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CHUHUMI: I have the opportunity of reading through your statement, which is undoubtedly of very great interest and importance, and we would now like to ask you a few questions in regard to the points which you have raised. On page 3 of your statement, you expressed the view that the detribalised Native acquires the habit of saving. This is what you say, "The detribalised Native acquires the habit of saving, for he no longer need share all his earnings with his relations. For the Native, individualism is the first gate to Progress."

Now, is it true that he need no longer share his earnings with his relations? From the evidence which we have had before this Commission, one would get the impression that he continues sharing his earnings with his relations?-- No; in town, not to a great extent.

I am speaking now of the town dwelling Native, the one who has been brought up in town, but there is a tendency for people from the country to come to the town, stay with the Natives in the town, be their guests and remain their guests.
There is a great deal of hospitality given, but not a great deal of sharing in Johannesburg, for example. Not what you find among some of the mine Natives who go home to their reserves and, within a very short time, dissipate a good deal of the goods they have brought back with them. Within a very short time they lose a great deal of that, and they have to give presents all round.

There is a certain amount of good in this custom of the Natives in helping the other man out?—Yes. Among the Coloured people in the Cape where there is no question of detribalisation or tribalisation, there is just the custom of the children giving their parents a great deal of their savings. In the Western Province I know it is so, but even that is disappearing, especially since the industrialisation of the Cape, of the Western Province, in the last 20 years.

MR. LUCAS: It is supposed to be a big handicap in the employment of Malay girls. It is stated that they will take no interest in their work, because the parents take everything they get?—Yes; the Malay life, the family life, is much more integrated, it hangs more together. I think I can state that definitely, because I know something of the Malay section in Cape Town. I did social work there for many years.

DR. ROBERTS: Yes, but is not that a common feature of the poor?—Yes, one finds a great deal of that. To a considerable extent it used to be so in Cape Town, 20 and 25 years ago.

CHAIRMAN: It is common with the poor in all countries, but here it is a national custom. If one man of the tribe is hungry, the others should not have too much
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food?—Every man is entitled to go and work. But if he appears on the scene, he expects to share.

It seems that socially there is a great deal of benefit which can be obtained if we could, in some way, keep the benefits of that custom without making it react against saving?—Yes, your only hope of doing that is to retain the family life pretty firmly, and that is pretty difficult in a community like the Witwatersrand. Family life very quickly tends to disintegrate.

Even in the locations?—Well, I do not know. We still have to see the effects of the location policy of the last few years.

You mean, it is too early to judge whether locations will stem it?—Yes.

Now, I want to refer to page 5 of your statement where you oppose a stock tax on three grounds. This is what you say: "The young men suggest a tax on those who own more than 20 head of cattle, but the older people strenuously oppose. I am opposed to a tax because (1) it will irritate unduly, without creating the right attitude towards overstocking, (2) it will cause forced sales and thus reduce the cash value of Native cattle, and (3) it evades the real tax, - education in regard to the evils of overstocking and the provision of an attractive market for Native cattle." And then you refer to Dr. Watkins Pitchford's scheme. The second part of your first objection does not seem to me to be at all plain?—My point is, that in a thing of this kind, if you want to get rid of overstocking, you must convince people that overstocking is wrong and that, merely to put on a tax, will irritate them without making them believe that it is a good thing, while reducing the stock.
Do you think that they will probably pay the tax under a sense of grievance and go on overstocking? I have found such fierce opposition whenever I have spoken about it to groups of Natives, and to tribal Natives especially. They are up in arms at once. They say, "Cattle are our bank, it is our only means of saving and you are going to stop that." It is impossible to discuss it calmly with them; they resent it immediately.

On the other hand, Mr. Thornton, who knows the agricultural side of the Natives pretty well, says, if this thing goes on, it is simply aimed in a period of 20 years to destroy all the bases for their stock holding altogether, and they will come to the same point in a very much worse way, and I must say that that is the impression that I have gathered in going round the country? I do not think that anyone could be more impressed about that than I am, and these old men realise it. They say"Our hills are red, why has all the grass gone?". One tries to rub it in, but it does not seem to lead anywhere.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you not think that intensive education will tend? Later on, you will find that I suggest that. When you begin with individual tenure and go in for fencing as a result of individual tenure, that will be the quickest way by which you will be able to limit the stock.

For grazing as well? No; once you begin to cut up the land, there is a definite limitation on the grazing as well in consequence and besides, they will have other things. Cultivation will take the place of the cattle.

CHAIRMAN: Could cultivation actually increase the
food supply, especially at a time when the food supply is shortest, in Winter? -- That is so. England did not begin Winter feeding until they really had enclosed lands.

I am not talking of special provision, but the ordinary cultivation of maize gives you a large amount of winter food apart from your grain? -- Yes, that is so.

But the difficulty is, your ordinary grazing ground, if you do not fence that, then how will you put a stop to overstocking? Now, supposing you have one location of intelligent Natives, who decide to reduce the number of their stock to what the veld can carry; they will have no protection from the animals of the locations round about them. As a matter of fact, the cattle will require very much herding -- that is, the cattle from the other locations round about -- to keep them away from the good grazing, because those cattle get no good grazing in their own grounds? --

There is one way of stopping that -- that is, having a definite limitation of your grazing grounds, so that one part lies untouched for a period.

Have you any idea that the stock tax will be paid -- will not the Native rather go in and do something else than pay his stock tax --- in other words, it will put another burden on him without actually reducing the overstocking? -- Yes; I am afraid you have to get right down to convince the Native that overstocking is wrong.

I mean, will not the Native rather go in for some other things and earn more money in order to pay his stock tax? -- Quite so. I have reports shewing that they will most strongly oppose this. I think Dr. Roberts' point that education at the bottom is the only solvent, is
a sound one and I am nervous lest the tax such as had been suggested may create the wrong attitude to what we are after. Honestly, I am afraid of it and when I listen to what people tell me, I am afraid that it may make the Natives more bitter and resentful and less inclined to listen to advice. Mind you, if the Bunga were to take the lead and were to say, "We are prepared to introduce a stock tax", coming from themselves and from a body of men who could go round and convince their people, there might be some hope, but coming from above, coming from us or from the Government, I am afraid of a stock tax, I am nervous of it.

MR. LUCAS: Would you still be nervous of it even if every penny were handed over to the Natives to make use of? -- It takes a long time to convince Natives that they really get the money. They do not see it. They do not see a return in the Gazette that the local fund amounts to so much and that the balance is available for development. It takes a very long time to soak in.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you think the race between the destruction of the country by overstocking and the education of the Native up to a point where he will realise the evil of it, -- do you think that education will win? -- I am nervous of it. I quite realise what is going on. I am really quite worried about it. I go round and see the state of the land; the good grass is gone in many places.

CHAIRMAN: Yesterday, we had two witnesses in Pretoria, Mr. Thornton and, quite independent of him, a Native Commissioner, Mr. Yates. Both expressed, in almost identical words, the view that, if we waited for education to solve this thing, the Native would have lost the best of his holding
-- his whole existence in the tribal areas would be ruined before education had overtaken him?-- I do not know what you could do by propaganda and I think possibly it might be well worth trying. Try it locally as an experiment, and not on a large scale.

MR. LUCAS: May it not be that these gentlemen, both of them, assume that there will be no increase in the intensiveness of the propaganda, or at any rate, no substantial increase. In fact, has anything substantial been done to educate the Natives?-- Very little. Of course, individual magistrates have been very good in this respect and I can mention the names of some men who have tried to do their level best.

You can see that, in Lady Frere, where sections of tribes in certain locations have agreed to tax themselves to provide the necessary fencing in connection with this stock question, but it is only the individuals who seem to have done that, and nothing has been done on a large scale?-- Yes, that is so. You have a very keen man in Mr. Harries of Lady Frere.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: But that is the policy of the Department, to impress upon the Natives the seriousness of the position?-- Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: There is no mass propaganda?-- Yes, that is the trouble, it is all individual.

One man uses one argument and another one uses a different one?-- Exactly. There is no real impact, but what is at the bottom of this nervousness is this resentment on the part of the Natives. They feel that the whole world is against them and now you are going "to touch our cattle, which is the last stronghold we have got and we
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will not have it". We have to take that into consideration.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Yes, that is your difficulty, that, with a Native, his cattle is almost sacred, it is his bank? -- It seems to me there are degrees in regard to that matter, degrees to the extent to which they regard their cattle as sacred.

MR. LUCAS: Mr. Thornton made a point of the fact that the land companies, by charging so much per head for grazing, have in fact limited the cattle so that their lands are not overstocked, while other lands adjoining theirs in the Native reserves, are badly overstocked, or even totally trodden out? -- Well, of course, in the Transkei the Bunga has tried, through the two schools, to tackle this question by a certain amount of propaganda and also by encouraging Natives to go in for stock selection, but for that, of course, you have to have individual tenure, fencing, etc.

It comes to this, that improvement of stock cannot be achieved by the Communal system? -- No, it cannot.

Mr. Redsett, in Eshowe, has been trying to get certain Natives round about that area to fence off about one morgen or one acre and have kukuya grass on that. He is rather hopeful of being able to do something that way, but the difficulty there is to get the chiefs to agree to allow a number of these areas to be fenced off, because it is depriving the others of their grazing lands? -- Yes, I realise that. There is that third point, too. You have, in addition, to provide the Native with an outlet for his cattle -- he has to get something for them and, in that respect, I find a great deal of complaint. They tell you this, they say, "When we want to buy cattle they are expensive
and when we sell we get nothing for them". Is it going to be possible, by the Watkins Pitchford scheme to have a market for the export of scrub cattle for extract?

CHAIRMAN: We were told yesterday that there is a report on the scheme in the hands of the Government now, but it has not been published yet?— No, I believe that is so.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Which particular scheme do you refer to, Dr. Watkins Pitchford's extract scheme?— Yes. It does not matter what the quality of the stock is at all, now, if that thing is a success, then there is a possibility of a very considerable market for scrub cattle.

Of course, there is a market in East London now, the meat extract works there?— I did not know that. I have put here just my own impressions about the tax, and naturally, being so much concerned about the position of the lands, my mind is quite open as to any steps which might be taken, but I express here my nervousness as to what effect a stock tax might have, especially if it is imposed from above.

MR. LUCAS: Could you express any opinion as to what effect it might have if we were to say, "There is a hill turning red, we are going to fence that off and we are not going to allow you to put any cattle on that for a time". Have you any idea as to how they would stand that?— Prof. Schoonland of Grahamstown, carried on some experiments in the Transkei on that, and I believe that the Natives were very much interested in it at the time and the experiments were very successful in shewing how rapidly grass would recover if only given a chance.
I think we know that, but the question I was putting is the reaction on a Native on being ordered to have a certain portion of his grazing land shut off and excluded from use for a period?-- I do not know what reaction there would be, unless one could secure his interest. As a matter of fact, I may say that Prof. Schonland got the Natives interested in his experiments and, for a period, they were quite prepared to do what he asked them.

CHAIRMAN: You say that there seems to have been an over-eagerness to use Chapter 4 of the Act in the Ciskei?--
Yes, that is so; I am sorry, I say Chapter 4 in my statement but it should be Chapter 5. It is the question of land titles. I am quite satisfied from my own enquiries that, if the authorities had been content to go a little more generally, they would have got all they wanted administratively, without going so fiercely at it. My information is confidential, but I think that that is so.

I do not quite follow in what way?-- Cleaning up the mess. There is no doubt that titles have got into a fearful way and the idea of the administration was, and quite rightly so, that things should be cleaned up. They started out by issuing new titles, holus bolus, but had they been content to go on title by title, as things came in, they would have got all they wanted. If they had been content to go more slowly, there would have been no difficulty. But now the Natives got the idea that the Government was trying to put something over them again and it was very unfortunate, because it landed them in litigation. At the moment, I do not know what is going to happen -- I do not know whether the case is going to the Privy Council. I am satisfied in
my own mind that they are stupid about it, but once they have a thing in their minds, it is difficult to shift.

What is the case?-- The question of substitution of title, as provided for in Chapter 3 of the Administration Act.

Actually, as regards building sites in the Transkei, no administrative action could ever put the matter right, because, if you gave a man title to a piece of ground, to which another man already had the title, it meant that you were introducing worse trouble and actually "A" was occupying ground to which he had a title, and to which "B" also had a title. You had the position that one man was occupying an entirely different piece of ground under the same title, and something had to be done. I am merely using this as the thing --- I am merely shewing the trouble which is facing the Administration at the present time.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you not think that what you said is perhaps more pertinent to your thought, that it was because of the other Acts which were being passed at the same time which gave the feeling of insecurity? -- Certainly. There is a feeling of unrest and insecurity. I brought these points in here to shew that the Native Administration Act is suffering from the unfortunate incidents which occurred making it more difficult to use the Act in the way that it might be used.

Now, on the top of page 6, you say that many of the Natives regard the Native Affairs Department as an enemy rather than as a friend. Do they have the feeling that there is a Department as apart from the local administration? This is what you say there: "There is now more than a
disposition among even tribal Natives to regard the Native Affairs Department as an enemy rather than a friend. One chief has spoken strongly on this to me:— "Queen Victoria was our good Queen, and we Zulus all remember her. Since she died we Zulus have had a bad time. Since Union we don't know where we are. We have no one to help us. We don't know the Native Affairs Department?— Yes; the Natives seem to know that there is something beyond -----

Do they differentiate between the Department as such and the Department's local representatives?— Yes, I have that definite impression.

DR. ROBERTS: It will all depend on the individual?— They speak of the Government and what the Government is doing in Parliament. They know all about it and those who do not are very few indeed.

CHAIRMAN: One got the impression at least in the districts that there are good and sympathetic administrators and there were good relations between the Natives and the Commissioners?— Yes, between the Commissioners and the Natives, but there is a good difference. Frequently the Commissioner has to say, "I am sorry, I cannot help it; my masters tell me to do so-and-so." There is a difference between what the magistrate feels and, however discreet he may be, -- they all try to be discreet -- they are bound now and then to make it clear that they have to do what they are told.

They get to the stage of saying, "Whenever I see that man called Government, I shall shoot him"?— Yes. I want to make a point that I am speaking here as one who is not in any way concerned in politics. I am merely speaking of the state which the Natives have got into in the last
And when you get into a state like that, it needs something pretty revolutionary in the attitude of the Department to get back to anything like a satisfactory position?-- May I emphasize the point which I made on page 6 and that is that even while the country as a whole has not yet made up its mind about our Native policy, it is urgent that Native Affairs Officials should come together soon and frequently in the various areas, and not merely in the various areas, but from all over the country. They have had one or two conferences in the past - officials from the various parts, because I do find that, taking only the officials - they feel very isolated because they rarely have an opportunity of knowing what the other men in their Province are thinking of, and they certainly do not know what the people in the other Provinces are thinking of. I feel that the Native Affairs Officials should meet from time to time and I am sure a great deal of good would be done in the way of clearing their minds and in the way of removing a great many misconceptions, and at the same time it would help them in dealing with Natives if they could arrive at a common mind among themselves. The whole difficulty is that there is no common mind in the Native Affairs Department today.

CHAIRMAN: In view of the fact that personal touch is so much more important with the Natives than with the Europeans, you think these people should be in close contact with each other so that they would all be able to speak with the same voice?-- Yes; have a common mind, as it were.

That common mind may be regarded as existing among the Europeans by virtue of their press and so on?-- To a
great extent.

They know that certain things are expected of them -- among the Natives you have not got that medium of contact between large numbers of people. The European communities as a whole are expected to obey certain laws, they understand the reason behind them and so on, -- they understand things through the press and through the greater facilities of communication? -- Yes, they are continually in contact with other people throughout the country. There is a definite level of public conduct which is expected. The Native on the one side and the Native Administrator at the same time, has not got that medium which keeps him in touch with everyone and, therefore, I feel that we should bring the Administrators together from time to time to get that contact and keep it.

I see your idea. You want to have regular conferences. I take it that that is your view? -- Yes. The Administrators themselves should know how they go on. In the Transkei, there is this annual conference with the Bunga which serves an excellent purpose and several men in other territories have said to me, when they have had the opportunity of attending such a conference, how much impressed they have been by those particular discussions.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you think that that is one of the causes of the homogeneity of the Transkei? -- I am sure it is one of the causes. There is a corps there, a corps of magistrates who are really working together. Elsewhere, you feel that there is not that cohesion and the result is that, in other parts, they are dispirited.
MR. LUCAS: In Natal, they are certainly dispirited?—And there is another important factor coming in now. I feel it is a very important one. The Government has initiated a new policy of transferring men from other areas and mixing up men from the Transvaal and the Cape, sending men from the Cape to Natal and from Natal to the Transvaal, and so on, and that again has increased the sense of uncertainty and lack of touch with each other. Now, the old Natal men had a feeling, "We all belong to the Natal Service and we understand each other," but the introduction of this new element has tended to change matters and it certainly has increased the need for regular conferences.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you not think that that has some good points in it?—I am not objecting to it, but I do think it is important that they should have an opportunity of meeting together and they should be able to discuss matters, they should be able to have confidence in what they do, and I feel that that would help to create that common mind of which I have spoken.

