring owners—is because they have no person to whom they can go in the way in which they would go to the European-owned farms, and as everyone who knows the native is aware, the natives are afraid to give evidence against one another, because of witchcraft and other beliefs and these are altogether undesirable conditions. We just
have these three farms there. Now, our district is a pro-
gressive district - it is the district of Blandselaagte, and
we feel that we are very much bothered with these native-
owned farms. It is not a recent thing. The question of
these native-owned farms was discussed as far back as the
Beaumont Commission, and it is published here in 1916, that
is fourteen years ago. If one refers to page 9, the follow-
ing clause appears: 2 "There is still another way by which
the difficulty of paying for the land is overcome. The pur-
chaser brings on to the land a number of natives as tenants
or as squatters. In this way the farm becomes small kaffir
locations, with no proper supervision, and here underlies
one of the greatest objections held by European farmers to
the ownership of land by natives in their vicinity, because,
as they say, these native squatters are many of them unde-
sirable characters, who find a haven of refuge on such lands
and are enabled to lead an idle life, by helping themselves
to the stock of the genuine European farmers." Now that
just sums up the case so far as we are concerned.

DR. ROBERTS: Did the second Commission bring the
matter up ?-, I have no record of that.

MR. MOSTERT: Was not that in 1917 ?-x No, this is
the Beaumont Commission Report of 1916. That was in section
13 of that Commission's report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does your Association suggest any
means of dealing with that position ?- Our Association
suggests that as a European is unable to collect rents from
natives on his farms, the same law should apply to native-
owned farms. It is a well known fact that if a European
owner has disorderly natives on his farm, his neighbours complain and a remedy is soon found for the evil, but with the native-owned land we can do nothing. The owners will not take any responsibility for their tenants, and as long as they pay the rent they do not care what sort of characters they are.

MR. MOSTERT: Do you lose any stock owing to these natives? - A good deal of partially grown crops are always stolen off our lands. There are instances within quite recent times of their carting away grown crops on horseback.

Do you know the number of natives there are, the number of squatters? - Impossible to say; the farm is covered with them, and it is getting worse and worse every day. Let me tell you this, Mr. Chairman, these three farms were three of the best farms in the Klandi Langte District, but they have been so over-stocked that erosion has taken place to such an extent that they are gradually becoming deserts. The sides of the kopjes are trampled down, and dongas are forming everywhere. I want to point out that these are isolated farms in the European area, and they have gathered together there all the natives that they can find, and they allow them to pay rent. I do not wish you to think that I hold with the paying of rent, most of us are against that.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is conceivable that you might even have bad European neighbours? - Quite so.

That is one of the disadvantages of the situation? - We think that if the native-owners of the farms themselves were to farm and to cultivate those farms, it would be quite all right, but we do strongly object to them gathering all
the rag-tag and bobtail of the district on to their farms. It is quite possible that a native cannot get another place to live on in the district because he is known to be a stock thief. He simply goes to one of these farms and gets permission to reside there, and once he is there he can go out from there and do as he likes.

DR. ROBERTS: Is there any part of the country near the reserve areas where farms could be got for these people?—Yes, quite.

Where?—We have the Natal thorn veld, and the idea of the Government at present is to believe to declare some released areas and the natives could be moved from there to the released areas. It is not a very great distance. Many of them, as a matter of fact, have come from what will be the released areas.

Is there plenty of land available there, do you know?—I do not know, but I understand that there is.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be a better solution than the one which you have proposed?—As far as we are concerned, we do not care where they go to, so long as we get rid of them. That is all we are concerned with.

DR. ROBERTS: It appears to be a good suggestion to send them to these released areas?—Yes, it would be an excellent idea if we could move them back to where the other natives are. There is a big native location in the thorn country, and the European owned farm adjoining that, which is quite suitable for natives. It is watered, and it is excellent cattle field, and the natives are continually making application to be allowed to buy that land. There was one
application in only yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to the farmers in your district, are they dependent largely on labour tenants? - Yes, I might say almost entirely.

Under what conditions do these tenants live on the farms? - The general practice in our district is that married natives get 10/- per month, the younger boys get 5/- per month, and females get 30/- for six months' work, that is house girls. Females who work on the lands get 1/- per day, to get we call it. Besides this they get the male labour practically as much land as they wish to plough, and on most farms they are allowed to graze also practically as much stock as they wish to. My own natives have 175 head of cattle, and nearly 300 head of small stock, nine horses and about 17 donkeys, and I think mine is a fair average of the whole district.

MR. MOSTERT: How many squatters have you got? - I have 14 working boys.

THE CHAIRMAN: They have to work six months? - They work six months in and six months out.

Does that apply to all the males in the family? - Not in every case. There may be four male natives on the farm. On most farms only one native goes in to service at one time for six months.

MR. LUCAS: That means two during the year? - Yes, but on most farms it has recently become the custom to call half in and half out.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about the females? - The females just come in, usually two from the kraal at the same time, so
that some of them are also perhaps two years before they come into service.

MR. LUCAS: What pay do they get? - 5/- per month generally, and their clothes and food.

MAJOR ANDERSON: And the boys? - The married boys get 10/- per month, and the unmarried boys 5/- per month.

And food, do they get food? - Yes.

MR. LUCAS: What food do they get? - That depends very much on the farmer. I have personally tried to feed them on practically the same food as I have at my own table, and I have found it most unsatisfactory. After a time they said that they did not want it, and they much preferred their own native food. We give them meat, mealie meal, milk, potatoes and beans, and anything that is going. I personally, with the exception of the time when I fed them on European food, have never had any complaints, but when I gave them European food they strongly objected to it, and they actually came to me in a deputation and asked me if I thought they were white men.

How often do you give them meat? - I do not think it is a regular custom, say once a week. Personally, I give them more sometimes. Perhaps you know that the Zulu is an eater of carrion; they are very keen on eating everything that dies on the farm, so that where you keep sheep it is very often that they eat meat every day. We as an Association consider that we treat our natives fairly, as farmers. We realise that we cannot have contented labour unless we do treat them fairly, but we do find that the native is very much inclined to say that he only receives so many shillings per month as wages, and loses sight of everything else. I
wish to stress this point. When he is charged under the Master and Servants Act before the magistrate, you hear him say that that is all he gets; it is customary for him to say, I have heard it myself dozens of times, "I receive 10/- per month," but he quite omits to inform the magistrate that he also is allowed to keep as much stock as he likes, he is allowed to plough as much land as he likes to plough, he forgets to tell the magistrate that he gets his food, and in most cases he gets sympathetic treatment from the farmer, and in many cases the farmer and his wife have to become a sort of adopted mother and father to the kraal. In cases of sickness I am sure every one of us tries to help him. I may mention that I heard the chief give evidence yesterday, and he laid stress on the point of the poor payment given to the native by the farmer in the Mlandselaagte District. But he altogether omitted to tell you of the thousands of head of stock that we graze for the natives, of the thousands of acres of land which they plough, and of all the privileges which they get from the European farmer.

MR. MOSTERT: Is it economical to have those squatters? - It is not, but what can we do? It is the custom of the district, and I have asked natives time after time to work for higher wages and get rid of the scrub cattle on my farm, but it is a difficult question. They simply will not do it. .......

.......It is the native custom and you cannot break it down.

And you cannot get ordinary monthly labour? - No, we cannot. There are times during the year when the native wants to plough himself. It is very difficult then to get the native that you need. It is for that reason that we have to keep these squatters with all their cattle. Unless you have them
Messrs. Shun and Holmes,

domiciled on your own farm, you are in a very bad way. Many of us are dairying as well as keeping sheep.

---

MR. WILLIE NOEL SHUN,

and MR. THOMAS GOODWILL HOLMES, called and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that you are the Chief Compound Manager of the Dundee Coal Company?—(Mr. Shun): Yes. (Mr. Holmes): I am Chief Compound Manager of the Burnside No.1. shaft. The Company is called the Dundee Coal Company, and the mine is called the Burnside Mine. (Mr. Shun): The subject which I want to deal with is in connection with the desertion and the registration of natives. I sent a report to the Company on this subject and I thought it was just as well to bring that report here. It was written on the 11th of September, 1930, addressed to the Manager of the Dundee Coal Company, Ltd., Burnside Colliery, and I think I might read it to you:

"Deserters January 1930 to June 1930. With reference to our recent conversation re above, I beg to report as follows:-

Number of Deserters: We had 152 deserters from No.1. Mine and 85 from No.2. Mine, Total 237; of this number we recovered 52 and 185 are still unrecovered. Attached you will find complete lists of these deserters giving their mine nos, Registration Nos, date deserted, outstanding advances, agent who recruited them, and date recovered.

Average No.of Boys employed monthly January to June was 2308. Monthly fees and registration fees paid to Native Affairs Department for same period was monthly fees £592.6.0, registration fees £122.3.0, total £814.9.0, average monthly
expenditure £136.0.0. Of the 52 boys recovered about 20 per cent were recovered by the Native Affairs Department through the F.I.R.D, and the balance returned to the mine of their own accord, so the F.I.R.D. only recovered, say 10 out of a total of 237 deserters. I would suggest that representations be made to the Native Affairs Department for them to tighten things up, so that our losses will not be so great.

The weakness in the present system of registration is in my opinion, first that only a small percentage of the natives employed in the Union are registered and that natives who desert from labour areas where they are registered seek employment in non-labour areas and cannot be traced. To get over this I think that all big employers of labour should be made to register their employees. Secondly, only prints of passless natives and suspects are submitted to the F.I.R.D. for classification, this enables a boy to desert from one mine, go home and apply for a renewal of his pass, then seek work elsewhere in a labour district and not be traced. Tax Identity Numbers and Passes; I am of the opinion that 75 to 80 per cent of the natives who desert from the mines come originally without their tax identity numbers or with their passes not in order and this is where the department could help us. No native should be attested or registered unless he has his tax identity number and his proper pass.

Employers are themselves to blame for a good deal of this for accepting boys in times of labour shortage whose passes are not in order and if we all made it a hard and fast rule that any natives who arrived at the mines without their proper passes and tax identity numbers were returned to the recruiter at his expense, the recruiters would soon fall into line and desertions would be considerably reduced. It should be...
made more difficult for a native to obtain a renewal of his pass and they would then look after them and all passes should be on the better paper and made out in ink, not pencil, tax receipts should also be made out in ink. I consider that only about 10 per cent of natives who apply for renewal passes have genuinely lost them, the balance are deserters and have left their passes with their employer. Natives are traced by the F.I.R.D. and prosecuted and it frequently happens that we are not informed and when the boy completes his sentence, he does not return to the mine he deserted from. The Native Affairs could assist here by taking the boy over and asking the mine to send for him."

