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NATIVE ECONOMIC COMMISSION

PRETORIA  3rd JUNE 1931  10 A.M.

ONE HUNDRED & EIGHTH PUBLIC SITTING.

PRESENT:
Dr. J. E. Holloway, (Chairman),
Major R. W. Anderson,  Mr. F. A. W. Lucas, K.C.,
Dr. R. C. M. Fourie,  Dr. A. W. Roberts
Mr. C. Faye, (Secretary),

MR. RUSSEL WILLIAM THORNTON, Director of Native Agriculture,
called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: The Commission has read with a great deal of interest your very full and valuable statement which has been put in. We should like to proceed now to amplify a number of the points which you have dealt with in your statement. On your first page, you make this statement, that, with the exception of a few favourite individuals, the economic assets of a Native under the tribal system are nil. This is what you say. The question is—"What are the economic assets? Except for a few favoured individuals, the economic assets under the tribal system of today are nil, in fact, for the progressive man they are less than nil." That is rather an exaggeration is it not? Take the yield of grain, very small per morgen certainly, but there is a certain amount of value in that; there is a certain amount of values in the animals they have. There is a certain amount of value in having residence somewhere which costs him nothing?—Yes, but I say, comparing the tribal system versus any other system, on the same land, on Crown land --- whether they have the land under the chief or under our direct administration, they still
have the same conditions. That is to say, they have free land, free water, free living place and so on.

You are differentiating between the tribal system and the possessions which the Native has as a tribal Native?—Yes.

I thought your statement was capable of an explanation which was different from the one it seemed to bear on the face of it. On page 2, you express the opinion that lobolo is the main factor responsible for overstocking?—Yes.

The view has been repeatedly put to us that the Native's love for cattle is something even more fundamental than lobolo and that even if lobolo were not there, the Native would still work for cattle. Could you express any opinion on that?—I think there is a marked difference between certain tribes in that respect. If you take the business instincts which are more marked in the Basuto as a whole, and I include the Bechuana of any description, the Bophutatsa and all of them, no matter where they are or what they are, then I think it shews markedly in those races that their love of their cattle is the commercial love which we have for our stock, plus, as any farmer has, the great liking for the stock which he handles. But he handles those animals very largely from the commercial point of view as a means of livelihood. When it comes down to the other two distinct sections, that is the Xosas and the Zulus, they value those cattle, I think, for two reasons. The one is an outward sign of wealth, which again corresponds with what I said about the Basutos, and the other is for marriage purposes, and I think that the greatest factor there is the question of cattle for the purchase——no, do not let me say the purchase,——to give as a present, or rather as a means of making a contract.
The means of making a contract not only for getting a wife, but the making of all contracts?—Yes, you can say all contracts. It is a business proposition, but he will not part with these cattle if he can help it, in the last two-mentioned races.

Do you think the Zulu and Xosa group have even a greater veneration for cattle than the others?—Yes, far greater? there is no doubt about it. The Basutos and the Bechuanas are prepared to trade openly and freely with their stock, whereas I have never come across that with the Zulus or the Xosas.

DR. ROBERTS: Is that not an historical difference?

Do you think that, in the course of centuries, this attachment for cattle may have become less in the case of the one group?—I think it is a historical difference; psychologically, the Bechuanas and Basutos in regard to this point are quite different from the others, due, probably, to the origin of the people, which I think must be considered as quite distinct from the origin of the other two races. They probably came from the East and the others probably came from the West.

CHAIRMAN: Among the Zulu and the Xosa group even the abolition of lobolo, supposing it were possible, would still not touch that other factor.—I think, if one removed that one factor, the other one would, to a large extent, disappear. You see, cattle is their bank. They have these two expressions that the cattle is their bank, it is their wealth and the other one is undoubtedly the question of marriage. The conservative Xosa likes to see that large number of cattle in his kraal; it is, as it were, a visible sign of his wealth. Now, if you were to remove the
marriage custom, which we cannot do, then I do believe the other one would disappear through the commercial instincts of the people. I can see no obstacle to it then.

MR. LUCAS: It is put to us that there is a sacred side to the holding of cattle, and that that is anterior to the lobolo system itself?-- Yes, that is undoubtedly so to a limited extent and that is why I always say that the spiritual and material wealth of the people is bound up in the cattle. But that only affects the cattle to a limited extent. However, fine an animal may be ---- you may find a very fine animal sacrificed to the Spirits of the Ancestors, but that does not affect the cattle as a whole. What I mean to say is that the spiritual side only affects a small portion.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but the feeling extends to all the cattle?-- Yes, but while it extends to all cattle, I do not think that, in practice, it applies to all cattle.

Obviously it does not apply to all cattle, because they will sometimes barter an animal?-- Yes, that is so, and also sell it.

Quite; and if the sacredness applied to all cattle, bartering or selling would be an abhorant thing to them.

But from its applying to the animal chosen for sacrificial purposes, it applies to all animals, because every animal could be chosen for that purpose?-- Yes, very much the same as is the case in India, but it is a special bull or a special animal to which it especially applies and it applies to the rest in a minor degree. I do not think, however, that it would interfere with trade.

One must accept the possibility that they will gradually go for the trade in cattle, otherwise the position would become an impossibility?-- I think lobolo is
responsible for the maximum trouble in the overstocking because a man has to acquire those ten animals if he is to acquire a wife.

The breaking down of the lobolo system, if possible, would probably produce even greater problems than are facing the country now in regard to cattle?-- Can there be a greater problem, Mr. Chairman, than the final and complete breaking down of the land on which these people have to live?

You have the intangible moral and social problems. You can deal with a concrete economic problem, but it is very much more difficult to deal with an intangible moral problem. The point I am trying to get at is this, whether the breakdown of the lobolo system, if that were possible, would be a thing to be recommended on the ground that it would solve the cattle problem?-- To my way of thinking, it would solve the cattle problem, because 90 out of every 100 men ----

Take your price, the price which you are paying for solving the cattle problem, you are substituting another problem, it is immaterial whether it is bigger or smaller, it is pretty difficult anyway?-- The suggestion is that it should be quality and not numbers, because, if the land allows each individual in a given area to maintain two animals satisfactorily, then that man can make a fair living out of the two animals of high quality, but if that land cannot carry ten animals, and the carrying of ten animals is killing the land, it means that he is killing the land permanently as far as the race is concerned. Now, let us take the other side, that is the married side. If even that cash basis were removed, or the cash value of two animals, it would still, to my mind, looking at it from the
race point of view, be less detrimental to the race than the loss or the breaking down of the land on which they have to live.

MR. LUCAS: You are advocating now some substitution, or another form of lobole for the existing one?—Yes, that is what I recommend, because then it becomes a factor for good and not for harm. If a man can supply two animals worth £20, instead of ten worth £20, it means rapidly building up a good class of stock which would give a good return instead of a bad class of stock which gives no return at all, but which breaks down the country.

DR. ROBERTS: Would not that mean changing his whole outlook?—It may.

Just now he regards a beast as a beast?—Yes.

How would you instil into him that, instead of looking at the beast as a beast, he must look at the value of the beast?—Through the economic returns which are produced by these cattle. Let us take it this way, that a good cow producing 18 bottles of milk is better than a bad cow producing three bottles of milk. From the economic point of view, the good cow is worth many times the animal which he has today.

Would your Department be prepared to go out and undertake a crusade on that?—That crusade is carried on all the time, from the educational point of view, but I am afraid that it would take too long, if we want to save these people.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Have you made any progress at all?—Do you mean, in the cattle question?

Yes?—Well, it is very negligible.
Are you hopeful that in the future you will make some progress? -- Very little, in the Zulu-speaking section, but I do think that we shall make progress very rapidly among the Bechuana and the Basuto-speaking people.

CHAIRMAN: Your idea is to bring about a Native system -- to adjust it to modern conditions? -- Yes.

But that adjustment along educational lines you think will take so long that, in the meantime, all the economic basis of Native life will be destroyed by the old system? -- Yes.

And you see no other way for it except what the late Principal, Dr. Henderson, described as the cure of the cattle problem by violence, if necessary? -- Yes.

That is a serious expression of opinion, especially coming from a man like yourself, having the source of information which you have? -- Yes, I realise that.

I want to focus the limelight on that, because of its seriousness? -- I realise, from the point of view of the life of the people, that at this point of their development it is a very serious proposition to make, but when I see the deterioration and the very rapidly progressing deterioration which is taking place in their interests, as their inheritance -- which the land is -- I say, better face that proposition than having a starving people on your hands in another 20 years' time, or even long before that.

If a thing of that kind is to be done, it will be accompanied by a vast amount of dissatisfaction among the Natives. I take it that you realise that? -- Yes, indeed I do.

Are you not perhaps inclined to underestimate the dissatisfaction which would result? -- I think the dissatisfaction might be so great that they might go to any lengths
at this stage.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you not think that the alternative of doing it by educated means is much better? -- I am afraid

---

It does not take long to educate a people, 50 years? -- In 50 years, there will be nothing left.

MR. LUCAS: Have we touched the fringe of the possibility of what can be done by education? -- In what respect? What have we done really to try and educate them? --

Let us take the position in a district such as Glen Grey and round about there; can you show me any sign there of improvement? I went and inspected that farm in 1907 in the old Cape days. Can you show me any sign of improvement in the cattle in that area?

My point is, what steps have we taken in the direction of education? A few Europeans have said something and lately a few demonstrators have gone out, but apart from that can you tell me what we have done to educate the Natives? Have we tried to call in the representatives of the Natives themselves, or have we called in the Natives themselves and tried to educate them? -- I agree that the educational campaign which could have been carried out through the younger generation has not been carried out. Is that what you mean?

Is not that still a possible thing, if we put our backs into it? -- Well, if you are able to cure the present school system, if you are able to alter and amend it.

DR. ROBERTS: That is to say, give them more agricultural teaching in the schools, is that the direction in which you want to go? -- Yes, and actually prove to them in the schools, through the system of training, what can be done, because a child is the father of tomorrow and the child
teaches the father. We know that through our mission schools in this country and we know of the work that has been done in the United States, and we know it through other countries. But I do think that a direct campaign with the elder people will have very little effect. You take this Glen Grey farm. You know what has been done there. Whatever was possible has been done there — they have had the farm stocked with good bulls. For the last 20 years they have tried everything, but it has had no effect.

CHAIRMAN: Now the educational campaign in Glen Grey, apart from the farm, what practical shape has it taken in the last 20 years? — Only the efforts to induce the people to use improved bulls.

How many people were preaching that? — Oh, a lot of people were preaching it.

Assuming that all the changes that could be made now in the Native schools could be brought about by a wizard's wand in order to focus attention on this question of cattle, do you not think that the education might go faster in future and stem the very rapid tide of deterioration of the Native countryside? — It is difficult to judge the extent of the conservatism and the period over which that will be extended, even if we have that educational campaign, but I do think we shall make a difference in the next 10 to 20 years.

DR. ROBERTS: You mentioned Glen Grey. Do you think that, in the past, the teaching there was effective enough to produce a change? I know that you know Glen Grey well — in the past — not as it is now. With the single exception of the Magistrate, I think, very little was done in a forceful way to push educational agriculture there. It was left in a dormant state? — Yes, very largely that is so. In the
Transkei, it has been pushed as much as possible in the last 13 years through the schools. If you take a centre like Tsolo. There is a training school there, as you know. Take that district surrounding the farm there and the school. You see no improvement in the cattle, in spite of the very definite teaching which has been going on for years in that area. They have done practically nothing there to improve their land or their stock in spite of all the example that has been set to them or the teaching that has been done. All our efforts there have been in vain. One cannot do anything by putting on improved stock -- it will not be of any value. In fact, I think it is criminal to teach those people to go in for better stock, because we know that the improved stock will turn into the worst scrub in two generations.

It is only when you can get a man to say "I shall have two animals under those conditions" that we can make any progress at all. I feel that our hands are tied and I have said so frankly that, while we are having these overstocked conditions, it is wrong to say to these people that they must introduce good bulls, as we know full well that the progeny will die.

CHAIRMAN: On this general question of overstocking, - because overstocking is the main evil?-- Yes, it is.

The position has perhaps reached its extreme in an area like Middeldrift, or in a different form in Glen Grey or Herschel ---- that position is typical of what is happening all over the country?-- Yes. The difference between, say, Rustenburg or Xhlandla or Quamu and MiddelDrift is purely a difference of degree?-- Yes.