CHAIRMAN: I want to refer you to page 6 of your statement, paragraph 3, (b). You say there that chiefs should be used as administrative officers in regard to (b) the registration of customary unions. You might as well include births and deaths?—Yes, certainly.

It will have a distinct improving effect?—Yes. We have gone back in that respect and I would certainly be prepared to have that if you think it is possible.

On page 7, in your last paragraph, you say, "The term 'detribalised' covers the following classes:— (b) Native labourers, labour tenants and squatters on European farms
who have nothing beyond the sentimental attachment (if that) towards their traditional chief". Now, do you not think that you are over-stressing the point of the attachment of labour tenants and squatters to their chiefs?-- In what way?

You say that it is nothing beyond a sentimental attachment. I query that?-- You think it is more?

Yes, it is a good deal more?-- Yes, I should be prepared to accept that, and to modify that statement. I do not know that I have sufficient intensive knowledge to say that. My own observations may be somewhat scattered. My own impression was that the authorities could not use the chiefs for any purposes of control.

You mention the Native labourers, too. The great bulk of the Native labourers are very definitely subject to the chiefs. For instance, take those who come from the mines?-- Yes, but they come from very special Native areas. I was speaking there of Native labourers on European farms.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you think there is any possibility, even if we did whatever we possibly could, to retain the policy of Government by Chiefs in the future, in the long future?-- I was very much struck by an article which I read the other day in "Africa". That is a journal. It was an article written by, I think, the late Native Chief Commissioner of Northern Rhodesia, on the position of the chief, and he expressed the view quite definitely that it is going to be more and more difficult to use the chief as an administrator and controlling officer and, so far as I can see, his views are very much on the lines which I have raised here.

Except that you suggest using him?-- He also says that we must use him as far as possible in individual
cases. You have to take individual areas into account, but by and large, the chieftainship is going because the chief cannot maintain it, either by his prowess in war or his skill in negotiation -- he is simply a recognised appointed chief and the tendency is for the Government to use the hereditary principal and, by the second or third generation, he is no great personality and so the interest disappears. I realise that there is something which still has a measure of value, and the chiefs have influence, no question about it and, if we can take chief by chief and see whether we cannot use this chief or that one in a particular way indicated by me here, in that way I believe we shall be making the best use of the resources at our command. But to make chieftainship a sort of basis for Native government, that, to my mind, is impossible.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you think that the Tanganyika scheme is bound to fail?-- In Tanganyika, they are still pretty well integrated in tribes according to Mr. Mitchell, the present Secretary for Native Affairs, but even he recognises the difficulty. If you once have to get too settled state of affairs where the chief is chief because he is his father's son, then, unless he maintains his personality, unless he has a personality of such a type that he is able to maintain his influence, the tendency is for the man of personality to have more influence than the chief.

Do you think that the chief's councils could be made more use of?-- Well, they are very hopeful in Tanganyika about that. They have not gone so far in disintegration, so as not to be able to use the tribal organization, but they quite realise that it is a sort of experiment which may have to justify itself in the future.
They have a clearly defined policy in the matter?—Yes.

Have you seen their instructions?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN: In the tribal system, without the influence of the European, was there not a certain factor tending to the correction of the failing of the hereditary system? Now and then, you could resort to the use of the assegai to correct the failings of the hereditary system?—In the Bantu life, the position of the righthand house is an important factor. The righthand house has a very important and very definite status and a person of independent character belong to the righthand house could develop into a chief from the very fact that his house is rather an independent house and, according to all investigations, one can find from Kenya, right down to this part of Southern Africa, the Bantu has always tended to disintegrate. Tribes have always tended to disintegrate. I do not know whether you have seen a little book written by Driberg. Driberg, in his book, makes it clear that the Bantu tribes have been very democratic and have hived off when there was any need for it without any supreme authority.

Yes, the word Bechuana means people who have gone in different directions?—Yes.

That is one method, but they did get rid of a weakling who was the next in the line of succession, in order to make room for a strong man when the weakling went out. They made room for the strong man in a way in which a civilised community could not, — that was through the assegai?—Yes, and not only that.

An accident would happen?—Yes. The position of the regent in Bantu life is interesting. Owing to their
method of succession, the heir was usually a young child and time and time again a regent was necessary. Usually, the regent was a man of outstanding personality and, if he was unscrupulous at all, he would quickly assume to himself all the power, even though the heir grew up and had to establish himself. It is true that it required a man of considerable force to do that, but from what we read of the history of Bantu tribes, right from the earliest beginnings, we find that constant breaking up — the influence of one particular personality seems to have been constant. It seems to me that one can say that among the Bantu people there is a greater tendency towards disintegration than towards integration. That is the point I am trying to make here, and one finds that right through their history.

MR. LUCAS: What did you have in mind when you made this quotation on the first page of your statement, that the hereditary system had gone mad. You say there, "Our present idea of chieftainship is 'the hereditary system gone mad'. The old system was not hereditary.'" — Yes, that is putting it in rather an extreme way. It was hereditary in a sense, but there was always this tendency to break away, first of all, because of the position of the righthand house and its tendency to become independent.

DR. ROBERTS: Would you tell us what you are quoting from? — It is a quotation from my own notes, — from my own rough notes.

CHAIRMAN: But actually, the cases which one knows of, where the person who was the next one to succeed has not succeeded, or where his run has very soon been broken, are very few compared with the cases where it has been strictly hereditary and, in these cases, there has—been
exceptional circumstances like, for example, the Ndambi?—I think there is a distinction to be made between the heir and a person of the blood. My argument still holds so far as the blood is concerned. (Mr. Faye makes a remark to the Chairman in regard to succession by the direct heir or a person of the blood.) I make a distinction between Mr. Faye’s point and mine. He makes the point that he does not know of any case where the chieftainship has remained in the blood. My point is that the succeeding heir, the line has been broken, and constantly been broken, because of the tendency of this righthand house to be independent and the tendency of the regent to be all powerful.

When you come to apply the hereditary system to Native administration, your first tendency would be to say, so that because and so is the heir to his rather, he must succeed. But he may prove to be a very unworthy man and he may be quite incompetent to carry out his administrative duties. The Government, on such occasions, has had very great difficulties in regard to whom they should select instead. Then you are right up against it. It is very difficult to say how far one has to carry out the hereditary system in the appointment of a chief.

CHAIRMAN: In Native tribal government, what did they do when they had a useless heir?—Well, he very often disappeared.

There were other corrections too for the failings of the hereditary principle?—Well, you cannot do that today.

MR. LUCAS: And supposing you adopt a scheme of educating the chief, then whom are you going to choose to educate, or do you want all the people of the blood to be
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educated? — I think a chief should certainly see to it that his family are properly educated. Quite a number of chiefs have said to me, "I feel I am not good enough for this job today and I want my son to be educated properly so that he can do the job." Is there any way by which they can be helped to help their people?

DR. ROBERTS: But there are very few chiefs especially among those in the Transvaal, who do not see to it that their sons are educated. They send their children to the various colleges, such as Fort Hare and Lovedale? — Yes; they want them to be educated in such a way that they will be able to be leaders.

CHAIRMAN: You consider there should be training of an administrative nature for sons of chiefs? — Yes; but I would not specialise too early.

You suggest that they should go at least up to Standard VII? — I say Standard VIII. That is a stage at which it is possible to begin to make a differentiation in education.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You want to use the chiefs where they seem likely to give good results — other tribes in the same area might ignore the chiefs? — I do not suggest that. The extent of his powers and functions would depend on the character of the man himself.

Would not differentiation create difficulties; one chief having power and another not having power, would not that cause trouble? — No. There have been so many changes throughout South Africa that you cannot apply one system throughout the country. One thing may be very good in Zululand, but in the Transvaal it may not be good at all.
One has to recognise that one cannot apply an uniform system.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Would you differentiate within one particular area, such as Semukuniland?— I would consider that according to the facts of the situation; but I do plead in a general way for differentiation.

CHAIRMAN: I want to go to page 3 of your statement, on land. At the top, you say "On the other hand, many friends of the Natives are troubled because of the wastage in freehold ownership. I advocate freehold since I believe that it gives greater inducement to saving and to cultivation? I should like you to explain more fully what you mean by that?— I notice that in the copy which you have before you, the word "committee" appears after "ownership". I do not remember using that word there and I would ask you to delete it. What I meant was that the selling to Europeans of land bought by Natives freehold, was causing a good deal of uneasiness. Natives get rid of their land very quickly. We know their tendency— they get into debt, mortgage their land and, in the end, lose it.

That is the old freehold title, where there was no reservation in regard to the sale to Europeans?— Yes.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: On that question of land, you take strong exception to squatting and to labour tenants. You take it from the point of view of the Native, but usually it is the other way about. I mean, that you find people say that, from the European point of view it is a bad policy to have either squatters or labour tenants. Do you not think that, after all, a farmer will tell you that it is not an economic proposition to employ labour tenants -- leaving out squating for the present?— Yes.

But surely, taking everything into consideration in
regard to the labour tenant, do you not think he is better off than the labourer if you define him as a paid man?--
In a sense I hold that the Natives like labour tenancy, because they can have their cattle with them and with wage paid labourers, the cattle usually are taboo; but looking at it from the point of view of development, I am quite satisfied in my own mind that, however comfortable a Native may feel as a labour tenant, he has no inducement, no real inducement to progress, because he has no status.

What do you mean by the word "status" there?-- He has no real anchor, no real stake in the land. He is there by the nature of things on sufferance.

Yes, but he has some stake. What has the pure labourer got?-- A man who works on a cash basis gets an immediate return for his labour, which is a matter for considerable satisfaction.

Now, of course, you must know that there are stages in labour tenancy?-- Yes, all sorts of stages.

In my part of the country, that is the Northern Transvaal, we have labour tenants who are on a three months' basis, which I think is the lowest basis in the Union. But there are others where they are on a nine months' basis?-- Yes, I know. One finds different conditions in different parts of the Union.

Now, I have always considered that, if we farmers in the Northern Transvaal, in the Waterberg area and the Zoutpansberg area, had to turn our labour tenants into pure labourers, it would be a very definite hardship on these Natives?-- Yes, as things are, I think so.

CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by as things are?-- Well, he cannot go away from there, he is landless, he cannot
go to any of the Native areas because he has nothing there.

Assuming that he can get occupation as a wage labourer ——?

SENATOR VAN NIKKERK: Take the labourers at my place. They are labour tenants there and they work for three months in the year. In my case, they work three calendar months. That labourer — that boy, gives me three months labour for nothing; he has his house free and his land, and he gets his crops from that land. He stands the same chance as I stand, there may be bad years when he will get nothing at all, but, on the other hand, there may be exceptionally good years. But he has something at stake. His wives and children are busy, they get moroch. They scuffle the lands; the women are kept busy. Now, If I turned these people into ordinary labourers, they are bound to degenerate. I have had experience of this sort of thing. I know what the position is in the Cape, where I originally come from. The labourers there at one time were also labour tenants in a different sense of the word, a man was allowed to have a garden and fruit trees, but he was engaged as a day labourers. Whenever he was required, he was called in, but economic pressure afterwards forced the farmers to say, "No, we are not going to give you any land to cultivate for yourself", and the result has been that your Cape Coloured man on any farm in the Cape has nothing to cultivate, — he can hardly run a few fowls. It has brought down the status of these people. Possibly they may get a little more money, but they do not profit by that—. I quite appreciate that, from the point of view of comfort, the labour tenant on a good farm is pretty well off, and a good many Natives with whom I have discussed it are
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terrified of a position being created in which they might not be able to have their cattle and their land which they cultivate, although they say that the whole position as it is at present is full of trouble.

It may be full of trouble, but look at this. A Native may have only one or two cows, but still, from these one or two cows, he gets enough milk for himself and his children?— You see, from the statement which I have attached to this, it is quite clear that the Native gets far more in kind than he ever realises.

Why should you people be up against this labour tenancy?— For this reason, that the whole thing, to my mind, does not lead anywhere. It is uneconomic because the Native does not realise that he is getting what is given to him and, secondly, he does not give the labour which the farmer is entitled to expect from him for what he gives him. Of course, I am speaking of conditions in certain areas, but there are so many degrees and conditions and in a great many cases I have come across conditions which are really deplorable, where the whole family worked the whole year through without any cash payment being made at all, and nevertheless, the family have to pay taxes and have to find cash for all sorts of things. To give you an example, I was in the Court House at Vryheid one day. I went there to have a talk with the Magistrate. A Native came into the court who was a labour tenant; he was asked by the Magistrate "Why have you not paid your wheel tax?" He replied, "I have not got any money, I have not received any money from my baas for nearly two years". He put that to the Magistrate, and the Magistrate asked him, "Why did you not call
and tell us?" The man told him, "I could not get permission to leave the farm to come and tell you". Well, the Magistrate postponed the case for investigation. I made some enquiries as to whether that was not an extreme case, but I was told that there were quite a great many of those cases in that area, and I found myself that that was so.

I found that there were cases where no cash of any kind was paid - there was no such basis between the labour tenant and the owner, yet the labour tenant has to find the cash somehow and so he generally has to get rid of his stock -- which, of course, is quite a useful way of reducing overstocking. On the other hand, he feels aggrieved, because he gets nothing for his labour.

I find the same sort of thing in the Southern States of America. It still exists there, although it is disappearing. Until 1916, 1917 and even later, there was a great deal of that kind of thing going on in the Southern States, and, as the Negroes put it, "They were working for a dead horse", and it was not worth working at all. Life had nothing in it. On account of the tremendous demand for Negro labour in the North and in the East after that time, things changed. Labour had to be revolutionised, the farmers began, more and more, to engage their people on a cash basis and the latest information which I have got is that the position is today infinitely more satisfactory both from the point of view of labour and from the point of view of the employer, and they are getting more and more to a common basis on which they feel it worth their while going on. The negroes feel that they are getting cash
for their labour and the farmers feel they are getting more labour for their cash. I quite realise that a change here would bring about a big social alteration, but I do feel, at the same time, that, to go over to a cash basis, would be of the greatest benefit in the long run.

CHAIRMAN: One need not go entirely to a cash basis?-- One has to go very gradually. I do realise that it would be a catastrophe in South Africa if we were to go over to a cash basis entirely, all at once.

As a matter of fact, the rural Natives do not want to go to a cash basis because it means giving up their stock?

Well, the question is whether, in the long run, it would not be better for them, whether going/as they are doing at present is of any benefit to them themselves and to the White farmers.

MR. LUCAS: Your point is that they have a definite status if they are placed on a cash basis?-- Yes, they will have something to work for.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you know Mr. Thornton's view about the share basis?-- Yes, I know he is keen on that, but I would rather see a cash basis than a share basis.

MR. LUCAS: Well, his is also partly a cash basis. The employer has to do the marketing as well and hand over the cash?-- Well, you know the story of the Negro who constantly felt that he was being done down by his boss. One year, he brought his cotton bales to the employer and his employer said, after disposing of the bales, "That is all there is for you. That is all you get." But the man had kept one bale back and he was chuckling to himself all the time because he had that other bale of cotton on the shelf. They
always feel that they are done down. I quite realise that labour tenancy has to remain a long time, and when I advocate a change I advocate it with a full realisation that the social and economic changes have to be brought about very carefully and gingerly. But you should aim at a cash basis all through. There are three types:— lease, cash basis, and ownership. The question is, which would be the most economic.

SENIOR VAN NIEKERK: I can see that it is going that way, when the farmer will not allow any Native to do any ploughing for himself or have any stock?—Yes, in that time you will have to have cash leasing.

If you come to cash leasing, then you go against the whole policy of segregating the Natives as far as land is concerned, and then we cannot agree with that policy?—I am prepared to agree with you as a matter of expediency, apart from principle. As a matter of expediency, you might have separation of ownership and where there is ownership involved, it should be in particular areas. But there are two factors which you have to keep in mind. The one is that the areas which are going to be possible for ownership, will be extremely limited and the second factor is that agriculture must be supplied with labour.

