interested in Item No. 7 and the general expenditure there. The total expenditure I think you made £28,000,000 for the year that you took. Is that not so?—Yes.

I go by the same book as you do, and the year previous, where it is, on the 36 votes, £27,000,000?—Yes.

I hope it will not weary you to take these votes one by one?—No, sir.

I will read you out the total; the Governor General is paid £27,000 a year—his office. I put down from the Native contribution, £2,300, because he really does look at Natives now and again when he passes through—that is to say a tenth?—Do you mean £2,000 of this comes our way?

No, no; the £27,000 does not even come our way, except to glance at the Governor?—Under what vote is that?

That is vote No.1?—Is it the Treasury?

No, it is the Governor General—Vote No.1?—I must really confess I do not know how much money comes our way.

The government of this country spend £27,000 on keeping the Governor General in state, travelling in trains, putting on a cocked hat and other things. Would you not pay any of that?—No.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Would you like the Natives to do away with the Governor General?—I am not expressing an opinion on that; I am only concerned with what comes my way.

I have got to pay something towards the upkeep of the Governor General?—I am concerned only with these figures that come back to us, not what we are spending.

CHAIRMAN: You do not think the Natives are benefitting by having the Governor General in the country?—I do not know that I can reckon it as a benefit; it is sentiment.
MAJ. ANDERSON: Europeans have the same? It comes the European way.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Dr Roberts wants to show you what is spent by the Government on the Natives of this country. He says the Government spend £27,000 on the Governor General. You do not want to make the White people pay all that; you have to bear some share? (No answer)

DR. ROBERTS: Let us leave that. There is a place called the Senate, and the Government gives £30,000 in salaries to these men. Would you contribute to the extent of £3,000 to their salaries? I am afraid you are getting me mixed up now.

Would you give these poor Senators who represent you nothing at all? To the Assembly the Government pays £90,000; would you agree to £9,000? As coming our way from that?

Yes? Yes.

Your Prime Minister's Office gets £39,000; I have put down £4,000 as coming from the Natives? I must say, when I made my calculations, I reckoned we were getting nothing from that side.

Surely the Prime Minister looks after you? In that case, I will have to modify my following paragraph.

It would probably weary you to go over them all. We spend £344,000 on the Labour Department; you know that?

Yes.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: If the labour conditions of the Europeans improved, are not the Natives sharing in that? You are meaning, on Public Works, they do not employ you? You have the buildings and you make use of them? In that case I will have to modify my paragraph. I have assumed that we get nothing from "Relief and Distress", Pensions.
DR. ROBERTS: You have a number of Natives who are pensioned? — I find no mention of Natives getting pensions.

But you know that they get them? — Under what head?
Well, where does the money come from? It is under the head of "Pensions"? — What Natives get pensions?
Mbele gets one. Well, I put down also for higher education £344,000 that they give Europeans, and I put down £5,000 — — ? — Yes, I have that.

On the Police, the Government spend 2½ millions. I put down £400,000? — Yes.

I need not go over it all? — What is the total?
My total is £3,300,000, out of the £27,000,000? — Yes, well I will agree with that.

And that Customs, Excise and other things come also to £3,000,000. So it equalises, I should say? — Do you mean that we get something from the Customs?

You pay and you get the drink that you drink? — I thought you were giving me the figures as to what we were getting back from the Customs.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: You pay there? — I would prefer you to tell me what I am getting.

£3,300,000? — From the Customs?
No, from the administration of the country? — Then we get back one ninth, whereas I say we pay one third.

MR. LUCAS: You are using the word "pay" in rather an ambiguous sense? — I have come to urge that we get the other two ninths back. Dr. Roberts has left out of account the indirect and the potential and wealth value and other things I have mentioned I am reasoning. I reckon that we contribute at least nine millions to the State and, at the most favourable estimate of nine millions, we get back about three millions. Therefore, without using exaggerated
language, there is room for the State to do much more for us than it is doing, - by at least twice the amount on allocation and appropriation the State makes to us. That is the whole burden of my presence here this morning. I have tried to establish that there is room for the State to give us at least twice what it is giving us today financially.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you think that the very valuable result you have come to can be come to without the greatest care and long study of how much really the Native contributes by his labour, by his low wages and by many other things to the country, which would require an enormous amount of enquiry, which has never been done except by yourself, and you can only make a guess at it?— Admitting that, I would like this Commission to recommend, among its findings, that the Government ----

It would take about two years?— I mean, to recommend according to its information, which is very imperfect, I admit; but there is much room for improvement in allocation and appropriation.

MR. LUCAS: I want to ask you one or two questions about other subjects which you have mentioned in the statement. You are a Professor of Social Anthropology?— Yes.

Have you made any study of the effect upon Native life of the absence of men away from their families for long periods?— Yes, but it has not been reduced to print. We have discussed it especially in our societies at Fort Hare and especially in connection with our welfare work in the district and also in connection with our commerce and teachers' associations — and the conditions are deplorable. The only person I know of who has put it down more or less accurately is Dr. Henderson, in his report to the South African Conference of 1925; there is a paper there in which
Dr. Henderson gave a lucid account of it and with which
I agree.

Could you sum up the conclusions arrived at?—
I have not my papers here, but I would just make the remark
that a great deal of the lack of discipline in our town
locations is due to this absence of people at work.

When you use the word "location", do you mean
town or country locations?— Rural areas; even within
five miles from here, there are stick fights with boys
and occasions of lack of discipline.

CHAIRMAN: You said rural and town; which of
the two do you mean?— I am speaking from the rural point
of view, but, in this case, "rural" is very near the town
area here. These locations are rural, although within
five miles of King William's Town; the Natives live
their rural life within five miles of this place.

MR. LUCAS: Have you had occasion to investigate
the standard of living of the Natives in any centre; how
they come out on their wages and how they supplement their
wages?— Yes, I mentioned this in my first paragraph.

Yes, I saw that, but that did not go very far?— I have not made any tabulated result of what I have investi-
gated, but what I mention here is a fair average for urban
districts. In the rural districts the wages are much
lower and, taking it as a whole, I would say very few
Natives do come out on what they earn; they have to make
up by sending their children out to do little jobs in town.
In some cases — I am ashamed to own it — some of it is
made up by stealth, by stealing; sometimes people have
to steal to clothe themselves, — stealing from stores. It
is made up somehow, out of dire need. These people
barely come out and, in some cases they do not come out.
and they live in a state of permanent indebtedness; others live by illicit liquor selling and other immoral practices.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: If a man is in debt, is it not the same as if you have no debt at all? No, sir. He lives under the throns of persecution by the lawyer; he pays him out so much, then does not pay for two years, then pays some more, and then keeps him hanging on again. He does pay his debts - on terms.

DR. ROBERTS: He has no peace of mind? Yes. He spends sleepless nights; some of died as a result of it.