And the stream is going the same way all over?-- Yes.
Would you say that in regard to the Sibasa area? Has it shown any indication of starting there yet? - Yes, it has shown a very marked indication, in spite of the fact that the area immediately behind the Sibasa Magistracy is one of the best in South Africa. It is an excellent agricultural area and they have from 50 to 100 inches of rain every year. It has very excellent soil and has a tropical climate. It has three tiptop conditions — excellent rainfall, a tropical climate and a rich soil, but if you look at the denudation of that section, it is really very remarkable, considering the short time that you have had it with a fairly dense population there. Of course, as soon as you come away from there, from that part, you come to a dry area, but there we have an area which so far is comparatively lightly stocked with population or livestock.

Now, take Zululand?— Zululand is the best off the areas in the Union, if you leave out Nqutu and Nkandhla. They are badly eroded. The best of Zululand is up to the present lightly populated with livestock and also with human beings. Livestock — the fact that it is not overstocked is due to disease.

Are those signs which we see in other parts also beginning to shew themselves in Zululand?— In Eshowe, we are getting a wire grass; in Melmouth it is showing itself distinctly. We have the blessing that where the soil is denuded, where the other grass disappears, an unpalatable grass takes its place and that land becomes valueless from the grazing point of view.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You mean, that it stops erosion?—
Yes, it stops total denudation. In Mahlabatini you see signs of actual erosion, but not in any serious stage at all.
And in Mapumulo?—Practically nothing. The districts which are worst are Nquthu, Nkandla from actual erosion, and the districts which are worse from bad plant succession are Eshowe and Melmoth.

And for the rest?—Makhabatini. Nothing farther North.

MR. LUCAS: Does that plant succession right itself?—Yes, but it takes a long time where wild grass succeeds. In other parts, in two years' time the land rights itself again.

CHAIRMAN: That development which we see all over has to be stemmed or eventually the only things that the Natives will have is somewhere to put a hut?—Yes, if I follow what you mean ——

In other words, if we do not stop it, if we do not stem it, the other parts of the Union will have in their agriculture or in their other industries, the to bear the additional population from the Native areas?—Yes, exactly. Every 100 acres or every 1,000 acres which are demuded, are so much less land on which they can make a living.

MR. LUCAS: And that would smash agricultural segregation?—Yes, altogether.

CHAIRMAN: The point of curing it by education has been suggested. You think that even if education were all to be centred on that point, it would not go fast enough?—I am afraid not. We would be in time to save Zululand, there is no doubt about that, but so far as the Ciskei, Natal, Herscheil, Glen Grey and parts of the Transkei are concerned — I doubt it very much; I do not think we could.

MR. LUCAS: Even if we really put our backs into educating him, if we did it thoroughly instead of just casually as at present?—You cut the ground from underneath the educationalists feet; that is the difficulty.
How?—Because you cannot prove what you express to the individual.

There must be thousands of Natives here whose memory goes back to the time when conditions were different?—Yes, that is so.

Now, suppose you took those Natives into your confidence, supposing you took those leaders into your confidence and you gave them as thorough an explanation as you could into the facts, supposing you took the councillors and then turned them loose, bearing the expense yourself, that is, the Government, so that it was not a voluntary effort at their own expense; supposing you paid them, could you not do a great deal then even with the old ones?—They would say at once, and they have said it to me over and over again, "If we reduce our stock, someone else will increase his". You see, everything is common. They say, "If I cut my cattle down to five, the other man will increase his to ten".

Your difficulty is the communal system?—Yes. I have no means of showing the effect of two animals versus ten in cash returns. If I had a little piece of ground, I could show that the bad animal would live whereas the good one would die. I could show all these things to them and prove the bad results of over-stocking. If you ----

If you did go in for education thoroughly, if the authorities were to put their backs into it thoroughly, a method such as you mentioned would have to be adopted and would have to be paid for?—Yes, it would have to be adopted and paid for.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but as soon as you have taught these boys and as soon as they go back to the reserves, everything they have learned is forgotten and becomes valueless.
Mr. Thornton

?— Yes, they cannot put it into practice.

Do you not consider that fencing, or at least a certain degree of fencing in the Native areas, is absolutely essential for the salvation of these areas?— Yes, it is absolutely essential.

MR. LUCAS: Have you seen the statement by Major Harries of Glen Grey?— No.

He states that, at the request of the Natives themselves, the running of inferior stock on the commonage has been prohibited?— Yes, I know, that is so.

He says that, in one location, the men voluntarily and without any suggestion, asked for a levy to be placed, for a special tax to enable them to fence off a special piece of land?— Yes.

It would look as though, so far as those and other people are concerned, your efforts have not been wasted?— No. There and in other parts, we are prohibiting the use of inferior sires below a certain grade. Certain sires are castrated. That is quite sound, but while their commonage remains overstocked, we cannot do very much and the use of the improved sires would not help. Then, when they fenced their commonage, assuming 20 men did then, unless it is a mutual agreement among themselves that no man shall keep more than five animals, they are still defeating their own object.

Supposing we were generous to the Natives in regard to taxation. Today, you will agree the taxation imposed on the Natives is very heavy, but supposing we said "we shall let you all hold your part of your present personal tax and we shall give you the power of deciding yourselves what you will do with your own taxation, but you must make a charge for each head of cattle that is run on the commonage, but you
Mr. Thornton

will have the money to spend in your own interests." Do you think that that will be feasible and that in that way you may be able to exercise pressure? Throw the onus on them themselves for further expenditure and say you can spend the money yourselves? I feel that this question is the root of the whole Native question as far as the land is concerned. One knows that it is not possible to say, "Remit half the taxation to any section of the community which will agree to stock limitation, which will agree that no more than 100 animals shall run on that piece of land." If that could be done, the deterioration would be stopped and those 100 animals you would be able to build up into animals which will produce ten times as much as they are producing today. At present, our hands are tied, we cannot do that.

DR ROBERTS: Do you not think you are minimising -- I do not know that that is the right word to use -- the effect of education on the people, or let me use the word underestimating the effect? Take the lad who goes to the town. In a generation, his whole outlook is changed. Would not the same be possible if you used intensive education on the Natives anywhere? -- My proposition to the Department was this. I said I want every man to have a chance. I said I want to carry out an intensive campaign for 12 months, using every unit, agriculturally or administratively, using every type of literature which can be used to reach the people, pointing out what is actually happening to the country -- I would point all that out, I would point out to them what is happening to the inheritance which they should pass on to their children, making the position absolutely clear in order to obtain voluntarily from them the assistance which is
necessary in stock limitation. Then, if it shows any signs of success, if sections should come forward saying to us that they were voluntarily prepared to do this, that would be an indication to us that we could carry on. If, in 12 months, or in 18 months, of an intensive campaign, no results shewed themselves, in order to save their inheritance for themselves, I should say that we would have to do so-and-so.

Your period of 12 months seems somewhat short. Would you not say five years? After all, it is a very plastic man who will change his mind in a matter of 12 months?— I do not know. You see, we have no method of getting at them in this. That is the trouble. I cannot prove to them what is going to happen as a result of these overstocked conditions, but something has to be done.

CHAIRMAN: Now, coming back to this question of fencing. A certain minimum of fencing is an absolute desideratum?— Yes.

Could you give any indication of what that irreducible minimum should be?— My proposition is this, that we should fence the commonage of any location free of charge, if that location would agree to a limitation of stock on that commonage. Do not fence the arable land, fence the commonage. That is my idea.

So your minimum is fencing the whole commonage?— Yes, that applies to Xosaland and th' Zululand. A different system would apply to where we have the Bechuanas, in the Transvaal particularly.

What difference is there?— Well, there we would fence the land and not the commonage, because the lands, the fields are grouped on account of the village system.
Mr. Thornton

It would be cheaper to fence the grouped fields?—  Yes, it would be much cheaper.

Putting one boundary fence around the commonage still
does not allow you to rest any portion of that?— No, that is
the drawback.

The problem of boundary fencing is as much as one
can bite off at present?— Yes, that is so. At Middelton,
we fenced off the whole of the commonage. I referred to that
in my statement. That is my little ideal estate. There,
we fenced off the whole portion so that we should have winter
grazing.

You have two paddocks?— Yes, enough for many years.

MR. LUCAS: Where is Middelton?— It is in the
Lichtenburg district.

How are you doing that?— It is a 6,000 morgen farm
close to Setlagulie. I have got the settlers all round the
outside edge and, as it happens, the best land is on the
outside edge. There are 100 acre holdings. The outside
of the farm is ring-fenced. There is a ring fence inside,
separating the holdings from the grazing ground. The water
is so situated that anybody's stock can get to the water with-
out having to cross over anybody else's arable land. The
grass land is divided into two. All these people come into
one section in Summer and into another section in Winter.
These people are paying £10 per year. Stock limitation is
imposed, and no donkeys are allowed there. That gives me
the opportunity to start dairying for them and to put im-
proved bulls into their stock. I have not said you may only
keep so many head of cattle, but for every head of cattle
they can keep five head of sheep. The stock, however, are
limited and they have accepted those conditions. They have nine years' leases with the option of renewal, which gives them permanency of tenure and they are putting up good houses.

Where they had the year to year system, they were putting up any kind of houses, just living anyhow without improving, but under this system where they have permanency of tenure things are different, and they are looking after themselves very much better.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you say that you are giving them each 100 acres?—Yes, it is dry country and they are getting something like one good crop out of every five.

Do they plough every year?—Yes. Of course, when I say that they get one good crop out of five— they will get a crop of sorts in the other years as well.

Do they grow mealies?—No, they grow kaffer corn, it is too dry for mealies there.

MR. LUCAS: How long was this in existence before you took it over?—Before I took over I think it was in existence for either five or seven years.

And when did you take it over?—Just after I came to the Department, two years ago.

Did you reorganize the allotment of land?—Yes.

Was it communal before?—The commonage is still commonage. It was the lands which I reorganised, and everything is blocked out now.

MR. LUCAS: Have you had any opportunity in these two years of noticing improvements?—Yes. There were five dams at this place, which were practically silted up. I took the matter up and I said to them, "If we help you, you must help yourselves". Well, they did so and now they have repaired these dams. Then it was necessary to put down bore
holes and I said to these men, "Well, if we put down a bore
hole, you must care for the windmills," and they undertook to
do so. Of course, they had to find all the material for
the building of the reservoirs. We said to them, "Each of
you has to care for his own section of the fence". Well,
they are doing that. Then they said to us they wanted a
school. They have built their school themselves, and they
have paid their rents.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Is it one tribe living there?--
No, there are odd people -- most of them men who, in the
past, have worked on European farms.

And so they have a chief?-- Well, they have one man
whom they look upon as being in charge. He is not a chief
in the ordinary way.

MR. LUCAS: Do they have a council?-- No.

How do they settle among themselves what proportion
each /is to provide of the material, say, for the dam or for the
school?-- If anything like that has to be arranged, we call
them together. We have a man out there, a Mr. Garde, who
is a farmer adjoining this reserve. He is a well educated
man and he sees to the calling of them together and he says,
"We want five loads of sand or of stone or whatever it may be
for this dam. You must discuss it among yourselves and
arrange who will supply things." They say, "Very well. So-
and-so will provide this and that group will do the other
thing."

And when it comes to things like cement and they
want cash, how is that found?-- In this instance, so far
as the building of the dam was concerned, we found the cement,
but it is charged against the value of the land. They are
paying that.
Mr. Thornton

It has to be met as part of the capital cost of the farm?-- Yes, of the development cost.

It is paid for out of their £10?-- Yes.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Are they going in for better stock?-- Yes.

And are you putting up a butter factory, or anything?-- We shall be putting up quite a number.

MR. LUCAS: How many holders are there?-- At present there are 50 families.

Does that mean 50 holders?-- Yes.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Are you going to have a central butter factory?-- I have thought of having a central creamery, but that would be the second stage.

And in the meantime they are all making themselves?-- They have not started yet. They are starting this winter.

I shall put the two schemes to them -- the semi-co-operative system, or the individual system. Personally, I prefer the semi-co-operative one.

Have you got separators yet?-- No, but they are going to have them.

MR. LUCAS: The actual factories, are they to be provided out of the capital funds?-- Yes.

To be added to the price of the land?-- No.

Who will provide for that?-- They will. I may say that a creamery like that costs about £5 roughly; that is complete without the utensils.

MAJOR ANDERSON: That is a thatched building?-- Yes, I can give you the plans which have been carefully worked out.