Have you any experience of practices of recruiters which are not entirely above board? - Yes, quite a lot.

Can you mention some to us? - One thing which I found a lot of recruiters do, is that they get a boy to sign a contract on any pretext. The boy says, "I want certain special conditions," and the recruiter says, "all right." The boy signs the contract before the magistrate, and the recruiter tells him that he will get what he wants afterwards. I have had as many as twenty boys who have come and said that they have attested for surface work and that they were promised that they would not have to go underground. I quite believe them. The mistake of course is that the boys did not bring that question up before the magistrate and that they took the word of the recruiter. When they come to the mine and they see that things are not what they have been led to expect. Quite a number of the boys desert because of that.
MR. LUCAS: What do you do in such cases? Do you let the boy do the work which he asks for?—No. We cannot do that, we make him do what he is attested for.

Do you think that you are legally entitled to do that?—Well, we have nothing to do with what the boy says. The recruiter might deny the statement of the boy. After all, we cannot take any notice of these statements beyond what is in the attestation form.

DR. ROBERTS: Is not the recruiter morally your servant?—He is, in a way. Of course, we can always cancel the contract if he is not satisfactory, and where we get such a thing we always point it out to the recruiter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there other examples of similar things? I have had cases where a boy has arrived on a mine and where he has disputed the amount of advance which was shown against him, after having admitted it to the attesting officer.

MR. MOSTERT: Through what recruiting channels do you get your boys—is it your own organization?—Yes, we have an organization of our own, and then we get boys from Hadley's labour organizations, from Theron & Co., and then we have an agent in Pondoland, and another at Flagstaff.

Cannot you place your finger on the spot where the fault lies?—The particular recruiter whom I was mentioning was a man at Queenstown working through Hadley's labour organization.

CHAIRMAN: Was he the man against whom the charges were most frequently brought?—Yes, we have a trader at Tabankulu, and we never have any trouble of that description
no far as the natives who come from him are concerned. He is a man of standing, and there is no trouble. But Theron & Co., we also have some trouble with.

Have you any cases of these agents who go back to the same or other labour agents and take an advance again?— No, we have not got that.

MAJOR ANDERSON: How much voluntary labour have you got?— I can give you our total supply for last year. Our own organization was 890 boys. In all we had 938, and the total for the year was 2964.

What system of stores do you have in your compound?— Mine concession stores.

Are they owned by the Company?— No, they are owned by an outside company, a company named Swart & Co., and they own nearly half the concession stores in Natal.

MR. LUCAS: Is it a fixed money sum which they pay in rent, or is it so much per head?— I do not know. I only know that they have the trading rights there.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you have the system of tokens there?— Yes.

MR. LUCAS: What is your view about that?— It has its drawbacks, and it certainly encourages the natives to spend more money than they otherwise would. On the other hand, of course, if the native spends more money, it also means that he remains there longer.

THE CHAIRMAN: When he has taken tokens for a given amount, can he again exchange those tokens for cash?— No, he cannot.

So really he is compelled to buy there?— Yes.
Messrs. Shun and Holmes.

Surely that is absolutely indefensible? You give them an I.C.U., and they ask you for cash for it, and you say, "I am not going to give you cash for that"; that should not be allowed in any civilised state?— Of course, with those tokens they cannot deal with anyone else.

No, but they cannot exchange them for cash with the people who have given them the tokens for cash?— No, they cannot.

Well, that is absolutely indefensible?— (No answer).

MR. LUCAS: What hours do your natives work?— Ten hours a day.

Are they underground for ten hours?— Yes.

How many days a week?— Six days a week.

And do they work any overtime?— Yes, sometimes they do work overtime.

And what wages do they get?— Well, the top wage is 2/9d. That is for what we call a single-pick boy. He gets 15 feet wide by 3'6".

Is that piece-work?— Yes.

Is that the highest?— We have boys who can finish regularly between ten and eleven.

That is a special rate. What are the other wages?— We have the double-pick boy; they have 20' wide by 4'. That is also piece work. Most of the boys get piece work, excepting the timber boys on road-work.

What is the lowest wage?— 1/8d.

What periods do your natives have to sign on for?— They have to sign on for from three to nine months.

Do you find that the same natives return for a second
spell? - Yes.

Many of them? - No, not a big percentage of them. A lot depends on the class of work a boy is put on to. Tramming work, for instance, is very unpopular. You get very few boys who have been six months on tramming who will stay on. They may stay on if you give them another job, but they will not stay on tramming.

What is the health condition of these boys? - Generally speaking it is quite good.

Did you happen to see an article in the Medical Journal of November 27th, about tuberculosis in the coal-mine? - No.

Have you had any report in regard to tuberculosis in your mine? - No, generally speaking the natives are fairly healthy.

There is just one point, does the law in Natal allow these hours which you mention? - Yes, it does.

They have reduced it in the Transvaal to fifty-two hours per week. Do you know why that has been done? - No, I do not know.

DR. ROBERTS: Would you like to say if this Queens-town recruiter, who is mainly responsible for sending you boys under age, attested wrongly? - We have a complaint - it was sometime ago - from the magistrate at Queenstown about boys being attested under age. But there are not many cases, because we will not accept them, as they are no use to us. I remember some boys coming along and we refused even to pay the capitation fees for them. The boys were so young that we could not send them underground.

Did these boys come specially from the Queenstown District? - Yes.
Messrs. Shun and Holmes.

(Mr. Holmes): I have a statement here which I should like to submit to the Commission, as it deals with matters of very considerable importance.

I am Compound Manager at No.1. Mine Burnside Colliery, and as much have been in contact with natives in large numbers daily in the ordinary course of my duties for ten years. I do seriously ask you - Mr. Chairman - to approach the proper authorities with a view to having the regulations of the Public Health Act No.36 of 1919 governing venereal diseases properly enforced. At present there is no lazaretto in the Dundee District, neither is there a venereal clinic for rural natives to receive attention.

It is my experience that cases of venereal diseases are on the increase amongst natives and I submit the following figures in support, which I have compiled from my records and those kept at the Burnside Colliery Hospital.

**MALES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Syphilis&quot; males treated</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gonorrhoea&quot; males treated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunts lost by above:-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Syphilis&quot;</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gonorrhoea&quot;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No. native employees</td>
<td>2315</td>
<td>2144</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>2324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage detected and treated</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEMALES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Syphilis&quot; females treated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gonorrhoea&quot; females treated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No. female residents</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage detected and treated</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>(9 mos).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases treated (male and female)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A private venereal clinic was established at the Burnside Colliery by our present mine medical officer during September, 1927, since which date native employees and their womenfolk have been encouraged to present themselves for treatment at a nominal fee of 10/- per injection, two
injections being the average required to cure a case of syphilis, and when necessary the amount is paid by the native in instalments.

14 females received free treatment. About 2 per cent of the total number of cases treated here have come forward voluntarily for treatment. The majority have been detected by having suspected persons medically examined.

In an endeavour to detect female cases I have three female detectives who are paid 2/6d. for every case they are responsible for bringing to light.

This system has been in force since the beginning of this year and has borne good results. (See figures quoted). Previously women were only detected on questioning men who were treated.

Every native male who is treated for this disease here is questioned, and in 75 per cent of the cases they admit to having contracted the disease from professional prostitutes who wander from place to place, 20 per cent contract the disease from women living on adjacent farms and mines, the remaining 5 per cent contract the disease from their wives or concubines resident at Burnside Colliery.

While we are doing all we can to eradicate this disease from amongst the native employees at Burnside Colliery, we feel that we do not get sufficient assistance from the local authorities, in fact the police refuse to prosecute natives for concealing and spreading venereal disease even when the cases are of obvious long standing.

On the 20/8/30 I caused two native females, who were
badly infected with syphilis, to be taken to the Blencoe police with a request to have them given medical treatment and to the best of my knowledge they were simply warned by the court to return to their kraals.

On other occasions I have gone to the trouble of charging native female professional prostitutes with trespass, given evidence to the effect that they admit being syphilitic and the court has simply cautioned and discharged them with a warning to return to their kraals. Having no kraals or having no fixed abode, they simply pass along to the next town or mine to continue spreading disease.

Iam of the opinion:—

1. That a lazaretto is necessary in the Dundee District.
2. That venereal clinics should be established at all towns, mines and villages under regulation 56, Act 36 of 1919 with the recognition of Government where treatment free of charge should be given.
3. That while treatment free of charge is necessary to encourage the maximum number of voluntary patients, strong measures should be taken against persons concealing the disease or neglecting to have themselves cured.

At the present time there are two cases of interest which are pending.

1. On the 2.10.30. one of my native female detectives brought to my notice that a certain native female, a resident of an adjacent farm was visiting her mother at Burnside Colliery and was syphilitic. The woman admitted that she was syphilitic, had not been treated and had contracted the disease from her husband more than a month ago.
I sent her to the Glencoe Police and understand from them that they are waiting instructions as to how to deal with her. Nine days later this woman reported to me that she had been reporting daily to the police and had not been treated. This case is still pending.

2. On the 5.10.30. a native employee of Burnside Colliery complained of having some chest trouble. On having him examined by the Mine Medical Officer he was found to be syphilitic. The boy refused to stay in Hospital and also refused treatment. Persuasion was of no avail, and I had no option but to have him prosecuted by the Glencoe Police. This case will be tried by the Dundee Magistrate on the 14.10.30.

In the one case I mentioned it was tried by the Dundee Magistrate yesterday, and the boy was fined £5, or in six months' imprisonment with hard labour. After the case was tried the doctor and myself interviewed the magistrate, and he promised strongly to support any application which my Company might make to him for free drugs in connection with this private clinic which we have established, and he has also promised to instruct the Glencoe Police that in future all cases of trespass should be sent to Dundee to be tried by him, as the officer at Dundee is very unsatisfactory. He also mentioned that he himself was astounded at the number of females running about. I pointed out that in view of the unsympathetic manner in which we had been treated in connection with these cases, it meant that these women were now simply chased away.
THE CHAIRMAN: This private venereal clinic established in 1927, would that mean that for the year 1927 you did not have as full an investigation as you had in subsequent years?—No, prior to 1927 the boys were treated at the hospital, and there was no clinic.

Those figures which you have given are compiled from your records, and from those kept in the colliery hospital? Has this clinic anything to do with the figures, do you get your figures from the clinic?—Yes, we get the number of cases treated.