MR. LUCAS: Taking the first point you made, about having to send young children to work; have you come to any conclusion as a result of investigation of the effects of that upon your people as a whole? Yes, sir; I can mention one very serious result, lack of respect for parental authority is the one finding we have come to.

Due to their having to send children out to work? Yes. I may amplify that by saying many of our people being unable to raise enough for food and clothing from their six-acre plots, send their daughter or two daughters to work in kitchens in town; they are sent to Cape Town or Johannesburg. These children come back with money to feed the parents and the family and they begin to assume airs of insolence to their parents because they feed them. The boys very frequently get into a row and they speak insolently to their fathers, the daughters also become similarly insolent simply because they have become the breadwinners of the family.

Are there any others? Another is the constant poverty which surrounds the family because, although these children are working, when the time comes when somebody gets married, a great deal of money has to be found and
a marriage is a terrible event with many of these families; it means a time of new indebtedness, which takes years to emerge from.

Is there any chance of this custom of large expenditure on marriages, breaking down; it is unjustifiable in the circumstances you mention? It is certainly unjustifiable, but it is ingrained in the minds of the people. They are prepared to face the indebtedness rather than forego it, because otherwise they become socially ostracised by their neighbours, and the man and woman would have no peace from their neighbours.

Are there instances of quite young children having to go out to work? I know of girls of eleven years old going out to work and boys of fifteen passing for eighteen, and even boys of twelve I have instances of being sent to work.

DR. ROBERTS: Where — up in the sugar fields? Yes, some go there and some work around here; others go to farms to attend cattle for farmers — very young boys twelve years old.

MR. LUCAS: The other point I wanted to ask you about was this. In the course of your travels around the country and your getting into touch with Natives in different areas — can you express any opinion on the state of the interracial relationship between Whites and Blacks; is it improving? It was improving for some time, but during this last six or seven years I have noticed a change towards hardness; there is a hardening on the part of the Black people against Europeans. To trace it is difficult. It is partly due to economic stress — being unable to make a living, and then they begin to think it is the White man who is causing this. Legislation, also,
seems to have contributed. Some of the bills in Parliament, especially in regard to the civilised labour policy, have done much to alienate Native feeling and to strain feeling; and then the advent of Communists has done a great deal to make us lose some of the following we had. Some of our followers are taught catch phrases such as "You are bribed or bought by the White man; do not speak to us". So that everybody now who favours good relations between White and Black is regarded as a man bribed or as a privately paid agent of the European.

MR. MOSTERT: And boycotted?—Yes; in many of our social uplift endeavours, it amounts to almost an impossibility or a thankless task for some of us to conduct our old associations of social uplift among our people.

Would you say that change is serious, or is it just something that you see signs of?—I am afraid, sir, it is serious. Each time I go to the country I find it in greater evidence than the previous year.

DR. ROBERTS: But admitting that, that it is serious and that it is there, is it not an indication of the growth of the Native people?—I suppose I should put it down partly to that, but I am afraid I do not feel I can do so. If it is a growth, then it is unnaturally swift.

MR. JACOBUS: Does growth mean you have necessarily to be hostile to the other sections?—Seven years ago they were developing slowly in sense and ambition with consistently good feelings towards the European, but now they have gone much faster with their hostility.

DR. ROBERTS: The moment you get out of a certain state which conduces to good feeling, you may raise ill-feeling on the other side?—Yes. There is another thing. When you introduce a bill in Parliament which the Natives
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look upon as anti-Native, it makes development quick and unhealthy, because it rouses people to organise who would not otherwise organize, - it rouses sleeping dogs -, and people catch on to unhealthy lines.

MR. LUCAS: Could you say whether the hostility of individuals, Europeans to Natives or Natives to Europeans, in the shape of pinpricks, is getting less or not? - I am sorry, I do not think I can answer that question. I have not made a special point of watching individual behaviour, but I think, from what I see, it is simply the trend of the Press. For instance, the Press does a great deal of mischief; today the Natives are reading more than they used to and when they see statements in the Press which are unfavourable to them, it makes a bad impression on them. I would attribute it rather to the Press than to individuals. Natives do know how to excuse an individual, but when they see in the press an article or the speech of a public speaker which speaks badly of the people, they take it far more seriously.

CHAIRMAN: It must be true, because it is printed? - I suppose being in print it has that effect.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: In one place we were told when a Native gives education to his son, the tendency nowadays for these sons who become educated, is to shirk their responsibility towards their parents in not paying them back or supporting them and that, therefore, the tendency today amongst Natives is they prefer sending their daughters to the higher school. That may have a very great effect on the development of the Natives in the future. Would you say that is correct? - In some cases it is correct; I have observed that; but I would not say it is a general tendency. There are many young
men who shirk their duties, but girls almost regularly do support their parents, and I know of many boys who do not.

Assuming you people feel that the wages paid to the Natives on the whole are too low - that they are underpaid, what would be the best for the Native development in this country? To have a standard of higher wages with perhaps an enormous amount of unemployment, or a general average wage where everybody is employed?— That is a difficult question to answer, but so far as I have thought of it I have thought of it this way: a gradual rise, say, of 1½ a year, which would not be felt, perhaps, too immediately by employers and which would enable employers also to adjust their monies to suit the conditions. A sudden rise is certainly a difficult thing for any employer, Black or White, but a gradual one would suit everybody. No matter how high the wage is you pay to Natives, they all go out in circulation. Natives do not hoard by banking money; the money is wanted for dire needs, and the country would benefit, I think, by it.

When a Native employs another Native, does he pay him a higher wage because he thinks he is a Native?— No; I think he pays him according to the return he gets from him; according to the efficiency.

Do you really think that?— Of course, he begins by studying the general wage and then he puts something extra on to attract the man to remain in his employ. I think the Natives will get the cheapest they can get, but it is efficiency they want.

THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED AT 1.7 P.M. UNTIL 2.30 P.M.

---------

Prof. Jabavu
Mr. Sigila

On the Commission resuming at 2.30 p.m.,

MR. OAKWOOD SIGILA, Hasldtown, Fort Beaufort,

was called and examined.

CHAIRMAN: I notice you put down land questions and Native rural life?—Yes.

Will you say what you have to say on this subject of land questions and Native rural life?—I will only take the main points in the question and I will leave myself to be questioned. We find that land was granted to the people with no consideration for the generation to follow. It now happens that the people who are occupying the land are more than the land itself, more especially at my place where I live, where we are very congested. We have communicated with the Government to that effect. Firstly, our land was granted to the chiefs and was occupied communally, unsurveyed, and at the time of Sir George Grey, in 1859, it was surveyed and that survey was appreciated by the people. We are very thankful that we had the survey because it has taught the people to use their land. We now understand that there are different kinds of survey and we understand that the Government is trying to do away with the system of survey that was first performed. Now we see that there is another system of survey, that would not do for us people living more especially in the part of the country where I live. That kind of survey is one similar to the Glen Grey in the Transkei. We find that that kind of survey does not give the people fixity of tenure. We would then urge that people like ourselves be given the former survey, the one of fixity of tenure. When we say we are congested at present, we mean that the Government should find land for us and grant
that land to the people in the same as the former survey, with fixity of tenure. That is all I have to say at present.

