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NATIVE ECONOMIC COMMISSION

QUEENSTOWN 19th JANUARY 1931 10.5 a.m.

FIFTY-NINTH PUBLIC SITTING

PRESENT:

Dr. J. E. Holloway, (Chairman)
Major W. H. Anderson, Mr. A. W. Mostert,
Dr. H. C. M. Fourie, Dr. A. W. Roberts,
Dr. F. A. W. Lucas, Senator P. W. Le Roux van Niekerk
Mr. G. Faye, (Secretary)

MR. CHARLES MAYNARD MALLETT, called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: You have a list of subjects which we are enquiring into and I understand that you have prepared a statement on some of the points on which you speak more especially. I understand that you are a representative of the Joint Council of Natives and Europeans?—Yes. I should like to say at the outset that those who are prepared to give evidence have been at some disadvantage not to have the aid of the terms of reference provided, and you know that only three copies of this list of subjects were delivered to us on Saturday. Therefore, if preparation was necessary, we have not been able to meet the case through not having the terms of reference. All of us are more or less at a disadvantage, but a document was issued by Mr. Rheinhalt Jones, who is known to all of you, based upon something which was issued by the Commission in June or July last and we have framed evidence upon that document. I think, therefore, that it would be necessary for the Commission to ask us questions rather than that you should expect any prepared statement from us. I may say that I received a copy of this list of subjects on Saturday and I went through it as carefully as I could in the time at my disposal. I do not know whether you wish to question me or whether you wish
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to hear whatever we have to say before putting any questions to us. The Joint Council in Queenstown will be represented also by Archdeacon Roley, by the Rev. Mr. Hodges and by Mr. Matshikisa. So far as the Joint Council is concerned, I may say that there will be a good deal of representation.

In that case, it might be better to take the Joint Council simultaneously, if that suits you?—My own evidence, or rather some of it, might go back a long way and it is rather different from the evidence which the Archdeacon and the Rev. Mr. Hodges will give. They will speak upon certain points which they are well versed on.

In that case, you are appearing here both in the personal and in the representative capacity?—Yes, in rather a general capacity. Now, the first point on which I wish to speak is that of tribal and detribalised Natives. In regard to detribalisation, I do not suppose that I need to say more than that I think that it began really with the introduction of civilising methods, first by the missionary and later on by the trader and others. I think, in this immediate area, detribalisation became more acute in 1878 when the tribes were broken up in that rebellion of Umfanta, Gungubela, Stokenghela and Gegeelo. Those tribes, or rather sections of the Tembu nation, were more or less dispersed. Matanzuma remained loyal and his people retained their land, but the others, that is to say the Chiefs, were all captured or killed and their people were dispersed and they want among the farms or among other tribes and so on.

I think a very serious condition of detribalisation began then. Of course, it had been going on previously but, with the outbreak of Krile and Sandali, this was started. I went through the country with Colonel Weyville and I saw some of the effects of the rebellion and I noticed that there
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was a very serious dispersion there.

The advantages connected with tribal conditions are that the Natives, of course, are at their homes, recognition of chiefs, certain importance and responsibility and the summons to return to the chief was always responded to, so that the power of the chief up to that time was retained in this neighbourhood.

Now, one of the disadvantages, I think, was loyalty to the chief, absolute obedience to his commands however unworthy the man might be. These commands were often capricious and one found that the Natives often sought relief from their chiefs by leaving the tribe. I think the property of the detribalised Native is even more secure than it is under tribalised conditions when he is under his chief, and the detribalised Native and his family are undoubtedly in a condition of greater freedom. On the other hand, a pauper or sick person in a detribalised condition is neglected by his own people.

Then there is the question of economic results and social aspects of detribalisation, the effects on efficiency and earning capacity. Efficiency and earning capacity depend on supervision and upon environment. Native customs, generally, were well based, but they were injuriously affected by witchcraft. So far as lobolo is concerned, that, I understand, is really a protection for the women. Possession of cattle is favoured, but I think also it is the cause of stock thefts in large measure.

Then I come to the question of land, types of tenure and so on, as set out in your list of questions. I may say at once that I think that every Native family should have a home and a recognised head so that labourers could go
to and from. Every labourer, every family should have his own place. This prevails to a large extent, but I think it should all be provided for while land is available.

Squatting on European farms is not allowed in this area, but under certain conditions it might be allowed under well-defined rules and regulations. At the same time, it is liable to abuse by bad men, white and black.

CHAIRMAN: In what sense is the word "Squatting" used here?—I take it, squatting in numbers on a farm, squatting allowed by a farmer on his lands. Of course, there is legislation against that.

You are not referring to people who live on the land and who render a certain amount of service; you are talking of people who squat on the land and pay a certain rental?—Yes, without rendering any other service to the farmer. I think, under certain conditions, that might be allowed. I do not know whether the farmer would favour it, but I think that many Natives would use that privilege reasonably and with benefit to themselves and, from those areas, urban industries would probably benefit by securing a good type of workman. I think there is a tendency to squatting on such places as Lesseyton and Kanaston. Those are mission properties and, as you may know, they were established in 1854. The land was granted, like a number of other farms about here, because of loyalty to the Government. But, some of the original people migrated into the Transkei and other places and their places have been filled up by others who came in and purchased erven and so on. There are a good many landless Natives about and they wander about the country and the towns. That, I may say, will cause serious trouble sooner or later if it is not causing trouble already.

I was speaking to the Commissioner of Lady Frere
the other day and I asked him what became of the Natives who were turned off the farms as the result of the jackal proof fencing and the uses of mechanical machinery and also of the Natives who were not allowed to live in the locations of the towns. His reply to my question was, "Well, we have no room for them but they do find a place. We cannot allot them to any servant or to any land, but they do find a place." I asked him then, "What about the cattle and any stock which they may bring with them?" He said, "Well, they are distributed among the people. So they get in, although there is a considerable amount of congestion already." The late Mr. Weir, fifty years ago remarked to me in St. Marks district, "Look at the abnormal congestion which we have here", that was fifty years ago and that has continued ever since. If you go through the districts of St. Marks, Lady Frere and Cala, you will see that there were too many people already for the land which they could cultivate as long ago as that. Today, there are far many more people and there is too much stock.

The migration, I think, depends on the law of supply and demand. For instance, if suitable labour is offered in a place, a large number of Natives are immediately available. If labour, which the Native likes, should be offered in Queenstown today, any number of Natives could be obtained at once. They are running round the country looking for work now and I can tell you that many of them are in very great need of employment, they are willing to work for a very small wage indeed at anything which they understand.

On the other hand, a Native will live a lifetime in town or on a farm if the occupation on which he is employed happens to suit his idea of comfort and wellbeing. Many of our farmers retain their boys for a lifetime with their families. They like their Natives to do so and they trust
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them. I was speaking to some of our best farmers and
they told me the same thing. They will tell you that
they will leave their best stud stock in charge of the
Natives and they will tell you that they will leave their
houses unlocked and they go right away and leave everything
in charge of the Natives.

CHAIRMAN: The comparison with conditions way
back which you can remember is the type of evidence which
the Commission can naturally only get from a limited number
of older men whose memories will carry them back over many
years. Any points of comparison and particularly any changes
which have come about will be of interest to us, and if you
can bring any such changes to our Notice, they will be of
great use to the Commission?—I have known their neighbour-
hood from here to Tsomo and Maclear for very many years and
I have travelled about a good deal since 1874, and I knew it
well in the Eighties and, in those years, I think the Natives
were in a better condition than they are today. For one
thing, there were not so many of them and the country was
not so overstocked. But the increase has been very great
indeed in the interval and the type of stock taken into the
country has been very inferior. Attempts were made in
those days by one or two merchants whom I could name, to
improve the quality of the sheep by distributing sheep
through the magistrate. Mr. Levy was the first Commissioner
in charge of St. Marks, Tsomo and Xolongo. That would be
somewhere about 1876. That was Mr. J. Levy, who afterwards
became known as Colonel Levy. I had a great deal to do
with him and I saw the influence which he exercised over
the Natives in those days. He took control practically
of the whole of the area, in spite of the chiefs of those
days. I may say that that was before the Rebellion, so
the chiefs were still with their people and were still controlling them, but Col. Levy controlled them all in a very able manner. All he had with him were about a dozen policemen and the Natives themselves, in those days, lived under very comfortable circumstances. Since then, their numbers have increased. Their stock, too, has increased very largely. The stock has become of very inferior quality and the country has become overstocked and tramped out.

The forests, too, have suffered and so has the bush and so we have come to the conditions which you see today. When with Col. Weyville, I had a Native servant with me, he was not a very old man. He told us that he could remember that, between St. Marks and Queenstown, the country was full of dense bush where big game was being hunted. So, the bush was very dense between Imvani and St. Marks in his lifetime and he was not a very old man. All this shows the change that has come about.