I am just as much concerned to see that agriculture is properly organized as to see that the Native is protected and, if you are going to segregate the Natives merely into areas where they are owners on such a basis that they will not be able to go and work for a period on a cash basis, then you are not going to give agriculture
a steady supply of Native labour. My a system of cash leasing, properly regulated, you are also supplying the farmer through the families of the lessee with the supply of cash labour which he wants. You have your tenants on your land, - you have a certain fixed number there. That tenant is there, he is there on a sound basis and able to make a decent living, and his children are able to see the possibility of themselves becoming lessees, but, in the meantime, they are available as cash labour.

Your idea is all right, but it will not work in practice, apart from the policy now. In actuality, you are reverting to squatting, because you give the farmer the right to lease his land to Natives. Surely that is just the same as squatting? -- No; I make it clear in my statement that every lease should be authorised by a land committee, and that it should be subject to very definite provisions in regard to cultivation.

I agree with your conditions, but the principle is the same? -- No.

Today, we say we do not want your Europeans to allow their land to be run by Natives, to hire it out to squatters, because these Natives are under no control and they deteriorate the land and they are a nuisance to the farmers generally. If they want to go in for squatting, they must go into their own areas. That is the policy which has been adopted in this country and I feel sure that very few people indeed will uphold squatting. Now, you say we must have a system of leasing which, to my mind, is very much the same as squatting. You take my Natives under the Native tenant system; you want me to do
away with that and I have to make another arrangement, but
I may say to my Natives, "You can have part of my farm on
a proper lease". Well, it would probably pay me to leave
my farm all at once and, instead of having ten Natives there,
just allow 100 Natives to go and plank themselves down
there?-- Well, the committee which I provide for would
not agree to your doing that, because it would at once be
uneconomic.

I do not know, it would be economic from my point
of view?-- It might be economic from your point of view,
but it would not be so from the point of view of agriculture
and that is what the committee would have to look at, for
one thing. That is what I provide for in my statement.

Quite so, then you go back on the whole statement.
On portion of my farm I might give a lease to my labourers,
but they are bound to give me 90 days' work, but if I give
those people a proper lease and I want to call upon them
after that to work for me, and I want them to plough for
me, they would say, "No, I am not going to plough for you;
I want to plough for myself"?-- Yes; that may be. Your
line then would be to go in for cash labour.

How can I go in for cash labour? If I am a farmer,
if I own my property, I may own more than one property -- on
the one property I may have the Natives who work for me for
90 days, and they have to come over to my other property to
work. How can I afford to pay cash to those people? That
is where I cannot see your argument. You are going back
to the squatting system?-- I am not contemplating anything
like squatting, but I am contemplating a very progressive
system of farming, under which your lessees will have to
comply with definite regulations. Your lessees will have
to cultivate the land in the same way as the crofters do in
Scotland. The crofters in Scotland are given a very de-
finitive status.

Yes, we have heard all that before, but if we go
back to that, it means that we destroy the whole principle
of segregating the Natives on the land. My contention
is that we have taken up the attitude in South Africa that
we want to have the Native farmer in a specified area?
What difference is there from the point of view of segre-
gating between having 100 labour tenants on your farm and
giving them a little bit of odd labour, and having 50
lessees all with their very definite jobs to do and their
own land.

Would you allow me to insert a clause in the
terms of the lease to these crofters, that they should give
me a certain amount of their labour every year?— No, I
do not think I would.

You see, your crofter in Scotland is not a labour-
er?— You say he is not a labourer!

No, he is not a labourer for someone else?— Oh, I see. He has his own position. He is made into a
respectable person. But, Mr. Van Niekerk, you cannot
have your cake and eat it. You cannot have your segre-
gation and, at the same time, have your labour.

Why not? I look at it from this point of view.
When we speak of segregation, we speak of a mass of the
population who want to put them aside, but I do not con-
sider that the five Natives who live on my farm should
necessarily be taken away from my farm and put into a bigger
reserve. Segregation means taking the mass of these people.
There are some people who have the idea that all the Natives should be taken, even those small numbers on individual farms. Col. Stallard, for instance, has that idea, and he says, "You must take all the Natives and put them into a reserve." Well, to my mind, that is quite impractical?--You want your labour left with you?

Yes, I must have my labour?--I want you to have your labour, but I say to you that, from the point of view of development, you would be better off if you had your labour supplied by those people who are your cash lessees, but you have to make your cash wages of such a nature that it will attract them.

What difference does it make to me; say my boys get five morgen of ground which they can cultivate, whether they are on a labour tenant basis or on another basis? I say, there is your five morgen which you can cultivate under certain conditions?--The difference is this. In your present conditions, speaking of the country as a whole, you are losing the cream of your Native labour. They are slipping out of your hands, and you are left with the dregs of the Native labour on the land. It is a tragedy for agriculture. By a system of cash leases, you have a home there whereby the tenant, in order to carry out his terms, must work hard. His children are in a respectable decent home. Now, those children are more likely to be decent cash labourers for you and to remain on the land because they have a decent home to go to, than they are under present circumstances, under which they run away from their home because they are likely to be called upon
FOR LABOUR. I am really worried by the way in which agriculture is losing the best of its labour.

I do not think agriculture is losing the best of its labour. Where we are losing, we are losing the rich Natives. You may perhaps call them the best. I am referring to the man who has 50 head of cattle and who has a difference with his employer, with his master. If he comes to my farm today, I have to tell him that I cannot take him?--

The opinion which I got all over the country from farmers and magistrates and people who are really in touch with the situation is that the best types of Native are leaving the land for two reasons. The one reason is that they must get cash in order to satisfy their needs today, and secondly, owing to the uncertainty of their relationship, the relations between themselves and the farmers, they are not content to remain on the land. These are the two main points, but there are lots of others. These are the points given to me all over the country, as to why agriculture is losing the best of its labour. Well, I want agriculture to be able to retain its labour supply as against the rather extravagant wages of town life.

Let us take a concrete instance. Take the high veld, where we have cash labour. Now, take the Free State where you have practically a cash labour basis. Take the Cape, where, on the whole, you have a cash labour basis. And the cash they pay, both in the Free State, where it is improving, and in the Cape, is on a low basis?-- Yes, that is perfectly true.

On the High Veld it is rather better. I think the Native labour is scarce. Mr. Mostert, who is a member of
this Commission, has to import his Native labour. But I do not think that these people are better off where they have that cash basis, and I do not think that they have a bigger supply of Native labour either than we have on this Native tenant system. It may be more economical also from the farmer's point of view, but I am not speaking from the farmer's point of view, but from the Native's point of view, and my experience is this, - my feeling is this, - that economic pressure will force the farmer to have all his labour on a cash basis and that is not to the advantage of the Native in general. I can see that all these Natives in the Northern Transvaal will be transferred on to a cash basis. That is coming; you cannot prevent it. Economic pressure is bring that about and these Natives, as a result, will be poorer off than they are today?-- If you take one part of my case then what you say may possibly be correct, but if you work a cash basis for your own labour and have a system of cash rent leasing, then you are supplying yourself with the right kind of Native labour, because these people will have decent homes from which they come.

On the other hand, if you transfer your labour tenant into what you call a crofter, surely the terms which you must give that man must be such as to enable him to make a living?-- Yes, certainly.

If he is in a position to make a living, then there is no necessity for him to go and work for you?-- Not he himself, but his family.

He will require the whole of his family on his own behalf?-- We do not contemplate a large farm, only a small
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tenant farm. It depends, of course, on the nature of the land and on the area. Some such thing as you have in the Transkei; not larger than 10 or 12 acres.

You have not answered my question. We are breaking down the whole system of doing away with squatters and segregating your Natives accordingly?-- Well, Mr. Van Niekerk, you want Natives on your land. If you want Natives on your land, we can suggest a way by which you will get Natives on your land, and a better type of Natives.

That is a practical question. If I cannot have my labour tenant, I shall have my cash labourer, but I will not have my own. I have a Native location next to my farm and, if it is a good year, I can get labourers from there. But if it is a good year I cannot get them?-- I cannot help feeling that you are rather cutting off your nose to spite your face. You are so much taken up with the idea of segregation and yet, while I give you the fundamental point which you want to make, and that is that there should be separation of ownership, -- I make you a present of that, -- and I say to you "I want you to get good types of labour, but you must have it under certain definite conditions, there must be conditions which you must comply with otherwise you will not get it", and we say to you, "Give the father of the family a definite status, make him into a respectable human being, give him something that will help to bring his family up; and the only way to do that is to give him a cash rent lease and then he will supply you with cash labour on your farm because he wants to keep his children at home".

Where are you going to draw the line? If I
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could lease out the whole of my farm to Natives, taking now purely a mealie farm, I would get a bigger rent from the Natives than from any other man. Therefore, the tendency might be, on the other hand, for the farmersto say, in certain areas, "we will not farm now. Let the Natives take the whole of the farm and give them 10 morgen plots"?— They cannot do it, unless your land committee says that they may do so, and I take it that your land committee will consist of intelligent men.

You put up a scheme, but you want to circumscribe it?— Yes, because we have in mind the good of agriculture and of South Africa as a whole and, at the moment, we are discussing the point of view of South Africa.

DR. ROBERTS: Take the whole of my farm and cut it up into 10 acre lots, do you not think the Native would produce, in an area like that, just as well?— The reason why I am not accepting it is that Senator van Niekerk is using it as a bogey to frighten me with the idea that this area will be filled with Natives. I am not afraid of it. It is only a bogey.

I am not seeing anything wrong in it. Is it being felt that Natives are perhaps?— I do not think it would be good to develop in South Africa a type of white farmer who draws nothing but rents. I think the white farmer has something to contribute in initiative and in ability and I think it is his duty to try and develop agriculture to the best of his ability.

Even in Scotland, the crofter has someone over him?— Well, I do not know whether it is to the advantage of Scotland to have that kind of person. I think it is to the benefit of agriculture. Agriculture by Natives would
benefit by a progressive European developing his area to the best advantage. That is what I have in mind.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Do you not believe, on the other hand ---- say, now, I take a boy living on my farm. He has 5 morgen of land to cultivate. He has an excellent mealie crop this year, for which he has worked three months for me. He has more mealies than he can consume. There has been a good deal of kaffer beer drinking. Now, the next year comes and he does not have a good mealie crop; he may get nothing; but if he gets nothing, I get nothing myself. Now, if I go to that boy and I say to him, "I am not going to have this sort of business any more, I am not going to have this three months' labour any more. Your three months labour are worth £6 to me. Now, in future, you do not work three months for me, but you have to pay me £6 instead, whether you get a crop or not". Do you think that boy will accept that?-- No; as things stand, it is quite likely that he will not accept that.

Well, then, it will mean that I am going to lose his three months' labour?-- Yes, that may happen.

I am not getting that three months labour from that boy then, and it means that I have to take on a chance labourer. I say to him, "I cannot depend on your labour, I have to hire another boy, and you have to pay me £12 or £15 for that 5 morgen of land which you have on my farm." Do you think that boy will accept it - he will not. It is too risky for him and he will not stay with me?-- I shall be surprised to hear that.

But that will be the effect?-- It takes some time to get new ideas into anyone's head and probably a Native agriculturist will take some time to get into it,
but from my own discussions with Natives and Native groups, I can say that they are so terribly hungry for land under decent conditions, that you will have any number of competitors for your leases on your farms.

No, Mr. Jones, you will not. All farmers are conservative and the Native is also conservative. If you go to the poorer class of White man today, you will get ten applicants for land on your farm, but if you say to them, "I want you to pay me £25 per year for that land," they will say "No." One can only go by experience, and I know in certain areas of the Cape where there are Native tenants what the position is. There are districts in the Cape where there are tenants, 700 tenants, and I made investigations and found that the average rental which they pay is somewhere about £60 per year each and they are only too glad to get that land.

Well, those may be exceptional cases. It may be very good land and you may have advanced Natives there. There are exceptions to all rules.

MAJOR ANDERSON: What do they use that land for? They use it for cattle and for crops as well. There is a perfect hunger for land among the Natives and they are not satisfied to go on a system whereby they have to go and plough their owner's land at the time when they want to plough their own land.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: You say in your statement that conditions on the sugar estates are very bad, and there they have the cash basis, have they not? Quite. But the mere word "cash" is not like "blessed Mesopotamia", it does not give you heaven at once. But it is a way by
which you can reach salvation, and that is all I say; and when I use these terms, they are very categorically used and you have all sorts of conditions attached to them and all sorts of degrees when you work up to these conditions of cash basis. Your land worker today -- hardly anyone of them get sufficient cash to meet their needs, and I can speak of scores of cases when I say that. That is an experience which I have come across practically all over the country.

I agree with your cash basis from the farmers point of view, but not from the Native point of view. Why should you not have the cash basis, without your crofter's provision? Take your Western Province. All your Coloured people are there on a cash labour basis, but they are not tenants and it is not necessary that they should have 5 or 10 morgen of land for their own use.?-- For this reason, there is no provision in the Cape preventing a Coloured man from leasing or owning land if he can get it, but you have a position here where there is a real land hunger on the part of the Natives, and there is no means of satisfying that hunger. You are very anxious to maintain your supplies of land workers and I am suggesting a way by which you will satisfy the needs of the Natives in that respect, and, on the other hand, you are putting yourself in a very much better position to secure a more satisfactory type of labourer. That is the whole basis of my contention.

I would like someone to make that experiment and cut up his farm into ten-acre plots for twenty Natives and depend on the labour which he would get ?-- He would probably have a bad experience in individual cases, but what
we are discussing is this. In what direction shall we turn our faces? We have bad traditions and one of those bad traditions is this, that it is not worth while working at all. I have heard Natives saying over and over again that working on the tenant labour basis is working for a dead horse. Well, we have to get away from that and we have to rectify the view which they have, that it is not worth while working at all.

I agree with you. I have had that evidence myself and I admit that there are many places where conditions undoubtedly are shocking, but I do not think that your scheme would improve that and that it would do away with these bad cases. You see, a man may hire a boy on a cash basis and, when it comes to paying, he may do him out of his month's wages.--- Yes, Mr. van Niekerk, I appreciate all that. One can go on arguing and bring out individual cases of wrongdoing on both sides, but what we are dealing with are fundamental principles, and I am asking you to examine the whole situation from this point of view, "What are the conditions on which we can develop agriculture in South Africa and secure a happy hardworking type of decent farmer". And I believe that by what I have suggested we can help agriculture and develop it along the right lines. I think that my ideas, if carried into effect, will be to the benefit of the Native as well as of the White farmer.

That is where our difference is. You want to turn South Africa into decent farming for the Native?--- No, Mr. van Niekerk, not only for the Native. I have in mind the White bywoner as well as the Native squatter. My heart aches for him. I find them pouring in here. I talk to
the boys and say "will you not go back to the land" - and the things they tell me of the reasons why they will not stay on the land -- for one thing, they say there is no future for them.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thornton gave the Commission a scheme, not like yours entirely, but based very much on the metayage system, and he pointed out on the one side various advantages and then he discussed the disadvantages attached to it, and one of the first which he mentioned was that, in his opinion, it would mean that there would be no further increase of the European population on the land?-- (No answer).

MR. LUCAS: The Native population would very quickly take up the land. What was desirable from the point of view of cheap production was to have a European owner who was at the same time a supervisor of all the land worked by Natives, their own interests being -- rather, the European owner's interest being the half share of the crop, the Natives to have the other half share; the farmer to supply the seed, the fertiliser, etc. The Native would have the interest of half of the crop. The big difference between what he suggested and your suggestion, is that you would limit the number on any particular farm on the suggestion of the land committee?-- Yes, I see. In Natal, of course, the Native sugar farmers are doing quite well. I have noticed Native sugar farmers who have 12 acres of land making between £5 and £6 per month. That is on their own holdings, of course.

MAJOR ANDERSON: It depends on the land?-- There is no suggestion of any minimum. Your Native worker has to get something to satisfy the rent; if he does not pay
his rent, he loses his lease.

CHAIRMAN: That is the weak point of your suggestion. It takes the Native at his weakest - the handling of money. I think it is generally admitted that the Native is weak in the matter of handling money, - it is a new world to him. -- He must have your cash or the equivalent cash minimum, otherwise he loses his lease. If he does not satisfy the farmer, for a number of years, he will lose his lease, but I say that his demand for land is so great, that you will get a large number of Natives wanting to go in for that.

That is a condition sine qua non? -- Yes; that he should supply the rent on a cash basis.

And that is where the Native has the least experience? -- There is nothing to prevent a farmer from getting from the Native his rent in produce at the market rate.