You say that the people appreciate the survey. Do you find that the people in the surveyed areas work their lands better than people in the locations? We find it so.

In what way? Because people who live in the surveyed areas take much trouble and interest in their lands, more so than the people who are living communally.

How does that interest show itself? They are free to use their lands at all times, nothing stopping them from doing that.

Do they plough and grow any crops in the winter? Yes.

What sort of crops? Wheat, peas, barley.

Are there other ways in which they farm better?- What sort?

You ought to be able to tell me. You say they farm better than they do in the locations. Now how do they farm better in other ways? It gives the people the minds thought that their lands are being attracted by their own lands and in that way, they can provide for themselves in a better way.

But you cannot think of any other way in which actual agriculture is better than growing peas and barley, which, I admit, is a good thing? Another good thing is that according to this survey that we have, people have a certain sort of way of self government.

Have they fenced their surveyed plots? Those who have means to do it have done so.

Are there many who have the means to do so? I would not say they are many, sir.

Do these people plough their land deeper? Under the influences of the present demonstrators, there are men who
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are trying to follow accordingly.

Are they doing anything to reduce the overstocking, or have they not got overstocking yet?—We do not find that we have overstocked our grazing commonage, but it is people that are congested who have covered the ground.

Have you not got dongas?—There are, at some places.

You are not overstocked?—We say the cause of these dongas is through water that comes from the mountains; it is not owing to overstocking—and also the kind of soil that can easily be washed away by water.

Do you think the water will wash away the ground when there is plenty of grass?—Yes; at the slopes the ground is washed away whether there is grass or not.

It is only on the slopes that you have dongas?—Yes.

Do you have jointed cactus?—Yes, we have lately discovered that there is some.

Just a little?—Yes; we have lately discovered that it is there. It is not very little. In many cases we have discovered it.

DR. ROBERTS: What have you against the Glen Grey system of titles?—It does not give ownership of land.

It does not give perpetual title?—Yes.

Is there any other thing that you have against the Glen Grey system of titles?—It is easily taken away from a person for small or trivial reasons.

Would you give us some of the reasons that you consider small?—If a person is two years in arrears, the land is taken away from him.

But it is very rarely done?—But the law states so.

Then you say when you were settled there, the Government had no consideration of the future?—We think so, according to present conditions.
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Quite. Now, do you think that Sir George Grey, wise man that he was, could look down one hundred years? Why we say that is because lands that were given to us at that time have been partly taken away from us; we have been told that those parts do not belong to us.

Are you referring to the parts round Fort Beaufort?

Yes.

The parts taken by the Municipality? Yes, and also taken by the farmers.

Where were these parts taken away by the farmers?

At a place called Gomaana.

Were they church sites? No, sir.

What were they? Just tell us? Gomaana was occupied before by Hermannus, Nattrusse, chief of the Coloured people, and when we were put there after the war of the Axe, Hermannus rebelled against the Government and his land was taken away from him and granted to us by Sir George Cathcart.

Was that after the 1850 War? Yes. It was then granted to us by Sir George Cathcart and we occupied it.

In 1859, at the time of survey, we were told that that land would be open as grazing ground. We then agreed and came and lived together in the location. In the course of time we saw a fence on that land and there was one European there occupying it. That fence came near our garden lands and we were told that that land did not belong to us.

CHAIRMAN: When was that land taken away for the Europeans? I could not say, because that white man occupied the land before it was fenced; the fence was put up long after he had occupied it.

Was that in the time of your father? Yes.

Or of your grandfather? Yes, my grandfather was living.

And you want us to put it right now? What I
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say is that we are congested and we see that the Government had no eye to the future when we were granted that land.

DR. ROBERTS: Did any of your men go to Peddie?

From Healdtown?

Yes?—To do what?

To the land that was given by the Native Affairs Department?—The people who were given that land to occupy were under the Municipal Council.

You had a Village Management Board at Healdtown?—Yes. That has disappeared now?—Yes.

And you have been offered a Council?—Yes.

You have not accepted it?—We asked for a Council long before and it was not given to us.

Of course, you know when it was refused it was because it was too small; was that not the case?—We/understand it and we still do not understand it.

Well, that is the position. Would you be willing to go in with Alice or Peddie?—The people of Heald never agreed to be joined with Alice.

Or?—We never placed the question of Peddie before ourselves.

Supposing it were placed before you?—I do not think we would accept it.

---------

MR. PETER NYATANA, (Fort Beaufort Village)

called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: You have put down three subjects: landless Natives, lobolo and deferred pay?—Yes, I am going to speak on the reasons I have put down on the paper. That is why I mentioned land. I am going to say, in connection with land, that the people of Fort Beaufort should be given land because, at present, they are living under difficult conditions and they pay rents which they cannot afford to go on
on paying, namely, they pay for beasts — for a cow or an ox — livestock, 1/- a month; a goat 3d a month; a sheep 2d a month; but tax 1/6d a month, and for arable land or gardens as we put it, 1/6d a month.

Do you pay those to the municipality? — Yes; and poll tax and dog tax 5/- a year. Those are the reasons why the people of Fort Beaufort would like the Government to buy them land.

Do you want to say anything about deferred pay? — I do not seem to know that subject; I am not prepared to give evidence on that subject.

Do many of the Natives living inside the Municipality of Fort Beaufort keep stock? — Yes, there are many, and everybody is entitled to keep as much stock as he likes, but on account of the taxes, the stock has now diminished.

Is there grazing enough on the commonage for the stock? — It was big enough, but some of it now has been fenced in and we are shut out and we are asked to pay 2/3d per month for everything that is put in.

Do Europeans put their stock in that special camp too? — Those who care to.

Do they pay 2/3d too? — Yes; we hear that they pay 2/3d, because they put in their cattle.

Is there more grass in the fenced camps than outside in the commonage? — Yes, because it is fenced.

Is it not better to pay more and get more grass for your cattle? — We do not see our cattle starve.

Not on the commonage? — No.

Why do you not leave it on the commonage, where it is a lower fee, then? — We cannot afford to pay the shilling let alone the 2/3d; it is beyond our reach.

Have you milk enough from your cattle for your
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household needs?— If we had enough cattle, we would get enough milk, but now, on account of this 1/- tax, we are unable to keep stock enough to give us milk.

How much milk would you get a day from one cow, say, a week after it has calved?— We cannot give an estimate, because we never sell our milk.

But surely you milk into a bucket?— Yes.