What is the position today?— The position today is that the country is very bare except on the European farms. One or two Natives were evicted in those days of the Rebellion and farms were given out to Europeans on this side of the Kei. The Natives were sent away to land which was found for them at Qumbu and at Tsomo. Of course, very many of them objected very strongly to going and I remember attending one or two meetings. I remember Sir John Frost having a meeting. Sir John Frost had been sent to represent the Government and I remember a meeting at Lady Gray where he was sitting at a table which had gold on it which he paid out to the men who were asked to go. If they declined to go they were forced to go. Many of the Natives objected. All that land has been repurchased by the Government. There is a farm called "Glen Adelaide" which belonged to the Chief Pangilla in the
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early days. He sold that farm to a trader for £450. The name of that trader was Baragwanath, and it is after that Baragwanath that your place "Baragwanath" in Johannesburg was named. Pangilla went afterwards to Matatiele, but the Government has repurchased that land and has paid £16,000 for it. And it was a very good thing to do because the Government needed it. 850 families were settled on that farm and the magistrate of the area has told me that there were plenty of people on the waiting list who needed more land.

This denudation of forests in this area, for what purpose was the forest cut down?—For fuel.

And was there no replanting?—No, there was no replanting. Well, there is no water supply. Mr. Harris endeavoured to improve two or three places and the forests at Cofimvaba are protected by the Government and have been so protected for a number of years. But, after all, those are simply small strips which are generally growing to the east of the mountains.

When the indigenous forests will grow there, surely there must have been enough water?—Oh, yes, in those days there was any amount of water, but if you take Lady Frere, there is scarcely a stream running there now. When I was a boy I remember swimming horses there in the streams. There were eight or ten of us and it was a habit of ours to ride into a large pool which was overgrown with reeds and bushes and we used to swim our horses about there. But that is all gone and now I suppose the river is 30 or 40 feet lower than it was and there is scarcely any water at all running there. There is very little provision made in the Territories for the Natives for watering their lands. The nearer you get to the Coast, the deeper the streams and the more difficult to get about, but there are many streams
which could be dammed up and led off in certain areas.

Mr. Harries is doing all he can in the Lady Frere area but, while he is greatly interested in the matter and while he is doing everything in his power to assist the Natives in that respect, he is only one man and it amounts to very little.

The need for irrigation is a new thing; in the olden days the Natives did not irrigate, did they?—No, they did not.

It is the closer settlement of the country which makes it necessary?—Yes, In the past, the Natives did not realise the necessity, but Natives who have been brought up on farms understand the realise the value of irrigation. Still, I may say that, in 1850, many of the chiefs understood the need for irrigation. I went to Matsanzima and I asked him for the right to lead off water for a trader. Well, he recognised that the trader needed the water, but the reply was, "My people need it much more and I cannot take their possession away from them", and the result was that my mind on was fruitless. He realised the need of water and they irrigated from his kraal right down to St. Marks whatever they could. But, of course, this work was done in a very ignorant way, as there was no one to guide them.

Would you say that it was a common practice in those days to irrigate?—Yes. A small stream might be led off, but there was no supervision and there was a good deal of quarrelling. I have spoken to the Natives in those areas and I have asked them why they do not combine and dam up the streams so that the water may be of use to them, but their reply has been that they cannot combine amongst themselves.

In the olden days, was the use of water for irrigation common, or was it only a few exceptional chiefs who did it?
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Wherever there was a bit of land they thought they could cultivate without water, they did so. Of course, wherever they had water, they would make the best use of it they could, according to their knowledge, but their knowledge was not great. That has always prevailed, but it has led to a lot of trouble and quarrelling. Things were not properly organised and the water was not properly dammed up. They had no engineering facilities and no engineering knowledge, that was their trouble.

CHAIRMAN: You referred to jackal-proof fencing. Now, is that jackal-proof fencing displacing many Natives from the farms? - Yes, so I understand. Two or three farmers will be coming here to give evidence before you and they know a great deal more about that subject, but I do understand that, on account of the jackal-proof fencing, fewer Natives are required to herd the cattle. In the olden days, the Native had to stay the whole day long with the cattle to guard against the jackals, but that is no long so today.

You refer to St. Marks as being over-grazed fifty years ago? - Yes.

Is not the term 'over-grazing' somewhat relative? - Well, I might call it over-populated, but they had a good deal of stock of an inferior quality. They had fewer sheep then, but more cattle and, of course, every now and then an epidemic would occur. Tuberculosis was rife in those days and large numbers of cattle were destroyed as a result of it. Cattle died off and there was great mortality on the farms owing to these diseases and there were also many captures of Nijjar stock. Kaffer stock was brought into European areas and distributed among the farmers. Mortality was very great.

That is in the Native Territories? - Yes.

So overgrazing was kept in check by animal diseases? -
Yes. And since then digging was introduced. But today we have the absence of grazing; the grass is trampled out and washed out and the soil is carried away by every flood. There are places which I knew which, every year, without irrigation, produced a good crop of kaffercorn. Today those places are barren and I have noticed the same kind of thing all over the country in those areas.

To what extent is that due to continuous crops on the same ground without fertilization?—There is very little fertilization because the manure is used for fuel. There is no fertilization that I know of in many of those parts.

As far as the cultivated lands are concerned, that may be the cause of their deterioration?—Yes, that and shallow ploughing. You know that the Native ploughs very shallow and then you get a heavy storm and the surface is washed away and the result is that the land deteriorates year by year.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: What wages did the farmers pay to the Natives fifty years ago in this district?—Fifty years ago the wages were nominal; 10/- a month was a regular wage with food.

MR. LUCAS: And what is it now?—I am told that the town wage is 15/- per month.

Yes, the town wage, but you were talking about the farms?—I think, on the farms, it is from 10/- to 25/- a month.

CHAIRMAN: The wage which you gave fifty years ago of 10/- a month, was that for farm labour?—Farm labour generally was 10/- per month. I know something about it in Fort Beaufort too, because I lived there.

DR. ROBERTS: You said that de-tribalisation began mainly in 1879; do you not think that it began much earlier
than that, that is begun after the 1850 war?—Of course, there was great detribalisation then, not only among our own people, but in 1866, among the Basutos. I remember crowds of Basutos going through the country looking for work and settlement. That will be somewhere about 1866. But our own people, in the Fort Beaufort and lower districts, dispersed them, but the Tembus were not dispersed.

But the policy of the Government, in those early days, was to settle large farms, European farms in this district?—Did that not begin in 1852?

I am just saying 1850. Do you not think that that was the main influence in detribalisation, the policy of the Government to shove farms right through the Native Territories?—No, I do not think so, because the Natives had already been driven tribally into the Tembuland area and there was too much land for him then. The Burghersdorp farmers wanted Moneksi evicted from the land below the Nek, but she refused. Her sons, with a few followers, went across the Indwe and then set up their small tribes there.

I was referring to Sir Harry Smith's policy of breaking down the tribes by infiltrating European farmers in between?—These European farms were buffer farms, they were not in between. The farms between the Natives were not given out until after 1880; in Lady Frere and a few in the Territories.

I was talking more of the district lying between here and Fort Beaufort?—Yes. Mkombo, I remember, was very troublesome in the Sixties and his tribe was not really broken up.

Not then?—Not until after his death.

Still, it was broken up. Now you referred to irrigation. Do you not think that the magistrates at that time paid a great deal of attention to irrigation?—I know
that Col. Levy interested himself very greatly in it. He had a very large area, he had three districts: he was the only Magistrate in Tsomo, St. Marks and Xolongo, and he interested himself very greatly on behalf of the Natives. He used to plant fruit trees and give them out if the Natives would only consent to make orchards. That helped a good deal in a small way, but all the same there are very few Native orchards today.

As you know, there are a number of furrows or watercourses there, which come down from 1850?—Yes, wherever they could lead water there did so and I know of a Native who was evicted from one location, who had spent £300 himself upon a furrow. Still, he was compensated, but he went very reluctantly and he had not been disloyal.

You think there was some attention paid by the State as represented by the magistrates to irrigation—more than is the case now?—No, I would not say that, because the magistrates are very good today. The trouble is, the country is more difficult nowadays, there is less water and the soil is very much poorer and inferior. There is one other subject which I know something about, and that is the effect of the credit system upon the Natives. I have been in business for a good many years in Queenstown and I have had a good deal to do with traders in rather a large section of the country. At one time I had a great deal to do with the traders right down to the Coast, between here and Tsomo, and the effect of the credit system to my mind has been to ruin many traders and also many Natives. The traders, very often, are untrained men. They think that, if they have a small amount of money and if they can purchase goods with which to trade, they are provided for. They go into the country and very soon they find that the Native has
comparatively little cash. They begin by taking stock from him as security and they give credit. You find the name of the same Native on the books of all the traders within, perhaps, ten miles of his home and the result is that most of the Natives are in debt to the traders. The traders, in turn, are in debt to the merchants, and so a vicious circle is created through this credit system. And, if that could be prevented, it would help the Native and the European as well. The Native will take credit and he will pay the trader any price for the article that he wants if he can get credit. Some of the Natives have been known to pay six years after incurring a debt. After having been working on their land, they have gone on to a farm and earned wages and, in that way, have been able to pay and they have done so, but these cases are rare and the result of the credit system has been as much as anything to ruin the people. It is infectious and they have to pay so much more.