MR. LUCAS: Treated at the clinic?—Yes.

For 1927, it is not really a full year?—The clinic and the hospital are in one and the same place. It is not a separate establishment, apart from the hospital.

For 1927 your figures are partly from the clinic and partly from the hospital?—That is so.

After that there was better facilities for treatment?—Yes, it was put on a proper footing.

That may affect the figures. After you have better treatment you are more likely to get the people to come and be treated; is not that the case?—My job is to get the people and the job of the doctors is to treat the people. But many of them go back and will not pay for it.

Before 1927 you had less facilities for treatment than after that?—That is so.

And therefore it is likely that your figures will not be as complete for 1927 as for 1928 and 1929?—Yes.

Your conclusion that it is on the increase does not seem to be borne out for the three years that are complete.
Your basis is so small that one cannot draw very much from it.

?— Taking the total number of cases treated—leaving out 1927—we had 57 in 1928 and 63 in 1929, and for the nine months of this year we had 69.

You watch the women more closely now of course?—Yes.

You have 18 women included in 1930?—Yes.

Before that you did not watch them so closely, you chased them away?—Yes.

MR. LUCAS: And those chased away are not included in this list?—That is so.

Did you try and investigate from any of these natives the reasons for their desertion? Some returned voluntarily?—(MR. SHUN): Yes. As a matter of fact, the matter was taken up with the Director of Native Labour, and I took statements from several boys whom we recovered, and statements were also taken on behalf of the Director of Native Labour. The particular cases which we investigated at the time, most of these boys complained of ill treatment by native boss-boys underground, and they gave that as their chief reasons for deserting.

Have steps been taken to prevent that in future?—Yes, steps have been taken, but it is a most difficult matter to prove. You may go into these matters and you find that your boss-boy gets someone else to come along and say that he never touched these boys.

Since you have taken these steps, have the desertions been less?—Yes, they have been less.

Substantially less?—Yes.
MESSRS. ILLING, etc.

MESSRS: AUGUST WILLIAM ILLING,
JOHANNES HERMANUS POTOLETER,
VICTOR JOHN BRISTOWE,
called and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you representing the Farmers' Association?—(Mr. Iling): Yes, Sir, we represent the Ladysmith and District Farming Association.

You are aware of the Terms of Reference, and we shall be pleased to hear what you have to say to us. First of all, what type of labour do you employ for your labour supply in this district—Is it tenant labour?—Yes, squatters.

Almost entirely so on the farms?—Yes.

Now on what conditions are these squatters kept on the farms?—The usual thing is that they render service for six months out of every twelve months. They have certain rights to run cattle, to plough their lands, and they have other privileges on those farms, and they are invariably, with very, very few exceptions, paid a wage which is agreed upon between the owners and the natives themselves.

What generally is that wage, can you tell us?—It is 10/- per month for married men, 8/- for unmarried men, and then down to the smallest, I suppose boys of ten and twelve years of age get 5/- and 6/- per month.

Do you put any limit to the number of animals which they may graze on a farm?—Some do and some do not. I myself have been forced to put a limit on to the animals that they graze on the land. Some three years ago we wanted to adopt the principle of allowing only so many cattle to be grazed on our these particular farms, and we came to an arrangement
among ourselves. I carried out that arrangement, but there are others who are not doing that. The arrangement was that those who have natives on their farms should allow them to run four head of cattle and six goats. In addition they are allowed to plough their lands, and I have never limited them as far as that goes. They can plough as much as they like, because the more ploughing they do, the more food there is for the stock in winter. Perhaps they have one or two horses, and then they are paid also at the rate of wage which I have mentioned and I think in the majority of cases in this district the farmers are following that course which I have outlined, with very few exceptions.

Can you give an estimate of the amount of land on an average that is ploughed for any one native?—Do you mean for every worker or for every kraal head?

No, let us take the kraal head?—Well, I should say about ten acres for every kraal head. It really depends upon the size of his kraal, but I should say that on an average it would come to ten acres. Each wife has ten acres ploughed for her, that is what I mean to convey. (Mr. Bristowe): I think three acres per married man is about the average, three to four acres.

Do you think that Mr. Illing's estimate is too high?—No, I do not think so, but it depends entirely on the size of the family. A man with six working boys, who are all married, will plough more than what Mr. Illing has said. If the family is large, well, he will do more; that is what you have to go by.

MR. LUCAS: Do you mean three or four acres per
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married man?—Yes.

And yours was ten acres per married man?—(Mr. Illing): Yes, that would be the average kraal.

Yes, but what does a kraal comprise, that is the point?—As I said, I have not limited my boys at all.

What does a kraal comprise in your case, how many married men?—I should say that the average there is about two, the average to a kraal. Because in olden days you used to find up to ten, but nowadays as soon as they get married they leave the parents, they go and strike out for themselves, and they go elsewhere. It is only in very few instances that the young married men will remain with their parents. There seems to be a tendency amongst them to go away from the parents and strike out entirely on their own.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bristowe mentions three acres per married man; there would have to be more than three men to a kraal to come up to your average, Mr. Illing?—(Mr. Bristowe): Three acres per married man is about right. There may be cases of three or four or five married men again, but on the other hand, as Mr. Illing has said, in most cases the young men nowadays go away, which they did not do in the past.

You expect a certain number of married families to one kraal?—Yes, one expects that.

Exactly, what would be the average?—The average would be two to three, I do not think it would be more.

So that your estimate is lower than Mr. Illing’s estimate?—I think so. As a matter of fact, I think his conditions are slightly different from mine. He has a larger farm and the smaller owners cannot allow as much land for ploughing
as Mr. Illing gives.

You think there is a limitation on the part of the smaller owners?— Naturally, there must be.

Now, the wage paid to the native, that 10/-, is that plus food?— (Mr. Illing): Yes, plus everything. You really look after him as well as you possibly can. That is to say, you look after his comfort as well as you can, and after his quarters and his food.

Does he get three meals per day?— Yes, he gets three meals per day.

MR. LUCAS: What do you feed them on?— Mostly on mealie meal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do they get skimmed milk?— Yes.

And do they get meat?— Yes, they sometimes get meat.

MR. LUCAS: How often do they get meat?— There is nothing regular about it, perhaps once a week.

Is it sometimes less?— Yes, sometimes it is less.

(MENEER POTGISTER) Hulle help baie male vir hulle self met vleis. Dit gebeur dikwels.

MENEER MOSTERT: Kry hulle soms meer as ons self kry?— Ja, in die winter byna dag vir dag.

MENEER LUCAS: Kry hulle dit van die boer, of steel hulle?—Hulle steel of hulle kry dit van die boere.

Is daar baie gevall waar die boere meer as eenmaal in die week vlees gee?— Ek slag baie op my plaas en ek gee meer as eenmaal in die week.

Is dit net alleen by U die geval?—Nee, dit is so by al die boere. (MR. BRISTOWE): On the small farms we cannot allow them to plough indefinitely, or to keep too much stock for ploughing, and the result is that in most cases the farmers
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will do the ploughing for the natives, and naturally, as a consequence, you have not to give them the quantity of acres per acre, because the work of ploughing is done better, and their production is larger.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the ploughing generally done with the farmer's oxen?—On the smaller farms invariably it is the custom, but on the larger farms it is not so. The native does the work and it is badly done.

Does the farmer supervise the native's ploughing?—Yes, in the one case of the smaller farms he will supervise that, because if he does not he may lose time.

And then, if he supervises it, the ploughing is done as well as when it is done for the farmer himself?—Exactly the same.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Can you give us the average yield per acre?—No, I cannot say that. There is no difference between the native's yield and what I grow myself. It would be about 45 bags per acre. Some of them put in a little kraal manure and a very great deal depends upon that. In this district, conditions vary very much.

MR. LUCAS: Conditions vary very much you say; in what way?—Well, some people do help the natives with the ploughing, and others do not, but in this district it has taken hold very largely.

What has taken a hold?—The ploughing for the natives.

THE CHAIRMAN: During the six months when the native is not required to work for you, what does he do?—As a rule, they sit at home, or they go to work, but if there is no shortage of food they like to go and sit at home and do nothing.

Can you get labour for wages during that period?—Yes.
Do they come out freely to work? - Yes.

At what wages? - Thirty shillings for thirty working days, including Sundays. They are paid for Sundays as for an ordinary day.

MR. MOSTERT: Do you consider that this squatting system is economical? - This labour tenant system is not economical; it is expensive labour.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then why do the farmers go in for it? - We go in for it so that we can be assured of our labour during the seasons and during the week periods.

MR. LUHAS: We have been told in some of the districts that one of the reasons why farmers cannot get this monthly labour is because they wait until the day when they want the ploughing to be done, instead of hiring their labour for a fixed period? - Yes, that particularly applies to contract labour.

Month by month, but with a guarantee of six months - if they went in for that they would have no difficulty? - I dare say that farmers could resort to contract labour, but we cannot afford paying a capitation fee of £2.10.0. for our contract labour. That makes it uneconomical.

I was not referring to recruited labour; those whom you get are not recruited? - No, they offer themselves.

The reason given was that farmers could not get that labour because they would only try to get it just at the ploughing season instead of telling the natives "If you come on now I shall keep you on for six months"? - My experience has been that at these rush periods you cannot get the labour.

That is so, if you wait for the rush period you cannot get them, but if you get them earlier you can? - No, I do not agree there. These natives do their own ploughing and they even leave you
leave you so as to go and do their own ploughing. (MR. ILLING):

These natives on the farm, we have to keep that system to
keep them in service until such time as we do start, and we
sometimes have to keep them as long as three or four months,
just for that.

MR. MOSTERT: The labour is really redundant, and you
just keep them for that? - That is so.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Have you had any cases of natives who
are prepared to become labour tenants without keeping any cat-
tle on your lands? - (MR. BRISTOWE): No, there may be iso-
lated cases where natives do not keep cattle, but they go on in
the hope that eventually they will be able to have some cattle.

MR. LUCAS: Admitting that there are a few cases where
they have no cattle, do they get better terms from the farmer
than the others who have cattle? - Better terms, in what way?

Do they get better wages? - No, they do not.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Would it not be worth while paying
them better wages if it were a condition that they had no cattle
?- Yes, certainly it would be worth our while. We have such
cases where we do the ploughing and everything for the natives
ourselves.

Would farmers generally be willing to pay more wages to
natives if they came without cattle? - I do not think that you
can say generally, because there are farmers who work on differ-
cent systems, but there would be a number who would be willing to
do that.