But I thought you said it should be a cash rental? -- Cash as the basis. You have a definite fixed amount. If you supply that £5 in £5 worth of grain, well it is on the cash basis, is it not? But when you speak of share farming, then it is merely that, whenever he gets a good crop, he shares half.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: My difficulty is this. I shall give you a concrete case. Say that the average land which the farmers give to the Natives as labour tenants works out at 2 morgen. Now, if he has to lease the land to the Native, in order to make him a self-contained man, the least you would give in dry land would be 20 morgen of land. He would not be able to exist anything under that and you would have to give him some grazing, too. Take
my case, for instance. Any farmer employs 10 labour ten-
ants. He will probably give 20 morgen of his land for
cultivation by these Natives. That is 2 morgen to each.
Working on the system which you want him to do, the farmer
will have to give these Natives 200 morgen of land. Your
Transkei Native has proved today that he cannot exist on
that land as a pure farmer, even with a huge communal
grazing?-- In the Eastern Transvaal, it was reckoned that
the Native required 4 morgen of land for cultivation and
14 for grazing.

They all base that on the fact that the Native
goes out to work for certain periods of time?-- No, it
is based on the agricultural needs of these people.

That is a very low rate of existence - can a man
exist on 4½ morgen of land - he cannot do it. The idea
of three acres and a cow has exploded, and that was not
dry land?-- No, that is so.

My difficulty is that if you really want the Native
to be a self-supporting man on the land by itself, then you
have to give him a good deal of land?-- Of course, I
would not for one moment dream of arguing on a point like
that with you, because you know more about that than I do;
I am just arguing the principle. You are discussing the
suggestions which I have put forward as if I were proposing
to impose this thing with one catastrophic stroke. If
your land is not suitable for allowing leasing to Natives,
then obviously you would not go in for that sort of thing.
My point is that if we are going to make a transition from
the present system, we have to provide the means whereby
that transition can easily be made, and without disturbing
the social or economic position of the country, which I say the 1913 Land Act, by its very final prohibition of leasing land to Natives has done -- it has done a great injustice to agriculture as well as to the Native. I say cancel that prohibition and then use common sense in each district and, if the Land Committee in that district says "Here is land which is very suitable for the farmer to have one or two or three Native tenants on", these tenants can be put there under definite conditions and I am sure that slowly and satisfactorily we would transfer our agricultural organization from the present unsuitable position to a much more suitable and progressive state of affairs. I am pleading for common sense instead of hard and fast lines in legislation.

On the other hand, do you not think it would be a saner policy to say, "Well, we put land aside. The reserves and the Government should buy more land, where you would have the Native agriculturists pure and simple", and if he wants to be a Native farmer, he must go into that portion, and if he wants to live among the Europeans, he must live there under prescribed conditions?-- My reply to that is given in this paper. If you will look at page 1 of my land section, you will see there" The figures given in the Beaumont report shew that the 2,270,000 Natives in Native areas occupy 13,647,146 morgen, which gives 6.01 morgen per head. But the actual land safeguarded to Natives in this schedule to the 1913 Act, was, roughly, 10,000,000 morgen, or, on an average, 4.4 morgen per Native in Native areas, -- including Crown lands and mission land. Taking the average Native family at five
"persons, this would give 22 morgen per family -- a little over one fifth more than the figure of 18½ morgen per family recommended in the Eastern Transvaal Report.

Allowing for a natural increase of 2½ per annum, (the rate of increase which Mr. Cousins, in his census report, sets down for Europeans, alleged to be less than the Native rate), the saturation point would be reached in just over ten years. The Beaumong report was based on 1911 figures, so that the saturation point was reached in 1921.

In some areas, the congestion is very great, (e.g. Butterworth in the Transkei, Glen Grey in the Ciskei, Mission Reserves in Natal, Spelonken in the Transvaal) and the migration of Natives from these areas is considerable. I have been reliably informed that there are Natives from Glen Grey on land in Portuguese West Africa.

The Native Lands Act of 1913, Section 2 (1), required the Governor General to appoint a Commission whose functions were to be to enquire and report (a) what areas should be set apart within which Natives shall not be permitted to acquire or hire land or interest in land, (b) what areas should be set apart within which other than Natives shall not be permitted to acquire or hire land or interest in land.

The Commission set out to set apart and recommended that a total morgenage of 8,365,744 morgen, making a total of 18,300,000 morgen of guaranteed Native areas. This would have given an average of 8.08 morgen per head or 40.3 morgen per family of five in respect of the 2/7ths of the Native population in Native areas. But what about
the 1,500,000 Natives on European lands who may neither own nor lease there? The additional land would have given the total Native rural population (i.e. 3,380,000) 4.7 morgen per head, or 23.5 morgen per family of five. Allowing for a natural increase of two percent, the new saturation point would have been reached in 1926, had the whole of the Native rural population been moved into the new areas."

Now, allowing for these being only figures. Give us 50 years to talk about. Assuming, on the basis of General Hertzog's present Bill, that Natives do have one half of the additional morgenage in the released areas. Supposing they are lucky enough to secure just 3,000,000 morgen more, I venture to suggest that, in 50 years' time, you will still have a large spill over from the Native areas and that you will want space for them somewhere. It is easy enough to say to them, "Go to your Native areas".

CHAIRMAN: You do not visualise a situation where all the Native population will be agriculturists?—No; there will always be a large population for whom there is no land available, if they want to be agriculturists. I am not dealing with the red population at all. There will always be a large Native population for whom no land will be available if they want to be agriculturists, -- either through purchasing land or leasing it, and increasingly so if there is no leasing. There will be a large population for whom there is no place to lay their heads. Well, that is wrong from the point of view of the economic position of the country. We should rather say, "On what
basis should these people be allowed to rest in European areas?", on two conditions -- one, that they should gradually come to a cash basis as labourers, or that we should allow a certain amount of leasing on a cash basis. The White man is not prejudiced, because these people are not acquiring the right of ownership in these areas. They are only there by the goodwill of the White people. If the Land Committee says, "We do not want any more Natives in this area", then they can all be cleared out in two or three years.

CHAIRMAN: I admit the possibility of your two forms of Natives coming to the White areas, but I do not admit that they are the only ones. Bearing in mind the fact that, to the Native, money economy is a new thing, and on the other hand that the reasons tending to agriculture are large, it seems to me that a system whereby the money element need not be in the foreground, and the risk-bearing can be divided up between the European and the Native, has a good deal to be said for it. That would be a third possible basis? -- I would consider that on the condition that the man is given a definite status. At present, the whole status of the Native as a labour tenant is unsatisfactory. We shall have to do something about this, but we must provide some alternative system of cash rent leasing.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: To boil it down to a nutshell, you contend that we are not making adequate provision for the Native as regards land in his own areas, unless we are prepared to allow him to be an agriculturists right among the Europeans? -- Yes. And I also say that I see no reasonable hope of our being able to provide the land
which is necessary. Land has become too valuable in South Africa today. Every bit of land belongs to somebody and it has become too valuable for Parliament to face what is going to be asked of it. We have shifted our ground. In the 1913 Land Act, we definitely said "We are going to have additional areas set apart for Native occupation". Now we say, "We are going to have areas where Natives, if they are lucky, may be able to buy". I reckon that, in 10 years' time, we shall be in a position when we cannot even contemplate setting aside any areas.

DR. ROBERTS: Supposing the Government were to set aside, say, ten million of money. Do you not think that that would be sufficient to go on with?—Yes, for the time being. But my point is that meanwhile you have to begin setting your economic house in order. Merely playing with this thing, which has a historical growth—we have to provide a sane and reasonable system, whereas at present it is a rule of thumb method.

Is not all political outlook like that?—Except this, that by the 1913 Land Act, by one stroke you made impossible an adjustment which was working quite nicely before.

CHAIRMAN: Take these three bases; two are not definitely/in conflict with the law of the land, namely, labour tenancy, or, in its present form, cash rent tenancy. Cash rent tenancy is a second and then there is the further point of a certain amount of controlled share tenancy. Your view is that we shall have to develop both labour tenancy and encourage cash labour, and you put in a plea
for developing a third basis, namely, share tenancy, and, along that, you say that you see great hope for development?—Yes. I may say again. Each word I say is equally applicable to your White worker.

MR. LUCAS: What do you mean by controlled share tenancy?-----

CHAIRMAN: You accept the principle of local committees having a certain amount of control where the share tenancy is to be allowed?—I do not quite like the words "share tenancy".

I am sorry. I thought you admitted, in reply to an earlier question of mine, that that tenancy need not be on a purely cash basis?—I used the words "cash tenancy" and you used the words "share tenancy", which has a limiting effect. There should be some criterion, according to which the Native has to labour to fulfil his obligations.

A form of tenancy other than labour tenancy?—There is a very definite nexus.

MR. LUCAS: Could one put it this way, that supposing the rent were fixed at £5, you do not mind the farmer agreeing to take ten bags of mealies—mealies being at 10/- per bag—instead of £5 in cash?—So long as the contract of lease mentions a very specific criterion of rent.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You are opposed to share tenancy?—My opposition to that is that it is neck or nothing. I want the Native tenant to have to work for something.

CHAIRMAN: Probably his Native bread?—I want him to be able to obtain his independent status as a lessee. He has to produce something.
I fear you are pitching him into an economic system which he does not understand. It is difficult enough for the people who understand it?— I give you an example of cases in the Cape, where he is working on that basis, and he was working very well in Natal and the Transvaal before the 1913 Law came. I have a case of a European farmer who said that in many cases the rents charged in Natal were excessive.

It was a share tenancy before 1913?— It was a cash rent tenancy, too. There was an increased tendency in that direction. Today, in the Cape, it is a cash rent under estimating tenancy. I think we are testing the adaptability of the Native; he is very adaptable.

TOBIAH VAN NIEKERK: I can quite see your point of view, and, from the Native point of view, you are on the right track?— I say that from the Country’s point of view I am on the right track.

No, from the Country’s point of view, not—is it your idea that the farmer, when he wants a labourer, will be bound to have only labourers as rent tenants?— That I would make a sort of hard and fast rule.

Do you mean, the opening should be there?— Yes. The opening should be there. Develop the thing naturally. In 1913, we made a hard and fast line; I say get rid of that, but control any leases that may come. Do not compel these things,— of course not.

But in the Cape you have that freedom today? — Yes. It has not developed to any extent?— It has developed and is constantly developing.

CHAIRMAN: Do you mean, in the private locations?
The private locations are terms in the Cape. (?)  

MR. LUCAS: They are nothing like our locations?—

No; the point is that, in the Cape, the situation is that the European farmers have found that they can do without Native tenants. That is the situation there. And then the Native has to take his luck in that respect. After all, you cannot go against economic forces without causing injury to someone, and my view is that the 1913 Act is causing injury to White and Black by the hard and fast prohibition of leasing. I do not want to compel anyone to do anything, but I want a natural movement.

DR. ROBERTS: You would be inclined to go the length which many Natives do want, namely, to withdraw the 1913 Act?— No, I would not do that. I would simply say alter this provision, or, if you like, I would make it a matter of policy, even. The 1913 Land Act provides for exceptions. Except with the approval of the Governor General, the prohibition stands. Before General Hertzog brought in his Land Bill, that provision was used by the Administration to enable Natives to buy lands which were covered both by the Committee Report and the Beaumont Report. But you see, there is such a strong feeling against anything in the way of discretion in respect of Native land, that the Administration, I am sure, would be most chary to allow leasing today, in fact, it would not allow leasing under that provision.

If the Government were to say, "We shall try this experiment", which need not even alter the 1913 Act, provided it made it clear that it would allow this as an experiment, it could do so, but if you want to make it perfectly clear that you are adopting my suggestion, then
you must alter that provision of the Land Act. You can make the experiment today with the law as it stands. I think so, but I am subject to correction. I any case, it would be worth while trying it.

CHAIRMAN: I thought your point was that you could make it by the law as it stands, by reason of being able to use the Governor General's sanction to allow experiments in certain areas?-- Yes. The whole policy, of course, has been not to allow leasing on any account and people regard it as absolutely prohibitory.

DR. ROBERTS: I understand that land is bought?-- Yes, but I am referring to leasing.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You want it to be clear that any experiment is under the strict control of these land committees?-- Yes, that is so, and I think it is worth while making experiments in that regard in this country.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: If you accept the principle, then why should you only accept it half way? Why should you limit the number of tenant farmers I should have on my farm, why not through the thing open altogether?-- Well, Mr. van Niekerk, because we are experimenting.

If you lay it down as a principle, the Natives should be able to hire land anywhere in the Union?-- We have definitely gone in for this principle of prohibiting and I am hoping to be a little reasonable. You see, I realise that we are dealing with very fundamental things and it is really only an experiment, but there must be good faith in that experiment. That is the point which I am trying to establish. I feel this morning that I have to argued case. I have not put the pros and cons, but Mr. van Niekerk has put the cons, -- he has put the case from the
the other side. Now, I do not wish Mr. van Niekerk to feel and I hope he will not feel that I have only taken the one aspect of the case. He has put the other side so clearly that it was not necessary for me to do so.

MR. LUCAS: When Mr. van Niekerk but to you that the Native should be rather shy about agreeing to pay an amount of £6 per year, or whatever it was, for a piece of land in cash, you said, "He might not do so, as things stand today". What do you mean by these words?— It is because we are dealing with a person who is subject to all sorts of prejudices and fears and he is a product of the past, and when we put a new idea, especially to a land worker in any country, it takes a long time for it to soak in. My point was that he would probably not see the value of working for the cash rent basis straight away.

And when you use the word "status" in connection with what we have been discussing, what do you imply by that; was it the security of tenure?— Yes, all the things which go to enable you to be on a parity with a man with whom he is making the contract.

His rights must be ascertained?— His rights must be ascertifiable in a court of law. A farmer, when he gets something, is also giving something and the Native, when he is getting something, is also giving something, and these things should be ascertifiable. At present, the Native in land tenancy feels that he is getting nothing worth anything and, therefore, he is not giving anything worth giving. I must say I have a great deal of sympathy with the farmer, but I say that the position is
due to the unsatisfactory arrangements.

I would be glad if you would summarise briefly what you consider are the defects of the present labour tenancy system from both sides?—One of the things is this, that the complaint has been that when a Native must work for the farmer—when the Native most wants to deal with his lands, wants to work his lands, wants to plough them and so on, the farmer also wants him most and he, the Native—can only go and plough his own lands when the rains are really finished. To what extent that is true or not, I am not prepared to argue here. The trouble about that sort of thing is that so much depends on the decency of the farmer and on the goodwill of the farmer.

CHAIRMAN: And the decency of the weather?—Yes, certainly. If you have a good farmer, there is very little difficulty, and I know hundreds of cases where the farmers go out of their way to help the Natives plough their land, but still, what I have just told you is a very common complaint.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: If you accept that complaint you must also accept the other basis, that the farmer has a surplus of labour, otherwise he would never be able to impose these conditions. I could not impose it on my farm, because I would lose all my labour at once?—Yes; I admit it is a pretty difficult position. The second point is this, that it seems to give rise to constant quarrelling. That is a frequent thing, so I have heard. They are always quarrelling about the question of stock, too much stock, or that the children do not turn out quickly enough in the morning, or that the children have gone into
town and that the father has no control over them. These are constant complaints. It comes down to this, that the whole relations are so illdefined that they lead to friction of all kinds. These are the main points coming to my mind straight away. I quite realise that it is a very unsatisfactory situation that Natives should be allowed to run stock ad lib, and that the stock should increase so rapidly that the farmer simply is chucked out and is forced to take steps.

MR. LUCAS: And in some areas the farmers have to get four times as many Natives on the farm as they really require, so as to provide for the time when they need the largest number of Natives to do their work? -- Yes. In the Southern States I found the same thing, that the farmers maintained on the land farm more labour than they required.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Is not that benefiting the Natives today -- where farmers are housing more Natives on the land than are actually required, is not that to the benefit of the Natives themselves? -- No, Mr. van Niekerk, I do not think it is. A situation of that kind is unhealthy for anyone. What is economically unsound cannot be socially just or sound in the long run. Merely because a farmer does that, he does more harm in the long run to the Natives than good, because it is giving the Natives social and other conditions and shelter under conditions which are not satisfactory. And, of course, we have introduced other elements which makes the position of the Native uncertain.

Taking things as they are, if I turn my tenants into cash labour and if I say "you cannot have any stock and
you cannot plough; I would probably have to discharge half of them?—Yes. You have to do that sort of thing gradually and justly. You cannot do it in five minutes. You have to keep in mind the principles on which you are going, but in the end you would have to do that.

MR. LUCAS: The great thing is to have a policy?—Yes.

The Commission adjourned for lunch at 1 p.m.