What sort of bucket is it?— Sometimes we have a big bucket and sometimes we have a small bucket.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Have you no idea as to how many bottles of milk a cow gives?— No, sir. We do not care to sell our milk, because we want to feed our children with it.

CHAIRMAN: We do not want you to sell the milk, we want to know how much you get?— I do not see the buckets now, so I cannot answer the question; and I do not see the cow in front of me to say how many buckets it would give.

How many children would the milk you get from one cow feed?— According to the milk I get that day.

MR. MOSTERT: How many children have you got?— Six.

Do they always get milk?— I do not personally own any cattle; I gave it up.

MR. LUCAS: Do you buy milk for your children?— When I have money.

DR. ROBERTS: Were you one of those who were offered land at Peddie?— Yes, sir.

Did you go?— I did go.

Did you come back?— No, I have not returned.

You are still in Peddie?— My property is still there.

In Peddie?— Yes.

And yourself?— I am in Fort Beaufort because I work there.
But your people are in Paddie?— My property is at Paddie, not my wife.

Then, have you a portion of the land that was given by the Native Affairs Department?— Yes.
Have you any cattle there?— One; one that I took over there from Fort Beaufort.
How much milk does it give?— I never measured it.
Have you any donkeys?— No, sir; I have one.

DR. ROBERTS: How many people went from Fort Beaufort to Paddie?— I just forget; I am sorry.
Try and remember?— I cannot at present make out how many there were.

Did many come back?— Yes, there were some that came back; they did not get enough ground to use as arable land.
Yes, but if they came back, why did they come back?— When the land was surveyed, there were only sixty people who got building sites and who could not get arable land.

In Paddie?— Yes.
Are you sure of that?— I was there. When the arable land was distributed, the location superintendent told us, "There is nothing for you", and that there were sixty people who had building sites and no arable allotments.

---------

RICHARD STAMPER
JULY MRWECBO (CHIEF)
EDLEM MARAMBANA

Native Witnesses from Paddie,
called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: You are from Paddie?— (Mrwebo): Yes.
Are you all from the rural area?— Yes.
Could you tell us why you consider there are no advantages in detribalisation?— (Marambana): We do not see where the advantages are.

Quite a large number of Natives have broken away from
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their tribes? - Yes.

Why do you think these Natives have done it if there are no advantages? - I do not think they leave their chiefs because they would get better advantages, but it is because they are congested where they live.

Do you think that the Natives who have broken away from their tribes are worse off than you are? - No, we would not say they are better than those who remain with their chiefs, but ----

Not better, but better off? - Yes they are not better off, but they are just living there temporarily.

DR. ROBERTS: Whose people are you? - We are sent here by the Feddie chiefs. We represent the whole of the Feddie district.

CHAIRMAN: You say there are no economical results to detribalisation? - No, sir. Even where they run to, they are not given enough money; some of them are even worse off than when they broke away.

So you do think they are worse off when they go away? - Some of them, but people are not all alike, some of them get a better chance when they go away; even when they are employed some better wages and others get very small wages.

You speak of landless Natives. Are there many Natives in your locations who have no land to plough? - There are people with no lands to plough.

Do you know how many there are in your own location? - I am in a surveyed area and would not know exactly. How are the landless people living now? - They are living on their friends.

Do their friends support them? - Yes, some get help, but mostly they go to towns and never come back.

Are there people who are living in the locations -
He told me: He had no land to plough. He sold their goats and cattle to get money to live on. When they have sold all their goats and cattle?—They are then a burden to other people, because, even when they go and plough on some shares on the land— the farms— they come back and live here with the people and when they have sold all their stock, some of them just live in the Peddie district; but, at the same time, they do not count themselves as persons belonging to Peddie. They pay taxes all the time and they wait for a time to hear when they can get arable land, and, when they are told they can now come back and get arable land, they bring back their families.

Where do they get money to pay their taxes?—In working places such as Port Elizabeth and elsewhere.

Do they leave their families there and then go away and work?—Some of them take their families with them, but send their money back for taxes. Most of our people there where I live are in Port Elizabeth, yet they send the money when the time for paying the tax comes. What really drives them away is that they have sold all their stock, which was a means of support for them.

What do you think is the future of these people?—There is no future, except that they will have to be taken to gaol. We also have no right, now, to keep cows: we only keep four oxen which we keep on farms and pay for. You would only recognize such a man who had once owned a lot of cattle when you go to the kraal and see a heap of manure.

You say you have no objection to a Black man...
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coming from other countries, unless he is an agitator?—
(Mr. Stamper): No, we have no objection. (Mr. Mrwebo): We have no objection.

Why do you object to the agitator?— We do not want persons to come and make a disturbance; we want a person to come and discuss matters with us peacefully.

Do you try and get rid of these people when they come into the locations?— Yes, we try to get rid of them. We cannot say they are doing any work now in our locations.

How do you set about getting rid of them?— We only tell him that he is not going to cause any disturbance when he comes into our locality.

What agricultural organizations have you?— They are proceeding fairly well.

No; what organizations have you?— We are trying to get an organization; we have the farmers' association.

One farmers association?— (Mr. Stamper): We have one farmers' association.

Have you any other associations?— We have a voters convention.

Is that all?— And chiefs' conventions, too. (Mr. Marambana): And the teachers' associations.

How many members has your farmers' association?— That information could be got from the secretary who keeps the record.

Does the farmers' association hold shows?— (Mr. Mrwebo): We send our exhibits in to Fort Hare.

You show there?— Yes, but we are trying as much as we can to start our own shows at home.

You say, with regard to Natives working for European farmers, that this has no effect on their agriculture; Do not these Natives learn how to farm according to the
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European method?—People who go to the farms, go there because they are starving and, when they get there, they are only given such work as hoeing, scotching and when there are three bags they get threepence.

Are there any of them who go to work for wages on the farms?—They get 10/- and a pint of ration. Even if a man has a large family, the wife and the children are not paid anything. These people are used and sent about by the farmer, and if they do not do what they are told, they are sent away.

You say a pint of ration a week?—(Mr. Stamper): They get a 6d dish full of mealies.

A day?—A week; he gets a pint a day and a 6d dishful of mealies a week. When they get to the farmers, the first thing they have got to do is to make a debt because they have to buy a bag of mealies, because they cannot support their families on the small rations they get.

What is a 6d dish; does the dish cost 6d, or is it sixpenny worth of mealies?—It is something like 9 lbs. of mealies. It is 9 lbs. of mealies a week, or a pint a day.

Which district are you referring to now?—The Faddie district.

Are you allowed to graze any animals on the farmer’s land?—Yes. We are allowed to, but in many cases we have no stock; there is just one beast and even that beast has to be taken by the farmer, he has to take it over because the man has taken a bag of mealies.