MR. LUCAS: Has any effort been made to get the natives
to come without cattle, but be paid better wages? - I could not
tell you, I have not heard of any effort being made, not in this
district anyhow.

Is it not worth while making an effort at doing it?—
I think it would be worth while, especially on the small farms. On the small farms if a man has to rely on the labour, there (question) it becomes a difficult question./ It is a system well worth trying, both for the Europeans and the natives?—Yes.

DR. FOURIE: Hoeveel families het U op U plaas?—
(MENEER POTGIETER) Ek het ses.

Het U hulle vee ook beperk?—Nee.
Hulle hon net soveel aan as hulle wil?—Ja.
Hoeveel land ploeg hulle per familie— hoeveel akker?—
So omtrent 5 of 5 akkers.

Wat is oor die algemeen die ophoërings per akker in die distrik?—As U mis gee kry U 8, 9 of 10 sakke, maar anders net tusse een en drie per akker.

Hulle gee nie mis nie?—Nee, die kaffers geloo nie aan mis nie.

Hulle se die mis verbrand die grond?—Dit is wat hulle se, of hulle se dat hulle nie tyd het nie; dit is nie hulle grond nie; dit is een van die dinge wat hulle se.

Waar bly die mis van die kaffers?—In die krala: die mis hoaar opgehoop, maar dit word nooit gebruik nie. (MR. BRISTOWE): We have men in this district paying 25/—, and the natives who are working for them are whole-time servants. They live on the farm.

MR. LUCAS: Is it 25/— throughout the year, or during the six months, and more afterwards?— No, that is a fixed wage throughout the year.

MAJOR ANDERSON: And is there a condition then that they do not keep cattle?— No, they keep cattle, but they have to work all the time. (MENEER POTGIETER): Die kaffer wil
vee he. As hyd nie vee het nie, dan beteken hy nik nie.

(MR. BRISTOWE): If a native has cattle he is more satisfied, he is satisfied to remain, and from time immemorial the native has always owned cattle, and they would sooner work for a small wage if they can have cattle than work for a large wage without cattle.

MR. LUCAS: Can you give us any idea how much of the land belonging to the Europeans, what proportion they themselves are working, that is land that can be farmed?—(MR. ILLING): That would be a very difficult question to answer, but in regard to the majority of the farms in this district, I should say that they plough quite one-quarter of it.

Now, taking this district as a whole, do they plough 50 per cent of the land that can be ploughed?—Yes.

More than that?—No, I should say that is about the area which they plough.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by land that can be ploughed?—Arable land.

Do you mean that land which is not too stony to be ploughed?—Certainly, you would not turn over land that is too stoney.

Still, it may be worth ploughing?—I think we have a very fair average in this district.

Is it good soil throughout?—Yes.

If it is worth ploughing it is good land?—Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Are any of these labour tenant contracts written, or are they all oral?—You will not get a native to go to any court of law to sign and bind himself. He will work for you under oral conditions of contract. About three years ago I entered into a contract with these native, and when I said we shall go to the magistrate and sign, everyone
of them refused, but today they are still on the farm under conditions which they said they would not sign. You simply cannot get them to sign.

MAJOR ANDERSON: If it were made compulsory, would it be a good thing?— Undoubtedly it would be a good thing. Are you in favour of it?— Most decidedly I am.

Have you seen the model contract drawn up by the Natal Agricultural Union?— Yes, I think I have, about three years ago. Mine is more or less on the same principle, my agreement with the natives.

MR. MOTTENT: It would be satisfactory all round if it were a signed contract?— Yes, it would certainly make a very big difference to the farming community if there were a universal agreement as between the natives and the Europeans—the European land-owner and his natives. It should be signed before a magistrate, but I think you will find that the natives will be the people who will hold back and refuse to sign a contract, because they will not be bound. Yet, if they have come there to your farm, so far as I am concerned, they will try and carry out that agreement which has been made orally, except where it comes to the children, the working boys; they will very often leave the old man in the lurch, because the old man has no power over the children just now, none whatever.

MR. LUCAS: Do you require the girls to work as well?— Yes.

And the married women?— No.

At what age do you require the children?— From ten years.

Is there much chance for the children in this district to be educated?— Undoubtedly, for those that want to be
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Is not there a general desire here for them to be educated?

There is not.

The boys from ten years upwards could not have had much schooling? Why not, they only work six months in the year.

(Mrs. BRISTOWE): If a native comes to a man and asks to be allowed to live on a farm, the natives will say that the children will work and the young men will work, but the kraal head himself does not work. That is a system which has been started by the natives themselves. The natives are as a rule not willing to work themselves, but they want the children to work.

Do the children get paid, or is the money for the fathers? The children get paid as a rule. (MR. ILLING): They get paid in every instance. I do not know whether you are touching on the matter of the segregation of the natives, or segregation of the Europeans. We are very closely affected through that law, that is the segregation of either one race from the other, and we are very much in favour of that segregation, because we consider that it will not only help the Europeans, but it will also be a help to the natives, in that in those areas where the natives are and where the Europeans are, each of them would be able to work out their own salvation, and we consider that it would certainly be to the benefit of the native more so than it is at present for him living in a haphazard manner, in the way he is doing. If he is segregated the powers that be can look after him in a very much better way than what they are doing at the present time. We think that there is a great danger to the native if he goes on in the way he is doing now, that instead of being an asset to the country -
as he undoubtedly is, or should be - he will become a menace. We consider that the segregation of the natives should be very clearly defined as from the Europeans.

MR. LUDAS: Will you tell us what exactly you mean by segregation? - It means this, to my mind. The country is divided up into two sections - there are the natives and there are the Europeans.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you mean that he will not come to work for you, but he will remain in his own place? - He can come to work for us under certain conditions, of his own free will. We do not want forced labour. Of his own free will he will come to work for us, and he will sell his labour in the dearest market. This matter of having at the present time natives on the farms we avail ourselves of simply because we cannot get the natives on any other system when we require them to do our work on the farm, and therefore we have to put up with it. We have to have them on our farms, and I can assure you that the native has to be well and fairly treated on these farms, so as to enable the farmer to keep that labour. There is no question of treating the natives badly, because if you do, you will be left stranded and we would welcome getting our labour in any other manner, in any other way, because it would cost us less, even if we were to pay the labour at the rate that they are paying in the towns. We would get very much more efficient labour and we would get the right type of labour. Now, I would go further than that. We have perhaps discussed this matter of the native very much more and we have gone right to the root of the trouble of the European and the native. We admit that he has troubles. We admit also that the European has a
lot of trouble, but you are speaking about the cultivation of their lands. Now, it is a strange thing that the natives who do our work and are working on our farms, and are doing good work under our supervision, and very little supervision at times, are doing very well indeed. That very same man goes to his kraal and ploughs his own land. You go there and see the way in which he is doing it - it is not the way in which you have taught him to do it. You ask him "Is this the way I taught you to plough?", and his reply invariably is, "Angsuy umlunga" - "I am not a white man, I am a native", and why should I do my lands, why should I work my lands in the same way as the white people do?" As far as getting manure on to their lands, they do it very seldom. It can rot there, and they will not put it on to their lands until they know it is the right thing to do. But to remedy that evil, this course has suggested itself to us; if the Government wants to remedy that evil it should be done more by indenturing the native to the farmer, and I shall tell you why I say so. We will take the olden days, when the Boers came here, and when the old Voortrekkers came into the country. In those days the Boers had slaves, and those slaves were trained by the people who had caught them. They were well treated. When they were liberated every one of those men that had been trained by their masters hired land and they were absolutely good agriculturists in every sense of the word. They had their own farms. They went in for irrigation schemes, they planted wheat and mealies and everything. As a matter of fact, even in those days, thirty or forty years ago, they were advanced very much more than the ordinary native is at the present time.
You very seldom get to any of their farms but what those men would heartily welcome you to their houses and you would find that they have their natives at work, and look well after them. But those men would invariably have a room there for the European, and no one else occupied that room but the European. He lived even in those days perhaps better - I do not think I am saying very much - but he lived perhaps better than most of the Europeans did. Through his energy he succeeded in making a success of his farm. He would sit down and work hard, and even that man respected the white man very much more than what the ordinary native, the raw native, does today. Now, I think that a lot of the evils could be overcome perhaps by a sort of indenture of the young boys to the Europeans, and perhaps we may succeed in producing a class of natives just as good as their forefathers were. There is no reason why they should not be. I am sorry to say that these very men, I can mention by name, some of them, - I am sorry to say that the sons of these liberated slaves, or very few of these sons, have become the men that their fathers were. They have dropped back again, and they became perhaps just ordinary natives about the streets. If a farm was left to them, that farm was eaten up, and in a few years' time nothing was left of that farm or of anything else.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you refer to natives who were liberated slaves, your history has surely gone wrong. The natives of South Africa were never slaves - the slaves were imported? - I am speaking of natives caught by the old Voortrekkers, who were caught when the Voortrekkers came into the country. There is one of their offspring here in Court now, and I think he will bear me out, and his father was one of the slaves that were caught
by the Boers in the earlier wars.

DR. ROBERTS: Would you not rather use the word indentured?—You can if you like, but it would not be right. I do not think that any of these natives take exception to it. I am perhaps speaking very bluntly, but then you must forgive me, for I am not a politician. I am telling you what has happened, and what is happening. Now, so far as the released areas are concerned, we are entirely opposed to such a thing because we feel that going into released areas will never solve the question. There will always be unrest; where the Government can proclaim a farm and release an area here they can next year proclaim the farm next to it and release an area again, and that will go on and on, and we can never know where the end of these released areas is going to be.

DR. ROBERTS: That was not a proposal?—That is what I understood it to be.

No, the proposal was definitely to delimitate large areas and not go beyond that?—What is the meaning of released areas then? Now, that is one thing which I want to touch upon, and I think that it has possibly slipped out of your evidence and not been brought to your notice before, but when you pass the land that has been hired by natives and a man possibly hires ten acres of land, and he takes ten kraals to live on these ten acres of land, drawing a rental from each of these half-acre places, you will see what happens. You can go only half an hour from here and you will see what is going on. There is nothing that will undermine the native more and that will make him a useless member of the community more than that, it will make him a danger to the European farmers who
are living alongside of him. Now every half-acre has a native kraal on it. They have not in a single instance got sanitary or other arrangements. They simply sit down there and ease themselves in front of the whole community. There has never been a health officer to these places, and I submit to you that it is a danger in every sense of the word and it should immediately have the attention of the Government. Not only on private lands, but also on the farm lands here the same thing is going on and I think it is a very great danger indeed.