On the Commission resuming at 2.30 p.m., the evidence of Mr. Rheinallt Jones was continued, when an additional statement covering certain other points raised in the Questionnaire, was put in by the Witness.

CHAIRMAN: In regard to this new statement which you have just put in ---?--- Before you proceed with that, Mr. Chairman, may I just say something on the land question? I want to mention a matter of interest — I had a very interesting discussion in front of me with the Directors of a Sudan Syndicate. This Syndicate entered into an agreement with the Imperial Government in regard to the development of land in the Sudan. The arrangement is that the Government rents the land from the actual holders and re-allots the land in 30 acre allotments to the same people again, on a very definite principle, whereby the holders, as tenants, get a share of the profits, the Imperial Government get a share and the Syndicate get a share for administering the area.

DR. ROBERTS: Are they connected with the Sudan Mission in any way?—No; it is a pure Imperial Government scheme, and I shall send you the prospectus. They took
the plain on one of the tributaries of the Nile and took over the whole of this area. The holders were expropriated for a period of forty years and they are given a rental of £/ per acre per annum for each holder as a sort of recognition of their eventual right to that land. The holders are to resume ownership at the end of that forty years period. The water belongs to the Government. The land is divided up into allotments of 50 acres each, one third under cotton crop, one third under leguminous crop, and one third under grain of various kinds. Now, the whole of those tenants pay over 60% of the cotton crop and 40% they retain for themselves. The rest of the crops they keep. The Syndicate markets all the cotton and then gets, I think, its 20% of the proceeds and the Imperial Government gets 40%, or vice versa. In any way, the Imperial Government shares in the proceeds. The Syndicate is responsible for the whole of the administration, it is responsible for all the heavy ploughing with a small charge, it is responsible for all the financing and it gives interest to the tenants on any credit balance they keep with the Syndicate, and the Syndicate supplies seeds for that area, and, from the reports which I have, and the discussions which I had with the Directors of the Syndicate, it is a very valuable system of small holdings.

MR. LUCAS: Is it a commercial syndicate?--Yes.

The Chairman was Sir Frederick Eckstein. Unfortunately, he died a week before I got to London. I had an introduction to him, but from the discussion I had, it is clear that it is an important co-operation between a commercial syndicate,
the Government, and the owners of the land who are now in
the form of tenants.

Were these owners on individual tenure?—Whatever freehold was in practise—

Did they hold any individual tenure?—Yes.

There was a very considerable amount of difference between
the amounts held by each person. The whole lot were
thrown into a pool and each man was entitled to 30 acres.
He gets something in recognition of the fact that he held
the land originally and, at the end of 40 years, the land
goes back to the original holders, but of course, we do not
know what will happen at the end of 40 years.

DR. ROBERTS: I fail to see the advantage of this
complicated system. Why should they not deal with the
holders?—A commercial syndicate is a very much more com-
petent body to deal with the marketing of commercial goods
and products.

Yes, provided they are a good quality of men?—

Yes, and the Government has a definite control over the
administration, without having too much trouble in regard
to the details of the administration. Why I mention it is
because it seems to me that it is the very sort of thing
which we might investigate for South Africa, for Natives
and Whites, with the possibility of combining commercial
spirit of venture, —the commercial undertaking with a
Government control and a closer organization of individual
owners.

DR. ROBERTS: You require to have a very fine
quality of man as commercial overseers, would you not?—
I say quite frankly that I have not got the tenants' side
of the story. I have read the Government's publications
on the matter, they are satisfactory, and I have also read the Syndicate report.

It seems to me that it would lend itself to abuse?— I do not know; in what way?

They might want 10%?— No, the actual terms are fixed by the Imperial Government before they enter the ground. I should like to refer to that paragraph about cash wage labour.

**MAJOR ANDERSON:** Before you come to that, I just want to put this to you. You say, in your main statement, that the sugar farms in Natal have "notoriously bad conditions, but one is glad to feel that the more enlightened sugar farmers are realising the need for standardized conditions." Are you sure that these conditions are so bad?— Yes, I am afraid the conditions are notoriously bad.

Are they bad throughout the whole of the sugar belt; what would you base that on?— Well, I shall mention a few things. One of the very bad things is the housing; owing to the nature of the housing, it becomes very unsatisfactory.

Would you say that it is worse than the housing of other labour, indentured labour throughout the Union? I think it is probably better?— I would not quite be prepared to say that. You have brought into the towns large numbers of Natives from other areas, use different types of housing, and there is no doubt about it that the type of housing used for so many Natives has proved so very insanitary. These people are not used to that type of housing and they become more insanitary than is necessary. On the other hand, I have found from enquiry that a great many sugar farmers are realising the necessity of a change to the
brick buildings. (In the foregoing paragraph the Witness uses the words "you have brought into the towns" etc.,-- this apparently is a mistake and should read "you have brought to the sugar plantations".) There are regulations of the Health Department in regard to the housing of Natives?-- On the sugar mills?

And for other farmers, too. The rule is that no farmer can put up new buildings now without having his plans passed by the Health Department?-- There is no standardisation of that.

DR. Park Ross has laid down standards?-- Yes. What I want to urge is what I say at the top of page 5. The time has come to standardise conditions. I say in my statement that sugar farms should be brought into line particularly as to (a) medical examination of recruits, (b) medical supervision and standardisation of housing and feeding conditions, (c) registration of all contracts and proper provision for consideration of complaints, and (d) cash wages only. After all, the sugar farms are a form of industry, a form of agriculture, but it is badly organized.

There are small farmers who do not employ more than 10 or 20 labourers?-- Yes, I grant you that, but still the time has come for standardisation. The reason why I mentioned the sugar farms is because the time has come to make a start with standardisation in an industry of that kind. It will take a long time in agriculture generally to enforce housing conditions, but in a case like this, where you have a highly organized cash basis, it should be possible to enforce the regulations better.

It is only fair to say that there are a large number
of small farmers -- the bulk is produced by small farmers --
who employ not more than 10 or 20 labourers? -- They
should comply with conditions. If they have the advantages
of such labour, they should comply with the conditions.

They have the same advantages as other farmers? --
If they have the advantages of recruited labour, then they
must observe certain conditions. They bring in large
numbers of Natives from the Transkei into that area to
settle there. They bring about a profound social change,
and if there is to be that change, one has to attend to
the necessity of achieving the best sanitary and hygienic
conditions possible. I do not think it is asking too
much and from my knowledge of the sugar farmers, I say
that the good type would welcome the imposition of regula-
tions of that kind.

I was just demurring at the statement that the
conditions were notoriously bad? -- I should be sorry to
do an injustice.

MR. LUCAS: You use the word detribalised just
as we have done? -- Yes.

We find that there is a certain objection to that,
as it is looked upon as implying some form of condemnation.
Also, it is not strictly correct and I was wondering if you
could, if not now then later on, suggest some other word
which could be used in place of it? -- I can suggest, or
I may suggest, the word "individualisation". They become
individuals as against tribesmen. I hope that before you
leave the land question you will allow me to urge strongly
this question of individual land tenure. I expect that
the Commission has had a fair amount of evidence on it, but
I feel so strongly on it that I should like to take two
minutes of your time to emphasize it. Everyone whom I have consulted has agreed that progressive farming must have individual tenure. Native Administrators, organizers, magistrates and progressive chiefs, as well as individual Natives, have all urged the same thing. They feel that there is a most urgent need to have individual tenure.

In Natal particularly, this cry is very strong, and last night I was reading through Lugard's "The Old Mandate" and he is very strong about it. Even in Central Africa that policy has to be followed. I have some extracts here. Curiously enough, I raised the same point in the footnote on page 2 of my statement on lands, where I say, "There is a sense in which land tenure in tribal life suggests individual rights (e.g. Inheritance by heir). It certainly has a form which makes the idea of individual tenure more easily grasped. Now, here is what Prof. Lugard says:-

"When the tribal stage is reached, the control passes to the chief who allots unoccupied land at will, but is not justified in dispossessing any family or person who is using the land. Later still, especially when the pressure of population has given to the land an exchange value, the conception of proprietary rights in it emerges, and sale, mortgage and lease of land, apart from its user, is recognised. It is clear from this description that African land tenure is not communal in the sense of tenure in common. Its fundamental characteristics seem rather to be an individual tenure of land, derived from the common stock at the disposal of the tribal family. Such a tenure would tend to develop very rapidly into individual ownership, and evidence that this is the case is available. It is
with remarkable/what tenacity the Native mind holds to the idea of private ownership, or at least to the absolute right to tenure in perpetuity. It was difficult in Lagos to dispose of Crown land to Natives on any terminable lease, however favourable its terms. The general principles would seem to be .......... The inevitable tendency to individual ownership is meanwhile constantly asserting itself with the evolution of the tribe by foreign example and by the replacement of annual by permanent crops (rubber, cocoa)."

If that is Prof. Lugard's experience in West and Central Africa, it is a lesson to us and my own experience for some years is that there is very urgent need for a much more progressive policy being adopted for individual tenure. I realise the difficulty with regard to survey and one of the old man's points in this regard is perfectly sound. This is what he says, "Give us what we hold". Before I go further, I may perhaps refer to some other extracts from Lugard's book: "It has been laid down as a principle from which no civilised government would think of departing that in countries acquired by conquest or cession, private property, whether of individuals or communities, existing at the time of the cession or conquest, is respected."

I just want to go on with this question of survey. As this old man said, "Give us what we hold" -- he wants that they should be allowed to hold without survey -- just leave the beacons. Use that for some time to come. They all know what is what and who is who.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: What difference does it really make whether they have survey or not? -- It is a
very profound psychological differences - what is mine is my own and I hold it.

CHAIRMAN: The Senator refers to the difference between survey and demarcation?——

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: No. What difference does it make whether he holds it under tribal system?—— Well, the difference is that they can hold a piece of paper and the chief will have no say over it. Today, without their title deeds, they have to be good boys, they have to be in favour with the chief or any relative of the chief. But when they have title, they hold it for themselves and their children. As it is, only one member of the family will hold the plot and the other members of the family can never hope all to live on that property. There is not enough of it, and they feel very strongly on that, and I am in full sympathy with them and I feel very strongly that they must have individual tenure if they are to do anything at all with their land.

DR. ROBERTS: I was going to ask you what, in your mind, is the relationship between individual tenure and actual survey? Can you have the one without the other?—— Yes, you can have the one without the other.

That has always been the difficulty in the minds of the people of the Native Affairs Department, — that it is not possible?—— It is possible, and they had it in Tanganyika without going to the cost of survey. They fixed certain natural patches as boundaries and the Natives all know what their boundaries are once it is worked out.

Because, if you are going to have exact survey right throughout the Transkei, it would cost nearly two
millions?--Yes, I was in Ladysmith some time ago and I was in a lawyer's office and he showed me how a particular area had been bought on individual tenure and properly surveyed by a surveyor, and they still owed £3,000 in fees. It is scandalous; but I am absolutely positive that it is possible to have a system of giving them what they hold without incurring any further expense.

Of course, he will always ask to have a piece of paper?--Oh, yes.

With a picture on it?--Yes. I was referring to Lugard's and I started quoting a part of his remarks there. He quotes, in regard to individual holding, "It has been laid down as a principle from which no civilized government would think of departing, that in countries acquired by conquest or cession, private property, whether of individuals or communities, existing at the time of cession or conquest, is respected". Lugard goes on, "The restriction or alienation matters little, I think, to the African cultivator, provided he enjoys fixity of tenure in perpetuity. This indeed is ownership in the Native sense of the term. And so we find in Africa, the oldest of the Continents, no permanent irrigation works such as those which terrace every hillside in Afghanistan, India or China. The African plants few trees and is careless of the productivity of the soil. Individual proprietorship is no doubt inimical to the supply of wage labour for large estates, but it makes for individual progress, thrift and character. It is the strongest inducement to good farming, and politically an asset to the Government to which the peasant owes the security of his holding. The French
verdict is the same. "The system of individual ownership is incontestably the one which is most favourable to production." I just wanted to emphasize that, because, to my mind, it is the very foundation of progressive cultivation of the Native areas.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: We have had evidence that one district is surveyed and another is not surveyed. In the one they have individual title and in the other communal title and they tell us there is no difference as regards the progressiveness of the Natives in either the one or the other?—(No answer)?

CHAIRMAN: I have a statement here from a man who is very keen on survey, Mr. Kockett, who is Magistrate of Cala. But what he says is this, "Administratively, the benefit of some form of survey is enormous. Speaking from experience, which began in 1906 in Glen Grey, I have no hesitation in saying that, in going from district to district, I have discovered little evidence of proper attempts to benefit by the conditions as altered by survey?—Yes, Magistrates will tell you, on the other hand, that once they have started the work of agricultural demonstrators, once they have started people on progressive farming, individual tenure is the only way by which they can keep it going. Glen Grey has been a long time in starting. Mr. Harries is concerned about the way in which the number of stock has increased, but he agrees too that you must have individual tenure.

I shall read to you what Mr. Kockett says:—'I decidedly favour the individual (that is the surveyed system) for the following reasons. At the outset, I wish to
maintain that, properly controlled, the surveyed system is the only one which will preserve the land for future Native generations. Unfortunately, the benefit accruing from survey appears to have been entirely obscured by (1) the cost and (2) failures which are due not to any inherent shortcomings, but to lack of control.

"During a number of years, some time from about 1920 onwards, enormous sums of money were squandered by Natives in these Territories who purchased useless imported scrub stock, which died wholesale or else assisted to impoverish the local cattle by denuding the veld. The amount of money spent in this way would have gone a long way towards liquidating the costs of survey. Strange to say, one hears nothing about the Natives having been impoverished in this way. The cost of survey spread over a long term of years, during which the land is used by successive generations, is negligible. In addition, it must be remembered that the average value of land - at least in these Territories - is very high and money spent on ensuring its correct limits is not wasted. Of the value of a title such as we give one year and change the next, I say nothing. Any form of certificate would equally serve the purpose.

"Administratively, the benefit of some form of survey is enormous. Speaking from experience which began in 1906 in the district of Glen Grey, I have no hesitation in saying that, in going from district to district, I have discovered little evidence of proper attempts to benefit by the conditions as altered by survey. If a district is to be surveyed and then once titles are distributed, the Natives are allowed to indulge in irregularities and
and to ignore the necessity for transfers, then, of course, the expenditure on survey is nothing short of a scandalous waste of money. I personally have never found it impossible to make the Natives toe the line, nor to maintain the office records in absolute agreement with the conditions in the field. Unfortunately, it requires unremitting energy and perseverance and staffs in surveyed districts are always inadequate.

"The survey of land is, in my opinion, only the first step in the right direction and it should be followed as soon as possible by conditions which will permit of Natives acquiring a real sense of proprietorship not only in their individual allotments but also in the communal commonages. If we survey arable allotments and then leave the Natives to progress in no way different from those who hold lands in unsurveyed districts, then perhaps we are paying too much for survey. At present, the nominal owners of a commonage can do next to nothing towards improving their conditions and, in addition, the necessity of granting at least residential rights to succeeding landless adults reduces their actual right to a mere legal fiction. Under present conditions they cannot reserve their winter grazing, they cannot arrange for the division of their grazing for different classes of stock and the limitation of the stock by the owners of the commonage would only result in providing more grazing for the stock of the adjoining location. In order to provide units of areas, we have the natural division according to locations, and I am of the firm opinion that, until each such unit is afforded the opportunity to progress as a unit, without interference by neighbouring units, there will never be any
real progress. Unfortunately, this opportunity cannot be afforded without fencing, but this should not be regarded as an insurmountable difficulty. The proceeds of the graduated stock rate recommended might suitably be devoted towards this undertaking. It would then be possible to use the commonages to the best advantage, to improve the quality of stock, to prevent the constant driving backwards and forwards of stock to be penned at night, etc., etc. The regulation of such matters would lead to the introduction of other reforms and would inculcate a spirit of mutual co-operation and this in turn would lead to genuine and steady progress.

CHAIRMAN: He says you can have survey and then you leave them and no difference is made. Unless you follow up survey, the money spent is wasted?-- Yes. Now, we have definitely adopted a policy of agricultural education for the people, through the demonstrators.

DR. ROBERTS: If you want individual tenure, you must have registration. You cannot have that, without some arithmetical survey?-- Yes Doctor, you can.

How?-- Descriptive, a descriptive survey. It is done.