MR. LUCAS: One of the difficult things with Europeans is to get them to co-operate without there being some form of compulsion behind them. So far, the Natives have done voluntarily all the co-operative work that is necessary?-- Yes.
Mr. Thornton

Do you think that they have the necessary spirit to make that go on and be a success in future? -- If I look at the lead which is given to us by the Bechuanaland Protectorate where they have three systems, I feel very hopeful. I think the one system, that is, the middle system, is the easiest. That is, one man erects one of these huts. His neighbours separate and store their cream in that hut. The owner of the hut, the man who has erected it, makes a small charge to each person who uses his separators and his utensils. It is not really co-operation in the ordinary sense of the word. The neighbours bring their products there to be separated and to be stored before those products go on to the lorry. Well, out of that, I hope that it will grow to actual co-operation as we know it.

It is your intention to work as much as possible under a system of co-operation? -- Yes.

Major Anderson: It will have to be a great deal more simple than the system of co-operation which is followed by the Europeans -- you will not be able to work under the Co-operative Act? -- No; we shall work under a Proclamation in which some regulations will be laid down. At Zeerust we have started. We have built the creameries actually and I have offered a reward for the first man who actually builds his dairy.

But that will not come under the Co-Operative Law, will it? -- No, it is not intended that it should.

But if it develops it will have to come under the Co-Operative Law? -- Not at this stage. I do not know that it will have to. At Zeerust, we have co-operative packing of citrus, but we are not working under the Act.

In what way is it done? -- All the citrus is pulled in the shed in the same way as it is done in the European sheds.
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I am not working under any law at all at present, but next year I shall have to have a proclamation to cover me to some extent, but I want the people to do it voluntarily, if it is at all possible. That is my intention.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You know, of course, what is happening in the Transkei. They are under some difficulty there and a little while ago they sent a deputation to the Co-Operative Division with a view to seeing if the Co-Operative Act could be simplified in order to meet the case of the people in the Transkei. Do you know anything about that?—Yes. They have now completed the draft. I went into that matter and I submitted the draft for final consideration to the Department of Agriculture.

It is a simplified system which they have there now?—Yes. It will be considerably simplified under that new draft. Are the Co-Operative Division willing to take charge of that, too?—Yes. And they will also give us inspection.

CHAIRMAN: Now, coming back to the Bechuanaland system of fencing of land, did you do that because you have only certain lands which are at all capable of being arable lands in Bechuanaland?—No. The village system -- it is like a French village system -- has necessitated the grouping of these lands near a village or in blocks, in many instances where they have picked their best lands. They have grouped their cultivated holdings which makes it very easy to fence these off and that leaves the commonages open.

Does not that prevent the tilling of perfectly good land which is now used as commonage?—No. They still work in groups quite far out. You will often find these groups on lands as much as six and eight miles away from the village, but they always group their lands following the
Mr. Thornton

instinct of grouping their homes.

In the Transkei, you agree that there is a large amount of land which is used as pasturage which is also useful as tillage? -- It will have to be tilled in future.

It is reaching the saturation stage of pasturage and tillage -- there is no opportunity of resting some of the tillage by taking in some of the pasturage temporarily? -- I think that we should depart from that system of resting land. Moses laid it down that land should rest for seven years.

I am afraid that we are a long distance from that stage with the Natives? -- Not with the Transvaal Natives. But it is certainly a long distance with the others. I think it is a great pity to plough up additional pasturage, obviously. We shall have to come to the allotment of one land to one family and that land must be worked properly because there is not sufficient land to go round otherwise.

MR. LUCAS: What would you substitute to resting the land? -- I would substitute fertilization and rotation of crops.

CHAIRMAN: The fertilization of land in the Transkei is a very great problem? -- Yes.

Do you suggest artificial fertilizer? -- Yes, until such time as we can get them to grow trees.

The problem in the Transkei of fertilization is a forrestry problem then? -- No --

You must have artificial fertilization? -- Yes, it is partly a forrestry problem, I agree. You have to go in for artificial fertilizer, until such time as you can get them to grow trees.

CHAIRMAN: You have mentioned the Transvaal Natives
several times. Do you regard the Transvaal Natives as a great
deal more advanced than the Zululand or the Transkei Natives?
Yes, you have only to look at the Transvaal Native's
method of living. He is not at this stage purely a pastoral-
ist, he is an agriculturist. He has a settled abode.
His houses are well built and he is not a nomad, whereas the
others are. You find that they are more pastoralists and
more nomadic than the other people. The Transvaal Natives
are essentially better agriculturists.

MR. LUCAS: Does that apply to the Bevenda, too?--
Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Take the Rustenburg Natives, who are more
influenced by the Europeans among whom they have lived for
very many years?-- Yes, that is so.

But you are not considering purely Natives who are
influenced by the Europeans?-- No.

Take the people with their original tribal customs --
not merely those who have come under long years of European
influence?-- Still, they are much better. If they had the
rainfall conditions and the climatic conditions of the Transkei
from the agricultural point of view it would be very marked.
Look at the cultivation in a district like Vryburg. I was
there a couple of months ago and I must say it is remarkable,
yet there has been very little European influence there.

DR. ROBERTS: Are you taking in Genesa?-- Yes, right up.

Is that your explanation why it is that neither the
Zulu nor the Xosa are agriculturists?-- Yes.

They are not agriculturists?-- Their mental outlook
is quite different. You cannot treat them in the same way.

They have never been agriculturists?-- Oh, yes.
500 or 600 years ago they were agriculturists. They certainly
were agriculturists before they were pastoralists, but they have forgotten all about it.

CHAIRMAN: On what ground do you make that statement?

On the ethnological side — you get the sedanic and the hemetic origin indicating that originally they were agriculturists far more than pastoralists.

You mean, they came from an agricultural stock before they started trekking away? — Yes, but it is so far back that it is lost.

DR. ROBERTS: It cannot be more than 500 years, because the Zulus have been there 500 years? — It is difficult to fix it.

MR. LUCAS: To what do you attribute the good crops which you say they get in the Vryburg district? — They work their lands well, and this year they have had a decent season.

Did they formerly work their lands well, or is it the European influence which has made them do that? — No, I would distinctly say that that is European influence, but for every ounce of European influence which these people have had, the Ciskei Native has had 100 ounces and it has not had that effect.

CHAIRMAN: They started with an agricultural tradition and it was easy to pick up? — Yes, that is so.

Whereas the Ciskei Native started with a pastoral tradition? — Yes.

He had to turn the wheels the other way? — Yes.

In your statement, you use the term "agricultural segregation". The term segregation is so often used that I would like you to define what you mean by it — you see, there are so many species of the same thing. Would you define what you mean to convey by "agricultural segregation"? — It is
really territorial segregation with absolute freedom of movement for labour.

Across the boundary?—Yes, to higher or lower employment. But I think they always return to their original home. It is the same thing if I were resident in France, I might go across and work in Germany or in Switzerland, but I would still want to go back to my home land.

Why is the term "agricultural" used in that connection?—Because, the whole of the development in the Native areas is agriculture. There is no industrial or commercial segregation of work established. It is simply bringing them back to one class of work. It would, perhaps, be better to say territorial segregation for the future, but today I can only bring them back to one thing, and that is agriculture.

But it really means territorial?—Yes, territorial with absolute freedom.

The term segregation which is probably one of the most loosely used terms connotes in some people's mind a barrier across which it will be very difficult to pass?—Quite so.

That is absolutely foreign to any conception which you have when you use the term segregation?—Yes, I look upon it that they should develop socially separate from ourselves. But you cannot divide them as far as business is concerned — you find them entering into the same spheres of business and work as we enter ourselves.

There can be no rigid economic segregation?—No, I cannot see how it is possible.

CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourned for tea, you mentioned co-operative citrus export from the Zuurust district among
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Natives?—Yes.

Will you give us an account of what is happening there?—When I visited the Zeerust district first, I found that the Natives there had established quite a number of small citrus groves. They had endeavoured to arrange for the export of their fruit through the Marico Co'Operative Society, but on account of their being non-members and on account of their being Natives, that was not possible. Several individuals had, on various occasions, sold their crop on the trees through a Mr. Poulton, who had given quite fair returns. So I suggest to them, in the first instance, that it would be better if we could relieve the local market which was heavily overstocked, and export their citrus. This was put to the local council.

It said it necessitated a local packing shed and putting in the necessary grading apparatus, etc., and the Council agreed to that. I also pointed out that it would (cooling?) be necessary to have a pooling system in order to make the best use of the fruit. They looked askance at this for a start, but they have now agreed to it. The packing house was completed last week and we are exporting. We arranged, with the Perishable Export Board, for the necessary space. Pupard's will be our agents and the work will be under the control of my supervisor, who will see, with the demonstrator, to all the packing.

The suppliers themselves will voluntarily supply all the necessary labour in the packing house. All the oranges will bear a brand. I put up several types to them and they picked one brand which was the totem of the tribe. The covers will be stamped with that and also the bags. I have also arranged with the Agricultural Department Grader, who
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will supervise our work in the same way as the work is supervised for the Marico Co-Operative Society.

Furthermore, we have, in order to press on the industry, this year established a number of rough lemon seedlings and we hope to be able to supply the trees at a reasonable price later on -- we shall supply them at cost. I put it to the Council that that nursery should belong to the Council itself and that they should sell those trees at a very small margin of profit, at one shilling per tree, which will cover them for the cost of production and it will put it beyond any dispute which might arise if it were put in the hands of an individual or under the State. Well, they were quite willing to undertake that, so we have established a small nursery to enable them to get further trees and supply the growers.

We have engaged the services of an engineer from the Irrigation Department, who has surveyed the furrows for us so as to increase the area under irrigation. The first furrows were built in the time of Livingstone. We hope that this will give us another 100 or 200 acres of land which at present are not worked. That, Mr. Chairman, is, more or less, the history of this movement and, as I say, we are expecting to send off our first consignment of oranges at the end of the third week of the beginning of the fourth week of this month.

Have you any idea as to how many cases you will have for export in the first year? -- I have tried to assess that, but I find it very difficult. The trees are in small groups and they are scattered. One group of nine trees I estimated would give a man 40 export cases. The man with 80 trees
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will average about the same number per tree. It may be a thousand cases, but it is difficult to say. Their practice in the past was to sell a few oranges locally in the local markets and to exchange a few oranges for grain and things like that with the people who came in from the Bechuanaaland side. But, of course, you will understand they could make very little out of that. This year they were successful -- it will give a great push and will enable them to go on, but I want to keep the oranges off the congested local market and prevent them from coming into competition with the European growers.

MAJOR ANDERSON: What is the quality of the oranges which they produce? -- The quality is good.

And are they likely to get a fair price? -- I think as good a price as you will get for the Transvaal seedlings or the Valencia. We have very few Navela. I had the entomological people to inspect and we had intended to fumigate our groves, but after they had inspected them, we found that we were so free of scale that it was not worth while fumigating at all. It shows that they can work together under a co-operative movement. The next step we are taking is in regard to the establishment of these creameries, four of which are being built now in the same district.

MR. LUCAS: Does your butter come under the Dairy Control Board? -- Yes, it does.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Of course, you understand that you will have to take your share of the export? -- Yes, quite so. In every way we shall rank in the same way as everyone else. Everything is open to inspection by the Dairy Division and we are subject to the regulations in regard to the erection of
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the dairy. Everything has to be done in accordance with the regulations. Everything is fly-proof -- the regulations are carried out in every possible direction, but, as I have told you, the cost of these creameries per man is only £15.

That is without the utensils? -- Yes, without the utensils.

Are Natives excluded from co-operative societies under the Co-Operative Act? -- In so far that they cannot become members except, I think, in the poultry section.

Take maize; what is going to happen as far as Native growers of maize are concerned under this new law? -- Well, I do not think we need worry very much about that. You see, we are so far from producing our own requirements, that we shall not be greatly affected. The Native areas will be 8 millions short of their actual requirements. That is to say, they will not have enough for what they will require for themselves and their families.

Is that true of the Transkei, too -- is the Transkei not able to produce any for sale? -- No, I am afraid not this year, although last year they had a small surplus.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Will any Native district have any surplus? -- No.

CHAIRMAN: You consider that we shall be 8 million bags short? -- Yes.

Perhaps you might tell me this -- what do you consider the average Native consumption? -- Two and three quarter bags per individual. I have taken the production and deducted the total requirements and that leaves 8 million bags short.