(MR. BIRSTOWE): I want to refer to the question of labour on farms. We farmers feel that the best thing for us to do is to have one universal system of contracts. Some three years ago we tried to introduce a system of contracts here to be universally adopted, but it fell through. We would welcome the idea of that being put into practice - the idea of written contracts.

MR. MOSTERT: In other words, you would like it that it should be unlawful for a farmer or a native to enter into anything but a written contract? - Yes.

MR. LUCAS: That applies to labour tenants? - Yes. Do you mean that only for labour tenants? - Yes, a system of written contracts.

MAJOR ANDERSON: To be the same for all? - I personally am in favour of it being the same to all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Even up to the amount of land? - Yes, fix the amount of land and the number of stock they are allowed to run. That can be decided by the Association concerned.

So that a very poor district, with very poor soil, might be given ten acres, and a very fertile district might also get ten acres? - There is that difficulty, but I
think that that would be a matter to be decided by the Association, though the principle of written contracts should be accepted.

MR. MOSTERT: The idea is that never mind the terms, it should be a written contract?—Yes.

It is for the Master and Servants to enter into this contract — and that would be best for both — they should enter into a contract which would be best for both?—Binding on both.

Yes, and therefore you cannot simply say that throughout the contract you have to give so much land or so many head of cattle. The main thing is that you must have the contract, never mind what it may be?—Yes, that is my idea.

MR. LUCAS: Have you heard of any cases of abuse of the terms of contract against the labour tenants in this district?—(MR. ILLING): By masters do you mean?

Yes?—Well, I do not think I have.

Let me put it this way. Do you know of any cases where the farmer has docked days that a tenant has worked, on the ground that the tenant has done something wrong — cases where he has knocked a couple of days off his contract?—I am very pleased to say that I have not heard of that here. I think if you take our farmers in this District you will find them very fair, and they will stick to their agreements as far as they possibly can.

Have you had any cases of natives complaining that they have been forced to do something that was contrary to the agreement which they have entered into?—No, I cannot say that I have heard that.

Have you had any cases in this district where natives
Messrs. Illing and others.
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have boycotted employers and will not go and work for them ?- I do not think so. There may be some people who are boycotted. As a matter of fact, when three years ago I put this limit on the number of stock on my farms, I gave everyone notice to quit. I also wanted to enter into a written agreement and I said to the natives, "If you want to make an agreement with me you can do so, but under the present agreement I could not possibly keep you on." The natives had a meeting, and they did not agree with my proposals, and quite a lot of them left me, but most of them have come back again under that agreement which I suggested to them at the time. I told them that they must reduce their stock or their goats to certain numbers, and I told them that they must sell the surplus, the same as I was doing. I said, "It is better for you to sell the surplus of your stock than to sell the skins, which will inevitably happen if you are overstocked." Natives have come to me since and they have thanked me for having brought them under that agreement. They said, "we thought you were going to bulalak us, but you have done the right thing." Most of them today are selling their cattle instead of having them die on their hands. It is quite true that we have not got a written contract, but they work under that agreement. I have told them, "I see you are in favour of having that contract; well come along to the magistrate with me and sign it," but they will not.

Have they been done down in the past by someone, would that account for it ?- No, they have always been against written contracts.

In some districts the natives have asked us to recommend a written contract because they claim that they have been badly treated ?- I think the boot was more on the other foot.
You said you admit that the native has his troubles. What have you got in mind there, what sort of troubles?—I suppose he has his troubles in the same way as we have others. Everyone has his troubles. If he has no real troubles, he has his imaginary troubles. But he has no more troubles than what we have. He regards his troubles as very serious, just in the same way as we look upon our troubles.

What do you consider his imaginary troubles? Imaginary troubles may give us much difficulty as real ones?—Now you are asking me. If I were thinking of anything that I could tell you now, I would do so. But the natives do think that we oppress them, and I say that that is an imaginary trouble. I do not think that the farmer would oppress the native, it would not pay him to do so. You have to be very friendly with the native on your farm. You have to have confidence in each other if you want him to work for you year after year. If you have no confidence in each other you cannot live on amicable terms.

In what way does he think he is oppressed?—In the first place, he thought that I was oppressing him because I said, "you must not rub more than thirty head of cattle," or when I said, "You must bring your number down to fifteen".

Can you give us another instance?—(MR. BRISTOWE): We had a meeting here in this town last week. The natives consider, and they actually say so, and they made a statement covering the whole of the farming community in this district, that in no case were they paid for any service rendered whatever. That is wrong, and that is one of the troubles which they have not got. There may be isolated cases where they are
not paid in cash, but they are paid in kind.

Can you give us some instances?—Say a man has a big farm here—a labour farm. These farms are mostly in the thorn veld. Those natives are probably living in a large family of twenty members, and the owner of that farm calls on one man to render three or six months' service, for which he does not get paid in cash, but that native forgets that he is entitled to run any number of stock. Then they also say that we charge them for dipping their cattle, but the majority do not charge them for dipping at all.

But some of the farmers do charge them, do they not?—Some farmers do charge them for dipping, but the great majority do not.

Do you know of any cases where the charges are as high as 12/- per month?—No, I do not, and I do not think that that occurs in any one case; as a matter of fact, in this district I am quite sure that it does not.

What is the average charge?—The average charge is about 4/- per annum per head.

MAJOR ANDERSON: We did hear in one district that the dipping was used as a way of discouraging them to increase their stock. The system followed was that they were charged high fees as a deterrent?—Yes, one can understand that; that may be.

MR. LUCAS: And in another place that method was used as a means of evading the Land Act?—That may be, too, but I do not know of any instances like that here. The natives said that farmers used the dip with a view to getting hold of the natives' stock, confiscating their stock. Not one per cent
would do that; and these are imaginary grievances.

If one per cent did it, then it would not be imaginary, but your point is that they generalise?—Well, it is very unfortunate if it ever should happen, but I do not know of it.

(MR. ILLING): In this instance, where you said that 12/6d. was charged for dipping fees, I do not think myself that natives would suffer very much under that. Say for instance a native had 200 head of cattle and he had to pay 12/6d. It would not be so bad. I have natives on my farms here who are paying me a rental and they have in their kraals up to 100 head of cattle, up to 300 or 400 goats, but these farms are abandoned, and they can remain there. I have nothing to do with this. Of course, they sell a lot of skins. But they would not allow me to go there and say, "I limit you in regard to cattle or any other stock." There are other farmers there too. They pay rent. The land is far down, and it would not be policy for us to improve that land.

But do these natives pay dipping fees?—Yes. Where there are natives who have quite a number of cattle that 12/6d. per head per month may not be such a big charge as at first sight it would appear to be.

Where are these farms which you are speaking about?—This side of the Mhlumuyu.

Is that near a native area?—That is adjoining one.

These farms are not owned by natives?—No.

You said that when natives had worked for you and when they went back to their own lands, they fell back on their old ways of farming and did not keep up the methods which you had taught them?—That I am afraid is the general experience.
Do you explain to your natives, when they do a certain thing for you, why they must do it? - Yes, undoubtedly, in every case, and moreover, the native has his own eyes to see why it is done, and where he does not understand a thing, he can always come to me and he always can talk to me freely about his work.

But do you explain things to him? - Yes, I do. I shall give you one instance. I have a lot of lime on the farm, and I may use of that lime, and other farmers in the district also buy it from me. The natives have come and asked me: "what are you going to do with this lime?" and I tell them, "I am going to produce crops out of that land, and good crops, too." I used the lime, and I was lucky enough to produce a very fair crop. Then the natives came to me and said, "Yes, I can now see what you mean; now I can quite agree that you white people are clever, but it is impossible for us black people to follow you."

Did you ask him why not? - Yes, I did, and he simply said, "Well, I am a native, and not a white man."

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do they consider it is too much work? - No, I do not think they consider it as too much work. That is not it, but they say, "We are natives and you are white men, and we cannot do as you do."

They will not try it? - No, they prefer to go back to their old haphazard ways. You can talk to them as much as you like, but they simply say, "We are not white men."
THE REV. KENNETH ADDISON JOHNSON, called and examined:

THE CHAIRMAN: You are of St. Chad's College? - Yes. Which church? - The Church of the Province.

Are you prepared to make a statement? - I was asked by the Joint Council to say something, but I am not really representing them, in so far as I was not a member of the Joint Council, and it only came to my knowledge a little while ago that they wanted me to say something; but so far as the economic side of this enquiry is concerned, I am afraid I have very little to say, except to corroborate many of the statements made by the natives, only from hearsay, because I cannot say that I have been actually on farms. The farmers with whom I am acquainted I know are fair with their natives, but I know there are places where there is a considerable amount of truth with regard to the treatment that they get. The question of the parents working without payment, and the sons of the family receiving 10/-, but more often 5/-, and the girls 2/6d. per month. But, as I say, I cannot definitely say. I know this, that because I am a parson and a missionary I am suspected, except by those farmers who know me, because they think I am taking the side of the native unduly, without considering the whole issue, and they very often think I would be inclined to connive at certain things, of which the native fails to keep track, and that I would be inclined only to consider those points where the native has been badly treated.

I do not think it is necessary to deal with the conditions on the farms, because we have a large number of witnesses who do know the conditions? - There are a large number of natives who appeal to come on to this mission farm, which
which is a 6,000-acre farm. That is how I come into touch with the conditions. When they have been sent up from other farms I either accept them or cannot accept them, depending on whether they can fulfil the conditions on our farm or not. We have about 150 families, which means something like 1,000 natives on a farm, and something like 1200 head of stock: but what I would like to point out is something which probably may not concern this mission at all, and that is the question of exempted natives.

You mean the political rights?— Well, rather the question of where they have failed to carry out the conditions of an exempted native, and whether it would be possible—I know it is under consideration— to expedite the law, or whatever it may be that is under consideration, of them forfeiting that right in cases of natives such as these: I wrote to the Native Affairs Department about a certain boy who had put it across five girls, and in each case we could not get hold of him, because he was an exempted native; that meant a civil action; a civil action meant that these poor natives had to go to lawyers and that the Court could not take it up as a criminal action on its own; they had to go to a lawyer; to me that would be merely throwing money away for nothing. The same with Europeans, it is a civil action. The same with Indians, it is a civil action. But with the native it is a criminal act. This is the reply, after I gave the information to the Native Affairs Department in this particular instance—but there were other cases, too, where we had to simply let things drift:— "I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, and to inform you, as the law stands at present, there is no means of cancelling a letter
of exemption. There is further provision for this in the new Administration Act No. 38 of 1907, which in this respect is not operative. It is anticipate, however, that the power to withdraw a letter of exemption should be granted in the near future, and I shall be glad if you will draw my attention to this case then, in order that it may be decided whether or not he shall be compelled to forego his privileges." The Secretary told me that the law is not yet operative. Does it mean that it never will be, or is there any hope of it becoming operative? And I would like to extend it even to Europeans, as to whether it cannot be made a criminal act, as in the case of natives, instead of only making it a criminal act in the case of a native, who has to go to a lawyer and throw his money away in order to get redress.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a criminal act as regards Europeans.