Are they given any lands to plough for themselves? I am now talking of the man who gets 10/- a month; is he also given lands to plough—not on the share?—(Mr. Mrwebo): Yes, he gets one acre.

Does he get anything else, such as clothes or
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skim milk?—Yes, he gets skim milk and he clothes himself with sacks.

Does he get any meat?—No, unless it is a dead beast.

How often do beasts die?—Occasionally. They died a lot during the drought of 1929, and there was plenty of meat at the time.

You say there are no obstacles in the Native rural areas to the more economical use of land?—No, there are no obstacles.

Have you got any erosion?—No, there is not much of it.

Have you jointed cactus?—No.

You say you have no overstocking in your areas, but you want more land?—(Mr. Mwebo): Our stock have no place for grazing unless you go and pay for your four beasts on a farm.

And yet you say there is no overstocking?—There is no commonage; there is no grazing ground.

But if there is no grazing ground, surely there must be overstocking if you have animals?—It is being taken away by Europeans, they fence it in.

They fence, in a Native location?—Yes, Native locations; land such as outspans —

DR. ROBERTS: Do you mean the commonage?—Not in the commonage, the location ground.

CHAIRMAN: It is being taken by Europeans?—Yes.

For what purpose?—They say it is theirs; they remove the huts and say, "Go and pitch your hut there", (indicating).

Have you complained of this to the Native Commissioner?—Yes, many times. At one time we asked the surveyor, Mr. Donn, and he excluded that part which was taken in
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already: they reclaimed it with the extension of the Land Act, which we are now in dispute about.

And the Native Commissioner knows about that?— Yes, that case has even passed the E. D. Court, I think, at Bloemfontein.

Are you taking the case to Bloemfontein?— Yes, we intend to.

You lost the case in the E. D. Court?— Yes, we lost it. (Mr. Marembana): I have something to say in connection with surveyed locations. Those in the Peddie district—our allotments after the survey came to be four acres, but I heard it mentioned here that an allotment was six acres. That is another pressure on us.

---------

MR. JAMES HEDASHE ) Representing Municipal Native Location, Adelaide, called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: Can you tell us on what conditions the Natives are allowed to live in the Municipal location?—

(Mr. Hadashe): In the first place, we pitch up our own houses and have to pay a rent of £2 per annum for that house and you will be given the right to keep two cows or beasts and a horse and three goats. For the large stock you have to pay 1/- per head per month and for the goats it is 6d per head per month. The dog tax is 5/- a year; dipping fees are 6d per head per month for two dippings.

Do you pay for your water?— We have no water in the location; we go to the station for water, far away.

How far?— As far as King William's Town station is from here. We have no gardens.

Do you pay for sanitary removals?— We are not asked to pay anything for sanitary removals.

Does the Municipality build latrines?— There are
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only three round about for 500 souls. They are miserable. The location is not cleaned up. There is no light in the location and no water.

What wage does a grownup man get who is working in Adelaide? From 2/- downwards per day and women get 5/- a month.

What sort of work do the men do? There are factories there and they construct dams and roads.

I am asking now of the people who work in the village? They work on the streets.

Is that the only kind of work? They are also employed as domestic servants.

The Men? Yes, they work in the yards.

But inside the house - do they cook? No, sir; it is the women who do that. It is the women who get 10/- and lower down they get 5/-.

Is there enough work for all of them? Yes, at present, because they have opened works, such as the construction of dams and there are factories there.

What sort of factories? A citrus factory.

DR. ROBERTS: Is there not a creamery there? No; the milk is entrained and sent to other places.

What rate of wages do the Natives get on the farms? Ten shillings per month. A man who gets the most gets 15/-.

What food does he get? He gets something like 20 pints a day; it is not even a pint; it is just dished up roughly, and if you were to measure the ration you get, it would not come to twenty pints. People starve. They have got to buy. It is only in name to say they receive 10/-, because they will never have this money in cash, they will always take food on credit and then, at the month end, they have to reckon out, and all that money is earmarked.
You are owing still on so many pounds of mealies that you have not paid for and that you must work for again, and the debt then increases like that, because a bag will be worth more than ten shillings and at last he will have to give in his beast, if he has any, to get rid of the debt. Again, we are congested in Adelaide, because people are being driven away from the farms and now they are going into the towns. If a person has three members of his family, two will be driven away and one will remain. If there were five, three would be driven away and two kept back. Those people wander from pillar to post, they have nowhere to live.

Do they get meat, or only when animals die?—They get no meat.

Animals do not die there?—Yes, they get it when animals die.

Do you get land to plough?—No.

What have you to say about the treatment of Native children over eighteen years of age, as lodgers in the location?—When they attain the age of 18, they are told to leave their homes and put up for themselves. I did not quite catch your question. The girls are not driven away when they are 18, it is the boys who are driven away. They have to live with their parents?—Yes.

Have the boys to pay £2 for their huts?—Yes.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Are the farmers in your district very poor farmers, or are they rich?—They are fairly rich.

And they allow their servants practically to starve?—Yes, they allow their servants to starve, in fact they have abandoned the custom that they used to follow in former times when I used to stay on farms with my children.
They are starved now on the farms because thick milk on the farms is not used for human consumption, the milk being sent away and they make cheese out of it; it is sent away by train, and whatever milk there is left is given to the pigs.

What custom have the farmers abandoned?—All the milk used to be given to the servants. They were even given acres to plough; they were given the right to keep stock; all that has been abandoned.

Since when has this new custom come into operation?—It was started before there were these jackal fences.

It started when the jackal fencing came into operation?—Just before, because now they get a lot of milk for the pigs; the milk is taken out and given to the pigs. There is a dairy factory in Adelaide and some of the milk is sent there.

Do you mean to tell me, if a farmer has such a lot of pigs, he will not give his boys milk to drink?—Pigs have been done away with now.

And what happens to the milk?—It is sent to the factory where cheese is made.

Have the farmers still got Natives on their farms?—Yes, they keep one or two, just to scare away the jackals.

Have they done away with most of their servants?—Yes.

And the few that are left, are they well treated?—Yes, I would say they were, because they make no complaints except that they are not allowed to keep stock.

DR. ROBERTS: What territory do you speak of except Adelaide; what was in your mind when you were speaking?—I speak also of places adjoining Adelaide.

And First Relief?—Yes.

Are these in any way different from Adelaide?—In what way?
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Are they better or worse?—Yes, there are some English farmers who give their servants 15/-.

Where are they?—Some are in Koomie and in Mount Kazans.

What are is the highest wage that they give them there—say down at Koomie?—The highest is 15/-.

And the common ones?—10/-.

You say there were women servants working at 5/- a month in Adelaide. What work do these women do?—It is girls, really, who get 5/-.

But what do they do?—They work inside the houses, doing domestic work.

If it is quite true what you say, that the farmers are very wealthy, can you explain why they give such poor wages?—We also do not know.