MR. LUCAS: Do you know much about the indebtedness of the Natives to their employers in this district. I am referring to the farmers? - I know that, if a Native dies and the expenses for the funeral have to be paid, that the money for the funeral is often borrowed from the employer. Very few, I believe, have anything beyond the day's immediate needs, but I do not think that those debts can be very large.

It has been stated in certain parts of South Africa, that the Natives gets into debt to his employer for advances or for taxation or for buying clothing and so on and that, in this way, he becomes in effect a serf and is never able to leave? - I have known of cases where the Natives have borrowed, but these men I know have paid off in perhaps 5/- instalments and they have liquidated the debt
as soon as possible, but I do not know of any case where there is a sort of servitude through it. I have not heard of any such cases.

In this district, are the Natives who are working on the farms given any land to plough?— I do not think that is allowed or encouraged. I cannot speak of any such cases.

Are you able to express an opinion whether the number of landless eese Natives is increasing?— It must be increasing. We have today about 9,000 Natives in Queenstown. They have no land and they are living here. A great many are children. The fathers have no land and that prevails more or less in all the towns and villages.

Now, thinking back thirty or forty years, were there any Natives owning land in this district then?— Yes, there were those farms given out to loyal Natives by the Government after the war of 1882.

Are they still owned by the Natives?— Makongo owns his own farm and several others do. The farms on this side, in one or two instances, still belong to the grantees, but half of them are now occupied by Europeans.

Does that mean owned by Europeans?— Yes.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Could they sell to Europeans?— Yes, those farms could be sold to Europeans.

CHAIRMAN: You say half?— Well, there were not very many granted.

When you say half, is that merely by way of speaking. Have you any more exact idea of the proportion?— I know of only one in real occupation of a descendant of the grantee. And then there are the Lesseyton Natives. That was granted to them. And the Komaston Natives are still in occupation of all their land. And Oxkraal.

Oxkraal and Komaston — were they not given under
a servitude so that they could be used by the Natives alone?—
Yes, that is so.

And Lesseyton had such a servitude too?—Yes, but many Europeans have purchased in Lesseyton—not many, but they have done so in two or three instances. There are instances where Europeans own land in the Native area.

In other cases, there was no such servitude. The cases which you mentioned where there was only one descendant of the original owner— —No, I do not think it was granted under those conditions and if they were not sold, they were occupied by Natives. There is a farm named "Bombani" which was occupied for a long time by Natives, but there is a Native who can give evidence on that. His name is Kula and he will be able to give you very valuable evidence on that point.

In those cases where there was no servitude, you mention one case where the descendant of the original owner is still holding it, but I take it that there are other cases where the land has passed to other Natives?—Yes, I think this Kula is one of them. I think he is on a farm which was one of the original grants.

Have you any idea of the proportion of those farms which are still held by Natives irrespective of whether they are descendants of the original grantees or not?—No, I cannot tell you what the proportion is.

Would the majority have passed into European hands?—I think so. But Kula will know exactly. There are only give or six of them.

MR. LUCAS: Would you say that there is more or less of a tendency on the part of the Natives to go off the farms into the towns now, or is the position the same as it was ten years ago?—There is a tendency, but I would not say that there is an inclination. There is a tendency to
come in in search of work to make a living.

Does that mean that they cannot live on what they earn on the farms, or does it mean that they are turned off? Many of them are not required on the farms and they have to leave. That does not apply to all of them, but to many.

Those who live on the farms, are they staying there contentedly, or is there a desire among them to leave? No, they are quite contented and if they can remain they stay. They have a good deal of liberty and good treatment, they and their families. That is my opinion at any rate.

MAJOR ANDERSON: On this question of detribalisation. I am not clear whether you approve of detribalisation or whether you regret it. Do you think that it is a desirable or an undesirable process?—Well, the chiefs that I have known took so to drink that they often became incapable of ruling their tribe and yet their people remained loyal to them because those chiefs always had advisors who looked after the interests of the tribe as well. We would rather see the people under one responsible head, wherever possible one of their own people.

Do you think it is feasible to do anything towards reestablishing tribal conditions, or do you think it is desirable?—I think the people would welcome it, because even when the chief may be a pauper he has a following and he enjoys great respect. If he refrained from the evil effect of drink, it would be a very good thing for the people.

You think it is possible and desirable to do something towards improving the position and authority of the chiefs?—Well, you see the Native who has been to Johannesburg is more or less a sophisticated Native and, speaking to a recruiter the other day, I put the question whether these people wanted to remain here or whether they
wanted to go to the mines." The reply was that these people speak of the mines as home and that they love it there. If they can have a short holiday at home they are quite happy and they like to go back. So that, so far as these people are concerned, seeing that there are so many thousands of them, it would be a very difficult matter to reestablish tribal authority, in fact it would be almost impossible.

DR. ROBERTS: Would not the Council system do a good deal for the bringing together of the people?—I have attended two or three meetings at which this has been suggested, particularly in the Ovamboland area, and the Natives were unanimously opposed to it. I could not understand exactly why they should be against it, because it is a good system and I think they should adopt it, but the influences among them are too great.

Do you find the same down Wiltzesa way?—It was at Wiltzessa where this one meeting was held and it was there in particular that they were opposed to it.

While we have been travelling round about, a good deal of complaint has been made to us about recruiting, especially in this district, for the sugar estates. Do you know of anything like that?—In this district?

Yes, in this district?—Well, I have not heard of any complaints.

Have you any recruiters here other than those belonging to the recruiting corporations?—No, I think all are connected in some way or another with the recruiting corporation.

You have no separate recruiters?—There are three or four recruiters here and I think they are all connected with the larger establishments.

And do they recruit for Natal?—Yes, for Natal and anywhere, but I understand that the young men and the boys are ready to go anywhere today.
That is due to the lack of money, I suppose?
Yes, it is due to poverty and causes like that.

CHAIRMAN: Was that the cause two years ago?—Yes, I think it existed two years ago.

We have found in various places that the depression has sent out the Natives, the Native labour, very much in excess of what was going out before. Can you say whether that is so here as well?—Yes, I suppose so, because there are so very many sheep owners in this area and the price of wool has dropped so low that they are not able to meet even their very moderate engagements. They are unable to send their children to school for want of money and so they have to borrow from their friends in order to be able to send their children to school. The best Natives, good honest men, have to borrow money so as to keep their children at school, because when the price of wool was good, they sent their children to school and they were able to keep them there, and these children may be just about finishing their education and now they have to borrow money so that they may complete their education.

Now, two years ago, naturally, a very large number of ye Natives from your Native area had to go out to work, but is the position more keen now than it was then, is there a greater pressure on them to go out to work?—Yes, the pressure is keener, but the Natives in this area have always been willing to go do work. If it was a reasonable job, work on the railways or work on dams, scooping or any job which they could do, there were always plenty of Natives available to be drawn from this area.

Take these Natives here, in comparison with the Transkeian Native, is there a tendency with your Queenstown Natives, who have been in touch with Europeans for a longer
time to regard work as a more normal way of spending their life. I may explain what I mean. With regard to the Transkeian Natives, the fact that they have to go away from their homes to work, the fact that they have to go to work on the mine, has led them to this position that, when they come back they want to idle?— If they have the means to live there, I think it is the right thing to do. They enjoy themselves there and it is the right thing for a Native to remain at home if he can do so.

Do the Natives here regard that as a right thing, or do they regard it as the right thing to go to work?— I find that this is the position here, if you have a Native and you offer him work, he will jump at it.

Is that so in this district?— Yes.

Do you think that there is any difference between this district and the Transkei in that respect?— I think it is easier to get your Native labour in a place like this than it is in the Transkei. You see, there they have their comfortable homes and things like that, and it is only in conditions of drought that they are driven out, but here they are ready to go out.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you think that that accounts for the low wages here?— Do you think that the wages here are lower than elsewhere?

I think so?— There are plenty of Natives here. I have been saying freely that, if I wanted a thousand Natives for a job, I could get them in three or four days at anytime, that is if the job is a suitable one.

Could you get them at any wage?— At the prevailing wage.

MR. LUCAS: You mentioned the wage at Queenstown as 15/- per week?— Yes, that is the wage for those engaged in the town, in the shops or in the Municipality, but there are
others as well who go up to as much as 25/- per week.