MR. LUCAS: I think we are bringing in too much refinement for the Natives?-- Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: I was the one who stopped surveying in the Native Territories, but I am convinced we must have some form of description apart from words?-- Yes, I agree with you. I shall give you an example of a group holding land under individual title. The example is that of a group which bought land on a syndicate basis before 1913, in the Dundee district. I cannot remember the name of the
group, but it is a group of individuals. I went into that area and I was very much struck, shall I say, by the solid appearance of the district. You have a group of houses on these farms, decent looking houses, and the lands were well cultivated, not brilliantly but just well cultivated, and I went into their school and I was immensely impressed by the children of these farmers. They were a solid, progressive type of the community; I can give you other cases, too. Take these Natal cases, the mission reserves. I stood on a hill and I counted 50 homesteads. That is on a place near Umsinto. They were all decent homesteads. I went into two of them and one of them had five rooms and the man very brightly brought out his title and said, "Here it is". He said nothing would induce him ever to go back into communal tenure; he was master of his own domain. That was the Isafa Reserve. Here is a group of 50 homesteads on one side and surely a community like that is an asset to any country. They cultivate their lands on modern lines. They had a sugar crop which was very profitable, more easily marketable than other crops -- and all this on individual tenure. I hope the Commission will take a very definite line on this question of individual land tenure, because I have a feeling that the Native Affairs Department is somewhat hesitant about the whole thing. What did they do in Europe before they had surveyors on the spot, in the days of the pioneers? Between man and man they had some way of describing it.

CHAIRMAN: They were not working in four acre allotments and in England and Europe there was no individual
tenure until they started the enclosures?-- Yes. I am quite sure the thing is possible, and every magistrate I have spoken to says he is satisfied it is possible.

Take your ground round about Umtata. Can you visualise the amount of trouble you will have by boundary disputes, when you have four or six or eight morgen holdings with absolutely no way of determining where they are. You know the amount of trouble there is with European farms, even where they are surveyed -- you know the trouble there is about the shifting of boundaries. There is more bad feeling in the Free State among neighbours over that sort of thing that there is between S.A.P. and Nationalists. When you have 4 morgen pieces and the land is just all the same, you cannot distinguish along the countryside; it is just the same sort of soil throughout and there is no landmark; there is not even a stone you can remember?-- But then there is no reason why a stone should be placed there.

I am not suggesting that a stone should be placed there. A stone might help, but there is no stone?-----

MR. LUCAS: You have no trouble in Sekukuniland where the lands are all adjoining?-----

CHAIRMAN: There is no individual tenure there?---

MR. LUCAS: There was nothing to distinguish the one from the other and it was pointed out how extraordinary it is that they never make a mistake?-- Take some of these mission reserves in Natal, where individual tenure has not come in and you find that they are crowded on the hilly ground, on the hillside, and yet every man knows what his allotment is.

CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that the question of
grazing ground is infinitely more important than the question of lands is?—Well, what happens is that some are on grazing grounds and they should not be there at all. The land should be available for grazing.

They actually grow a larger crop of food for the animals than for themselves. The cultivation of the ground after all gives them a bigger yield than running animals all the world over?—Well, accepting that. I have talked this over with a great many magistrates and they would rather have this than stagnation. We need not be tied down to the original expenses survey. If you leave it to the magistrates, I guarantee you that eight out of ten magistrates would fix it up without the slightest difficulty.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Would you allot lands in individual tenure to individual heads of families?—That is one of the very important aspects of individual tenure; it very quickly tells you where your surplus is. I have said to magistrates in the Transkei, "How many people have you got for whom you have no allotments?" In the Glen Grey area they have large surpluses of people for whom they have no allotments and I know of Natives from Glen Grey who have actually trekked to Angola. In the one case you do not know that you are short of land and in the other case you do know that you are short of land.

MR. LUCAS: You say that you have definite information of Natives from the Glen Grey district trekking to Portuguese West Africa?—Yes, I have the information. A South African friend of mind that the Natives might emulate the Voortrekkers and go to the Congo, where there was plenty of land for them.
CHAIRMAN: What sort of a trek was this when these people went to Angola?— I do not know how they got there.

Do you know how many of them went?— No, I do not know.

We have found Natives from the Union who have gone right up as far as the Equator?— Yes, I believe so. I was told about these Natives who had gone to Angola definitely, by an Official who said that their reason for going there was that they said they must have land. Then, if you are passing over from the question of individual tenure, I may say I am constantly receiving letters asking whether it is possible to raise funds in Johannesburg on a commercial basis for the purpose of financing the purchasing of farms by groups of Natives. There is a real need for some form of fund by which Natives can be assisted to buy land. I wanted to bring this before you to see whether you had had any similar requests brought to your notice. I receive letters regularly. Say there is a block of land of five or six farms. In one particular case, the company owning land will not sell fewer than seven farms in their area. That land is extraordinarily good for Natives. It is well watered and right contiguous to the Native reserves. The fact is that the Natives must have more land. They want to buy under individual tenure and not as a tribe, but there is no way by which they can get the money to do so; no way by which they can get funds to buy that block and, if it were possible for them to secure the funds, it would be extraordinarily good for the country to get these Natives settled there. The land is quite in the right
position, but there is no machinery of any kind to enable them to buy it.

DR. ROBERTS: Have you made yourself acquainted with the way in which Chief Zivi raised money?-- No; I was rather interested to know how he got it.

He got it from the people?-- From the individuals?

They sold their stock and they gave him the money?-- He had a lot of integrated people together in the Cape, they sort of sold up. But here, the only way would be to form a sort of trust, but obviously it is the sort of thing available for Europeans, but apparently not for Natives.

In the United States, I found that the Land Bank there for Europeans also had funds available for Negroes, although there is some prejudice in some of the States where 95% of the population is Negro.

It is rather a different position here, where you have these large Native areas. I think there should be a Land Bank, but the question is whether there should be a separate one?-- I am merely pleading for some facilities.

CHAIRMAN: If you have these facilities, unless the Natives can sell their land to anyone, you are going to make it very difficult to get private capitalists to advance any money to them?-- Except that there is enormous competition as between Natives for land. They will pay almost anything for land - it is perfectly amazing how, in Johannesburg, they are able to get land near Johannesburg. They will pay ridiculous sums, and as far as Chief Qumalo's group was concerned, they wanted to buy a farm and a meeting was held of the people concerned. I was present at that meeting/the farmer whose land they wanted to buy was there. They never asked the price of the land at all. All they wanted to know was whether they were in agreement that they
should buy. The farm was an excellent one. I went to the owner and I said to him, "Are you going away North?" He said, "No, I am going to the Free State. My daughter thinks I should join them there", and, by way of apologising for selling the farm to Natives, he said, "I offered this farm to Europeans on several occasions, but they would not give me my price and said it was too much, but the Natives were quite prepared to buy without any hesitation". I spoke to the Natives and asked them to satisfy themselves whether the price was a fair one for the district -- I also spoke to the Native Commissioner about it. But this was an indication of the hunger for land which these men have. So far as any question of security in respect of advances for the purchase of land are concerned, it seems to me that the demand for land among Natives is sufficient.

CHAIRMAN: It is only a question of payment, -- if the interest cannot be paid by these Natives on the amount advanced, that farm goes into the market. It can only go to the Natives and, if there are no Natives able to buy, the land becomes worthless?-- If the Land Bank can advance a certain amount of money on any farm, it would have in mind the fact that it could not be sold to Europeans. Then the amount of the advance is another matter which has to be fixed. I do not know whether the Land Bank gives two thirds of the value of the farm or what they give, -- I believe it is 60%, and it may be that the Native Land Bank may not go as far as that. There is no doubt about it that it is a doubtful venture for private capital. The trouble is that the commercial men seem to feel doubtful about the policy in this regard and that is a very important factor. In regard to this
land which I saw in the Northern Transvaal the other day, a great deal of land had already been sold in that area by a particular man and it had been very well sold and well paid for. I was told that one Native actually planked down £500 in cash and he said there were many more awaiting the opportunity to pay cash for land, but the trouble was there was no more land available.

MR. LUCAS: How would many Natives in that area be able to get together £500?-- I do not know; I was asking one of the banks here whether they had many Native customers on their books, and they said yes, they had, and they told me there was one Native woman who had £6,000 in the savings bank.

It was suggested to me that such an amount was due to illicit liquor selling?-- No, I do not know. This had been there for some time. There was a Johannesburg mine Native the other day who had £400 to invest, and he asked a friend of mine to invest it for him. My friend said to him, "You go and see so-and-so" and the Native said, "No, he might borrow it from me".

What happened?-- Well, the money was invested by my friend for him.

On page 11, at the end of paragraph 1, you say that in one town in Natal an official told you that as many as three kraals would come into the town. In what period was that?-- He said per day. I did not put that down. But what the man was after was this, that frequently three kraals came in in one day. He wanted to convey to me that that sort of thing happened frequently.

At the bottom of that page you say, "Squatting and labour tenancy are doomed. The proposed legislation
will drive the Natives away from the farms into the towns."

Now, what is the legislation which you think will drive
the Natives away from the farms? -- I am in that para-
graph referring to the Native Service Contract Bill as it
stands.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Take now the position in
South Africa, where we have the towns ----

MR. LUCAS: May I just get the reasons for this.
In what way do you think it will drive the Natives off the
farms into the towns? -- For this reason; the effect of
the clause in regard to taxation, this tax of 2½, if it is
applied logically, will be to cause many land companies
particularly to take immediate action in so far as the
Natives on the land are concerned, and also it will have
the same effect as the 1913 Land Act had in respect of
other employers; namely, the very fact that there is a
tax will make them take rather drastic measures when coming
to terms with their servants, rather than letting things
develop. The fact that there is a tax in sight will
make them do that. What happened in 1913 was that a
great many Natives preferred to clear off the land with
their stock, rather than carry on under any definite form
of contract; they lost their stock and they arrived in
the towns. I want to say quite frankly that I quite
realise the necessity for legislation dealing with labour
tenants and some of us are exercising our minds a great
deal for practical suggestions for the amendment of that
Bill.

CHAIRMAN: Legislation dealing with labour ten-
ants - what have you got in view? -- We recognise the
necessity for some very much better state of affairs than
exists now. Many farmers do suffer from the fact that Natives do not fulfil their contracts and we have to work from that and to see whether we can find common ground whereby the farmer can get what he needs and whereby the Native can get a better state of affairs. As things stand now, I think the Bill is too drastic and the effect would be, if it came into force in respect of these employers who are not considerate to their Natives — their Natives would go off and would drift into the towns.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: I think it has been accepted that the penalty is too drastic and that may be one of the reasons why the Bill was not gone on with? I am impressed with the necessity for those of us who are concerned with this to come to an agreement on this matter. Some of us are on one side of the kloof and the farmer is on the other side and there is nothing to bridge the gulf and, if we could persuade our farming friends that it is necessary to provide better conditions in regard to labour tenancy, that we, on our side, would have to face the fact that there is to be more control in some way or another. If it is to be labour tenancy, we would rather have it effective than allow the present system to continue, whereby both sides are discontented and handicapped.

I want to ask you this. It appears to me that there is a general feeling in the country that the influx of Natives into the towns is not proportionate to the needs of the town? — Yes, there is that feeling and it has been expressed repeatedly.

Do you think that that is so? If you take the fact that the European is the employer of the Native, and the sole employer of the Native today. The European lives
in the town and has his interests there. Is it not the natural thing that when you have 5½ million Natives and you have half a million people living in the towns, that they should attract the people from the land into the towns?--That is what is happening in the United States. Since 1915, there has been an enormous migration of Whites and Negroes into the cities of the South and particularly in the North and the East. Because, since that time, there has been an enormous increase of wages all round in the towns. Agriculture has not been able to hold their own in regard to the level of wages. This has been so strong that the State of Georgia, for instance, in 3½ years time lost 300,000 Negroes. One county alone lost 45% of its Negro population in the course of one year.

DR. ROBERTS: Where did they go to?--In some cities in the South, large industries were beginning to develop and they also went to the North and the East and I found in the City of Philadelphia that they were faced there with double the Negro population which they had had a very short while before. But again that sort of thing, in the course of time, finds its own level because, last year, when I was there, the depression had set in and there was a terrible amount of unemployment and the town Negro was finding that he had to stand up against the country Negro just as in South Africa today I find that the town Native's competitor or the town Native's enemy in an economic sense is the Native from Basutoland and Bechuanaland and the Native reserves. I have made that point to Native groups when I have addressed them, and I have told them that the difficulty which they are faced with is the same as their
White friends have to face. I have told them, "You have been competing with the white man and now you are approaching the same position and together you are finding that the man from the Territories is undercutting you and competing with you for jobs. There is no colour bar in these problems, but you have to realise that in the course of time we shall find that the only way of helping the situation is by improving the rural conditions generally and also by the fact that there is no work in the towns for these people and they will have to find a place somewhere else."

I want to put this to you. Do you consider the influx of these Natives into the towns unnatural?-- I think it has been accelerated by the fact that wages in our towns have increased in recent years.

DR. ROBERTS: Have they increased? We have evidence -- I think, more or less, untrustworthy, -- that they have not increased during the last two or three years?----

MR. LUCAS: I do not think there is much evidence of an increase of wages even in the towns?-- I was not thinking of Natives so much now. I think I have indicated some reasons which I found for the Natives coming to the towns. I found that in most cases the desire for cash was a very strong reason and I would say that the fact that their social wants in the Territories have increased tremendously -- far in advance of their ability to pay.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: What I am driving at is this -- one cause may be greater than the other. Has the influx of Natives into the towns in the Union in the last ten years been unnaturally high, more than you would expect
in a new country like this? The towns are bound to attract them?—I do not know that I can give you a definite answer to that question. I was struck in the United States by the remarkable parallel which I found in that respect. Whether the causes were the same I cannot say. Except that, in the United States, the Negro gets the same wage as a white man. The Native here does not benefit to the same extent. Industries have increased in the Union since 1914 and the employment of Natives in the towns did increase very rapidly in the years 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918. To my own knowledge that was so, and there was a real need for Native labour at that time, because there was a shortage of white labour, and that has definitely been a factor for getting Natives into the towns and many who have come have come to stay, especially those who came on contract. And it also happened to coincide with the fact that the 1913 Land Act came into operation in the beginning of 1914, and there is no question from the evidence which I have that Bloemfontein and Johannesburg have received a great increase of population as a result of that Act at that time.

MR. LUCAS: "On the last page of your statement, under the heading of "Lands", you say, "I would also urge the gradual control of all agricultural labour conditions coupled with assistance to farmers in securing labour". There, I take it, you mean the control of ordinary farming, not sugar?—Yes.

And as a compensation for that, you would give assistance in the securing of labour. In what way do you contemplate giving such assistance?—I do not know that
I can go so far as to suggest that the Government should undertake recruiting. This is a very delicate point and I am not sure that I am prepared to go as far as that, but I do say that the Government might well control recruiting for farmers, they might do so very much more than they do now and they might give special facilities in regard to the seasonal transport of workers on condition that they are satisfied with the conditions which will be given to the workers and that they are satisfied that the conditions of employment and housing shall be in compliance with the regulations laid down. That is in my mind in that paragraph which you have read.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you think it dangerous for the Government themselves to undertake recruiting? -- I am a little nervous about it.

What is your objection? -- I do not want the Government to be too much associated with things which cause a certain amount of discontent. There is a danger of associating the Government with industrial or agricultural organization in such a way that the Natives will think that the Government is responsible for a certain state of affairs.

DR. ROBERTS: How would such a body as the Bunga meet your thoughts? There again you would have the same difficulty? -- To a certain extent, yes. Then I do feel that I would like to help agriculture to get the labour at once, but only in that case, if help is to be given it must be on conditions.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You refer to the question of the separation of the work of the Director of Native Agriculture, from that of the Union Department of Agriculture, but is it
not to the advantage of the Native that he should have a separate Department of Agriculture. He will get more attention and more benefit that way?— The only difficulty to my mind is that there are so many other highly developed services which are of great advantage to the farmer — I am speaking as one who is not a farmer — I do feel that these resources should be available in respect of such matters as the type of cultivation which should be adopted in a particular area, measures which should be adopted for dealing with pests of various kinds, so that agriculture as carried on by Natives could have the advantage of the highly specialised knowledge and discovery of agriculture as carried on by the Europeans.

They practically have access to all the services, as far as discoveries go?— Yes, that is so. I understand that the Bunga can get the help of the Department of Agriculture when they need it, but my point is this. I went into the Department of Agriculture at Washington, The Federal Department of Agriculture, and I had lengthy discussions with various of the officials there and I was greatly impressed by their knowledge and by their energy in pushing on progressive methods among both Negroes and Whites in the Southern States. They had joint meetings. And this is in an area where colour feeling and colour prejudice is a great deal more intense than it is even in South Africa. After all, we treat the Natives and the Whites as being on a friendly footing, — but not so there. The Negro farmers, all the same, are able to get the benefit of all the specialised knowledge which is available for the Whites as well. I look upon agriculture as one, and
not as Native or as White agriculture, and I say that it is to the advantage of South Africa if Native agriculture becomes efficient and progressive just the same as White agriculture.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Do you not think that the Natives score by having a special branch themselves?— So long as Mr. Thornton is not so isolated that he cannot say "I want an official to investigate the position in this area, or in that area—can he go?" At present it has to be done by very special arrangement.