MR. LUCAS: What is the date of your letter from the Native Affairs Department?—The 11th October, 1928. To revert to another little point— that is, the danger of natives travelling by train. I know the Government have their eyes open; I know they have detectives; but I do not know whether the general public are aware of the danger which they are up against with these card-sharers, who are not only card-sharers but thieves, and who go about probably as exempted natives. A native will have his accomplice; he will keep the man busy trying to point out what the game is, from which he hopes to make some money out of the man, and while he is busy showing him the game his accomplice is already getting hold
of his money, whether he wishes to enter into the game or not. And then they make off down the corridors, and you cannot touch them. I am afraid it is a sort of question of wheels within wheels.

Also, on another point - that is, the large number of native women who go up to the large towns like Johannesburg and make a business of illicit liquor selling ostensibly while they are engaged in domestic work, and the result is that the young boys who go up from here spend practically all their money in these dens, and the women in the local districts suffer because no money is sent home. They then in their turn, because of economic pressure, are obliged to seek work in the towns, just to get pin money. As I say, it is wheels within wheels. It is the women up in Johannesburg who are luring their sons to come and spend their money in these dens, and then their women-folk suffer at home as well. That is really what draws a lot of women to the towns.

I would only like to say that I corroborate much that has been said by the natives - knowing really that there are a large number of exceptions, and that there are a large number of farmers to my knowledge who are absolutely fair and square; but on the whole a native also likes a fair and square deal, and those who are not fair and square are not so negligible in numbers as it may be thought.

DR. ROBERTS: Are you in charge in any way of the industrial work at St. Chad's? - Yes, it is a training college for native teachers; but then I am Principal of that, and am in charge of the farm for natives.

You are not in charge of the industrial part? - We have no industrial part, except that which comes in the syllabus
of the teacher's training. There is a training college in this direction at St. Hilda's.

MAJOR ANDERSON: On this farm of yours, do you limit the number of stock which the natives can carry?— We do not; but if we find large kraals which are tending to very large herds, we have to speak to them to get rid of them; but we got rid of goats two years ago. There were something like 1300 cattle, 1500 goats, 300 donkeys, and something like 30 horses. Well, it made it impossible for the farm to carry it. It is only a 6,000 acre farm. Something had to be done, and the goats were driven off, which gave the cattle a very much better chance of getting through the winter the last two years than they have had for years. I know it is a sore point with the natives, but they are appreciating it today. They have been warned that if the cattle increase too many in individual kraals, they will have to reduce them; but we have made no actual reductions; although it was said the reductions would be made in 1929, we did not make any actual forced reductions.

MR. MOSTERT: Under what conditions do the natives come to you?— They have their four-acre plot to plough, and they generally get what they call isavanda, which means another acre practically; they pay £3 a year for the field, and 4/- per head per year for the dipping.

And do you find that you are getting over-stocked?— Yes.

What is the intention; to what are you going to limit them?— There is no rule about it except when we would have to do it to individual tenants whose herds seem rather large—when we find that the total is too many.
MR. LUCAS: Has that been done yet? - It has been done in the past.

And the reduction taken place? - Yes.

Without any difficulty? - I think not; it was in my predecessor's time where he went to some of the owners of large herds and said, "You will have to reduce a bit."

What is the nature of the complaints on the part of natives who have come to you and made complaints; what is the reason why they have had to leave and come to you? - They say they have not got the facilities for schooling for their children on the farms; the farmers will not let the children go to school.

Is that a prominent complaint? - That is one; I will not say it is so in every case.

But is that a prominent complaint? - Yes, it is one. They say they are tired of being farm labourers where they are obliged to work for a small wage. They do not see of course that there are other facilities on the farms which would count as a wage outside the farm; but that is what they say. I do not say there is unfairness in every case.

MR. MOSTERT: Do you impress upon them this: that they are not only getting the 10/- as wages, but that they are also getting all those privileges? - I cannot actually definitely say I have, but they come to me and ask me whether they can come on my farm; I accept them or not, as the case may be, but I never discuss it.

Do you say to them: "Your mind has to think differently; it is not only the 10/-, but look at all the privileges you have got"? - Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Are there any further grounds for complaint?
They very often speak of the cattle being restricted; that is another complaint; they complain that the farmer has said they have too many cattle, and that goats are not allowed. When they come to us we say they are not allowed here, and that they will have to get rid of them if they can. They say on many farms they have to plough on Sundays - I do not say it applies to a lot of farmers I know; but they say it is absolutely the case on some farms where they have to plough their own fields on Sundays, and plough for the farmer during the week, and that if that is not the case, they are allowed to plough their fields towards the end of the season, when it is very doubtful whether they will get a good crop or not. I think those are the main reasons which they give.

DR. FOURIE: How long have you been in Ladysmith? - Eight years. I was born in Zululand, but came straight back from England to Ladysmith.

MR. LUUS: How many pupils do you have in that school? - There are 180 in the day-school, and between thirty and forty in the intermediate, and about 80 in the college.

The eighty are being trained to be teachers? - Yes.

Is there any difficulty in placing them? - Not very often, no; there are a few cases where they have not been able to get employment, because they cannot get it in the middle of the year; they generally find their posts at the beginning of the year, but occasionally I have had grantees or school guardians writing to me in the middle of the year and I have not been able to find them teachers, because most of them have been placed from the beginning of the year.
Those in the primary school, are they residents of your farm? - They are the only ones who are residents; the others are from outside, with the few exceptions in the intermediate school.

In that intermediate school do they get industrial training? - Yes.

What happens to them as a rule when they finish? - I am afraid they do not get a commercial course - which is only standard VIII, and then go out and find work like any other boy and girl, and very often they have to conceal the fact that they have had a certain smattering of English education.

Why is that? - Because they are told that they do not want an educated native but a raw native.

To which districts would that apply? - In Ladysmith.

So there is a good deal of opposition to educated natives in this district? - Yes - prejudice.

Have you been able to do anything to remove that prejudice? - I cannot say that I can point to anything, except from coming into contact with people; but I cannot point to any definite example that I can give.

---

MR. FREDERICK ARTHUR STEAD, called and examined:

THE CHAIRMAN: You are a pensioner from the Native Affairs Department? - I am.

You are aware of the Terms of Reference of this Commission? - Yes, I have read through them.

Are you prepared to make a statement with regard to any of the matters dealt with therein? - If you question me on any points, I shall be only too pleased. I did not
Ilr. A. Stead.

I anticipate giving any evidence here; I was called away to Newcastle on business, and went hurriedly through the terms of reference.

I understand you represent the Joint Council?—Yes. The Rev. Mr. Turnbull was to have given evidence in the event of my not being able to get back.

Are there any points that the Joint Council wishes to bring before the Commission?—The one point is the migration of natives from the rural to the urban areas. As regards the migration of these natives, it is a very difficult problem to go into—that is, the reasons. One of the main reasons I think is due to poverty; they come into the towns here, or to exist near the towns, to enable themselves to get more money on which to bring up their families. Another is, out in the rural areas they are unable to obtain schooling for their families; they desire to come within touch of the towns for that purpose. Another reason is they are turned off the farms and have nowhere else to go for the time being. They come to the towns, settle down, and become accustomed to the life here, and are loath to go elsewhere, even if opportunities may offer. The endeavour now is presumably to prevent this migration into the towns: but the question is, how to do so. This Council was only formed a few days ago, and has not had an opportunity of going into these matters, as we intended doing, to find some means of combating this. There is no doubt it is very detrimental in many cases to these natives who are coming to reside near the town. They come here with real hopes, and these are intensified when they get near the towns—that is, as regards beer and other matters. Of course, beer is strictly prohibited; they do it, notwithstanding any Regulations to
the contrary prohibiting them. Consequently, there are numerous cases here in the court in connection with this illicit sale of liquor. They are accustomed to having their own liquor at the kraals on the farms, and they think they can do the same here. The women in order to supplement the income of the men, rightly or wrongly resort to this practice of making and selling beer illicitly.

Another matter is the housing question of these same natives. They usually come and approach an Indian landlord in most cases who charges exorbitant rents - as much as £1 a month; that is exorbitant to a native. We all know what they earn. They simply make little shacks out of any material they can rig up, in the way of paraffin tins and anything they can scrape up. These shacks are very often so small that there is no room for the family, and they crowd together to the detriment of their health. That is another matter which should be gone into very carefully.

Another matter was to approach the Government for assistance in having a hostel built for native girls who come in from the farms to seek work in the towns. They go into the towns now and have nowhere to spend the night; it may be they have no friends or relations here, and they put up at any place where they can find accommodation for the night. The police on duty patrolling the streets it may be finds these girls, they are arrested, and put up in the lock-up for the night; the next morning they are brought before the court and are charged with wandering about, without being able to give a satisfactory account of themselves; very often they are quite innocent, as the magistrate soon finds out when enquiring into the case. It does not alter the fact that these girls are very often put to considerable temptation.
It is a matter for the Government to take up, and not the Corporation.

THE CHAIRMAN: You state one of the reasons/which they come into towns is to get more money for the maintenance of their families?—Yes.

Do you think the wages paid in towns are worth more than what they get in kind on the farms?—From our point of view, I should say no; but from the native's point of view I should say, decidedly yes, because natives regard everything in the light of money. If they do not see anything actually representing money in their hand they do not regard anything in kind as equivalent to money; if they have not got the money to buy what they want they ask what the farmer is doing for them; they want the cash.

But the economic condition of the native who has to come into town, buy everything, and pay rent, etc., as against the native who is a tenant on a farm—which of the two is economically better off?—I think myself the native who is residing on the farm; decidedly he is economically better off because he has not the same expenses.

So that when they come into town after more money they are really pursuing the will o' the wisp?—Yes, and that is where I think we should find the means for combating these natives coming into town. There are far too many; I think there must be three times the number of natives in and about the town than there should be.

In this place the Urban Areas Act does not apply?—No.