Would that be with or without food? - That would be without food.

And without lodging? - Yes, without lodging.

That would be just the wage? - Yes, I asked a Native, a secretary of some of these societies, what the average would be. He will be giving evidence before you. He said the average would be 15/- and up to 25/- per week. I should just like to say this, that the Chairman of the Committee of the Native Section of the Cape Town Council was here a short while ago, and I took him through the location and, while we were there, he went through some of the houses and he took the Superintendent of the location with him and, when they came away he said, "You know, there is a very different spirit in this location than there is in Cape Town, in the Cape Town location. There is a very much better spirit here." He said, "It is dangerous in Cape Town, but here you seem to be working together harmoniously."

SENATOR VAN NISSEKKE: And then you have the local people here, home people here. In Cape Town you have them from everywhere? - Yes, that is so.
Native Witnesses:

1) ROBERT JAYIYA, (Cathcart)
2) GORDON SODIDI, " called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: Can you tell us what is the prevailing rate of wages that the majority of Natives get in the town of Cathcart - the town labourers? (Mr. Jayiya): There are different salaries the boys get for work in town.

But there will be one rate which a very large number of boys get?- Some get £2 a month and others £1 a month; the majority of them get £2 a month.

Do they get paid monthly or weekly?- Some are paid weekly and others monthly.

What is the most common way of paying them - weekly or monthly?- They are mostly paid weekly.

How much do they get a week?- 10/-.

When you say £2 a month, do you reckon that as 10/- a week? - That is so.

Can you tell us what is the lowest wage you know of that is paid to a grown-up Native working in Cathcart? - The least I have heard of is 10/- a week for grown-up male persons.

There are young boys who earn less than 10/-, and for grown-ups the least I have heard of is 10/-.

When you say £1 a month, you mean £1 a month?- Yes.

When you were referring to £1 a month, you were referring to boys?- Yes. Perhaps for a week they would get 5/- or so.

On what conditions are they allowed to live in the Cathcart location?- If you have your own hut in the location, you have to pay 6/6d a quarter as rent.

Do they hire houses from the Municipality?- Yes.

What do they pay?- Some of the houses they hire from the Council at 10/-, and others at 15/-.

The 10/- a month house, how big is that? - Just the ordinary small house with two rooms.
För 10/-? — Yes.
And for 15/-? — The rooms are a bit smaller than the 10/- ones, but the houses have three rooms.
Are there houses with only one room? — No.
For the payment that you make, do you get water and sanitary services? — Yes.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Do you get light? — No, no light.

Have the streets in the location no lights? — No, there are no lights in the location streets.

When you spoke about £2 a month — that is 10/- a week, is that without food? — Yes, that is without food.

Are the domestic servants employed in Cathcart, males or females? — They are females; there are also male persons.

And what do they get respectively? — The women receive from 10/- or 15/- up to £1 a month.

And the males? — Most of the male persons get £1 a month for doing domestic duties.

With food? — Yes, they get food also from their masters.

DR. FOURSIE: And lodging? — Yes.

MR. MOSTERT: Did you say that some get up to £2 a month for house service? — Yes, they prefer getting the £2 at the end of the month instead of the 10/- at the end of the week.

You did not quite understand me. I understood you to say that some of the houseboys get up to £2 a month and their food? — Yes, that is so.

DR. ROBERTS: What do you mean by houseboys — they are working for ordinary houses, or hotels? — In the hotels and also in some of the residences or homesteads in the town.

MR. MOSTERT: They get up to £2 with their food? — Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Are there many who get more than £1? — No, there are not very many.

CHAIRMAN: Why do some get the higher wage? — If the
master likes him very much he gives one more than the others, if he is satisfied with the work and so on. If he does his work satisfactorily and so on he gets more than the other boys.

So that £2 is paid to the boy who has been with the same employer for a long time?—Yes.

Do you find that Natives move into the town from the farms?—Yes, sir.

Is there a great deal of that?—Yes, sir.

What effect has that on the people normally living in the location?—It is difficult to find work.

Do they find it makes it difficult for them to get higher wages because there are so many of them asking for work?—That is so.

Why do these Natives move in from the farms to the towns?—They have some squabbles on the farm and they just leave the farm and come into town.

(Mr. Sodidi): The reason why I think these people are always flying into town to see if they cannot find any work is because they have no place of their own to stay in; that is why they are always going to the towns and running from one town to the other.

Do you find difficulty in getting employment from the farmers?—It is not actually very difficult; some of them find work on the farms, while others cannot.

Is the work more difficult to find now among the farmers than it was a few years back?—Yes.

Can you give any reason why that is so?—Some of these people have families, they go to these farms and the farmers say they cannot hire them because of the family. Others again have small families and the farmers prefer them to those with large families.

Does that mean there is no work for the children or the children are too young to work?—Some of these children are too small to work and some of the youngsters who are grown up
are sometimes hired on the farm for little odd jobs about the yard and so forth, but most of them are not hired.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: But why does the farmer object to those with large families? - I do not know; that is amongst the farmers. I do not know why they do not want them.

Are you quite sure on that point, because generally it is the other way about; usually the farmer likes a Native with a large family to come on his farm? - Some of these farmers prefer people with large families, while others again prefer them with small families. It is according to the farmer's own will. Some of them have a lot of work to do and they prefer a large family; some cannot pay too much so they just hire those boys with small families.

CHAIRMAN: What were the view that the people who sent you wanted you to put forward about wages? - (Mr. Jayiya): They sent me to see whether I could not have the wages increased.

The wages that were mentioned were 10/- a week; those are the wages of the men. Are they added to by the women and children earning money? - Yes, there are some of them; the women are also working and some of the children.

Can you tell us about how much the rest of the usual family can earn in a month? - If a man has one wife and, say, one child working, the two of them would earn about 15/- a month.

Between them? - Yes.

So that would mean a total wage for that family of somewhere round about £2.15/- a month? - That is so.

Could we take that as being the income of most of the Native families in Cathcart? - Yes.

Did your people ask you to come along here and say that that was not enough; that they wanted more? - Yes.

Now, what is it that they cannot do now on their wages, that they think they ought to be able to do? - They think that they will be out of debt and will be able to pay
their rent every month and will have better food.

Are many of the Natives in debt now?— I do not know; I see that the Messenger comes into the location practically every day and brings 'summons.'

Was there a meeting of the Native people of the town to appoint you as their representative?— Yes.

Well, was there any discussion on this question as to what you were to say about wages?— Yes.

What was the nature of that discussion, what were the points that were made?— Those were the three points chiefly discussed, viz:— debt, food and then the paying up of the rent.

Does that mean that they are not getting enough food?— Yes, sir, they do not get enough food.

Are they allowed to keep cattle?— Some of them are not allowed to keep cattle, while others are allowed to keep one beast only, — a cow.

Why are some not allowed at all?— Persons who have not their own residence in the location are not allowed to keep stock.

And those that have their own residences are allowed to keep one, is that correct?— Yes, one cow.

Are those who keep no cattle able to provide milk for their children?— Yes, they have to buy the milk.

How much do they have to pay there?— 3d a bottle.

Can many afford that out of their wages?— It is very difficult to buy the milk on the wages that they receive.

What sort of bottle is it that they pay 3d for — a long black bottle, or a small milk bottle?— Yes, the ordinary sized bottle which the White man buys liquor in.

MR. MOSTERT: You got your instructions from the committee. Did they classify the educated Native, the semi-educated Native and the raw Native, as far as the wages are concerned?— No, they did not classify them.
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What did they discuss, what wages do they think they should get in order to come out?- They did not actually discuss what wages they should receive, they only just discussed the matter of increasing the wages.

Their discussion was all Natives, whether educated, semi-educated or raw, should receive the same money?- It is mostly that they want the raw Natives' wages increased.

Not the educated Natives?- They did not say anything about the educated Natives.

Do they think it should be a flat rate for all?- It is very difficult to say, because some of these educated Natives can do nothing with their education; others again are educated in such a way that they can do something with their education.

Do you mean that an educated Native cannot work?- No. I mean you can see that the work of the educated Native is according to his education, but others again only have a small education; they can only read a small letter and write a couple of names and so forth. You can see that they are unable to do the same work, as far as the education part is concerned.

MR. LUCAS: You also, in your list, Mr. Jayiya, have wages; you are representing them in connection with their wages. What were you asked to represent about that?- (Mr. Sodidi): They are not receiving enough money on which to live in a way in which they desire. They cannot get enough food and so on. The things they have to buy are so expensive and they do not get enough money.

Have the wages in your area increased in the last ten years?- Some of them do not get the money they got ten years ago, but some of them still get the money they got ten years ago.