There is no explanation?—No, I could not give an explanation, except that I see they do not want a Native man to have stock.

SENIOR VAN NIEKERK: What do the Natives earn in Adelaide?—2/- a day.

With food?—No, they have to find their own food, clothe themselves and pay all the taxes out of the 2/- they get.

DR. ROBERTS: But there must be some reason why Adelaide is so bad as that?—We do not why it is. I posted that memorandum on to the Magistrate and also the Superintendent of Locations; I showed them the memorandum and they cannot contradict that statement because it is true.

You know that the wages in Adelaide are lower than the wages at either Beaufort or Alice or elsewhere. There must be some explanation. Either the Natives are very bad, or the farmers are very bad?—I do not know the reason.
When I showed that memorandum to the Magistrate, he did not say, "You are the cause of all this trouble", and the Native Superintendent did not say, "You are the cause".

MR. LUCAS: Does the farmer pay the Natives' poll tax?—Yes.

Does the farmer pay it for the Native?—Yes.

And do you have to pay it back?—Yes.

----------------

MR. CORNELIUS LABASE
STEPHEN BUNJICA
SHILONK PETSA
REV. VIGOROT KUATSHE

Native Witnesses, called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: (To Rev. Kwatsa): You wanted to say something about the incidence of the poll tax on the poorer members of the community?—Yes, sir. I was sent here by the Ciskei Native Chiefs' Convention to represent them on that point, although I have not much to say because Professor Jabavu touched on many of the points. You have heard how we live under distress. The poll tax has added to the people's distress. The way this tax is collected is very hard on the people. If a person has failed to pay his tax, after three or four months he is arrested and put in gaol as a criminal, and, after two or three months he is released and is told to go and work for the tax. That kind of management resembles what we read in books as something like serfdom - a person who is arrested, having stolen nothing, and put into gaol, and after that what he has is confiscated. The outcome of that is many people stay out in the veld. To give an instance: one man in the Amandlambe tribe here committed suicide when he received a summons that he must pay his poll tax. He did not know where to get the money with
which to pay it, because, as you have heard, most of these people live in conditions of hardship and in that way are unable to pay poll tax. If a boy goes to work, although he is 14 years of age, he is registered to pay this poll tax. An old man, although very aged, if he only has five cattle or whether he has none, has to pay this poll tax. If he says he is not well or is not very well, he must go to the doctor. Even the doctor’s fee is not an easy fee for these people, they are living under such hardships. The people are not able to follow well this poll tax business, because we are told it is a Native development fund - yet only 4/- is used for the Native people; the remainder goes to the Treasury. Most people find that this poll tax is very unfair and heavy.

MR. MOSTERT: With regard to the complaint that you are put in gaol, is that peremptory, immediate, or afterwards? - After three months with some.

And with others? - In the Keiskama Hoek district, where I live, they are given a longer time - from they are given six months.

Do you not think that is a reasonable time to give? - Yes, to people who have money it is reasonable.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Do not these people work? - Some of them are sent back from work, because they are old and cannot work. Some of the younger ones are sent back because they are not quite physically healthy.

Are there many sent back because they are unhealthy? - Yes, there are many complaints of that sort; if there is any defect, they are sent back.

Yes, that is from the mines; but are there any other places from where they are sent back? - There is a young man in the Bebe location, where I live, he wants to
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be exempted from poll tax; he cannot see well and is not
accepted for any employment. He is not exempted even today.

Has he applied to the Magistrate?—Yes, sir.

MR. LUCAS: You said a number of Natives go out
into the wild parts of the country to escape the poll tax;
do you know of cases of that sort?—There are, that I
know of.

What do they do?—They escape the police.

How do they live?—They come back and work their
lands at times, when they get a chance.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Where do they live then,—
in the bush?—Yes, but not all the time; when the police
go back, they come back home.

They only flee into the bush for a couple of hours
or so?—They remain there the whole night.

Are they fit to go and work elsewhere?—Those are
aged men who are sent back from work, who are not accepted.

No, but I mean these men who fly into the bush?—They
have to go to the bush because they are running away
from the poll tax.

Are you pleading for these men?—I do not say it
is good that they escape to the bush, but it is because they
have no money by which they can pay their poll tax.

If they went out to work, would they not have the
money?—Some of them are not physically strong—not
physically healthy.

MR. MOSTERT: Do you know of instances where a
Native has the money in his pocket and does not pay poll tax?—
No, I do not, but I do not say there is no such thing.

DR. ROBERTS: How would you get out of the difficulty;
you are apparently opposing it. How would you get out of the
difficulty; would you have a limit in the age?—Yes, there
should be a limit.
What limit would you make?—I think, when a man attains the age of sixty, he is old enough.

After sixty, the poll tax should not be paid?—Yes, sir; secondly, it should first be ascertained what earnings a person gets, because most people who pay poll tax get 5/- a month—some of them.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Where do they get 5/- a month?—On the farms in the Keiskama Hoek district—and an acre of land; they have families to support.

You have your own lands, have you not?—Yes; people who go to work have no land.

DR. ROBERTS: Then, would you be quite satisfied with the other limit—the lower limit—18 years of age?—We know a man attains his majority when he is 21. When they are 18 we still consider them as boys. It is their fathers who pay the poll tax for them in many cases.

How would you manage with those who are not quite well; would you rely on the magistrate or would you require a doctor's certificate?—I think also that should be dealt with in the same way as others are dealt with,—in this way. The magistrate, to bring such a case in to the Native Gundhla at home and there have the matter discussed and the doctor's certificate be done away with.

Do all the farmers there pay 5/- per month?—Most of them. I do not say there are not a few who do not pay more, but I do not know of any who pay more.

And they only get one acre of land?—Yes, sir.

Are they given food?—Yes, they get rations; only the man is rationed; his family and his children get nothing.

MR. MOSTERT: Unless they work?—They do work.

I say, unless they work for the farmer, they do not get rations?—Yes.
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But if they work for the farmer, they get
rations?— I think so.

You say, you think the women also get their ration
if they work for the farmer?— Yes.

You are not certain?— No.

But you will not say they do not?— No.

SENATOR VAN NIERKERRK: These men who get the 5/-
and an acre of land, are they casual workers, or do they
live permanently on the farms?— They do not get any cash
because they are in debt.

MR. LUGAS: But do they work for the whole year?—
Yes, they stay there for the whole year.

How is it that these people stay there when they
only get 5/- a month and there is no food and the whole of
the country is clamouring for Native labour?— It is because
they are in despair, they do not know what to do.

But if a man is in despair he gets a little money
and looks for something better. Is it easy for them to find
a place for themselves and their families if they do move?—
Unless they go to another farm and have the same conditions.
In the locations they have no room.

SENATOR VAN NIERKERRK: Is there no room just to
live there?— They have no ground; they do not plough.