Do you think, if it were applied, it would improve matters?—I think it would in many instances.

DR. ROBERTS: I put the question to a previous witness
that it is very curious that both the Municipality and your previous Department did not do anything in the way of having, not a hostel, but an office where you could send natives who come in to apply for work? - Yes, I am very glad you have brought that up. That matter has been mooted over and over again, but allowed to fall into abeyance? I do not know for what reason, but that is the case. There has been nobody here to press the matter, and I am very glad to see now that we have a live wire, and I hope something will be done.

In the town? - Yes.

Do you think you will have an office - an exchange office, where natives, both male and female, can come and enquire about work? - For labour?

Form labour? - Yes, we are hoping to very soon; that will be one of the subjects to be brought up at the next meeting.

I suppose it is just indifference that has let it slip? - Yes, that is it - indifference.

MR. MOSTERT: Have you explained to the native his conditions on the farms - that it is better than the conditions in town? - Over and over again - almost daily.

He takes no notice of it? - He certainly does not, because he cannot see from our point of view. As I remarked, unless a native sees the actual money in his hand, he will not regard kind from the same point of view as cash.

Are there any of the educated class amongst the farmers? - The native residing on the farm?

Yes? - I do not think so; there would be very few; they are mostly on the native-owned farms.

MR. LUCAS: The cattle the native has on the farms;
are they of any value to him? - Yes, they are all of value; they are his entire wealth.

That is another matter. They do not produce anything for you worth talking about? - No, but he can see them.

On the whole, do the natives on the farms get much milk from their own cattle? - I should say they get a fair quantity, but there are some things that would be better unsaid regarding the milk question. I will mention this much: on some farms I know it to be a fact that the farmer milks these cows, the cream is retained along with his own, and the milk is handed to the natives: but I am very glad to say those who do that are very much in the minority. The natives as a rule who own a good farm have any quantity of milk.

That is not quite my point, but I am glad you mentioned that: but the cattle are a burden to the farmer? - Exactly.

And they are merely signs of life to the native, but not worth to the native anything like what they cost a farmer? - That is so.

So that really the native economic - his wealth position for use is merely the wage that he gets and the crop that he gets? - That is so.

The evidence we have shows that the crop will be round about ten bags a year? - Yes.

So he gets 10/- a month? - For six months?

For six months, and 10 bags of grain? - Yes.

Comparing that with what he gets in the town, is there much to compare with the farm then, except the fresh air? - Of course, I have not travelled a very great deal, but I have been over most of this district. I think the natives as a rule, however, have not sufficient food of their own, they come to
towns and buy, and then return. For the short periods they work they can buy sufficient food to maintain their kraal for the balance of the year.

But they have to pay a tax, which is two months' wages?—Yes; but we must not lose sight of the fact that these natives for six months are allowed to sell their labour wherever they chose. A very large number from this district go to Johannesburg. In regard to the farms, we issue here on an average 500 outward passes.

DR. ROBERTS: In what period do you issue them?—Right throughout the year.

For the whole year?—Yes; the average is almost the same. I could not help remarking on it over and over again.

MR. LUCAS: Yes, but he earns that money when he is away from the farm?—Yes.

What I am trying to get at is the value to the native—the value that is of any use in assisting him that he gets from the farm as compared with the towns?—The native cannot see it from our point of view. I see your meaning. There is no doubt whatsoever his living on the farm is far more to us than if he lives in the town.

From the figures you have given, I am not satisfied that from the point of view of what he can live on he is better off on the farm than on the town?—We have worked it out here very carefully, and we find that to maintain a kraal of approximately five natives—that is, father, mother and three children—taking the average, that works out at about £10 per annum.

MAJOR ANDERSON: On a farm?—Yes; and out of that he pays roughly in direct taxation about 15/- per annum—that
towns and buy, and then return. For the short periods they work they can buy sufficient food to maintain their kraal for the balance of the year.

But they have to pay a tax, which is two months' wages?—Yes; but we must not lose sight of the fact that these natives for six months are allowed to sell their labour wherever they chose. A very large number from this district go to Johannesburg. In regard to the farms, we issue here on an average 500 outward passes.

DR. ROBERTS: In what period do you issue them?—Right throughout the year.

For the whole year?—Yes; the average is almost the same. I could not help remarking on it over and over again.

MR. LUCAS: Yes, but he earns that money when he is away from the farm?—Yes.

What I am trying to get at is the value to the native—the value that is of any use in assisting him that he gets from the farm as compared with the towns?—The native cannot see it from our point of view. I see your meaning. There is no doubt whatsoever his living on the farm is far more to us than if he lives in the town.

From the figures you have given, I am not satisfied that from the point of view of what he can live on he is better off on the farm than on the town?—We have worked it out here very carefully, and we find that to maintain a kraal of approximately five natives—that is, father, mother and three children—taking the average, that works out at about £10 per annum.

MAJOR ANDERSON: On a farm?—Yes; and out of that he pays roughly in direct taxation about 15/- per annum—that
is on his household goods. Of course, the blankets and so forth cost very little. We reckoned out on the life of the blankets and general clothing that they buy — well, that is only £10.15.0. for a kraal with say five inmates.

MR. LUCAS: Would he get 35/- a month in town? — The wages in town are only from 10/- to 22 a month.

For adults? — Well, that would be adults in a way; from 10/- upwards; it depends on the work the boy is doing.

Yes, but the type of natives who would leave the farm and go into town; would he get between 30/- and 22 ? — A very fair average would be 30/- a month.

That is £18 a year. Of course, he has to pay rent out of that. But is there very much from the money value between the two — leaving out the health point? — There is very little. Of course, in town, taking into consideration that he cannot get a place under I should say £1 a month — 15/- to a £2 a month, well that is £12 off his £18.

Take Estcourt; he would pay 15/- a month for a two-roomed house — that is, £9. a year; he would get his water, lighting and sanitary services? — Yes.

You said you worked out some figures; who worked them out? — They are worked out by the clerks in the office here.

On what basis did you calculate the 15/-? — In direct tax; what he would spend on clothing for himself and children.

What figures were taken for that? — The figures of the value of the goods.

What goods? — Such as the cotton blankets worn by the average kraal native people.

How many did you take? — Two.
Two blankets for the family?—No; say two for the mother—and the children would average about one each; one blanket as a matter of fact would last them two or three years, the way they use them.

Six months was the period given in one district we were in?—It may be they were harder on the wear and tear; but from my experience it is more like two years.

You said you took one year?—Yes.

What is the price of those blankets for the mother?—The blankets would be about 5/- to 10/-.

Each?—Yes.

That is, 5/- tax for those two?—Yes.

And those of the children?—They would be reckoned about the same—about 5/- also. That is on the proportion we worked it out—5/- for the two children, 5/- for the wife, and 5/- for the husband.

That is 15/- straight away?—Yes.

How about other things?—The pots and things almost last a lifetime; we did not take them into consideration.

What about coats, trousers, shirts and boots?—They are very rarely worn in the country; a beast dies and they make what they require from the skin.

DR. ROBERTS: Could you get us at any time—because this is an exceedingly interest/direction of thought—a statement giving for a family say of five—a man, his wife and three children—what you consider would be not only their cost, but how much of that goes back to the Government in revenue?—Yes, I will do that with the greatest of pleasure. .........There is a question of lobolo on which I would like you to question me. That is of course dealing with rural
Mr. F. A. Stead.

MR. LUCAS: Will you say what you wish to say about that?- I do not know if you gentlemen would care to ask me anything on that. I did hear it mentioned that the Government had an idea that this should be done away with. I do not know whether that is correct or not.

We have not heard that; but do you think the lobolo system should be interfered with?-- Should be done away with? Should be interfered with; do you think so?-- No, most decidedly not. I think it would be interfering with the absolute bedrock of native domestic life. Their whole thought and action is lobolo.

Would you say in this district it has developed into purchase?-- No, certainly not; no more in this district than anywhere else: from our point of view it appears to be so, but from the native point of view it is not.

DR. ROBERT: Is it a religious basis?-- Not the ordinary native marriage.

But lobolo; is it a religious ceremony?-- No, there is nothing religious about it - not so far as I am aware; it is merely a native custom.

But from your and my point of view of religion - but what about their religion?-- I think we can almost regard it as a religious practice, because it is a thing of so long standing; it has become part and parcel of the nation.

MR. LUCAS: Have you noticed any changes in regard to lobolo - the method of arranging it, and the payment?-- Yes, there has been considerable alteration in the last few years in the different methods of paying. What I have noticed is they are getting more prone to paying in cash than cattle.
That is developing, is it?—Yes.

Have you come across any instances where it has been entirely money?—Yes.

In this district?—Yes; I had an instance only a week before I left the service, where a man remitted the whole amount of his lobolo, amount of £40.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you think that should be encouraged?—Yes. In many cases now the father-in-law insists on the cattle being paid in cash; the intending husband then has to sell ten head. The father says, "I only want five or six", and the balance in cash. Well, that certainly is helping to get rid of the cattle.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who buys those cattle?—Other natives. In some cases the farmer will buy them if they are in good condition, and send them to the butcher.

For the rest, they are just being handed on from one native to another?—Yes. We have quite a lot of travellers in the district who buy up the stock. I think the natives are getting more prone to selling cattle now than they were a few years back.

MR. LUCAS: You find they are selling their cattle now?—Most certainly. I know a boy employed by a very influential man in this town, he is fully trusted by his employer, and he always comes back with about from ten to twenty head of cattle purchased from natives; that is only about a week's purchase, or it may be even less. That is only one instance out of others.

CHAIRMAN: For slaughter?—Yes, and also ordinary trade cattle, as they call it.

MR. LUCAS: When a native sells the cattle, he does not care what is done with them?—No, it is finished; he does not
care at all what happens to them afterwards.

MR. LUCAS: Are there any natives in this area trading on their own behalf? - Yes.

In what line? - 

MR. STEAD: One as a general dealer, and we have two butchers - in the rural area, of course; I am not referring to the urban area.

The one who has been a general dealer, has he been trading long? - Approximately eight years.

Is he successful? - Well, so far as I can judge, he has; there has never been any complaint; he renews his licence most religiously every year.

And with whom does he trade? - With the natives.

Purely natives? - Entirely, yes.

It is not in a reserve? - No; it is on a native-owned farm.

Is there a large native population round it? - Fairly large, as there is a large population on all these native-owned farms. He does not only get those on the farm; the store happens to be on the main road, and I think he does a fair amount of business with the passing native traffic.

And the butchers, where are they? - They are also on a native-owned farm in the Driefontein area.