Could you go farther back and say before the Big War; what were the wages? About the same as they are now, or less
or more than they are now?— The wages they receive today are little more than the wages they received, say, twenty years ago, before the Great War.

When you say "a little", how much is that?— That is according to the agreements these Natives enter into; some get 10/-, others 15/- and others 18/- up to £1; some of them get a little more than others.

CHAIRMAN: For what period is that — a week or a month?— That is a week.

MR. LUCAS: Those that are getting 10/- a week now, how much would they have got twenty years ago, say, for the same sort of work?— Some of them, before the War, were hired at 1/6d a day.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: What do they get a day now?— Some of them receive 2/-, others 2/6d and others 3/- a day.

MR. LUCAS: Now, your Gotion Mission Station, is that in Cathcart town?— It is outside of the town.

Is it in a farming district?— Yes.

Are there Natives working for the mission station for wages, or do the Natives at the station go out to work on the farms?— Some of them go out to the town to work and others hire themselves on farms just for a day or so: they do not hire themselves as monthly servants.

And those who go and work on the farms by the day, how much do they get?— Some of them get 2/- and others are paid 2/6d a day.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Do they get any food?— No, they have to supply their own food.

MR. LUCAS: Do they get work for any long period, ten, twenty or thirty days at that wage, or is it only just for odd days?— Some of them work for two weeks and others for three weeks at these wages.

Do you know what the farm labourers who live on the farms in Cathcart district get?— They receive different
wages: some receive 10/-, some 15/- and others 18/- to
A week or a month? - Per month.
CHAIRMAN: With food? - They receive food too.
SENATOR VAN NISPERK: Have they other privileges; are they allowed to keep sheep and cattle? - Yes, they are allowed to run a certain number of stock on the farm.
MR. LUCAS: Are they given any land to farm for themselves? - Some of the farmers give their boys a certain small piece of land to plough for themselves, while other farmers do not.

In this statement, it says you are going to speak about land; what was it you wanted to say about that? - The pieces of land that they get are very small and they would like a bigger piece of land.

Are you talking now about land in the town location or land on the farms? - I am talking of the Mission lands.

How much is the usual tenant able to grow on the plot that he gets? - Most of them have about a morgen and some odd square roods; it is very hard to get a bag of seed from it on account of the drought.

Who do you get this land from - from the Mission? - The Mission people have their own lands; our lands are separate from the Mission.

On whose behalf are you speaking about this morgen of land not being sufficient? - I am speaking on behalf of the people who live at the school - not the Mission people.

CHAIRMAN: Not the White people, do you mean; are you speaking on behalf of the Mission? - I am speaking of the whole of the Mission residents. I am speaking on behalf of the people who stay there - not the Church people.

MR. LUCAS: Does the Mission allow people not connected with the Mission, to hire land on its reserve? - Some of them hire land there and others do not. Take the
person who resides in the place and say a person who comes there with cattle; the person who stays in the Mission has no cattle; these cattle are run there on behalf of the visitor by the person who resides in the Mission, and then this other person helps him to plough his land and perhaps gives him a share out of the land.

How many Natives are there on this reserve?— There are many there; I am not sure of the number.

Do many of them have more than a morgen?— Yes, there are some who have more than a morgen.

What is the largest that anybody has?— The largest is about two morgen and five acres.

What was it you wanted to state about land?— (Mr. Jayiya): I was not asked to say anything.

MR. MOSTERT: The land that you are referring to now is all Mission land?— (Mr. Sodidi): Yes.

It is vested in the Mission Station, it is not Government ground?— It is land that used to belong to the Mission; it has now been cut off and divided between the people who stay there now. They each have their own piece of land.

Have they got transfer of the land?— Yes.

The Mission sold that land to them?— They did not buy this land; when this ground was divided up they went and each got a piece of land.

They merely leased the ground?— Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Do they have to pay something each year for that plot?— Yes.

MR. MOSTERT: How much?— Some of them pay 10/- and others pay 15/-.

SENATOR VAN NIKKERK: Is the 15/- payable by the man with two wives?— No, sir; this is a person generally with one wife.

CHAIRMAN: Why do some pay 15/- and others
Some of them have water on their land, that is why they pay 15/- Others pay only 10/-.

MR. MOSTERT: How many plots are leased in that way generally, all over the Mission reserve? Between 80 and 100; I am not sure of the exact number.

Do you know how many of those have water? The majority of them have water.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Are they making use of this water for irrigating their crops? Yes.

What do they grow? Some of them grow wheat and others oats, just according to what they want.

CHAIRMAN: Can you plant a bag of seed on this land, or do you only get a bag of crop? I was speaking of reaping a bag. These people who have no water on their lands, would reap a bag and some of them may reap two bags.

MR. MOSTERT: What would they reap on the watered lands? From five to ten bags from the irrigated lands.

That is wheat? Yes, if he only sows wheat, but most of them sow other things too.

If you sow wheat, a morgen of ground will take one bag of wheat; you will sow one bag of wheat. Will you only reap five or six bags from land under water? If there is enough water, you will get more than five bags.

What would you get - ten bags? Sometimes the water gives out and then ----

Never mind that. Do they sometimes reap as many as ten bags per morgen? If there is sufficient water you can get more than ten bags from it.

MR. LUCAS: Were there any other points that your meeting asked you to bring up? In connection with the education of the children in the location, we would like to know whether the Council would not meet them by giving us some money for the education of the children in the location.
For what purposes have you not enough money?— We have not enough money as it is now and they cannot see their way clear to put their own money together to have these children educated and would like the Council to help them.

SENIOR VAN NIEKERK: Of what are you short in connection with education— cannot you find teachers, or what is the difficulty?— The education stops at the fifth or sixth book, and they would like them to go a little higher than that.

CHAIRMAN: Are the majority of the children carried on to Standard V or VI?— Yes.

Do the wives of people who live in the location go out to domestic service?— (Mr. Sodidi): In Cathcart they do.

Do you experience any difficulty when the wife is away with regard to looking after small children?— Yes, sir.

How they get over that difficulty at present?— The women have to leave their work and attend to the children at home when the child is still very small.

The women can only go to work when the child is capable of being left alone?— Yes.

You mentioned £1 as a wage for a piccanin; do all piccanines get £1?— No.

What is the lowest wage that is paid to a piccanin?— 5/-.

MR. LUCAS: A month?— A month.

CHAIRMAN: That is according to their age; they get from 5/- to £1 a month?— Yes, sir.

Do the young girls go out to work?— Yes, sir.

What wages do they get?— Some get 10/- a month, some get 15/- and others 18/-, and some of the bigger ones get £1.

Do not some of them get less than 10/-?— Yes, the smaller ones get less than 10/-. What is the lowest wage?— 7/-.
So the girls get more than the pioscanins? - Yes, because they look after the children; they are nursemaids.  
DR. ROBERTS: Do you mean, they work longer? - Yes, they work longer than the pioscanins.  
CHAIRMAN: Do they get food with their wages? - Yes, the girls get food and some of the boys get food, but not all of them.

What would be the lowest wage that a married woman would get who goes out to work? - 10/- or 12/- is the least a married woman would get a month.  

You said a family consisting of the husband, the wife and one child would get £2.15.- That does not seem to add up properly; £2 for the man, 10/- or 12/- for the woman, and 6/- for the pioscanin, were the lowest wage that they would get would be £2.15.- if they all worked? - That is so.

Some of them would get more than that when the three were working? - Yes, the bigger the family, the more they would get.

No. If there are only three working? - I do not know it is very difficult to find work sometimes.  

But if the three do find work, there must be some families who get more than £2.15.-, according to your own evidence? - Yes.

Do the women sometimes take in washing for the White people? - Yes.

How do they get paid for that? - Some of them get 1/6d a bundle and food for the day they are washing.

Do they take in washing for more than one family? - They generally take washing from one family.

One family only? - Yes.

So then they get only 1/6d a week with their food? - Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: But for how many days with the women do this bundle of washing - one day or two days? - Some of them take one day and some two days.

When they take two days, do they get twice 1/6d? - I
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am not sure of that, but I think they do not, because it is only the one bundle and it is their own fault if they do not finish that in one day.

Are there any women who get that sum a month to do the washing of the family? - There are some who receive money at the end of the month for the washing.

CHAIRMAN: How much? - They say they get 10/- a month, I have asked them.

And those women who take in only one bundle of washing, what do they do during the remaining days of the week? - They sit at home.

They do not earn any other money? - No.

Is that because there is not enough washing, that they only get two bundles a week? - Yes, there is not enough washing.

DR. ROBERTS: It seems to me impossible that a woman would wash and dry and iron a bundle of clothing in one day? - (No answer)

Are you living in the location? - (Mr. Jayiya): Yes.

How big is your family? - There is myself, my wife, three daughters and a son.

A big son or a small son? - A son of seven years of age.