That gives a much bigger consumption than what is generally regarded as the consumption of the whole country? -- Not as a grain ration -- that, of course, is all grains.
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Two and three quarter bags of grain?—Yes. It is a very low figure. If you average the individuals at the age of 15, you will find that it is a very short ration. If you take an army or a hospital ration, you will see that it is very low indeed.

Do you take individuals above 15 years of age?—Yes.

Not for the whole population?—No.

You would multiply the \( \frac{2}{4} \) bags by the population of 15 and over?—Yes. You see, we have only a 30% crop approximately throughout the Transvaal. 50% of the Natives normally in the Transkei is 2.1 bags per acre. It is not much more than that in the Ciskei. In the Transkei it is 50% of the crop. In Natal and Zululand, which we hoped would be all right, particularly Zululand, was stricken by a severe drought, a very severe period, which has brought them below 50%. The Vryburg district is the only part where they are about normal. Kuruman was caught by frost which knocked them out early in the year. These are all very important factors.

MAJOR ANDERSON: What would be the position in a only normal year?—The Natal area where we would have a surplus in a normal year would be the Transkei. It might be only a few thousand bags, but still it would be a surplus. We have control through knowing what is coming in at every station. There is a small surplus in the Transkei in a normal year, but in an abnormal year, of course, things are different.

But with improved methods such as you hope to get from your work, the position might be altered?—In the Transkei, because it is a good maize area, they would go quite beyond their requirements, but not so in the Transvaal where I am afraid they will never get beyond their requirements. The amount which they produced is limited by the nature of the country— it is dry country. In Zululand, they would easily
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go beyond their requirements. If you take a number of other than
/demonstrators' crops, the average production on Native land is
normally 2.1 bags. That is a good normal season. The
demonstrators' places work out at 5.4 bags per acre over sever-
al thousand plots. That is more than double, in fact, it
is almost three times as much, but even then it is still a
low yield.

MR. LUCAS: I notice in the report of the Director of
Native Development in Southern Rhodesia, that he stated
that the demonstrators' plots yielded five times the normal
yield in the district which they worked? -- Yes, possibly that
is so.

CHAIRMAN: In the figures which you quoted, you
quoted this year, which was a very bad year? -- No, sir; I
took last year. It was 2.1 as against 5.4, but the Transkei
was a little higher.

The figures which Mr. Hughes sent to me were about
11:4, not quite three times? -- Yes, it is not quite three
times. It is nearly three, but not quite. We have taken
these figures for the whole of the country. In the Ciskei, we
have different figures again.

In this Western area where you are proposing to start
with dairying, how is it that you have a surplus of milk there
which the Natives do not seem to have anywhere else? -- They
have more grazing there.

And, in relation to the carrying capacity of the land,
are they less overstocked? -- Quite.

Still, they are overstocked? -- Yes, but far less.
Of course, Zululand is not overstocked at all. If we can get
over their conservatism, we shall be able to start dairying
there tomorrow. That is Zululand proper, of course. Here, it is less overstocked and then they have agreed to these two schemes. The one is a limitation of cattle through the bull camp scheme. We fence off a definite piece of land, say, a thousand acres. Into that piece of land I put a certain number of bulls. Each man would be allowed to bring cows there. Just before the grass season starts, the scrub bulls will not have worked many cows. They are put there and kept for three or four months and then they will go out. The next year, we expect to get the same cattle back because we are offering rewards, and in the year after, we hope to get the progeny back. We breed these bulls to the progeny again and, in that way, we hope to build up a definite lot of good stock for the people who are sending their stock to these camps.

That is the nearest way I can work this thing under this awful communal system. They realise the benefit because I called the chief's in and I showed them what the result would be and they talked to the people and in that way I managed to achieve a great deal. It was at Zeerust that I started this. The man who does go in for dairying realises very quickly which cow produces more milk. The result of it all is that they are prepared to get rid of their bad stuff and to have better stuff.

How many of these bull camps have you started?—I want to start two.

You have not started any yet?—No, but I am starting two in Zeerust now.

Have you got any figures showing the yield per cow, the Native cow in milk in any areas of the Union?—Yes; I have taken a tremendous number of statistics in Union areas and
in the Protectorate as well. The Protectorate is the highest. I found one herd of cows there which, for 280 days, yielded one gallon of milk per cow over and above the requirements of the calf, and the calves were in good condition. There is nothing in our areas to touch that. Now, I come right away down on my figures of the food supplies of a family which I worked out. In many parts of the country, they do not get per family more than one quarter gallon of milk at the outside. Now, you must bear in mind that that is for a family of five, - one quarter gallon of milk per day. You know how many bottles go to one gallon; you can imagine how little it is, and, in the Transvaal, there are locations which do not even get that.

Could you put in any statement at your convenience, boiling down the result of such investigation? -- I have done that. I split up the Transvaal into districts because we have such a tremendous variation. I worked out these results for the Pietersburg, the Groot Spelenken district and for several other areas. For various locations, for the Rustenburg, the Pilansberg area, for Zeerust, Molla's Reserve. There I worked them out separately. Also in the Transkei.

I want to get back to the subject of overstocking? -- Yes, that is the most vital one.

I read with a great deal of interest the statement which you put in as an annexure, and I want to congratulate you on an extremely powerful and well written statement on that subject, a statement of real literary value. In attacking it, it seems to me that one must look for a certain indirect means of attacking a thing -- that, to me, seems to be the best strategy? -- Yes, I suppose so.
Let us assume that we get the Natives to the stage where they are prepared to sell animals. Is it not going to produce inside the local markets a position — all they are fit for is beef extracts — is it not going to produce a position of congestion which will bring the prices down so much that it will give a knock to the work which you have done in persuading the Natives to sell their cattle; they will get so little for their cattle when they sell it that they will say, "Well, it is not worth while anyhow"? Of course, our market today for that class of stock is relatively higher than any other market in the world is today.

Yes, we will leave that point for the moment. But is not our supply of that stock even greater than the market can absorb? — If the Native stock came on to the market, it would be infinitely greater than the market. This is the thing — we want an intermediate stage between the extract works and the export — what we want are factories which can absorb those animals at reasonable prices. We want an intermediate stage between extract works and the export of quarters.

Of course, that is done to some extent at East London today? — They only have the extracts and the quarters. The extract brings your prices down, say, 12/6d, and your quarters run round about 25/-.

DR. ROBERTS: That is not counting the skin? — Oh, no, the skin is thrown in. This is per 100 lbs. weight. Now, we want something which will bring is un something between 18/- and 20/-. That is for the canned beef. At the time when we were negotiating with Leibig's, those were the quotations which we received. I want to emphasize that if we can
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got that intermediate stage, then the problem is solved. That
is the canning factory. I do not know whether you have got
the figures of the Transkei in this regard.

The figures which we saw there seemed to show that a
comparatively small number of the Transkeian cattle went into
quarters?—Well, it is a higher percentage than we antici-
patcd, or than even I anticipated. The first consignment of
900 animals showed that 40% were sold as quarters, which was
much higher than I had anticipated.

And even then it is a very low percentage?—Yes.

And, as the average price for the poorer class of
stuff was rather low—would not make it very attractive?—
No, but still, the average is infinitely better than anything
we have been able to get up to the present.

It seemed to me right through the Territories that
the conversion of cattle to economic value was, to a large
extent, brought about by animals that were good enough to
die?—Yes.

That is the chief gain which the Native gets out of it,
because then he gets food?—Yes.

Now, on the question of getting an indirect attack on
it, if a system were encouraged by which Natives in the Trans-
kei could get licenses as butchers, so as gradually to accustom
the people to buy or barter their meat in small quantities,
would you not be creating a market inside the Territories for
some of their meat, for more of their meat than they are using
now?—Yes, I think you would probably do so, where you are
right away from the tribal system. But where you have the
tribal system in force, there I am afraid that all that work
must, of necessity, break down.
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Why should that be so?-- Through the chief. For instance, the chief will send down and he will say to the butcher, "I want a leg of beef". The butcher says, "I want the money first", and the chief replies "I will send you the money tomorrow". Alright; if the money is not forthcoming tomorrow, that man goes broke and, if the pace is forced, then the country becomes too hot for that butcher; the country cannot hold him and he has got to clear out. I know what happens. Any number of men have told me that that is their difficulty, but where you get away from the tribal system, it is possible and I think it would be very advantageous if a start were made in the more advanced districts, the thing might gradually grow?-- That is so.

And, in that way, the people would gain experience of the system?-- Yes.

And it would give the Natives themselves an opportunity of entering into trade which they are asking for?-- Yes. Always provided it were laid down that all transactions must be on a cash basis and not on the bartering basis of the present time.

I agree, but why do you say that?-- You can make a comparison between the Protectorate and the Union. In the Protectorate, the Native brings in an article which the Native trader may want to have, it may be beneficial to him to have it. The trader says, "I shall give you 4/- for that"; the Native says alright and he gets a chit for it, not cash and that chit he uses to buy other goods in the store of that same trader. If the business is done on a cash basis, the man is paid in cash and he can use that cash in buying any other articles he wishes to. Cash is a peculiar thing in the hands
of anyone, and particularly in the hands of the Native who will bargain for two solid days in order to save sixpence. He learns to know the value of the article he is buying and he learns the value of money. The thing which I think is really desirable to establish in cases like that is the cash basis.

Admitting all that, still, in the Transkei they are accustomed to the barter basis? -- Yes.

Should one not make use of what they are accustomed to in instances like that in order to tackle the cattle problem rather than try and teach them the value of things and thereby retard what may be the solution of the cattle problem? -- Well, they are all asking for the cash system in the Transkei today.

That may be so, they may ask for it, but, in practice, they do the other thing? -- I grant you that, but that is because they are forced to.

Why should you force the Native trader to a system to which you do not force the European trader? -- The European trader today does not barter in among the Europeans -- it must be made universal. I think that would give a small outlet to start with in areas where the tribal system is not too strong.

In an indirect way -- as a way of indirect approach, the system would be to encourage everything which gradually tends to go over from pastoral to arable? -- Yes, Doctor Holloway, and there we meet with a very great difficulty at present. Because of the overstocking, the animal is too weak today to work. If we could insist on ploughing an average of 3 acres, let us say in the Transkei -- if we could divide the Transkei up, its four million morgen would work out at 40 acres per
family unit of five. Instead of working 8 acres of that land, if you could work 20 acres of it, every acre would produce more foodstuffs.

The animal is too weak to work you say?—Yes, that is so.

There is nothing to raise the wind?—No, nothing to raise the wind. They have approximately 800,000 acres under cultivation; that is, 8 acres per family unit of five, but that just produces the grain for the family and a few mealie stalks for the beast.

DR. ROBERTS: Does it produce the quantity that is required to feed the whole population?—In a normal year, the Transkei meets its own requirements and perhaps a little over.

I understood that it was slightly under, — I understood that they had to bring in a little?—Yes, Dr. Roberts, they bring in, but they do send out first. It is really a bad piece of trade.

CHAIRMAN: The amount which they bring in almost balances what they send out?—Yes. We have all the returns from the Railways and we know what the position is.

DR. ROBERTS: That has not always been the case, has it?—No, it has not.

CHAIRMAN: On what basis was the estimate of 800,000 acres arrived at?—We have the allotments, plus a vast number of others in the districts and then we averaged them out per family unit. I did that all over. I go into a district and measure up a number of those. In Zululand they will work out at 2 or 3 acres and then I say, "This district contains so many family heads"—

MAJOR ANDERSON: What is the area in Zululand?—
I have it roughly worked out, but I have not taken enough to average it. Where I have taken it, it works out at round about 2½ to 3 acres per family.

CHAIRMAN: Is similar work done in any other part?—
Yes, it is done all over the Transvaal. I may say that I have quoted many of these figures in my reports. There are a number of figures which the Secretary did not want me to make available to the Commission. I have taken the F'F'Rust district and I have taken the average of that. I have taken the details and it works out at 22 acres or 11 morgen of land per family unit, and approximately 4 acres under cultivation.

DR. ROBERTS: That is larger than Zululand?—Yes, and it is equal to the Transkei?—No, Doctor, it is half the Transkei. Now, I have some details here in regard to Pietersburg District. There are 17 locations there I have treated each one separately. The lowest of them is the Matock Location, where it works out at 4 acres of land per family unit of five. They own about half a head of cattle each. Then I have Louis Trichardt here, which works out at 20 acres of land per family unit and it shews approximately 4 acres of land under cultivation.

CHAIRMAN: What is the 20 acres?—The total land is 20 acres per family — that is, dry country.