Have they no opportunity to erect a hut, live there
and go to work somewhere else?— They are now only squatters.

The point is this. The difficulty is their family.
If a man were alone, he could go off and work somewhere else.
Could they not find a place with a hut for their family in
the location and they themselves go off to work somewhere
else?— It is not easy.

Why?— There is no land. The commonage is Crown
lands under the Government.

Surely there must be a lot of Natives living in the
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reserves who do not own plots?— I would not gainsay that.

There are lucky people who are fortunate enough to have a place to put up at. Others are refused; they make application but they are refused to be allowed to live on the commonage.

DR. ROBERTS: 5/- seems a very low wage. Are you sure it is common right through the district?— It is common in the Keiskama Hoek district.

Only there?— Well, I can only answer for the Keiskama Hoek district; maybe it is, because the farmers there only own a small amount of land.

Is it because the farmer cannot pay more, or is it because they have agreed not to pay more?— I could not say, but they are not rich farmers.

CHAIRMAN:

You wish to say something about the system of land occupation?— (Mr. Peteni): I am not prepared for that at present.

When will you be prepared?— I can only touch on a few points. I have made up my paper already.

Oh, I am sorry; it is my mistake. (To Mr. Sonjica): You want to speak on Native customs. Before you start, I would like you to define particularly what you want to do, because we do not want a description of Native customs generally, because that is not our work; but there may be particular Native customs that have an influence on the economic position of the Native that you wish to refer to?— I wanted to speak about the lobolo custom, but I heard you say that we should not bother about that point.

Yes, we have heard plenty about lobolo?— Well, I am disappointed.

Are you disappointed because we know something
about it?— No. I will not press the point.

I do not think it is necessary to take any more evidence on lobolo. We have gone through the points again and again?— I only came forward because my name was called.

Now, Mr. Labasa, you heard what was said today by Professor Jabavu and others about taxation?— Yes.

Have you anything to add to that?— I wanted to speak on this point; I wanted to know if the Government would not make a law for us. Children leave us as soon as they attain the age of 17 and they go and get employment with Europeans—boys as well as girls,— and when you go to fetch them back you are told they are of age, and when they become sick or blinded they are sent back to you. This surprises us. Why is it, when they are healthy they are now under the Europeans, but when they become sick they are sent back? Even when they commit a crime somewhere they are brought back to the parents and we are told, "He still lives with you". I would like to know if the Government would not make a law to help us out of that. Girls are being 'deflowered' by young men and we get nothing out of it. We would like to know if the Government could not make a plan or law in order to control our children.

CHAIRMAN: Can you suggest in what way you would want that law made?— I would suggest that if a young man or young daughter is still staying with his or her parents, if he earns a pound when he goes to work, part of that money should be kept back for his parents and he get the other part.

MR. MOSTERT: What you want is that the deferred pay should be sent back to the parents or guardians?— Yes, sir.

Well, you can do that now?— Well, we do not seem
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master it.

Of course, that is not the fault of the law, it is the fault of the parents. Then, another thing; the younger boys cannot leave without the consent of their parents or guardians?— They have gone away already, being young, as was mentioned in connection with the poll tax.

Of course, that is not the fault of the law?— But when we bring their employers to the Magistrate, we are told "Well, they are of age".

Well, if they are of age, it is quite a different thing. We are referring to the underage Natives?— If they still stay with us, we do not agree they are of age, or that they have attained age. We know when a girl is married she is of age. Whether a girl be fifty, she is still a child if she is not yet married.

That is the Native custom?— Yes.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: What about the boy?— Even if it is a boy and he has got a wife, if he has not pitched up his own kraal, he is not fully grown yet.

CHAIRMAN: You want Native custom to continue to be in force in that respect?— Yes, we want that.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: We have had the complaint elsewhere that one of the reasons why the children run away to the towns and some of them do not come back again is, because it is the fault of the father — that they never give these boys anything of the money they earn; that if they earn 10/-, the father keeps the whole 10/-— Is that the reason why some of these boys run away?— What is he going to do with the money, because he is provided for. He gets all his food and his clothes. What is he going to do with the money?

Well, they say they want some of the money?— It is not our custom for a child to keep money; they cannot keep
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it; they do not know how to keep money.

MR. LUCAS: Are not the children rebelling against that custom? - That is why I would like the Government to assist us. The Government should assist us.

Do you really think they will go out under those conditions? - Yes; they will be in rags and then they will have to go out.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Are you still living under Native custom, or do you consider yourself an educated man - a detribalised Native? - Yes, I see both these points. I was not detribalised until I was grown up. I am under the law of the officials established by the Government.

MR. MOSTERT: But now, if you are detribalised, owing to your being detribalised, your son is detribalised? - I am obedient to the headman who have been put there by the Government, because the chiefs have been deposed.

If the chief's headman told you to bring 5/- or a £1 to him, would you still comply with that? - With ease.

CHAIRMANN: Has ground which was formerly held as grazing by Natives been taken for forest reserve? - (Mr. Petani): Yes.

(Mr. Labase): Yes, more especially in the Keiskama Hoek district.

Do you know how much has been taken? - It is over 31,000 morgen.

When was this made forest reserve? - It is a long story, beyond my knowledge, when it started. Firstly, the Government wanted to take these forests on the ridge of the Amatola Mountains.

MR. LUCAS: Do any of the European officials raise cattle on location land - the Forestry Department particularly? - No, sir. But they can do it on leasing terms.

CHAIRMANN: Are you referring to the whole of the
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forest including the Peddie Forest and that forest along the Amatola?—Yes, sir, but within the boundaries of the Keiskama Hoek district.

But did your cattle graze in the forest?—Yes; they were not stopped from going anywhere formerly.

Was there any open ground taken away where there were no trees?—Yes, extensive grounds too.

Keiskama hoek; was that also a thing that was taken long ago?—I think steps were taken drastically in 1908 and at that time demarcations were done and it took a long time; and in 1912 there was legislation in connection with forest reserves. An Act was passed and then we were deprived of those rights.

Was that open ground right on the top of the mountain, on the top of the Amatola?—Yes, as far as the Piri Bush.

DR. ROBERTS: It is underneath the present forest lands, is it not?—On both sides.

CHAIRMAN: Have trees been planted on that ground?—Yes, on the Piri Bush Mountains and just behind Keiskama Hoek, Gatso Ridge and also at Ustoko.

If these forests were not protected, do you think you would still have that nice stream of water that flows past your place?—Yes.

The water would still run?—Yes. What has stopped the water is the wattle plantation that was on the Lenye plateau. There was always a stream of water when cattle used to graze there, but since the planting of these wattle trees, the water has ceased. Last year, just at the end of the year, people went and complained to the magistrate that the water there had ceased owing to the wattle tree plantation. (Mr. Labase): I have a point I would like to mention. There is another thing in the Keiskama Hoek district. Our children from the mines get down at Thomas's River station and come
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along the mountains, but down at Gata that road has been closed.