Will you tell the Commission what they earn? - I do not work; I am old.

What is your age? - 70, sir.

What do you do all the time; do you sit at home and drink beer? - I do not take liquor.

What do you do - nothing? - I just preach on Sundays.

Do you get paid for preaching? - No.

You get nothing? - No.

How do you exist then; who provides for your wife and children? - The Government help me.

What does the Government give you, a pension? - Four pounds a month.
(Chairman: He is a Headman)

Do your children work or not?—Sometimes they work and sometimes they do not.

CHAIRMAN: Does the woman who does the washing for 1/6d have to iron the clothes too?—Some of them have to do iron the washing as well for the 1/6d, while the others just have to do the washing.

Do the others get paid extra for doing the ironing?—Some of them have to iron for 1/6d and do the washing as well, and those who do not iron, and those who do not iron do not iron at other places either; other women take on the ironing.

DR. ROBERTS: That would be the servants who would take on the ironing.

MAJOR ANDERSON: With regard to wages; do you find you can buy things now cheaper than you were able to do say three or four years ago?—No, we have to pay more now than what we paid a couple of years ago.

You would not have to pay more for mealies, would you?—Sometimes the price of mealies is up and at other times it is down again.

What things do you have to pay more for?—Clothing, sir.

Anything else — any food?—The food is more or less the same; the smaller things are practically the same, but it is mostly clothing that has gone up in price.

MR. LUCAS: Do you use more or fewer blankets than you used to?—At one time, a male person used to use three blankets but it is very difficult now to use three blankets.

What do you mean by "very difficult"?—It is difficult to buy three blankets.

Why is that?—The price is up.

Does that mean that you try to come out on two where you used to use three?—Yes.

THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED AT 12.50 p.m. until 2.15 p.m.
MENEER WILLEM ADOLPH LANDMAN (OPGEROEPE EN ONDERVRAA):

VOOR SITTER: Ons verteen daar is sekere punte wat U onder ons aandag wens te bring?-- Ek wil net kortelike duidelik maak wat die boerdery toestande in hierdie distrik is, virnamelik wat betref natuurlike arbeid. Ons boerdery is gemengde boerdery, dit wil se ons boer met skape, beeste en landbou en ons is baie afhankelik van natuurlike arbeid. Wat betref die kwessie van loon, ons betaal die natuurlike van af 10/- tot op £1 per maand, án in party gevalle selfs 'n bietjie meer. En by dit gee ons vir hulle nog ander voorregte; byvoorbeeld, hulle word toegelaat om skape te hou en ook beeste; in die meeste gevalle is dit beeste wat hulle aanhou. Soos U miskien weet, daar is ou volk wat lang al by die boere gebly het en daardie mense koop in baie gevalle vir hulle self beeste wat hulle aanhou op die boereplaa.

DR. FOURIE: Word daar beperkings gestel op die aantal beeste wat hulle toegelaat word om aan te hou?-- Ja, as ons sien dat die beeste word te baie dan se ons vir hul "nee, julle kan nou nie meer hou nie", maar meestal sien die naturelle die vir hul self en dan kom hulle by die boer en dan se hul ons moet plan mask en probeer party van die beeste vir hulle verkoop. Ons doen dit meestal vir hulle of ons mask 'n plan hoe te maak om vir hul te help. Soos ek gese het, dit is gemengde boerderie by ons en landbou speel nie so'n groot rol nie as wat dit op ander dele doen. Maar ons het nou en dan te kamp met groot droogtes. Ons groot werk is nou dit-- ons moet altyd sterk en klaar wees vir die droogte. Ons het natuurlik baie vee en ons moet altyd klaar wees wanneer die droogtes kom om vir die vee te verkoop of anders om weiding vir hul te vind, maar ek kan se ons het altyd goeie markte vir ons vee. Ek is 'n gewoon boer op die plaas en ek het baie ondervinding gehad van naturelle sake; ek het tussa hulle in geboer. Ek het ondervinding van die sisteem van op helfte saai, maar van 1919 tot 'n paar jare gelede was my plaas 'n grens plaas gewees; ê
Ek is bekend met hul skut-sisteme; maar ek was op die grens gewees; hulle noem dit "heuws" (?). Dit beteken hulle is almal afgeskei in lokasies, en ek weet dit maar net aan om dit te se: as wil weet of die naturel vooruit of agteruit gegaan het in verband met landbou, met boerdery, dan kan ek bealsie se hy het agteruit gegaan.

VOORSITTER: Praat U nou van die boerdery wat die naturel vir hulle self doen?—Ja; die witman se boerdery het baie vooruit gegaan.

MNR. LUCAS: Waarom het die naturel se boerdery so agteruit gegaan?—Omdat hulle nie sorg vir die droogtes nie. En hulle trap die veld so uit dat dit altyd minderwerdig word, en dit het die nie meer draagkrag nie wat dit gehad het. Die gevolg is dat hulle nou met die prul beeste—wat die Engelsman se "scrub cattle"—boer. Hulle kan glad nie met die allerbeste beeste boer nie, want die goeie ras beeste is nie tasi genoeg om die kondisies te weerstaan. Dan is daar ook nie voorziening gemaak nie teen verspoeling van die veld, en in die meeste gevalle goed die land self die vee af. Elke maal as daar 'n droogte kom—ek praat nou selfs nie van die ernstige droogtes nie, maar net van die klein droogtes—dan verloor hulle baie van hul vee. Tien jaar gelede het ons nooit donkeys daar gesien nie; in die dae het hulle nog pragtige osse gehad; vandaag is daar honderde donkeys en die pragtige osse het hulle verkop; die osse kan daar nie meer leef nie, maar die donkey kan ooral leef; hy eet enig ding wat op die veld is.

MEENEER MOSTERT: Wat maak hulle met die donkeys?—Hulle ploeg met hom en hulle ry 'n bietjie transport, maar in die laaste jare ry hulle ook nie so baie transport meer, want die motor lorries het ingekom en het daar die betrekking van hulle ingeneem; so dit is nie meer so nie.

VOORSITTER: Is daar ander tekens van agteruitgang behalwe
die grond verspoel? -- ja, daar is; ek wil net dit se -- die ander teken is dat die veld baie minderwerdig geword het; as mens vandag die veld sien, dan vind hy daar die renoster bossies en ander bossies / van diéselfde soort; die gras wat vroeger goed gegroei het word nou baie skaars en waar vroeger goeie vee was gewees, daar kry mens dit vandag nie meer nie. Vandag is dinge heelmaal anders geword. En die water het duer al die dinge ook baie skaarser geword; vandag moet hulle ver trek met die vee om by die water te kom; hulle moet die vee myle lang jaag om by die water te kom en in die and moet die vee in die kraal ingebring word; hulle trap die veil af en hulle trap op die manier die gras uit. Daar is 'n lokasie by my in die buurt; daardie loka-
sie is 3,000 morg groot; op daardie 3,000 morg het hulle 93 erwe waarvir hul elk 15 per erf betaal. Dan betaal hulle 10/- vir hut belasting en 5/- vir die land. Daar het hulle 93 erwe. Daar is net 'n klein klompie van hulle wat vee besit en wat 'n bietjie ryk is; die meeste van die natuurlike daar het maar net 'n klein klompie beeste. Maar die veld is verskriklik uitge-
trap; waar in die ou dae die gras mooi gestaan het, daar is dit alles nou platgetrap; waar eers glad nie slot nie was nie, waar die land mooi gele het, daar le die slotie nou langs mekaar.

Dit is baie ernstig, en dit is om die rede waarom ek dit nou aan die hand wil gee: Die berg veld en die moes veld behoër van elkaar afgesny te word, sodat hulle nie tegelyk gebruik sal word en nie so afgetrap sal word nie. As dit kon gedoen word dan sou die toestand nie so wees nie. Maar nou moet die vee van die een kant na die ander trek en nou word alles afgetrap en die gras word uitgetrap. Die vee trek myle ver van die een kant na die ander en alles word afgetrap. As die twee dele afgeskei sou word dan sou die vee gedurende een deel van die jaar op die een deel kan bly en gedurende die ander deel van die jaar op die ander stuk land kan bly.
Is daar water genoeg in die berge sodat die vee daar ses maande kan gehou word? Ja, die fonteine daar was eers sterk, maar hulle is nou swak; maar hulle sal weer sterk word. Maar vandag word die vee elke aand na die kraal gejaag en hulle ruineer alles waar hulle oor loop. Nou 'n ander ongewenste toestand is dat in die lokasies is dit in ons lokasies sal mense dit sien en ek kan dit nie wegsteek nie--- die gelerde kaffers, die kaffers wat opgevoed is en skool toe gewees is, is vandag in vee die armste, maar dit is die ongelerde kaffers wat die rykte is wat betref die besitting van vee.