Is that grazing and arable?—Yes, grazing and arable of which 4 acres are under cultivation.

MR. LUCAS: What report are you quoting from?—I am quoting from my Transvaal report shewing the exact conditions in each location, the number of livestock, the number of livestock per family unit of five, etc.
CHAIRMAN: Has a similar report been made for each Province? -- Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Were these reports made recently? -- They have been made for the full period of time, and I have taken Province by Province.

CHAIRMAN: I think, in principle, you will agree that steps which will change over from a pure pastoralism to arable should be encouraged, bearing in mind the difficulty which you have already mentioned of the weak cattle? -- I would say, rather, to change over to full diversified farming. The thing is that you must keep that land if you are growing the food to feed an animal, you must keep the land employed throughout the year. You must do that as much as possible. Through your animals that are fed on the land, you maintain the fertility of that land. There you have three objects in view. If we want to maintain the people on the land, we must work in that direction.

Does not the present system of surveyed districts in the Transkei rather militate against that? You see, you are keeping a cast iron boundary between arable and grazing land? -- Yes, it does.

And, therefore, it has really got to the end of its usefulness as it has been applied? -- Yes, that is so.

It has to be modified to meet the newer needs in agriculture? -- Yes. In these surveyed allotments --- say, a surrounding area were always maintained for grazing, then the thing would have been quite sound, because each man would have the grazing alongside of his arable land. The thing that I am asking for is that they will take definite pieces of land as at Hartebeestpoort and work these with Native families and I think that would prove what can be done under a diversified
system.

MR. LUCAS: Then you must get away from communal grazing?—Yes, and you must get permanency in land tenure. If you have individual land tenure, you will have everything. Overstocking and everything you will be able to cope with.

For the grazing land as well as for the arable?—Even if the grazing is communal up to a point, and if it is laid down that each individual can only have so much stock on it, you will arrive at the same and you will have definite improvement.

That is what you have under your Middelton scheme?—Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: You think now that under this system of diversified farming, each family could produce sufficient to make them independent, so that they would not have to send out men to the mines and elsewhere to work, in order that they may supplement their income?—No, I do not think that. I do not think that we shall get that independence any more than we get it in a European country or in Egypt or in India. You see, the young people will always want to go out.

The position today is that they have to go out, is it not?—It is not so much that they want to go out. The point is, would they still go out when the family can be self-sustaining?—The family would be self-sustaining, but I think they will still go out.

MAJOR ANDERSON: The point is that you could remove the economic pressure which today is forcing them to go out?—Yes, I think so.

MR. LUCAS: And leave just an opening for those who wish to go out?—Yes, a free labour market. You would find that they would go out even more so. That has been the experience all over the world. They would go out more than they
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do under the economic pressure of today, because it is the
elementment which makes them go out.

Your point is that it gives them greater desires? - Yes.

CHAIRMAN: In actual practice, it will take a long time
before the Natives will have reached that standard of agricul-
ture which will make them self-sufficing? -- Yes, it will
take a long time.

The most one can look for at present is to reduce the
economic pressure? -- Yes, that is the best way. If you had
the cattle in the Transkei, if it were possible to reduce those
cattle tomorrow to half their present number, and improve them
to double their present standard, you would already remove
the greater portion of the economic pressure, because you
would have huge milk supplies both for the family and for
export, and you would be able to work your land. I think
that is a very important factor, in the whole position - reduce
the number and improve the quality.

MAJOR ANDERSON: That is all very well, but you have
to consider the question of markets for a largely increased
dairy supply? -- I always work on overseas markets -- I keep
them in view and not so much the local market.

You must bear in mind that the world's market is not
too promising at the present time? -- No, that may be, but
the factor which is overlooked is this (1) The land bears no
value. It is their own land and so it has no value and,
(2) The work is done by the family themselves - so there is
no cost of labour. If you follow what I mean, they can
market that animal in the world's market at a tremendous
profit.

DR. ROBERTS: But is it not the case that there is
over-production? -- For dairy products -- not at the price
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at which these people could produce. They could make a handsome profit.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Yes, they can replace some of the present suppliers?-- Yes.

They can compete with New Zealand, for instance?-- Yes and make a big profit. If you take the relative value of the land in New Zealand and down in Marico, for instance, compare the land in New Zealand and Denmark and in this country. Take Denmark - take a man who works there on an area of from two to 60 acres. It is a very big piece of land which he has to work and he has to maintain his family and compare that with the no value for land here, plus the family doing every-thing and then take into consideration as well that the requirements of the man's family here are small, take all these factors together and you will realise at what a big profit they can produce that product.

Provided, always, that you can get them to produce the quality as well?-- Well, they have 198 creameries today producing as good stuff as they produce in any part of Europe.

That is in Bechuansland?-- Yes.

And is that being exported now?-- Yes, and they are shewing there what can be done.

Are they exporting first grade butter from these parts?-- It depends on your cream. They have a higher proportion of second and third grade cream than the European produces under the same conditions in the Protectorate, but that is due to the transport difficulties and not to anything else. In Zeerust, where we have two bus routes, we never meet with that difficulty at all and there we shall produce all first rate stuff.
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DR. ROBERTS: Is the difficulty of transport not another economic consideration? We have good roads all over. In the Protectorate, they are practically roadless to a large extent. I do not want to say that they have no roads at all -- no main roads. They have one railway, but they have practically no roads except the one main road which follows that railway; so the people have to cart their stuff on donkeys backs for 40 miles. Now, we do not meet with these difficulties.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Is the Bechuanaland dairy product competing in the Union markets? -- Yes.

And are they being controlled? -- Yes, they are under the same Proclamation as we are. The same Proclamation under the Act on both sides.

CHAIRMAN: On page 4 of your statement, you refer to China, Nigeria, Belgium, France, etc. You say there, "Improvement, in stead of destruction of the land, (for this result see China, Nigeria, Belgium France, Denmark, etc.) Permanent improvement will be carried out on the land (See Middleton Estate Native Settlement, France versus England, etc.) It will mean improved stock raising and agricultural methods, which means a land can carry far more people. Far greater production will result and the commodities exported will bring outside money into the country, i.e., increased trade with resulting benefits." I would like you to be a little more explicit on Nigeria and tell us what you have in mind there? -- In Nigeria, the system of individual land tenure is very evident.

Pre-European? -- Yes, long pre-European. They started under a system of their own. They all hedged off and that is why I am experimenting with hedge plants in the Union.
at present. Their land descends from father to son and that has been happening for the past 900 years. The consequence is that the land is well cared for and well fertilized. Each man has only one field.

What size are the fields?-- The fields are small, because the area which is capable of cultivation, particularly in Northern Nigeria, is small. Generally, about four acres. In some of the still dryer parts, they go as low as one acre out of which the family is making its living, and that land is perfectly cultivated and has been in the family for generations.

DR. ROBERTS: The land has been subdivided, has it?--

That is the way in which the land has come down to these small holdings during the course of these many years. From what I can gather, the holdings were much larger many years ago and they have come down to these small holdings of an acre or two in the present generation. The population today is practically stationary. The land could carry no more people. That sort of thing always happens in any country.

CHAIRMAN: On the same page, in paragraph 2, you deal with squatting and its effects on farming and on urban industries and you say there, "The limited form of squatting permitted under the law today is one of the worst factors we have in the Native question. It is subject within the law to various abuses by landowners. It restricts labour supplies for agriculture and urban industries, it retards progressive European farming, encourages laziness, bad and unprogressive methods of life, industry and agriculture in the Native." Are you referring to squatting there in the sense of labour tenancy?-- Yes. They have tried everything
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- all forms of squatting, but they are all really the same. I am referring now to the farmers in the Transvaal or Natal, who have people squatting on their farms.

MR. LUCAS: This squatting in Natal is squatting in a different sense?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But here you mean labour tenants, do you not?—Yes.

Will you explain more fully what you intend to say by that sentence, - in what way is it one of the worst factors?—First of all, I think it is subject to various abuses by landowners. Take a case like this, for instance. Say I am running a farm somewhere near Pretoria or say in the Northern Transvaal. I have a certain number of people squatting on my land in the Northern Transvaal somewhere. One of the boys who is not required on the farm, comes along to Pretoria and seeks employment and secures it with you in town. He works for you for a while and then I find that he is there and I say to him, "Come away, you have no right there". Well, he has to go. Now, that sort of thing hampers that individual to a great extent in his movements, so far as producing a living for himself and his family is concerned. Secondly - perhaps not so much in the Transvaal as in Natal, — while a man has to put in so many days work, in some instances they also have an arrangement by which the individual is paid so much on paper. That individual is not really paid so much, it is a question of crops between the owner and himself. But there is no legal way of catching the individual out.

CHAIRMAN: You mean that that is a way of getting round the Land Act?—Exactly.

The Native is paid a wage, nominally he is paid a wage
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but in reality he is not paid at all by the landowner?—quite so.

Now, how is that wage worked to get round the Land Act?—

Well, in reality the man produces crops which are sold and
he is paid out of the sale of these crops. It covers him
as far as the law is concerned. I hope you do not want me
to point out any individual on that particular point, but I
do think that there can be no doubt that that system restricts
the labour supplies — for one thing, the man is not a free
agent — it restricts labour for agriculture and for other
purposes.

DR. ROBERTS: It comes down to this, that he is tied.
?—Yes; and then that necessarily must lead to this; that
man may lie there and do nothing. He may be called upon by
the owner of the property at any time, but, in the meantime,
he simply loafs about. Now, that must encourage laziness
and unthrifty methods which is a most undesirable thing,
because, after all, industry is the result of training. You
can train a man to be lazy or hardworking. This simply
means that you are training him to be lazy.

He is naturally lazy and that simply adds to it?—
Yes. Then I think speaking on the European side of it, — it
leads to unprogressive methods. It is through that type of
labour, under which he can be called upon at any time that
unprogressive methods are created. If the farmer had to
employ labour and pay for it, and that labour lay idle for a
time, say for a day, it would mean that that farmer would be
paying his £/- or whatever it was, for nothing, so you would
soon see to it that he found something to keep his labour
employed right through and that would induce him to go looking
for better farming methods. I say that this system reacts
just as badly on the European.

CHAIRMAN: Under the present system, he has no method of management or control?—No. The other man who has to pay for his labour will say, "I cannot afford to leave my workmen to stand idle today and I shall have to give them something to do, — I shall have to introduce new methods. I had better have a few cows which have to be milked and looked after." But to the man who has not got to pay for his labour it does not matter and he will simply leave them idle, unless there is something definite for them to do.

Your cure for that position is dealt with in the next paragraph and it seems to be that one of the main principles of the Land Act should be given up. You say there if we did away with the squatting system and replaced it by the metayage or share-tenant system, this system would give the reverse results to those shewn in my first paragraph, and, in addition, efficiency of agricultural labour would increase?—Yes.

That is your considered view?—Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Will you explain that a bit more clearly please?—If I had a good farm, I would say, I shall pick 50 Natives and give each 20 or 40 acres, whatever a family can work, and we would work that on a share basis. I would say, "I shall supply the seeds and fertilizers and the stock to work the land". Well, the worker would receive one half-share in the crop and I would receive the other half-share. The labour, which would be the great factor in the cost of production, would be removed, we would share and share alike in good and bad sessions. My cost of production would be comparatively low and so would the Native's cost of production.
DR. ROBERTS: Has that not proved unsatisfactory where it has been tried?—(No answer)?

CHAIRMAN: You want something different from the share system, you want the metayage system?—I may say this system was introduced by Napoleon and it was that which largely made France. They have gone on with it until these people owned the land, but it started through that system. The great advantage of it is that that person is thoroughly educated and shown how to work by the organizing head over him.

MR. LUCAS: Your proposal differs from anything we have had, in that the owner of the land supplies the seed and the fertilizer and the stock and the only thing which the tenant supplies is his labour?—Yes.

Whereas today the tenant has to take the risk of the seed and the fertilizer?—Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: Not always?—Generally. The great thing is to ensure good seed and good fertilization of the land and good management of the land and you supply the stock to work that land properly and then you have to see that the labourer himself does the work.

CHAIRMAN: This would involve direct supervision by the landowner?—Yes.

In that way, it would mean an improvement of the pre-1913 Share system?—Yes, that is an essential part of it. Each man would be a first class small holder under that system.

MAJOR ANDERSON: How could you do that? You would make it only legal if the owner did these things?—It would have to be done under a definite contract and we must have a law to bring that about.
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It would be very difficult to carry out; would it not probably go back to the old share system?—A man would have the right to appeal under the law at once.