CHAIRMAN: You must refer that matter to the Native Commissioner. We cannot deal with a local question.

-----------

MR. SAMUEL MCUYI called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: I understand you wish to speak particularly with regard to the position of the Transkeian chiefs?—Yes, sir.

Will you carry on please?—Four months ago, sir, our chief—I refer to Mr. Jansen—came here. I do not whether what I said to him then might be of interest to you, because, in his case also, we have received no reply up to now. We are not quite clear, sir, as to what exactly is the position of the chiefs in the Giskei. The Government seems to take a different view from ours with regard to chiefs and we do not understand what the meaning of it all is. Again, with regard to their powers, we do not go so far as to request the primitive powers which they had, but it seems to us that their position today is a pitiful one, because they are actually placed in a position below that of their own servants. That is the point I wish to bring before you.

With regard to our chief, I belong to the Ndlambe clan. We made a request for land because, in the case of our land, it was entirely and absolutely taken away from us.

When?—During the cattle killing, in 1856, our land was lost in its entirety.

DR. ROBERTS: Could you give us what you consider should be the status and powers of the chief?—As things are, sir, the chief is placed under the authority of the Magistrate, but we see the peculiar practice with the magistrate. Instead of consulting with the chief, he passes over his head and goes and consults with the headmen, who are under the chief; the result is that the headmen no longer respect
their chiefs, but only the magistrate. That gives rise to a tremendous amount of confusion to our people in the locations.

We will admit that. We know how the Government works; but how would you remedy that?—If I were in authority, I would put the position as this—the magistrate first, then the chief and then the headmen.

Would you make the chief a paid official?—The labourer, sir, is worthy of his hire, and I would recommend that he be well paid.

Then, would the chief deal with headmen and not the magistrate?—No, sir. I began by saying that the chief is under the magistrate in any case. (Q)Would the magistrate deal with the headman through the chief?—Exactly, sir. That is what I want.

And the headmen would deal with the magistrate through the chief?—Exactly, sir, that is our desire.

Who is Dhlambie’s successor now?—Simelela.

Would he call the headmen?—Yes. It would be a help to the Government itself as regards discipline, because, all these troubles that we hear of between the Government and the people are a deliberate affair. It could be avoided in time, if this system were adopted; the chief lays down his word and, according to our methods, there would be nobody agitating or working up a contrary impression among the people.

Now that deals with the position of the chief and his dignity. Would you give him any powers?—I would give them the right to take up local domestic cases. For instance, a case coming before a headmen, before it is taken on appeal to a magistrate, should first of all be tried by a chief.

Minor cases?—Yes, sir.

Then, would you also have civil cases, regarding questions of land and property?—Disputes about land
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Boundaries might begin with headmen and then pass through the chief before they get to the magistrate.

Are you right in saying that the land was taken from Dhlambe in 1856?—With regard to this clan, I will explain; there used to be a magistrate located at Molestantown; he was called the Magistrate of this Dhlambe clan and it was their head office, as it were. Today, that whole territory is just a succession of unbroken European farms.

All that we have now is one plot granted to missionaries by the chiefs, namely Chief Umhala, and called "The Newlands Location".

I was always given to understand that they themselves were willing to sell their lands on account of their poverty after the cattle killing?—We know nothing of that, sir.

Would it be quite possible to restore the chiefs; for example, take the chiefs at Peddie, would it be quite clear there who the chiefs would be?—Do you mean to restore them back to their former places?

No, to restore them. Would there not be difficulty and doubt as to who are the chiefs?—Every Black man knows his chief well; he is thoroughly conversant with who the chief is. There is no dispute about that whatsoever.

With regard to that question, for instance, would you put the son of Edwin Sundili back as the supreme chief?—In the whole of the Ciskei, right as far as the Gamtoos River, all of us know no other chief than that man.

Would you like him restored to deal with the Native people?—That would be the first occasion for me to realise that the Government really means business, if the Government did that.

What is he doing now?—I live in the Crown location I mean the son of Sondili?—He lives on the farm Gwaru, near Middeldrift.
Supposing the chief of an educated Native happens to be a red Native, would not that present very considerable difficulty?—No, sir.

But you admit the possibility that there may be a red chief over educated Natives?—As it is, sir, I myself am living right under red chiefs and it so happens that the present chief, who succeeded last year, is a man of education civilisation.

I presume you were pleased when you came under a chief who was educated?—Yes, of course I was better pleased.

I find it a little bit difficult to think of the picture of yourself or Prof. Jabavu being subjected to a red chief?—It is exactly the opposite as it is; Jabavu himself is under a red chief.

Now, you speak here as representing the chiefs?—Yes, I am representing the Ciskeian Native Convention, sir.

Do the educated Natives in the Ciskei, as a class of whom there are quite a large number, subscribe to the views that you have put forward here this afternoon with regard to chiefs?—Very strongly, sir.

DR. ROBERTS: Would you explain to me a difficulty I have always had with the young men at Lovedale. You say that every man knows his chief. Why is it that, among these students at Lovedale very often they do not know who is their chief at all?—These young men, sir, have strayed far from the chief's court, on account of their fathers not having been conversant with the chief's court as a practice.

But you know that is the case, as I have stated?—Yes, I quite follow you, sir; it is so.

That about only half the students at Lovedale know who are their chiefs?—Supposing the chiefs were restored to their places, those boys would have no difficulty in knowing who are their chiefs. The reason is, because
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their chiefs are deposed and headmen are acting in their places; that is the reason why they cannot tell who they are.

SENIOR VAN NIEKERK: Are there many chiefs here in the Gisela who are not recognised?— No, there are not many.

How many are there?— The Government itself does understand and agree that those whom we say are the chiefs are the chiefs. There is just one thing which we fail to understand; there is a classification into Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3, by the Native Affairs Department.

A classification of chiefs?— Yes, whereby the Department deliberately chooses a subordinate man and makes him Class 1 and the real man is reduced and degraded to Class 3, so as to confuse us all most deliberately, as it seems.

CHAIRMAN: Does it not generally happen that the man who is made Class 1 is an educated man?— No, sir, it does not follow on those lines.

MR. LUCAS: Do you know what lines they do proceed on?— Do you mean the Department?

Yes?— During our discussions with our local magistrates, sir, it seems that it is because some of the chiefs had fought against the Government long ago and that a distinction is made against those who have never fought against the Government, and that makes us think that the Government has an everlasting grudge against those who have fought against it.

DR. ROBERTS: What about Njokweni; is he a chief?— Yes, sir.

SENIOR VAN NIEKERK: These chiefs you are speaking about, have they and their following their own lands - their own reserves or locations?— Yes.

The Commission until 9 a.m. Wednesday, 28th January, adjourned.