Is dit in prul beeste dat hulle die rykte is? Nie allee in prul beeste--- in skape; dit is nie so erg nie in beeste, maar viral in skape. Nou gebeur dit so, dat die ryk kaffers die vee laat intrek in die aangrenzende lokasies; die vee kom uit die lande uit en trek in die lokasies in en die kaffers keer dit nie. Ek weet van 'n geval waar 'n man 2,000 skape het wat oorkom in die lokasies in; dit is ongelerde kaffers wat daardie skape besit, en nou trap daardie skape die lokasies totaal uit. Wel, ek wil net se, dit is baie ongewens. Die vee het reg om in te gaan, maar dit is baie sleg....

U se die vee het die reg om die lokasies in te gaan? Ek wil nie se nie hulle het die reg, maar daar is niks nie om vir hulle te keer.

Onder watter omstandighede kan hulle skut? As hulle in die lande in gaan.

In Herschel is die weiveld deur die hele distrik? In werkelikheid gebruik hulle die weiveld ooral; ek weet in ty's van droogte trek hulle die berge in, en ek geloo dat hulle gesom gekeer kan word. Maar naturelle privaat eiendom besit, daar help hulle vir elkaar.

MENNER MOSTERT: Hou hulle baie bokke aan?---Nee, net hier
en daar; as daar berge is wat baie steil is dan sal hulle daar miskien 'n paar booke aangehou, maar nie veel nie; die meeste is maar skape en beeste, en die beeste het in die laaste jare baie agteruit gegaan.

VOORUIT: Het hulle baie agteruitgegaan in getal of in kwaliteit? -- In getal; kwaliteit is uit die kwessie uit in die lokasies waarna ek refereer. Ek kom nou op 'n ander punt, en ek wil hier net 'n woord inset oor die Bungha. Ek reken die naturel is in die meeste omstandighede onder 'n misverstand in verband met die werk en die pлиge van die Bungha. 'n Paar onoffisiele maar baie influensiale mense bring die ding totaal verkeerd /\ onder hulle aandag; daar die mena is teen die Bungha gekant. Ek wil nou dit se, en U kan dit van my aanneem, al as U miskien ek is 'n kind -- die redding van die naturelle in dié omgewing le is die Bungha. Ek is persoonlik bekend met die werking van die Bungha in die Transkei, en ek se dit sal hulle redding wees as hulle hier 'n Bungha kan kry, met dieselfde regulasies as wat hulle in die Transkei het; maar ongelukkig is daar persone wat invloed het onder die naturelle wat hulle ompraat teen die Bungha. Die enigste gref wat hulle het is hulle bang is dat hulle kaart en transport sal verloor.

In die wet van 1923 staan dit reguit dat hulle die kaart en transport nie sal verlies nie; hulle kan my nie oortuig nie dat die instelling van die Bungha afbreek sal doen aan hulle kaart en transport. Maar die moeilikheid wat ek uitgevoer het in daardie transke kwessie is dit-- baie van die naturelle het hulle kaart en port OESBAND vasgeset as sekeriteit vir geld wat hulle geleen het of vir skulde wat hulle het. Of dit die groot faktor is weet ek nie, maar dit is die hele moeilikheid.

Is dit kaart en transport in verband met plase wat absoluut aan hulle behoor? -- Nee, dit is vir die lokasie erve.

MENEER MOSTERT: Maar hulle het nie kaart en transport van daardie erve? -- Hulle het sekere dokumente en dit gee hulle baie in.
VOORSLITTER: By wie gooi hulle dit in?—By die handelaars—by die traders—en ook by ander privaat persone.

Maar wat as soort pand is dit?—Wel, hulle kan dit nie verkop nie, maar daardie natuurlike voël lekker as hulle daardie kaart het; die natuur voël so, dat hy self die kaart wil hou en hy wil dit nie verloor nie. Dit is die groot faktor.

Dit is 'n morele druk?—Ja, die witman weet goed genoeg hy kan die grond nie koop nie, maar as hy daardie kaart het, dan gee dit vir hom 'n soort van vat op die man wat hom skuld. Die natuurlike denk meer van die kaart en transport as wat ons mag denk, en hulle wil daardie dokumente baie graag terug he—dit is die hele ding.

SENAATOR VAN NIEKKEK: Is die meeste van die kaffers in die lokasies in die skuld?—Ek sou se die grootste deel van hulle is. Die naturel sal nie maklik 'n lyn trek solang as mense vir hom krediet gee. Ek se dit—die krediet stelsel is net so'n groot vloek vir die naturel as wat dit vir die witman is; baie van hulle is diep in die skuld.

VOORSLITTER: Die naturel sal altyd krediet vat as hy dit kan kry?—Ja, hy sal. Omtrent die Bungi wil ek nog dit se: die moeilikheid by ons fis dat die meeste' onwikkelde en die meest ingeligte kaffer wat die ding goed verstaan in die minderheid is, en die ander mense is teen die ding en hulle oorstem hom.

Die ongeleerde kaffers is teen die Bungi stelsel, is dit so?—Ja, dit is die moeilikheid en hulle is nog altyd in die meerderheid vanaf.

En die beter begaafde kaffer, is hy ten gunste van die Bungi?—Ja, in ons lokasies is dit so; die geleerde kaffer is ten gunste daarvan maar hy word oorstem deur die ogeleerde lot.

DR. FOURIE: Het die kwessie van die kaptaenskap iets daarmee te doen?—Ja, hulle hou nog altyd vas aan die ou kaffer gewoontes
om nie teen hulle hoofman of "chief" te gaan. As daar vandag 'n verkiesing gehou word en daar moet op die kantoor gestem word--as daar in die geheim kan gestem word--sal hulle bepaal die oorhand kry; die enigste ding is dat hulle kan nie teen die "headman " gaan nie; die vergaderings wat oor die kwessie gehou word, word in die openbaar gehou en die kaffer het nie, wat die Engelsman as "the courage" nie, hy het nie die moed nie om teen die chief te gaan, al weet hy ook dat dit vir sy welsyn sou wees as hy teen die chief sou gaan. Dit is nou eenmaal so.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Waarom denk U dat die Bungha sal goed wees vir die naturelle?--Wel, daar is baie dinge wat ek meen sal verbeter word onder 'n Bungha sisteem. Vandag is die groot vraag wat op die naturelle rus die prul beeste wat hulle nou nog altyd aanhou; as hulle die Bungha hier kry dan sal dit verander en die Bungha sal vir hulle in staat stel om beter metodes van boerdery hier te sien en te leer. Hulle moet zien en hulle moet geleer word hoe hulle hulle boerdery kan verbeter en hoe hulle die landbou hier kan opwerk; as die gronde be hoorklik bewerk word sal daar baie meer kaffer plek op kan vind. In ver skillende opsigte het die naturelle vorentoe gegaan--hulle het vorentoe gegaan om ons na te aap en om ons klere te dra, maar die boerdery van die naturelle het net so primitief gebly, of byna net so primitief as dit altyd gewees was. Ons weet, die prul beeste is sy bank en op die manier word hy armer en armer elke jaar. Dit help nou nie vir ons nie om so of so te se, maar as die lokasies nie afgekamp word nie in winter en in somer veld, dan is dit hopelooos om vir hulle beter beeste te gee;dit kan elkeen insien. Daar word vandag nie faciliteit vir die kaffer verskaf nie om sy land toe te maak; hier en daar moek se daar is party wat intelligent is,
en wat hulle water oor hulle lande set en wat baie doen om hulle metodes te verbeter. Daar is mense wat jong kaffers kry om hulle vee op te pas; die naturel sou maklik kan klaar kom as daar kampe was vir hulle beeste; dan sou dit nie nodig wees nie om jong kaffertjies aan te hou om die beeste op te pas; die lande sou toe wees, en as dit gedoen was dan sou die naturel sy kinders kan uitstuur om te gaan werk. By ons is daar tekort van werkvolk--dit is nie so danig groot, maar dit is so. As die boerdery verbeter kan word, dan sal dit die draagkrag van die grond verbeter en die naturel sal in staat wees om sy land beter te verbou en hy sal in staat wees om beter vee aan te hou, en daar sal meer werkvolk beskikbaar wees om uit te gaan om te werk. As daar fasileite sou wees vir die naturelle soos 'n landbank dan sou dit van die grootste nut vir iedereen wees. As die Bunga hier sou wees, dan sou baie van daardie dinge kan gedoen word, en in elke geval sou die Bunga hulle help om hulle landbou baie te verbeter.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Vandag het hulle nie gelykeheid om self die dinge te doen?--Nee, hulle kan self dit nie doen nie; daar is nie 'n landbank nie om hulle geld te leen om hulle lande toe te maak of om hulle metodes te verbeter of om hulle lande in kampe op te smy. En as hulle nie geriewe van daar die soort kry nie, dan sal dit altyd slechter gaan; dit is om die rede dat ek se dat die Bunga hulle baie sou help.