The Native would have the right?—Yes, but you could not do it without a legal backing—it would be impossible. Then it would be a contract, just the same as if I entered into a contract with them; him.

Mr. Lucas: What period would you lay down so as to give some sense of security?—I think there should be at least a minimum of 5 years with an option of renewal for a further five years and in really difficult bush-covered land, which has to be cleared, even a longer period would have to be given, say ten years.

Dr. Roberts: Would you be prepared to go a little further and say that at the end of, say, the fifth year, the onus of proving that the man was incapable would be on the proprietor of the land? Unless he were able to prove that the crofter was incapable or that there was something wrong with him, he should be able to remain?—I do not know that I would be prepared to say that, because both would be making a profit out of the business and, if there were one individual who would be working badly and did not shew a profit, one should be able to get rid of him, to get him off the land.

Chairman: Native witnesses all over the country have put this point very strongly before us, that that particular clause of the Land Act should be abolished, but then they wanted a reversion to the pre-1919 system and incidentally the right of renting. Do you think that a reversion to the pre-1919 system would be a good thing?—I do not think
that that system would lead to as good a system of production as the other, and I do not think it will be as advantageous to the Natives and the Europeans. After all, this system will ensure a big output from this country along right lines at low costs, which will render the whole of the country economically well off, and I do not think that the other system will do that.

Do you think that European farmers, excepting unprogressive ones, would be prepared to revert to the 1919 system? — No, I do not think so.

Whereas, if they can have this system which at the same time would produce a decent production per morgen of ground, they would be prepared to go in for that? — There are hundreds who would jump at it.

This would be a further ingress on territorial segregation? — Yes, it is the parting of the ways. What I am trying to visualise is this. If we cannot segregate territorially, then rather adopt a policy which does not mean the extinction of European civilisation which is to the disadvantage of Natives and Europeans — in other words, do not let us set up a state of competition such as exists in certain American States today, where the Native wage has dragged the European down to the Native level, as far as wages are concerned, — and that is the thing which has caused the crash.

I take it that the explanation which you have just given about the cost of production is what you referred to in paragraph 2 on page 5, "If this system were once brought into vogue, it would make South Africa one of the countries where the cost of production would, in certain lines of farming, be the lowest in the world." — Yes, that would bring us to the lowest possible cost of production.
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MR. LUCAS: Your idea would be that the owner of this land would occupy himself with supervising his tenants? -- Yes.

He himself would not be a farmer in the sense of the word today? -- No, he would not.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Would you apply the same system to pastoral stock-owning by Natives? -- No, you cannot apply it in the same sense, except on a much wider scale. It is not really a possible system, except where you can have diversified farming.

It includes dairying? -- Yes.

Where the stock would be the property of the tenant? -- It might be the property of the tenant or of the landlord.

MR. LUCAS: There would have to be different conditions? -- Yes, you would have to have different conditions.

CHAIRMAN: Pure pastoralism in small areas is bound to fail? -- Yes.

You must have something rather better? -- Yes.

The Commission adjourned at 12.45 p.m. until 2.30 p.m.

On the Commission resuming at 2.30 p.m., the examination of Mr. Thornton was continued.

CHAIRMAN: On page 5 of your statement, section (5), you say, "Expansion of the European rural population would cease. In any case, such degree of expansion as is possible at present will not be possible under this system. But, in any case, such expansion will be negligible." You say expansion of the European rural population would cease. I do not know that that follows? -- It might ultimately expand very greatly. If these people were cleared off the land again, -- but you would have nowhere to put them. If the land is once
occupied by these share tenants, then where is the European going to? There is no space.

MR. LUCAS: Are there not some forms of agriculture where the Europeans even under a system like this, could find a resting place?— I do not think so.

It would mean that you would have these supervisors in the rural areas and the Europeans elsewhere— in industries and so on?— Your stock districts would remain the same, but they can only take a very small percentage more of people and the increase would be very small. The area which you would cultivate would carry a dense population. That would mean restricting your European population if you are to have these tenants.

Is not the mechanisation of agriculture likely in some of the richer areas and so likely to lead to openings for Whites?— Not if this system is adopted, because the land will be worked on the share tenant system and, if the landlord considers that it will be better to introduce more machinery economically, he will do that with his tenants. I have here definitely and I say distinctly it is the parting of the ways.

MAJOR ANDERSON: What is the system— you are contemplating the Native worker being content with something like his present low standard of living, but if he wants to rise in the scale, may not your system be inclined to break down?— This is a system of peasant-farming, the same as in Denmark. It is a permanent system. You will get the people who want greater salvation than what they will secure through this system, but supposing it happens in a hundred years time. The only place where they will get a greater share in this world's wealth will be through industry.
MR. LUCAS: Large numbers of Natives have a very much higher standard of living than it is possible for the Native farm labourer to get today, and probably higher than the majority of your share tenant Natives will be able to get?-- I do not think so. I think that today you are right, there are many Natives who have a much higher standard of living than their neighbours, but if we reach the stage in 50 or 100 years' time of the standard of living of the Danish land owner, your peasant of today will then, under this system, support that standard of living. If you take the standard of living at £36, the average standard on, say, another 50 years will be £72 and the land will bring up that additional amount through the better system of diversified farming, because you cannot introduce the most complete system to start with. These people will have to be trained to it.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You know Mr. Henry Ford's theory is that it will not pay any farmer to dairy on a small scale, but he has to do it on a factory scale and he must have 50 or 60 tractors and so on. That practically means the mechanization of farming. If he is right, can a peasant system stand up against it?-- No, then you reach the stage which Dean Inge mentioned, that England has a population of 20 million. That 20 million will be reaping the benefit of the present millions that you have in England. Then you must have a decrease in your population. Mr. Ford's arrangement allows of a small population, a very small population occupying a huge area, but that is not possible in the world today, it is not practical politics. But when you get your population standing still and decreasing, as it
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will do and as it does in every country, then you arrive at
that standard.

Unless you find other occupations for the people at
present on the lands?—Yes, in industries and even then
it is doubtful whether they will make any more than they make
at this per family unit, because, in the manufacturing centres,
the individual makes very little more than the man on the
land, when you take all the disabilities in the shape of rents,
water supply and more costly food and things of that de-
scription.

MR. LUCAS: There the difference is merely in the
degree of freedom?—Yes.

MAJOR ANDERSON: There is another difference. The
Russians are trying to work it on their State farm, and they
claim that they are succeeding, but one cannot say whether
they are?—If you go into it carefully, as I have done,
through the literature which I have been able to get hold of,
I think it amounts very much to slavery, to slave labour.

DR. ROBERTS: It is slave labour?—It is very
close to it.

It is the Government ordering a man that he must do
as he is told. (No answer):

That may be a feature of it, but it does not seem a
necessary part of the system. They may be working it on a
basis which you may consider is slave labour, but that may be
only a passing phase?—If that system were evolved along
right lines, it would develop into this system in which each
man takes a fair share of the profits, as Mr. Ford's men do.
In that gigantic factory, things are equivalent to a gigantic
farming scheme, and then they are not slaves.
MAJOR ANDERSON: The Russian system is one of central management?-- Yes. Mr. Ford's scheme is one of central management on a great big farm.

Under your scheme, you go in for the very opposite?-- No; also central management.

MR. LUCAS: It would be central management for each farm?-- Yes. If there is a farm with 100 tenants on it, central management is vested in the landlord who has these tenants.

DR. ROBERTS: He is a dictator?-- Yes, under this scheme of mine, he is. But you are giving that power of dictatorship under the law which lays down certain requirements which have to be fulfilled by both contracting parties.

MR. LUCAS: We have not got that system now and it would involve an alteration of several of our laws. Supposing we just made these alterations and adopted a policy which certainly was not hostile to this, do you think that this would develop by itself in a reasonably short time?-- Yes, it would develop very rapidly.

Could you visualise what the effects would be in an area where one or two farmers took this up and their neighbours did not?-- Yes; the result would be that the one or two who took it up would be extremely prosperous and their prosperity would force the others to take it up --- if your neighbour is making £5,000 a year and you are making only £300 a year, it stands to reason that you must follow his lead.

DR. ROBERTS: Have you taken into account too what the attitude of the Native, with his conservative quality of mind, would be to an organization of that kind?-- Yes, I think he would welcome it.

You know the Native better than anybody, but I am not
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so sure in my own mind?-- Yes, I think he would welcome it.

MR. LUCAS: The type of Natives who would be affected are those who are already on the farms?-- That is so.

And they have broken away from tribal control and from the general conservatism of the Native?-- Yes, you take that lot whom I have at Middleton. If I had a group of men like those, I would make a very great success of it.

DR. ROBERTS: And you think that they are common in mind and outlook with the general body of Natives?-- No; there are a big section today who would still say "We would rather stay in the reserves". That undoubtedly is so.

It is a new idea altogether?-- The thing is this. The other side of the picture is, can we retain them in their areas. If not, on account of their vastly greater numbers, what are we going to do with them. I do not like the idea. As I put it here, the idea of Native tenants surrounding Europeans is certainly not enticing. I do not want the Natives to have ownership of land. If this is not considered, which it would not be by the Government, we presume then we must then get permanency of tenure with a sufficiency of land in the Native areas -- we must get permanency of tenure and sufficient land in the Native areas. That means this, that we have got a Germany and a France. We will say the European section is France and the other is Germany. We have then to work out the salvation of the Natives in that area and we cannot do that; under the communal system, there is no hope of our doing that.

You mean, there is no progress under the communal system?-- No.

That is to say that the communal system is only fit
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for a backward people?— That is so. We have to face the
two issues.

MAJOR ANDERSON: If the Russians do succeed in their
experimenting with the communal system, — the communal system
would suit them. They have expropriated all the land and
they have made it communal property. If they are going to
produce cheaper, as they claim, than can be produced by
individuals, is there not a chance of the rest of the world
having to follow suit, or else allow Russia to become the
sole provider of agricultural produce which/is out to become?—
Russia will produce, under that system, at a cost which
Canada or Australia will not be able to touch. They have
expropriated the land. They will farm on a large scale,
with mechanical means. If they had expropriated and farmed
with the tenants on the land, they would have built up a
very sound national scheme of agriculture for their people.
But they dispossessed the land, dispossessed the people from
the land, they mechanised everything and used the people
as slaves in the machine. From the point of production
costs today, they may carry on. Whether they will be
able to carry on for any length of time — I do not know.
They will certainly kill us from the point of production
costs, but we may be able to stand up under this scheme.

DR. ROBERTS: Your scheme, as I understand it,
has nothing of communism in it, in fact, it is the very
antithesis of communism?— That is so.

MAJOR ANDERSON: If they had succeeded, and if they
had succeeded and if they were able to produce at a lower
cost and at the same time gave a better living to the in-
individuals engaged in farming, it would mean making it very attractive to other countries?-- Will any democratic country permit such a state of affairs. At the present time if outside of the Transvaal, some system of permanency of tenure of land with restriction of stock were provided for, there is no doubt that we would enable the Natives to produce a great deal more and live satisfactorily in the Native areas. In the Transvaal, we have not got enough land. Half the population live on other people's land. We have to meet their requirements. Supposing we were able to put those conditions into force and meet the requirements of the population. In the good areas we can halve the land, halve the 40 acres and they can still manage even if they increase to 272 instead of 236. When we reach that limit, unless the population will become stationary, if it reaches the point of saturation, they must brim over out of these Territories.

DR. ROBERTS: Are you visualising a body of overseers of a quality which we do not possess in large numbers?-- Do you mean under this metayage system?

Yes, they might grow up to it?-- I think we have a large number.

MR. LUCAS: Yes, you have a large number, but there will not be room for their sons?-- No.

Their sons will have to find something else?-- Just so. That cannot be avoided. As I say, it is one of two courses, individual tenure of some description on the one hand with certain strong measures taken, or this other system which I have referred to.

CHAIRMAN: You seem to think that the increase of the European population will not be able to compete under this
system with the increased Native population?— I have tried to puzzle that out. Taking it on the one side that the Natives have taken all the land—17 million morgen of land out of 143 million—-

DR. ROBERTS: According to the new idea, they are to obtain almost another 10 millions?— I am taking it as the figure stands today, 17 millions out of 143 millions. The White population will increase more rapidly than the Native population; I do not think there is any doubt about that.