CHAIRMAN: You mentioned the Bunga, but that is quite different from Mr. Thornton; he has no authority over the Bunga?— No, that is so,—he is their adviser.

Yes, but do they take his advice? How often do they take it—up to the present they do not seem to have taken it?— Quite. There is a danger of separation of services which we cannot afford to have in South Africa. There is the danger of separating very highly specialised services. We could not afford to attach to the Native Affairs Department a very highly specialised department of Agriculture, and I think it would be very unwise to do that.

MAJOR ANDERSON: A very large percentage of the work of the Department of Agriculture is available to the Natives and is brought to their notice by their own Department?— I was given an example in regard to that train which went to the Northern Transvaal, the demonstration train. That was not available for Natives, and they were shoed off.

I agree, when you come to a sub-department. But you find that anything like research work in regard to
scab prevention, stock diseases, etc., all the work done there is available to the Natives and the research work in regard to stock diseases is most extensive?—Yes, but in what way is it available to the Natives?

The results of research work, remedies are all available, and probably brought to their notice by their own Department?—Yes, through their own Department. It is available to anybody in the same way; anybody who takes the trouble to enquire. It is the organization of agricultural education and agricultural economy, various divisions of agricultural education.

CHAIRMAN: The Natives say that they would rather have less of the attentions of the Department of Agriculture?—Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: It is a new development which my colleague, Senator van Niekerk, urged. You have not had much time to enquire into these particular fields which you are speaking of now?—One is very grateful for the fact that you have been able to get a man like Mr. Thornton, who is so keen on his work. I would like to draw your attention to the resolutions which appear in this little white book, and the importance of these resolutions is that they were strongly supported by the Natives, and also papers were contributed by Natives.

CHAIRMAN: I now want to refer to the statement which you handed in this afternoon. First of all, page 2, the second paragraph, "I also ask that long term leases—20 or 25 years, be granted to those who wish to build their own homes." How would you suggest that this class should be chosen?—In regard to differentiation of treatment of Natives in townships. Well, those who are old
residents and who live according to hygienic and civilised ways, they are generally to be found among this type, the Native teacher, the preacher, and the very old experience Native storeboy.

I have in mind what machinery you would use?—They would be found the same as among the Europeans. Those who were able to pay for that type of accommodation and those who ask for it. I find that it is quite a sore point amongst the good class of Natives that they cannot have any place where there is peace.

What exactly do you mean by that?—Well, they have to take whatever house in the location is allotted to them and, on either side of them, there may be just ruffians, and the children are hooligans. Those people are particular that their children should be brought up in a nice way. I find that the location superintendents are waking up to this and, in discussing the matter with them, half a dozen of them have said that they would welcome the possibility of developing the townships in this way. One man said, "No, I do not approve of it, because it would mean taking away from the rougher element those others who have a leavening effect", but generally speaking the superintendents welcome the better classes having better accommodation and even separate accommodation.

Now, take Item 2 in your further points, "Need for arable plots near towns for market gardening". Would you explain that a bit more fully?—I have been giving some attention to the thought of layout which is desirable for Native townships and I have been impressed by the fact that there have been good arable lands being used for dwelling
houses and that such lands might be put to much better use by not putting houses on them and wherever I have had the opportunity of discussing these matters with the Municipality, I have urged them putting houses on rising ground, keeping in mind the necessity of drainage and being careful about every bit of arable ground. Some places have made the mistake of giving large plots to every house, including the building and garden plots. My experience is that not every Native, nor every White man, is interested in gardening, and a great many of these plots just lie full of refuse and tins of all kinds and all sorts of rubbish.

Skokiaan holes?--Yes. It is far better to arrange your houses on rising ground and then to make available to those who desire arable plots so that they can use them for augmenting their family rations and also they may develop the idea of market gardening. I have found in some parts of South Africa quite a tendency among Natives to go in for market gardening. At Eshowe, I saw a few plots outside that were cultivated by Natives and used for the selling of vegetables and I think that in Queenstown and King William's Town, too, I found the same thing. Well, I think it is a very sound and very healthy development and municipalities should be encouraged to set aside for the use of Natives, arable land on which they can go in for market gardening.

Take a place like Johannesburg. I do not know anywhere nearer than Evaton, quite 29 miles away. It is a long way from the town, but a certain amount of market gardening is done there and the stuff is sent to the town. I think it would be desirable for a place like Johannesburg
to have a township where Natives could have their own homes? I would give them long leases, 20 or 25 years and longer, and I would allow them to go in for market gardening even if it were only to augment their wages.

Now, your next heading which I want to deal with is the effectiveness of advisory boards and the causes of their weakness. Will you tell us some more about that?--Yes. That is really quite a troublesome matter to many location superintendents. I have had the opportunity of discussing it with most of the superintendents in the country. In a great many places, they find a difficulty in getting any elections at all, but when they do get elections, very often they get the wrong type of man and consequently there is frequently a disposition to say that advisory boards are no good at all. I have urged this point on the superintendents. In most towns, the population today is of a very conglomerate character. They come from the four ends of the country and it takes a long time for a new community to develop a community sense. It has taken Johannesburg a long time to become a city -- the public life of Johannesburg was of a most difficult type; it was difficult to get the right type of man to stand for election to the Native advisory board. But what very often happens in an election is that the decent element is overawed by the crowd which has come in. It is too ignorant to know what it wants, it is not used to the new type of living. It is dissatisfied with the new conditions and very often the law-abiding element is overwhelmed by the other element. The law-abiding elements are very nervous of doing anything that may bring them into
conflict with the rougher element, and when they do get on the advisory board, they may give advice quite genuinely but they are extremely careful and nervous of saying anything outside, because they are afraid of getting into trouble.

To my mind, the only way of dealing with it is by giving time for these people to get into the habit of living together, and the second way is to divide up townships into blocks and in that way to attract the decent people together, to break the power of the crowd and gradually to get leaders into your blocks and in that way get your advisory board. I do feel it is necessary to have a considerable amount of patience. The advisory board principle is sound and, instead of ignoring them, our best plan would be to strengthen them as much as possible. But my feeling is that there is far too great a gulf between the advisory board and the town council. The advisory board may give its advice or suggestions, but goodness knows what happens to that when it gets to the town council.

DR. ROBERTS: It is not a gulf, it is an abyss?—Yes, I agree with you. Now, in regard to my other point where I say that I strongly urge that the Bloemfontein system should be guide for all municipalities. I think the Bloemfontein system is very sound in having one or two people of the Town Council on the Board. That is quite useful. I wonder whether we could not go a little further and encourage public spirited men in the various towns to be nominated on to advisory boards. A very limited number would be necessary to help the other members, give them moral support and make them feel that they are not alone.

CHAIRMAN: Nominated by whom?— Nominated by
the Town Council. I believe in experimenting, but I am not laying down any particular line.

Would you suggest that, instead of the Town Council nominating Natives as they do now, that they should nominate Europeans?— It would be very often useful to have the right to nominate Natives, too. There are some who, because of their moral courage, do not get on the board.

It has been represented to us that the Natives nominated in the case of the municipality, are under the thumb of the superintendent of locations and that they give him the majority on the advisory board?—Yes, that is so.

MR. LUCAS: Another superintendent told us that he made it a rule to take the first three of the defeated candidates and appoint them?—Yes, I know that that is done, too.

In some cases, there is no nomination at all?—Yes. I only put forward this suggestion about getting the support of the Europeans and getting Europeans to come in with a view to strengthening the advisory board for a while and with a view to getting closer contact between the Town Council and such bodies.

MR. ROBERTS: Do you not think that it is better to allow the Natives to stand on their own legs, even if they fail, rather than bring in Europeans?—Except this; I believe that they may have some trouble because of their lack of knowledge of quite a number of problems, and if you have your Natives stacked away in the location and no one knows anything about them, you may one day have a big eruption because no one knows anything, whereas, if you have a small number of public spirited Europeans helping, it may
help to educate public opinion in the town.

The superintendent, if he is a man at all, must be aux fait with everything that is going on?— Let me tell you that the superintendent is the most isolated and the most lonely man and very often he himself does not get into contact with other sections and I want to surround him with healthy sentiment and sound advice.

I now come to item (b) "Representations of Natives on Town Councils"?— I issued a questionnaire to a large number of bodies and individuals in order to help them to raise points to place before this Commission. I have heard expressions of opinion on this particular matter and quite favourable expressions—that is, that they feel that it would be a good thing if the Native location could be heard directly on the Town Council by special representatives, or European representatives, of course. That is a matter of expediency. It might be well worth trying the idea somewhere of having one or two Europeans representing the location. At present there is no way by which that can be done, but it might be worth while encouraging this by having some power by which municipalities could have this way of representation.

DR. ROBERTS: Could you not turn the location into a ward, for instance, and have that ward represented on the council?— Yes. On the other hand, some councils might take up this attitude and say, "We shall wait until we have nominated people". I do feel strongly that there are grave elements of danger in the gulf which is being developed, especially in our big towns, between the location people and the others. It is practically a case of two
towns being up against each other. - the location and the
town itself, without anyone being there to ease off the
friction and the sense of resentment.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Is there a likelihood that
the Superintendent may become the tool of the Council?--
Well, he is that today.

I mean, that your superintendent of locations is
not independent enough?-- You have that danger because he
has the town council, which is also concerned.

He serves another council - does not that prejudice
him?-- Certainly, he has to do what he is told.

CHAIRMAN: Of course, that point raises the ques-
tion of the status of the superintendent?-- Yes, there has
been a distinct improvement in the last few years in the
status of the superintendents. There has been a new
recognition that the type of man must be improved, and
there has been a disposition to give him greater powers,
a greater position commensurate with the community he is
dealing with, - a large body of human beings, but I feel
that there is still a lack of appreciation of the tremen-
dous weight which is resting on the shoulders of the super-
intendent.

MR. LUCAS: In several of the reef towns he is
under the sanitary inspector?-- Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: Would you say that this man should
be the chairman of the advisory board?-- I personally do
not think so.

Why not?-- I think it is far better that he should
be there to attend the discussions. I would much rather
you had one of these public spirited people in as chairman.
The superintendent should be there to hear the discussions
and form his own opinions and he should be free to think carefully of what is taking place. And also I have found this particularly in getting evidence for this Commission. I had several meetings with representatives of reef advisory boards, in which they helped me in the preparation of evidence for this Commission, and there is this point which was put up by them, "How can be give evidence as an advisory committee except through our chair, but our chairman is an official of the council and, therefore, he cannot say what he thinks, and if he interprets our views, then he is not carrying out his duty by his council."

DR. ROBERTS: But his first duty is by his Native people? -- The superintendent will tell you quite emphatically that his first duty is by the council. In Cape Town, Mr. Bennie is Chairman of the Langa Advisory Board, and he finds his job pretty difficult because he does not know whether the members of his board will back him up outside, but he is in a better position as chairman of the board than the location superintendent would be. He is freer to give advice to his board.

MR. LUCAS: Should not the position of the superintendent of the location be analogous to the position of the medical officer of health? -- No, the superintendent is really definitely personally responsible for conduct and good order in the location and consequently he must be very much more active in enforcing his own policy than would be the medical officer of health, and as long as he is personally responsible, you must give him a certain amount of freedom of action.

CHAIRMAN: You must give the advisory board a certain amount of right to criticise him and, if that is so,
then it is difficult if he is in the chair?—Quite.

MR. LUCAS: The main point put to us is that you cannot expect the superintendent to put to the council a criticism of his own actions?—Yes, I should think that that is pretty sound, too.

DR. ROBERTS: But if he is chairman, then surely you are putting him in a better position in guiding the people whom he is supposed to guide. If he is in a different position, it means that you are simply putting him into the corner as a witness?—Surely not; he is there as adviser and superintendent. I cannot see how he loses any dignity at all. He is a much freer man. The chairman of the advisory board comes to him and says, "The advisory board has decided upon such and such a policy" and the superintendent says, "I do not agree with it a bit". The chairman of the board will say, "Well, it is my duty to pass these recommendations to the council", and the superintendent will reply, "Very well, I shall still oppose it in the town council committee". He has a much freer hand and is in a much stronger position. He is a man able to express himself, whereas now, when he is chairman of the advisory board, he is torn between two loyalties, — his loyalty to the council and his loyalty to the advisory board.

DR. ROBERTS: In your memorandum, you have a paragraph under the heading, "Treatment by the police"?—It is a special heading — treatment of Natives in court.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Before we go on with that, I want to ask a question about the superintendent. Have you given any thought to the idea of a general inspector of locations?—Yes, that was originally intended under
the Native Urban Areas Act. That was very generally the idea that there should be such a person who would be a sort of general supervisor.

MR. LUCAS: Like a provincial auditor, not with the same functions, but that type of person, independent, who would report and keep up the standard?-- Yes; and I think it very necessary that there should be some such appointment made. For one thing, it will help the superintendents, because, as I have said before, they really get very lonely.

SENATOR VANZHIEMKERK: Some of these municipalities are rather lax?-- They are not interested, very often. A man is there in the Native location, very often very close to it; he is far away from the town and he gets very lonely and no one worries whether he does his job decently or not, and I do think it is desirable that there should be a person of that kind. You will find the resolutions passed by a Conference in 1924. You gentlemen, Dr. Roberts and Senator van Ziekerk, were there. It was a conference mostly of location superintendents. When these men came together, I called them to a room and said, "Look, the time has come when you people should help each other more than you do now and to help yourselves," and I strongly urged them to form an association of superintendents of locations. I just shut them into a room and left them there and they decided to form an association such as I have suggested. Unfortunately, the thing has fallen into disuse, but everywhere the superintendents tell me that they wish they could get it going again and they have asked me to arrange for another conference with a view to getting their association restarted.
It is desirable that these men should be kept up to the mark and that they should also have an opportunity of considering policy and that they should be able to deal with suggestions especially from the people of the small country towns. I find some very keen fellows in some of these small country towns and they are anxious to get help and guidance.

DR. ROBERTS: What you said about loneliness - a man who is in sympathy with the Natives and who is fully entering into his work, surely does not suffer very much from loneliness; in fact, I think he would welcome being along? -- Well, I do not know. He would require a very great deal of personal resource.

Take our great missionaries? -- They are sustained by what they do, but I know that even they get very lonely and they open their doors very wide to people like myself who come from other centres.

MR. LUCAS: Is there anything you want to say about trading rights? -- Yes; I am afraid that the Free State is a very bad sinner in this respect and I was very glad when the Minister brought in that amendment to the Act. I find it very difficult to understand the logic of the Free State people in this matter, but, as a matter of fact, it is not confined to the Free State, I find it elsewhere, too. If these people are to live by themselves and are to be excluded from trading in other places, obviously they have a fair reason for asking "Give us the right to trade in our own area with Natives". I have been very much impressed by the evidence which I had the last few months, of the growing capacity of the Natives to carry on a trade. I do not know
whether the Commission saw these shops in Kimberley, Port Elizabeth and also in Johannesburg. Now, that is a very new development and I should say a very healthy development, and I think that the more we can do to encourage trading by Natives in locations, the healthier it will be altogether, and I want to urge very strongly that the Commission should give a lead to the country by bringing in definite recommendations strongly supporting the rights of the Natives to trade in the locations. Then, may I just refer to another point in regard to saving facilities. Perhaps I could come to that later on.

MR. LUCAS: Before you come to that; I know you have been making investigations about the relation of sewage farms to locations? -- Yes. There is a curious, may I call it, marriage between the locations and the sewage farms, the reason being that both are usually on municipal land. Now, I do not know whether the Members of the Commission have seen the report put forward by the Medical Officer of Health in regard to the Klipspruit Location. I am not prepared to support that statement which was put forward, because I have no means of knowing, but I am impressed by the fact that there must be some sort of connection between the infantile death rate and the sewage farms, largely due to the present of large swarms of flies. And I have written several letters to the Municipalities urging them to take definite steps to divorce these two -- the locations and the sewage farms. But it is a sort of accident which noone seems to have thought of ever before. Although, in Aliwal North, the then Native Commissioner of the Ciskei, asked the Municipality to move the sewage farm away from the location. They did -- they moved the
sewage farm nearer the location. I understand that the Native Affairs Department has taken definite action on the matter. I had a case in Ladysmith. The Mayor and Town Clerk kindly took me out to the new site for the location. It was an excellent site, it is true, for a Native township. It gives you both good building land and arable land and it is also near the river for washing purposes. It is quite a good river --- but, right across the river is a sewage farm.