Maar U se hulle wil die Bunga hier nie he nie?--Nee, ek meen die meerderheid wil dit, maar die minderheid praat die meerderheid oor.

DR. FOURIE: Onder die Kaptein sisteem kan dit nie gebeur nie?--Nee hierdie nie, tensy hulle tot insien kom en elke teen hulle tot die oortuiging kom dat hulle heil daar le. Dit is nodig vir hulle om die gelykeheid te kry; dit was net so ge- wees met ons boere; en tensy die naturelle nou die gelykeheid kry sal dit altyd slechter met hulle gaan in die toekoms. As
MENEER LANDMAN: ons boere dit nie sou gedoen het nie, as ons ons lande nie sou toegemaak het nie, dan wonder ek waar ons sou gewees het. Waar sou ons gewees het in die groot droogtes wat ons in hierdie streke gehad het? En die naturel behoor gehelp te word om in te zien waar sy redding le.

MENEER MOSTERT: U beveel die Bungha ten sterkste aan vir hier die land?—Ja, absoluut. As ek die reg sou kry, sou ek die hulle hier in Bungha sou aanstel, nie tereenstaande die proteste van sekere sekse onder hul. Ek is oortuig dat hulle word oorheers net deur 'n deel wat die sake verkeerd voorstel en wat verklar dat die Bungha hulle selfstandigheid sal ondermyn. Maar dit is nie so nie; dit is 'n totaal verkeerde voorstelling van die kwessie.

MENEER LUCAS: Beveel U ook die Landbank aan vir die Natu-rel?—Ek se dit: Al lop hulle ook oor van intelligensie en gesond verstand, as daar nie 'n opening is nie waar hulle 'n bietjie finansiële hulp kan kry, wat kan hulle dan doen.

Hulle kry dit vandag nie?—Nee; ek se "help die man wat wil vorentoe gaan". Dan kan ons vir die man se "daar is 'n geleintheid"; maar as talle daar nie van wil gebruik maak nie, dan kan ons nie vir hulle help nie. Vandag se hulle "ons boer altyd agteruit en ons moet help kry" Hulle se vir ons "ons vee verrek, kom en help vir ons", en ons moet vir hulle help en vir hulle wys wat kan hulle maak.

Is daar 'n neiging vir lokasie kaffers om dorp toe te trek?—Ja, daar is baie.

VOORSLIER: As hulle dorp toe trek, trek hulle dan met die hele familie?—Ja, en as hulle eenmaal dorp toegegaan is, da kom hulle nooit nie na die lokasie terug. Dit is die onderwinding wat ons hier gekry het.

MOSTERT: Is dit as hulle na die dorpe toe trek of na Johannesburg?—Al twee. Maar nie so baie nie na Johannesburg.
Die ongeleerde kaffer kry 'n klompie by elkaar en dan gaat hulle saam na die myne toe, en in die geval kom hulle later weer terug en dan gaat hulle weer weg. Dan betaal hulle hulle skulde en dan later stuur hulle die jong kaffers.

MEEMER LUGAS: Gebeur dit dat hulle van die plekke na die lokasies toe trek?—Neen U die werkvolk?

Ja?—Nee, nie bissonders; die werkvolk bly meer daer, of hulle gaat na die myne toe; maar die werkvolk is vandag skaars so wat dit vroeger was; die volk bly meestal op die plekke; hulle is geneig om die witman se gewoontes te volg. Ek ken 'n kaffer wat op Lovedale skool gegaan het; hy het landbou daar geleer en 'n vryde van my het vir hom lectures gegaan in "general farming". Maar daardie kaffer werk nie op die land nie, alhoewel hy landbou geleer het; vandag werk hy hier in die dorp by Mnr. Hartley se store; hy werk vir 'n paar pond in die maand. Wat het sy geler gedaan vir hom gehelp? In plaas van lectures te kry in "general farming" sou dit baie beter gewees het as hy 'n vak sou geleer het; dan sou hy tenminste iets het kan doen in plaas van nou vir 'n paar pond vir Mnr. Hartley te k moet werk.

VOORSTITTER: Hulle trek van die plekke af by voorkeur na die dorpe toe?—Ja, nie na die lokasies nie.

Is dit die eerste rede dat U die skaarsse van werkvolk het begin te voel; het U vandag meer werkvolk nodig as wat U op die plase kan kry?—Ja, ons het meer werkvolk nodig.

Jackal proof fencing is hier in die distrik algemeen?—Ja, dit is hier oorale.

Het dit nie die behoeftes van werkvolk verminde?—So ver as skape betref, effentjies, maar nie in die algemeen nie. Ons moet ons plekke vandag beter bewerk as wat dit vroeger die geval was. Ons het skaskoes wat elke nag in die stal word
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geset en ander dinge wat baie werk nodig het en ons het mense nodig vir daardie dinge. Ons het romery en ons weet dat as ons nie oppas vir ons vee, dan kan ons nie verwag nie.

Senator van Niekerk: Wat is die rede dat kaffers wegtrek?-- Wel, die rede dat werkvolk skaars word is dat hulle in die meeste gevalle omgepraat word.

Deur wie word hulle omgepraat?-- Hulle reken hulle kry te min £½ loon; dit is nie die ou kaffer nie; hy weet hy het sy beeste op die plaas en hy leef goed, maar dit dit die jong kaffers wat omgepraat word; hulle reken hul kry te min; hulle gaat eers na die myne toe, en dan as hulle van die myne terugkom dam bly hulle nie, maar dan trek hulle na die dorpe toe. Dit is die rede vir die skaarsheid van die werkvolk op die plaas.

Gaat hulle nie na die lokasies toe?-- Nee, hulle gaat nie lokasies toe; hulle trek na die dorpe.

Wat is die voorregte wat 'n plaaskaffer kry; wat beeste kan hulle op die plaas aanhou?-- In die eerste plaas kry hulle lone; die minste is van 8/- tot 10/- in die maand; dit is net vir klein kaffertjies. Maar die groot kaffers kry meer; hulle kry £1 in die maand en sommige kry meer; dit hang af hoe lang hulle daar was en of hulle goes is. Daar is kaffers wat baie goes is op hulle werk; kaffers wat meer weet as die ander; daar is van hulle wat 'n windpomp kan opset, of wat die ploegskate kan reg maak, of baie ander dinge op die plaas kan doen; Daar is kaffer is baie nuttig en niemand sal ongee om hom van £1 en selfs tot £2 te betaal in die maand. En buite dit hou hulle nog 'n klomp vee aan en dan het hulle nog baie ander voorregte wat hulle op die boereplaas kry; dat die soort van kaffer is dit weder vir die boer want hy doen baie werk.

Hoe veel vee kan hulle aanhou?-- Dit verskil natuurlik. In die meeste gevalle het hulle die reg om 20 beeste te hou of
miskien ook meer. Maar mens kan so oor die algemeen se dat hulle die reg kry om van tien tot twintig beeste aan te hou en daarby ook 'n klopie skape.

VOORSITTER: Hoeveel skape kan hulle aanhou?—Ek moet se daar is maar min gevalle waar hulle skape toelaat; die reg om skape aan te hou het uitgeroep in die dae van die brandsiekte; in daardie dae het die boere nie toegelaat vir die naturalle om skape aan te hou; die gewoonte het uitgeroep en dit het maar altyd meer of min so geblê.

Is dit algemeen dat hulle grond kry om te ploeg?—Wel, dit is nie 'n saai wereld hier nie; dit is meer algemeen 'n vee wereld; as dit 'n saai wereld sou wees, dan sou dit seker anders wees hier; maar in 'n vee wereld is dit nie die gewoonte nie om vir die naturalle grond te gemaal te ploeg.

Daar die plaaskaffers wat beeste het, kry hulle ook melk van die boere?—Ja, hulle kry die afgeroemde melk, en dan het hulle ook meestal hulle eie koeie.

En kry hulle melk van hulle eie beeste?—Ja.

Hoeveel melk sal so'n gewone kaffer beest gee?—Wel, ek kan dit se: hulle gee baie meer op die witman se grond as wat hulle in die lokasies gee; op die witman se gronde is hulle in beter kondisie; die kaffer beeste op die witman se gronde is seker beter as wat hulle in die lokasies is.

Laat ons die beeste op 'n plaas neem; hoeveel melk sal 'n man van 'n koei verwag?—As 'n koei 'n kalf gehad het, dan sal hy miskien twee gallon melk per dag kry; dit is so omtrent die gemiddelde wat hy sal verwag.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Sal hulle soveel van die koei kry—dit lyk baie?—Ja, hulle sal.

MEENDER WOSTERT: Ja, maar twee gallon lyk baie?—Nee, dit is nie te veel nie.