CHAIRMAN: Why?— On account of the greater facilities, the better health condition of the Europeans generally. The European land owner's family is decreasing, but it has not decreased to such a marked extent as the Native family has. I think, for a time, there will perhaps be a better increase for the Europeans on that account, but I doubt whether they could keep pace. If we can get a population saturation on both sides before another 200 years' time, so that the population in both cases would become stationary, I think everything would be all right, but it seems to me that in the 17 million morgen you will find a condition of great congestion and the Natives will have to look for more land to meet their requirements with the result that there will be so much less for the European requirements, and they will say we must extend that land. My first calculation was purely on securing saturation on both sides in 200 years.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you not think that saturation will be reached in 100 years' time for the Natives, if it is not reached now?— It may be that we shall get that on account
of the improved medical attention which we are now providing for them. If we see the improvement which we have made from the livestock point of view, then there is no saying what we may do from the population point of view.

Take the case of Scotland, where they have been absolutely stationary for the last 20 years? -- Yes.

And you would not say that they are not fertile in Scotland? -- No, I would not.

Mr. Lucas: Why do you take this 17 million figure? -- I take 17 million on account of the other types of land on which the Natives are.

Are you taking 6 millions as representing the farm lands occupied by Natives? -- I am taking mission lands, lands that have been purchased, etc. I have some figures here: Native reserves and locations, 11,164,000 morgen; Mission land and reserves, that is, mission reserves and mission lands, 538,343 morgen; Native owned farms, 1 million morgen; Crown land occupied by Natives, 942,000 morgen, Land owned by Europeans, but occupied by Natives, 4,156,000 morgen, giving a total of 17,800,000 morgen.

What did you mean by that last figure of 4,000,000 morgen? -- Out of that total of 4 million, 3 million is in the Transvaal. Most of that is Company land occupied by Natives today, where they have Native tenants. A small portion of it is private farms.

That is apart from Natives on European farms? -- Yes, it has nothing to do with Natives on European farms.

It is not acres? -- No, morgen.

Now, on page 6 of your statement, you say that the present communal location system will result in the Native driving the European from this country through economic
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pressure. The Europeans must choose now before economic conditions force the position beyond control. I do not quite see how you arrive at this?-- Yes; because the land, the 11 million morgen of land today is rapidly being rendered valueless from the farming point of view. What are we going to do with it, it is being ruined, and they have to have a place to live somewhere. They are turning a large portion of that land into what will become, as it has become in North Africa, desert land.

Yes, but how does that drive the European from the country?-- Where is he going to? We cannot support millions of indigents. The drones will be far more than the worker bees. If we have to spend millions on maintaining these people, we cannot do it. I am putting the case in its extreme, of course.

They are not entirely drones, even if their area is rendered worthless?-- But a farmer cannot employ more than is necessary to run his farm. Supposing we had on our hands today 500,000 Natives for whom we had no work, we would have to pay for relief work to keep these people alive, and can we afford to do that for ever-increasing numbers?

That 500,000 will not appear as a sudden phenomenon, it will gradually creep up to it?-- I will grant you that.

And that will mean a depression of wage rates which will mean that certain lands now beyond the margin of cultivation, will come within the margin of cultivation?-- You can only depress the wage rates to a subsistence level.

Yes, but that subsistence level can still be maintained by working zones just outside the margin of cultivation now?-- No. I think that margin will be covered by mechanical means.
DR. ROBERTS: Do you not think, Mr. Thornton, that your argument is rather weak, in comparing South Africa with North Africa?— No, I do not think so, Dr. Roberts.

After all, the collapse of North Africa was due to the withdrawal and collapse of the Roman Empire?—Quite.

And so long as the White man is here, he will rule and make the Native do certain things, which will prevent the very thing which you have before you, that is, the turning of certain parts into a desert?—Quite so. The means by which it is being arrived at is different, but the effect will be just as it was there, because we cannot go on paying people who cannot be economically employed.

MR. LUCAS: White or Black?—That is so, and so it must drive us out of those conditions because the civilised world will not allow us to let people starve, not for any length of time anyhow.

But why should they starve?—They would not starve if they were allowed the land outside their own areas. As I say, the present communal location system will result in driving the European out of the country through economic pressure. If the Natives destroy the land on which they are ---- I put it this way in my memorandum. I say that 11 million morgen of land today is stocked four times as heavily as the European areas are — and the European areas are certainly not understocked. The Native areas are heavily overstocked. Now, if you double the 11 million morgen and make it 22 million, it is just twice as heavily stocked as the European area. If they expended one million in the purchase of land at the rate of £100,000 per year, by the time you had reached the tenth year, the first £100,000 worth
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of land would have been ruined through overstocking. That is the position as I see it.

DR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Thornton, you are holding that the future will be exactly as the past has been and as the present is?—Yes.

I am arguing that the average European has brains to deal with that situation?—No, sir. The time is on us, why does he not deal with it today. Let us take Glen Grey as an example and see what has happened there.

It is not the White man there?—The Glen Grey district carries a population of 60,000 people. Since then you purchased all the European farms, adding between 17,000 to 20,000 morgen of additional land, yet your population in that district today has dropped to 43,000. It has been de-populated through the country being trodden out and being worn out so that it cannot today carry the human population any longer, and that, sir, is a progressive factor. It increases more and more rapidly. Every bush that you remove allows quickly of the removal of two more. These people have to go somewhere and my point is, where are they going to?

You do not think that they will go where they are going now—they go now from Glen Grey to the towns, to work there?—Yes, quite so. That is what they will do, and then we will arrive at the stage where we have arrived today. It is not absolutely permanent yet where we have a large surplus of labour which we do not know what to do with. That surplus is not absolutely permanent, but the day may come when it will be, and what then—how are we going to feed these people, if there is nothing for them?
And what ---- ?-- Well, we tell them to go back to the reserves, where we have no work for them either.

You are dealing with the future as a part of the past. In the olden days, we used to say that if we had 30 years ago tried to describe the conditions which exist now, you could not have done it and, therefore, we are not able to picture what will happen 30 years hence. Is it not likely that the whole position may alter as time goes on ?-- I think that if we had been asked 20 years ago to picture the position as it is today, we would have been able to do so --- if no action had been taken. It is simply a matter of normal progress.

Progress or retrogress ?-- Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Where did you obtain the figure of 60,000 for Glen Grey from ?-- The Chief Magistrate, Mr. Abthorp, gave it to me.

When was that, can you tell us ?-- I am afraid I could not tell you the exact date.

CHAIRMAN: I have these figures here. The Glen Grey district in 1904 had 690 Europeans and 54,417 non-Europeans. In 1921 it had 730 Europeans and 43,463 non-Europeans. Do you know these figures ?-- Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: But Glen Grey is not unique in that respect. You find the same condition of affairs in every single Native Territory in the Ciskei ?-- Yes, I agree, that is so.

MR. LUCAS: When were these farms bought for the Natives in the Glen Grey Area ?-- They were bought recently.

Recently ---- since 1921 ?-- Yes. The European now has left the district, has gone away, and all that additional Native population has also gone.
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When we were there, they told us that one quarter of the population living there is landless?-- Yes, that is so. The land there has deteriorated since I knew it first in 1907, anything up to 30%.

CHAIRMAN: In what way has it deteriorated?-- Through denudation, primarily through surface erosion. The whole of the top layer of the soil which contained the plant food has gone. It is that surface layer which has worn clean away, and to establish plants there will take many years. You can see that all over that area.

And, of course, the ordinary Donga erosion you have there as well?-- Yes, you find that there as well.

And the vegetation?-- If you look at the slopes when you come over the hill from Queenstown, you find a great spread of harpuisbos, which is a blessing. It is a good thing that there is something there. No animal can touch that stuff—not even a goat. And every year, large pieces of land become valueless as grazing.

MR. LUCAS: This harpuisbos, is that the bush with the yellow flower?-- Yes, but you must not confuse it with the kankerbos.

CHAIRMAN: There is the ngangabos; is that the same as mkankerbos?-- It is about the same, although there is a difference.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Which is the worst of all these?-- The harpuisbos is much more difficult to eradicate.

DR. ROBERTS: Have you not got the same going on in every civilised country—a steady decrease of the rural population as compared with the urban population. It is certainly going on in Scotland most strongly?—In most of the European countries, the rural population has increased over a large
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number of years up to a point where the land could carry no more. Then you had the population saturation as far as the land was concerned. The holdings became smaller and smaller. Typical of that, were Belgium and Denmark, where this process has gone on to such an extent that the land now cannot be divided any further.

MR. LUCAS: You gave as a comparison over, say, 25 years since you first knew Glen Grey. Now, could you give us any similar comparison for any of the other districts?—Yes, Herschel has gone worse than Glen Grey. You take that valley which you cross when going to Palmietfontein. In 1907 that was a beautiful level stretch of vlei. As a matter of fact, the Cape Mounted Rifles used to exercise their horses there and have their manoeuvres on that stretch of country. Today you find a donga there which is 40 feet deep and it has eaten that out of the sides. It is just a mass of laterals running out there.

DR. ROBERTS: That is not the only place where you find that; you have the same in Victoria East. The whole vegetation of the hills has disappeared completely?—Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Could you give us any other illustration of the same sort of thing anywhere else?—Yes. One of the parts which has disappeared most rapidly is the covering of the Amatola Mountains with Healythry(?). I gave the material when I was at Grootfontein. Under proper management —— what one would do is to fence that land as soon as the grass is seeded and stop the stock from grazing there. One could reestablish the grass and one could provide for heaps of grazing there, but today it is absolutely valueless. If one could provide for rotation of grasses there, the whole of that
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are could be reestablished.

When did that change take place?— I should say very largely from about 1910; it commenced about then. It became very, very bad by 1919.

And it has remained bad since?— Yes, and now it is absolutely covered.

DR. ROBERTS: From 1900 to 1905 it was beautiful grass?— Yes. I can give you many other instances in other parts in Natal, where you have nothing but wire grass today.

CHAIRMAN: Have you a knowledge extending over a lengthy period of the Middeldrift area?— Yes, perhaps for longest of all.

What has happened there?— There you have a complete surface denudation. It was a seed grass at one time, followed by bitter karroo, but the small bush with the yellow flower is not there; it is a bright, brilliant green.

And that is no good for anything?— No, not even a goat will touch it. It was at one time the most beautiful grass seed you could imagine.

CHAIRMAN: That is where these things have gone worse?— I think parts of Natal are just as bad.

MR. LUCAS: Which parts of Natal?— The country extending from Illovo right away down to Port Shepstone.

MAJOR ANDERSON: The Native sections?— Yes, there is practically no grazing left.

MR. LUCAS: To what do you attribute that?— To overstocking. If you take the plant succession in 12 years at Cédara, we have shown that we can completely kill the good grasses and then you get these bad grasses which can reproduce themselves. They cover the lands. It is a blessing in a way.
because it will at least prevent the water from disappearing.

MAJOR ANDERSON: How can that land be brought back to fertility?—By fencing. If any good grass grows and drops the seed, they can graze it. The following late winter and Spring you can let the animals go onto it again.

You can get rid of that kaffer weed by burning it, too, can you not?—It would take a good many years. The best way of strangling most of these bushes is by removing the cause, and the cause is overstocking.

CHAIRMAN: If you did get rid of it by burning, would you do any good?—In sweet veld you would make it worse, but in sour veld you would make it better. In sweet veld burning does harm, but when you are dealing with sour veld in Natal, burning in the first instance will help in the right season.

Now, take your Transvaal where you have the nkanga problem?—Yes.

Take Ngeobo and take that Valley near Umtata?—Turn that into spare veld for two years and you will have nothing of it left.

Would burning do any good?—Very little.

MR. LUCAS: We had an illustration. There was one part where a donga had been fenced in and inside the fence there was grass?—Yes, it will crush the other out. As far as that part as concerned it is an exotic.

That was one part where we saw the grass growing after the donga had been fenced?—Yes. You will find that in various parts.

CHAIRMAN: Your resting need not be absolute?—No; judicious grazing may be allowed. In the Proclamation for Middeldrift, I said that if we could only get the fencing done
I could rescue that country, but I said definitely that the country must be fenced to save it, but I would not deprive the people of such grazing as there is in it, but, of course, it is a question of the amount that is required for fencing.

And incidentally, it is rather difficult to keep the fences up at night time?—Yes. The old Spoor Law which they are going to enforce as far as Glen Grey is concerned, will enable us to deal with the people and collar those who do any damage to the fences.