DR. ROBERTS: You have exactly the same things in King Williams Town? -- Yes, and I do believe that there is a direct connection between the high infantile death rate and the presence of sewage farms, and it is most definitely a cause of trouble. At Klipspruit, the missionaries tell me that they dare not open their windows of the churches and schools, and what the effect must be on the stamina of the people, one can hardly imagine.

MR. LUCAS: As far as recreation facilities are concerned, I think we have heard a great deal about playgrounds and halls, but we have not heard very much about the Pathfinder and the Wayfarer movements and the possibility of dealing with the problem of the child in the town, between leaving school and the time when he or she would be able to go to work? -- In the first place, may I offer a very warm invitation to the Members of the Commission to attend a meeting on Saturday morning, when they will see something like 2,000 odd Native boys and girls meeting Lord and Lady Baden Powell. That will give the Commission an idea of seeing what can be done in the way of orderly gathering together of boys and girls and also of giving them an insight
into the co-operative efforts that are being made through the Pathfinder and the Wayfarer movements.

May I just mention this. Mr. Ballendon was asked a question about the Pathfinder movement, and he raised, as an objection to it, that it had a military tendency. We should like to hear your opinion about that?-- The Pathfinder movement is based on the Boy Scout movement and it is under the auspices of the Boy Scout movement. They have a different constitution. I am the Chief Pathfinder for South Africa at the moment. The Wayfarers movement does not as closely follow the Girl Guide movement, and is independent. The Wayfarer movement has tried to base itself on the actual needs of the girls more than the boys have done. We have rather followed the Scout lines very closely. Now, I have noticed that Mr. Ballendon expressed the view that the Pathfinder movement had a military tendency about it. I may say that I strongly oppose anything of a military nature in the movement, but obviously if you put boys into uniform there must be uniformity. You must have discipline and we do, therefore, spend some time or marching and on drill. Drill, we believe, is good for the general physique and health and also helps them in many other respects in the movement, so that, when we have 1,000 or 1,500 boys to move, we move them very much on disciplinary lines, but every person concerned with the movement emphasizes the fact that that sort of thing is merely incidental in order to help in the rapid movement of these people. What we do lay stress on is giving these boys and girls something that will enable them to be self-standing, will enable them to do things for themselves.
enable them to be helpful to their fellow human beings. We teach them obedience to their parents and give them discipline which, under tribal life, they would get through their various schools and through tribal organization. We realise that they should get something in the place of that and we try and give them a pride in themselves and a pride in working for their fellows and, at the same time, giving them definite ideas on how to help themselves and their people. There are about 2,400 Wayfarers organized in the Transvaal. The movement is to be found throughout the Union, throughout the Protectorate, Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia, and the whole of the syllabus is designed to make these girls into useful wives, homemakers and also clean healthy members of society.

In regard to the boys, we have something like 2,000 to 2,500 in the Transvaal and perhaps altogether about 5,000 also in the other Territories which I have just mentioned, so that the movement is really pretty widespread. The other day I was at a camp with 150 Native boys and there was not a single case of discipline, they were all extraordinarily well behaved. They were learning things like trekking through a forest, finding their way by the compass; they were taught signalling so that they could give signals over long distances if they were trekking through the country, and they were taught a great many other useful occupations, like simple veld cooking, mending their own clothes and washing, and generally making themselves into respectable individual.

I believe that the two movements are really capable of helping us with the difficult problem of discipline
among our citizens at a time when other forms of discipline are fast disappearing. So the criticism of the movement on the ground of being militaristic was illfounded. I mentioned this to Mr. Ballenden and he said that he spoke on the spur of the movement and he had been influenced by the fact that he had seen a lot of boys marching together. Our idea is emphatically not to teach anything in the way of militarism.

**Senator Van Niekerk:** I see your idea, of course, but may it not be the result of that -- bringing these youngsters into uniform, may not that have the effect of creating a military spirit? -- Well, Mr. van Niekerk, if you can suggest any other way by which we can give them healthy occupation, teach them these things, teach them useful occupations, I shall be very pleased to hear it. If you can suggest a way by which we can teach them these things and, at the same time, teach them to work together, I shall be pleased. I shall be very glad to avoid anything like militarism. We emphasize to the boys that the uniform itself is nothing; what counts is what is inside the uniform; it is a matter of a decent heart and a clean life, and we feel definitely that such persons are more likely to become decent citizens and people who will be a real asset to the State, than the crowd of hooligans early influenced by someone with the gift of the gab. We teach our boys loyalty to the authorities over them. It is part of their laws that they must obey those in authority over them and that they must obey their parents. And unless we fail to teach them this loyalty in other ways as well, I cannot help feeling that the movement is a great advantage to the State.
and to the citizens of the State.

DR. ROBERTS: In all the big training schools, discipline of a definite military character is one of the things that is taught? Yes, that is so.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Yes, I see all your points, but could not you find two proper Native names for these movements?—Well, we have tried, but the difficulty is to find a name which may be common to all the groups of Natives throughout South Africa, a name to which they all will agree, the Basutos as well as the Zulus. Lord Baden Powell was keen on "Adabi". Well, we are still experimenting with this. You must remember that we have to get a name that is understandable in Basutoland as well as in the Cape, and that is our great difficulty with that.

I can assure you they will pick it up. You get a suitable Zulu word and it will be all right; they will all accept it?—Well, that of course is the great point. I am glad to have had an opportunity of saying something about these two movements and I hope that the Commission realises that these two movements have the one common purpose, to make these youths into useful members of the community.

MR. LUCAS: Can you suggest any other measures which should be taken to deal with that difficult period between the school-leaving age for the town boys and the girls, and the time when they are fit for the world. There are not very many openings for young boys and girls, and that is one of our great difficulties today?—Do you mean in their organization or employment; in social organization or employment?
Both ?-- In regard to social organization, we tried to make these organizations do that. We are steadily developing a senior branch of the boys side and the girls side, which is certainly suitable for these girls in the towns. With regard to the employment side, that is a growing difficulty -- to find employment for the boys and girls that are growing up. With regard to the boys, they are confined largely to newspaper selling, which is a very deteriorating sort of job anywhere, and also to jobs of messenger boys. Native parents are more and more keeping their boys in school later, because they say, "There is no hope for our boys unless they are educated". When they are educated, they take on jobs such as mine clerks, and they go and try and get teachers jobs, but there is a glut of teachers jobs now († slump) and so we are turning to that problem, we are turning our attention to it, to the problem of finding a sort of occupation which will fill in that time from school-leaving, say, to a man's job. Here is a little bulletin which I issue every month. It deals with vocational training and the employment of Natives. I may say that I have been concerned for some years with juvenile problems among Europeans. I was Chairman of the Juvenile Advisory Board for some time and I am still an active member and there has been a Conference sitting, of which I am Chairman, of various organizations dealing with White workers. We have the same problem, so far as the Natives are concerned -- Natives in the towns -- and what jobs we can find for them. At the present moment, I am not in a position to give any definite information either as to the job they can go in
for in future, or what can be done. It has been suggested that committees similar to the Juvenile Advisory Board should be set up, but that is still in a very embryonic point and I am not in a position to give you any further information on this point at this stage.

SENATOR VAN NIJKERK: How do you finance your Wayfarers?—By personal subscriptions and by by subscriptions from anyone who is interested. I shall be very glad to received any subscriptions.

MR. LUCAS: Now the next point is in regard to saving facilities?—I wonder if the Commission has had before it any evidence as to the extent to which employers on the Rand hold monies belonging to their Native employees.

CHAIRMAN: Excepting as far as the Mines are concerned, no?—I have not given this figure, but I give it to the Commission for what it is worth,—that probably it is in the region of about £8,000,000; that is Mines, private, industrial and other kinds of employers.

DR. ROBERTS: That is very extraordinary, because the Native only gets in the year about £7,000,000?-----

MR. LUCAS: That is the Mines only, and you are referring to all employers?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Do you mean that they are actually holding at one time £8,000,000 of savings?—All monies due to Native employees, monies which have not been paid out. It is amazing the extent to which Native wages are held by employers.

Held?—Yes, I mean held in trust. I do not mean withheld. The reason I mention this is this—do not take it, please, that that figure is anything that I am satisfied with, but I am satisfied that a great deal
more could be done to utilise Native savings. I am glad to say that, in recent years, the banks in Johannesburg have shewn a far greater disposition to receive Native savings than in the past. But the other day I was asked by a Native church to act as Trustee for a Building Fund. I agreed to do so under certain conditions, and one of the conditions which I laid down was that the money should be deposited in a building society or a savings bank. My condition was complied with and we went to a certain building society.

I want to emphasize that we had here a group of very respectable educated Natives. They were going to raise a fund of probably £1,000, for building a church. Now, this building society to which we went is a very keen progressive body, a very good class of institution, but there was considerable hesitation about accepting this amount. The matter was referred from one person to another and eventually it had to go before the board of directors, and in the end I received a communication that they were not prepared to make any declaration on principle, but, because I was interested, they were prepared to accept the account. And so the account was opened.

To my mind, it was a very unfortunate lack of initiative on the part of this very progressive body. Here is a big class of the population, a really great potential money-saving class, and I do believe that a great deal more could be done in the way of encouraging Native savings and in making use of Native savings than is done at the present time. The Post Office does receive Native savings, but I have known of cases where considerable hardships were
entailed through Natives wishing to deposit their savings with the Post Office Savings Bank. I should like to give you an instance of that. I was on a farm and a Native had £6 saved which he wished to pay into the Savings Bank. The town where the nearest Post Office was, was about eight miles away, and on a day convenient to his employer, the Native was allowed to go down to do some shopping and to pay in his money.

He went to the Post Office and he had to wait there for several hours before he was attended to. And even then, before he was attended to, the Savings Bank was closed and he was told that he was too late for that day. Twice he went in to pay in and then, on the third occasion, the employer sent in a very stiff note to the postmaster and it was only then that his money was taken. It is a very unfortunate thing from the point of view of the country. If Natives are not to be encouraged to deposit their money in the Post Office, then surely it is a very bad thing for the finances of the country.

The general point I want to make is that more could be done to encourage the Natives to save and more could be done to give them facilities for saving. I do realise that there is a greater disposition today in that direction than there was in the past and that people are seeing that there are great possibilities in that direction.

CHAIRMAN: If there is any truth in that £8,000,000 which you mentioned just now, we shall have to start overhauling the idea that the Native is not paid enough. Do you realise that that £8,000,000 would constitute £20 to £24 per head, that is over £100 per family?
You have to go a long way up among the Europeans before you get savings to that extent?—Well, that is what I am told. Of course, it may be money saved over a long time.

MAJOR ANDERSON: It may be wages held for months. It is not savings in the ordinary sense of the term?—No, that is so.

CHAIRMAN: That figure which you gave us for the Reef?—Yes. I want to emphasize that personally I have no means of checking whether that is correct or not, but I simply used it as an indication to show that there is a considerable amount held.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Natives on my farm often ask me to keep their money for a month, or perhaps two or three months, and I should think that is the sort of thing you are referring to. They are not really savings in the ordinary sense of the word. The point is that if those monies were deposited with a public institution, they would be available for investment?—Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: I would think over that amount again, otherwise it might give a clear turn to the thought that the Native is underpaid?—No. The point is that there are many Natives here on the mines, for instance, where you have the deferred pay system.

MR. LUCAS: Yes, but the deferred pay system counts only for £150,000 roughly, in a year?—Yes. I really am not in a position to discuss it. I merely used a statement which has been repeated to me two or three times, but I mentioned it because it seems to me that there is an indication that there is a considerable opening for giving the Natives greater facilities to save.
Take it that there is a population of 350,000 Natives for the Reef - a lot of these are children, but take an average of £3 per month - which is really more than it would be - that would give you just over £1,000,000?-- I have a Native in my employ who, before he came to me, used to give all his money to his clergyman to look after. Now, this clergyman has gone away and he brings this money to me and I take it to the savings bank. There must be thousands of Natives in the same position.

MAJOR ANDERSON: It is not saving, it is money which the Native wants to be held until he has finished his period of work and until he goes home?-- Yes, but it is not paid into circulation, that is my point, - not paid into circulation so far as the Native is concerned.

May I deal with one other point under paragraph 4, - health conditions, etc. It is one of my jobs to find out the actual conditions in locations and to suggest ways by which these conditions can be improved. I am very much impressed by this fact that what we want, so far as Natives are concerned, is not so much in the way of new services, but very much more the correlation of existing services. We have got into the way of thinking of services in watertight compartments and instead of having one agency for social life, we have two, one for Europeans and one for Natives. I was very much impressed in this regard in the States. Although there is a very strong colour feeling there, they have one social agency for White and Coloured, social agents, and they save considerably on the overhead organization. But now I go to a South African town, - you can take any town; I have one particular town in mind. The conditions in the location were deplorable
FROM the point of view of health. The Natives looked terribly disease-stricken. There was an enormous amount of tuberculosis and venereal disease. A great deal of excellent work is being done by the Child Welfare Society of the town. Two miles away was an excellent hospital with a splendid out-patient department and very good tuberculosis and venereal disease clinics, but being two miles away from the location, very few of the Natives ever went near that hospital, although they treated the Natives there. By getting together the Child Welfare Society and the Medical Officer of Health and the private medical practitioners of the town, together with the hospital authorities, it was possible to arrange with the Town Council for the out-patient department to be brought into the location and for the tuberculosis work to be done there, the patients to be attended to there and part of their welfare work to be worked in with the hospital. The point is that everything was done under the same organization.

DR. ROBERTS: Did you bring in the venereal disease cases?—Yes, they were brought into the location. Well, that sort of thing is really a most urgent need in South Africa, so far as the towns are concerned. What we want is not the institution of new medical facilities, but the correlation of the existing ones.

CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to say anything about the question of home brewing?—I do not know whether the Commission has arrived at any very definite opinion on this matter, but I must confess that I myself am much confused in my mind on this liquor question— I am more confused today than when I started. It is quite clear to me that municipal brewing in Natal is going down very steadily in
popularity. In Northern Natal, the figures are striking of the great decrease in consumption.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Is that due to the special boycott?-- They say no. They say they are much more sophisticated and there is much more illicit liquor than there was in the past.

DR. ROBERTS: What is your view of free brewing?-- The Natives say that they want home brewing. Here again I am all for experimentation. I can quite see that home brewing might be quite a possible thing in small rural towns and it might be chaotic in a big town. Take Europe, take the towns where you have your small populations; there home brewing of ale is a perfectly normal thing. But if you get industrial life in large towns, it is necessary to organize and have licenses and control very definitely for the brewing of ale and the consumption of liquor.

CHAIRMAN: In Belgium, you can buy beer anywhere you care to walk in?-- There is a difference between beer drinking in a rural area and in an industrial area where the workers live most part of the day in a close atmosphere and where they restrict their drinking to particular hours and, consequently, there is a tendency to increased drunkenness. Therefore, to lay down a system of home brewing or municipal brewing seems to make it far too hard and fast. I would like to see experiments made in particular areas and in particular types of towns in regard to these matters.

So far as the Rand is concerned, I must say that I still feel uncertain as to what policy should be adopted here. I cannot help feeling disturbed at the extent of illicit liquor dealing. As an intelligent Native said to
me, "If I get a drink, I have to drink it off in a gulp and it makes me drunk at once." It is safer there than in a bottle in my hand. The sooner I drink the stuff, the less likely I am to be caught." And I realise that that is the position, I realise the evils will follow in the wake of a situation like that.

DR. ROBERTS: It is very rare you find men in industrial areas taking beer, but your harvesters can drink it out of a bucket?-- Yes, they can perspire it out.

MAJOR ANDERSON: The experiment you want to try is on the same basis as White liquor?-- I want to experiment.

MR. LUCAS: One of the troubles, it seems to me, in some of these areas which have municipal brewing, was that there was a feeling of resentment because of the high prices which were charged?-- Yes, that may be.

The prices charged were four or five times what it would cost the individual to make the beer himself?-- That is so, and there was also a feeling of resentment that the municipality should make money out of it.

They want to make the money themselves?-- Yes; they said that if anyone is to make a profit out of the making and the selling of the beer, they should make it themselves. This question is so difficult that I do feel that it is one on which we should experiment before coming to any definite decision.

THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED AT 5 p.m., UNTIL 9 a.m.,
ON FRIDAY, JUNE 29TH.