Do they slaughter cattle? - Yes; they do not do too well; I think they are practically closed down during the summer months; they have no facilities for keeping the meat; they just kill off small stock, such as goats or sheep; they do not kill off cattle.

And the native produce - how is that traded; is there any trade by the natives in their agricultural produce? - It is very negligible - in fact, I do not think you can see any
that they sell.

Do any of them have to sell for the purpose of raising their tax money? - Yes, they sell whatever they have for raising their tax money, and later on in the season, before the new crops arrive, they have to buy in again at double the figure they sold at. That often happens.

Is there much barter? - With stock and produce?

Yes? - No, very little.

When the stores take over anything from the natives do they pay cash? - Usually they pay in good - but that is not frequent; I think the native as a rule, if he has hides and such like to sell, usually sells to these Indian hawkers, who are fairly numerous; they travel from kraal to kraal and buy up spare hides, and that sort of thing.

The native-owned farms here, are they divided among individuals or are they held the same way as tribal lands are held? - They are divided practically among the individuals - but the land in most cases has been unsurveyed. I am afraid our coming magistrate is going to have a great deal of trouble over it: most of the natives have title, but they do not know where the land is.

Have they a joint or individual title? - Individual.

The Chairman: Undivided? - Yes, undivided. We have had several instances of that, The Assistant Magistrate went out quite recently in connection with a land dispute and he questioned one man of the party and said, "Where is your piece of land?" The man pointed at a different piece shown on the plan, and there was nothing to indicate it. That is quite common, too.

Mr. Lucas: What is the standard of farming of the
natives who have these individual holdings?—I am afraid in most cases very poor. They are beginning to improve now. On the farm Driefontein, of course, the Government have appointed a demonstrator; he has only been there two or three years, and the effect of his teaching there is becoming evident on the adjoining lots.

Do you think the fact that the land is held in undivided ownership affects the improvement of agriculture?—No, I do not; in this way: that with these undivided shares, if the Government or any responsible authority could appoint somebody to supervise and instruct these people generally, I think it would show most marked results. The native demonstrator who is there has not sufficient scope; it wants somebody who would be able to travel over the whole of the district, and not simply over one block of land, like he is doing, and to insist upon their adopting the up-to-date methods. I think it is the ideal place to practise this in, because the soil in that area is very good—in fact, it is the pick of this district; it could be put to better use than it is now.

Are these privately-owned native farms over-stocked?—Very much. The magistrate and I went out to one farm—a farm called "Bertha"; the conditions of over-stocking there are deplorable; I am not at all exaggerating when I say the veld up to the boundary line looks as if a mowing machine had been over it.

And on these privately-owned farms, is the grazing common?—Yes, but there is no fencing to divide off grazing from arable land—at least, nothing to speak of.

Would that prevent those who wish to improve, as far as stocking is concerned, from doing so?—You mean, if it were
Mr. F.A. Stead.

Mr. Stead?

Yes; would that help them?—Yes, most considerably. That has been the suggestion of the Kolwa Tribe—a tribe occupying this land—to have the grazing land separated from the arable land, in order to enable them to develop as they should do.

You mentioned to us an instance of a farmer taking the milk?—Yes.

Are there any other instances of abuse of the labour tenancy system?—Yes, another instance, too—also dealing with cattle; that is, the farmer taking the native's oxen and using them in conjunction with his own for ploughing his lands, and by so doing throwing the native out of the season; the native then has to cultivate at the back end of the season, missing the early rains in most cases. That is one serious abuse; but fortunately instances such as those are rare—but there are cases like that in this district.

Do not they tend to get Europeans generally a bad name?—Well, I do not know; I do not think so; the natives know which Europeans they can trust and which they cannot. But regarding that, such natives have been to my office here to complain, not once—but often, and have asked me what they can do. I said, "You are residing on that man's farm rent free; you have got to work; I have no doubt that is part of your agreement to supply the milk of your cows." He says, "No," I then say, "The only thing is for you to give your then landlord notice and to go on to another farm." He says, "Where can I go; there is no land?" It is the same cry throughout Natal really.

So it is Hobson's choice so far as he is concerned?—
?— Yes; he has to wander about from month to month before
he can settle down again. Some natives I have known have had
to change their kraal sites three times in one year. I suppose
the fault may be on both sides.

You mean three kraal sites on the same farm?— No;
he is allowed by one farmer to go and reside there under cer-
tain conditions. Well, if he does not comply with the condi-
tions, the farmer ejects him; he comes here to complain;
he shows a document: £ "the bearer hereof is ordered to
remove from my farm within three days"; the official writes
back drawing the farmer's attention to the fact that he
cannot turn him off for three months, and that native's life
is made unpleasant in the meantime, and he is practically
pushed off. But that is rather an isolated case I am quoting
where a man has been known to change his place three times
in one year. It is of daily occurrence, natives coming here
to complain that they cannot find a place on which to reside.

Are there any openings in Ladysmith for educated na-
tives?— Not so far as I know. I think the positions for
educated natives are very few and far between. Educated natives
are getting very poor wages, with the exception of one or two
solicitors' clerks. Educated natives in the employ of the
police are only getting police pay — you might call them
well-educated natives — some of them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think the introduction of com-
pulsory written contracts for labour tenants would be an
improvement?— I do.

Would the natives take kindly to that?— No, they
would not. I heard Mr. Illing (?) give evidence. The natives
have an ingrained suspicion in their minds that they are being
got at. I believe even if Mr. Illing brought his natives here
and endeavoured to persuade them, and pointed out the advantage of their signing such a contract, and informing them that this contract was a safeguard to them against the employer who could not go outside it himself, they would say, "No; if he forces us to go to a magistrate we must go, but we are not going to sign this." It is not an isolated district. In previous districts I have been in we have made every endeavour to induce them to sign such a contract.

In connection with the amendment to Act 14 of 1901, there were four farmers in the district I was in who brought their kraal heads to the court to comply with this agreement, but not in one single instance could we persuade them to do it. They have that ingrained idea in their minds that we are trying to get at them.

DR. FOURIE: Which district was that?—Richmond, beyond Maritzburg; I was there for a number of years.

THE CHAIRMAN: If a written contract should be made compulsory, how do you think the natives would react to a law of that nature?—I think once they realised it was entirely for their benefit, it would react in their favour, they would be favourably impressed with it; but it is a thing which could not be brought on drastically straight away; they would have to be given time to think it over. A very good opportunity would be afforded to the magistrate at these meetings of the chiefs; it could be explained there.

MR. MOSTERT: The chiefs are in favour of these contracts?—I think in the majority of cases they are.

MAJOR ANDERSON: In this new joint council you formed; are any farming interests represented on it?—I do
not think so. It is only in its baby stage yet; it was only started this last week. I really do not know anything about it. I have been away. I do not think there are any farming interests on it as a matter of fact. There may be among the eight members, but I would not like to say.

MR. LUCAS: Are the natives in town here much in debt?

? - Not as far as I know.

In the country? - No, I do not think so; there are cases of debt, but I do not think there is a great deal. I know they are in debt for food supplies to various merchants in the town, but they seem to get their money in; there has been no civil litigation over the debts.

They can get credit? - Yes - that is, if he is supported by anybody who knows him and who would vouch for him. There is a small matter with reference to detribalised natives that I thought you gentlemen might like to hear a little about. I do not know exactly what you mean by that - whether a native exempted from native law, or one who has migrated from the country into the town?

THE CHAIRMAN: One who has cut himself loose from the economic assets of his tribe? - In Natal we would hardly regard him as a detribalised native, because he is still under the jurisdiction of his chief. Take a native migrating from the country into this town; he is still under the jurisdiction of the chief; all his allegiance must go to his chief. One of the natives was asking me what you gentlemen meant by "detribalised native" - Kumalo, as a matter of fact; it did not seem that "detribalised" applied to Natal. All these natives are still under the jurisdiction of the chief and are answerable to him for any litigation.
For any civil litigation?—Yes; any coming within the power of the chief. We have matters here daily; a chief will come here and ask us to write to so and so in the employ of a white person and say, "I want that native to attend at my court on such and such a day". That repeatedly happens.

MR. LUCAS: Is the native then forced to attend at the chief's court?—No, but he is liable to contempt of court if he does not attend.

Is the employer obliged to let him go?—No, but a reasonable excuse is always taken; we always make arrangements with the employer, asking him if he can spare the native to attend the court of the chief on such and such a date, and if it is not suitable, another day is arranged.

Is an employer says, "I am not going to let him go at all"?—Then there is a subpoena issued.

You have that power?—Yes.

In practice, in Natal have not you natives who do not recognise any authority of their chiefs?—They are very few and far between, I am glad to say. That is what made me refer to this detribalised question just now, because it seems to me that the natives do not really realise what they are going in for; that is, referring to natives exempt from native law. Firstly, in Natal, they really take out these letters of exemption to enable them to make a will to dispose of their immovable property. Of course, under the Natal Act there is no provision for it. They took out these letters of this exemption enabling them to do it, but this Native Administration Act of 1927 that is no longer necessary; they are able to make their wills. Even those who take them out
under these conditions still regard themselves as members of the tribe. We have approximately 200 detribalised natives in this area, and I do not think there is more than a dozen of them who do not recognise the chief.

MR. LUCAS: When you say 200 detribalised natives, you mean 200 exempted?—Yes, that is the meaning we put on it here.

DR. ROBERTS: I think the word was used more to meet with the general view—a native that has given up all his tribal connections?—Yes, I suppose that is so.

MR. LUCAS: You say there are very few of these in Natal?—Yes, very few; I do not say in Natal generally, but in the districts I have been in there are very few; they are considerably in the minority. The native prefers to keep under his tribal system. I know that is my experience of them all along.

THE CHAIRMAN: But does he continue to enjoy the right of grazing in the location and the right of cultivation?—Yes, just the same as the ordinary tribal native.

But then he is not detribalised?—No.

He has still got some of his tribal assets?—We only regard him as being detribalised through having taken out letters of exemption.

But your exempted native may still continue retaining his right to tribal lands?—Yes, as far as I know he can.

In that case, he is not detribalised?—No; but I do not know as to the ordinary Government locations; I am not in a position to speak as to that, where he can still maintain his rights, because I have had very little to do
with locations. I have not looked at that matter and have nothing to do with it; I have merely gone on with the ordinary rural matters.

THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED AT 3.10 p.m., and

WENT INTO RECESS, to RESUME AT MATITIELE,

ON WEDNESDAY, 29th OCTOBER, 1930.