Now, on page 7 of your statement, you refer to the Japanese peaceful penetration into Brazil. You say there "As in the case of the Japanese peaceful penetration into Brazil, we, like the Portuguese, will wake up some day to find the position beyond our control, as is the case today in the States of Mississippi and South Carolina in the United States of America." Will you be a little more specific on that point?—What is taking place in Brazil is that the Japanese line which runs over there, each boat carries not less than 700 immigrants who are imported for the purpose of handling the coffee crop. They go, men, women and children, fathers and grandfathers, the whole lot, and they are gradually settling in the country. The Portuguese are perhaps not realising that 30 to 50 thousand Japanese immigrants are settling in a year. I do not think we quite realise what is taking place as far as the Native question is concerned. It must be a steady penetration with this removal off their lands through the deterioration of their lands. If it could come in a 500,000 trek, it would startle everyone into a realisation of what is taking place, but now it is going on so quietly that people do not seem to realise what is going on.
But the public will wake up with a start some day to find that all these Natives are there -- they will find them all in the towns and all over, and then what will they do?

MR. LUCAS: In the same section you say, "This landless section of the population is increasing rapidly, not only by introduction from the Native areas, but by rapid breeding and low mortality"? -- Yes, I meant that specifically.

But a little earlier on you say that the Native does not increase rapidly? -- No, he is not increasing. This is one section of real peaceful penetration. In the Native reserves, the families are small, but you take the farm Natives who have been there for years? they all have very large families.

You are drawing a distinction as between the Natives on the farms and the Natives in the reserves? -- Yes; I can take my own farm where I have a number of Natives who have been with me for years. My best boy on the farm has a family of ten.

CHAIRMAN: Do you consider that on European farms the Native mortality is low? -- Yes, certainly, compared with the mortality in the Native area. The Native gets any amount of medical attention in the better parts; I am not speaking now of the absolute backveld where the European himself is not able to get medical attention, but I am speaking of the progressive sections where he gets better care and where he gets good food and that is where his numbers increase.

MR. LUCAS: That surely is not true of the Eastern Provinces? -- Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You know most of these districts? -- Yes.

Now, let us take Adelaide, for example. I want to
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take a few specific districts ?-- Let us take a district where I know the farmers better. For instance, let us take Bedford where I know them individually. Take the old hands there. I know most of the farmers there and their Natives.

DR. ROBERTS: You are taking the very cream of the farmers, the men who are semi-millionaires there ?-- Yes, that is so, they are very well off in that area.

CHAIRMAN: Do you know Victoria East ?-- Yes, I know it to some extent. There are families there who have had labourers for many years in their service.

MR. LUCAS: Of course, in those areas, you have the influence of Lovedale, which has been felt among the farming people, but take the Alexandria District ?-- Yes, certainly. There are large families there, the same as at Albany.

DR. ROBERTS: Of course, you are talking against all economics law when you say that care and attention produce big families ?-- As long as these people are well fed ---

MR. LUCAS: The impression very strongly make on my mind in a number of the districts in the Eastern Provinces where we were, and also in a few which I visited with the Economic and Wage Commission, was that the economic condition of the Natives there was the worst in the Union, --- my impression was that they were underfed and badly paid and altogether depressed ?-- You find that, with a number in the lower section of the Eastern Province, but I would exclude Alexandria, Beaufort and those parts.

Say we limited this statement to human employers, men who are fairly wealthy themselves ?-- Then you can go and take districts like Somerset East, Cradock, Middelberg and Hanover, and those areas round about there. You can take all that central group of districts and you will find conditions there
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to be fairly good. You can take a great many farms running through the western section of the Free State, in fact a large portion of the Free State. Take great many of the farms in Natal, too.

The point is that this is not a general statement. I want to see whether it is limited? No; as I said at the beginning, where you have a good class of farmer, they are certainly increasing very rapidly. They are well treated and well cared for and their living conditions are good. To come back to what Dr. Roberts said, the crofters in Scotland had the biggest families -- we know that there were cases where they had families as high as from 14 to 17.

DR. ROBERTS: Because of their poverty? They had as much porridge and milk as they needed. And on the statistics taken, when they had the biggest families among the English people, among the upper classes which ran to five and six reared, a higher proportion than the crofters did, but even those that were reared left the crofters with their big families. (Reply not quite clear, but transcribed as given)

CHAIRMAN: You have limited the statement about low mortality to farms where they get good treatment. Now, take the Natives on European farms in relation to Natives in the reserves. Would you say that, on the European farms, a larger number of children are reared per family? Yes.

In other words, the proportion of European farms where conditions are favourable for breeding, in relation to those where they are unfavourable for breeding, still gives that advantage for the Native race? Yes.

Quite a large number of Natives and Europeans who brought evidence before this Commission, spoke about the exceedingly bad state of the Natives on European farms. Now, throughout the work of this commission, we have come across
great difficulty to get anything quantitative and when a statement of the kind such as I have mentioned is made, it is well nigh impossible to find out whether they had in mind 500 cases or 50. You know all these parts of the country very well. I wonder whether you could hazard something in the quantitative nature about these things. We naturally know that there are a number of farms where the Natives are treated well and a number where they are treated badly, but when it comes to percentages, what is the general position — the position in regard to treatment generally, in the way of adequate food supplies, in the way of human treatment of employees and so on. Can you give us any information on that? — I think that, over the greater portion of the country, 75%, let us put it at that, 75% of the farming community treat the Native comparatively well from the point of view of food supplies. In many instances, wages are low, but the food supplies are sufficient for the family to enable those children to grow up satisfactorily in every possible way.

**MR. LUCAS:** That leaves a very large number, of course, outside your class. 25% of the total would be a very large number of individuals? — The 25% embrace the North-west, some very poor sections, from Griqualand West up there at Kuruman, some of the sections in the Transvaal, not only on the Low Veld, but on the High Veld as well.

**MAJOR ANDERSON:** Is it not largely a matter of the economic position of the farmer himself, his ability to feed them well? — Yes; the economic position of the farmer and the area in which he is has a very great deal to do with it.
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CHAIRMAN: Do you think there is a corelation between that and the way in which the Native is treated -- the farmer is poor and, therefore, the Native is poor? -- Yes, but there are exceptions. There are bad exceptions in the Highveld and the Transvaal.

MAJOR ANDERSON: In districts where they are prosperous, the percentage of bad treatment would be very much lower; would you say it was 5% or 10%? -- More than that. I made a very careful run from Hanover and Richmond area between Christmas and New Year, visiting all these people, many of them rich and many of them poor farmers, and looking into the labour side, and you would find one farmer here, a good farmer, doing quite well for himself, and you would find his servants well looked after, people who had been with him for many years. And then you would come across another farmer next door who was poor, and then you would find that his Natives were not looked after.

MR. LUCAS: Was that farmer poor because he did not look after his labour? -- It had a lot to do with it.

MAJOR ANDERSON: And also the farm was poorer than that next door? -- Yes, and then you also had the inability of the individual.

MR. LUCAS: But are there Natives on the farms in Richmond and Hanover -- are there not many Coloured men? -- Yes, and most of these Natives have been there for donkeys years.

CHAIRMAN: The predominant labour there is Native and not Coloured? -- Yes.

Would not the poor type of farmer be apt to get the less satisfactory Native servants, too? -- Yes, he does,
because of his bad and unfair treatment. He gets a bad name and no one but bad will go to him.

And the bad Natives get squeezed out of the good farms and they cannot go to any of the good farms and they have to go to him?-- Yes, that is so.

DR. ROBERTS: Have you not found that the farmers who are thoughtful and human are quite prepared to give fair and good wages to their Natives because of their commercial value?-- Yes, they realise that.

But do you not find that they are rather indifferent to things that would not be helpful. For instance, very few of them have schools for the Native children?-- Very few farmers look after the scholastic side at all.

But yet they are educated men themselves?-- Yes; but they say, if we want good workmen we provide a good house, we provide good food and we pay good wages. That Native is then quite happy and satisfied. The majority of these Natives are sending their children to schools which are a long way off. That, of course, is a great difficulty, but it is extremely difficult to overcome that in any way, owing to the scattered nature of the population.

Exactly; that is due to the fact that the farmer does not concern himself with these things which are not of commercial value?-- Not a bit.

CHAIRMAN: It is probably also a difficulty of the European rural population?-- Yes, it is a difficulty with the Whites as well as with the Blacks. The European goes so far as to say, "I shall have a governess for my children".

DR. ROBERTS: He can get a Native teacher in a Native farm school?-- Yes, but those Natives are so far apart,
that it makes it very difficult.

But they can surely get 20 children together for a school?— It would be difficult. They certainly have not touched that side and it is a very difficult side, but they have not really cared for it. It is the commercial proposition which they concern themselves about.

MR. LUCAS: Which districts are you speaking of? I have seen very little good housing in the districts which we have been through?— You will find the best housing in the Midlands of the Cape and then naturally in the Western Province of the Cape.

Would you call the housing on most of the farms in the Free State good?— No, it is not absolutely good, but then it is not absolutely bad. It is not what one would like to see.

CHAIRMAN: If the Native builds his own hut, as he has been accustomed to do under his tribal conditions, then you cannot say that it is bad housing?— No. The housing is not good in various parts of the Free State, and it is not as good as it should be in the Eastern Provinces.

Well, the Free State is a large area. Take the Northern Free State, where the Native usually builds his hut with sod walls and where he thatches it ---- ?— Yes, there he has a good house, and you find it in the Transvaal, too.

And it is cleanly kept?— Yes, that is so. You find that among most of them.

When you say it is not good in the Free State, what part are you thinking of?— Almost the whole of the Eastern Free State and the South East.

Towards Bethlehem?— Yes,
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Do not the Natives build their own Natives huts there?—Yes, but they are very indifferent, not nearly as good as they are in Basutoland or in the Transkei.

They do not thatch properly?—It is not a permanent institution.

Mr. Lucas: Do you think it is a question of permanency of tenure?—Very largely. You see, they have a large floating population as a result of the seasonal work there and I do not think that in the Eastern Free State, they get the same amount of permanency in their labour as in the further outlying parts, where a man remains with his master almost all his life.

Chairman: The Eastern Free State has the same amount of temporary labour as the mines have?—Yes.

There is a very large number of people from Basutoland who are temporary farm labourers in the Free State?—That is so.

It is an easier system there than on the mines, because they can bring their families with them and then they can trek back again?—Yes, that is correct; they do not live there permanently by any means.

Now, I want to take you back to your statement. On page 8, you mention the insufficiency of land in the Transvaal and there again it would depend on your areas. You say, there the Native cannot make a sufficient living in the reserves to meet his increasing wants, due to universal over-stocking and bad farm practise. To these factors must be added lack of sufficient land in certain parts, mainly in the Transvaal.

For instance, in the Matok Location, Pietersburg District, each family unit of five has an average of four acres of very poor dry land and half a cattle beast. Now, what you say
about insufficient land in the Transvaal, there again it would depend on your areas. Take the Bavenda area, you would not regard that as inadequate, and the Sibasa area, you would not regard that as inadequate?—No. The areas in the Transvaal as they stand today, with the exception of one portion of Sibasa and Zeerust, are all inadequate, actually on acreage per family unit. Because, if you go to Sibasa, half the area which you look at is Crown land, it is not Native location at all.

But actually the Natives are living on it and very much in the same way as they live on Crown land in the Transkei?—If they are going to be allowed there permanently, then it is all right. If you give them a lot of these locations and make use of the water supply, you will have ample land. I can give you an instance. Take Mpefu's Location. It is 15,500 morgen in extent. The population is 8,940; the cattle number 4,400, and there are 5,300 sheep and goats. That location will not have more than 10 to 15 inches of rain per year, in most years they only have ten inches and, roughly, they will get a crop about once in every five years. Now, if you take out the Ngeleli River, that will bring 5,000 acres under irrigation. That is a very considerable amount and that is one of our best permanent streams. Now, if you do that, if you take that river out, then it means that really that district is under-populated and not over-populated, as it would appear to be at present, and all over the Transvaal probably you will find that that is the position. If you use the water supply, you can do a great deal more than you can do at present.

MR. LUCAS: Could you economically take out that
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water ?-- That water will cost, on a rough estimate, £1 per acre to put over the land. There is no such scheme in any European area, no scheme as low as that.

Is that at the capital cost of £1 per acre ?-- Yes.

We do not want to face a position like the European irrigation scheme has to face today ?-- The condition I would lay down is this, that no scheme in the Native area where the land costs nothing, must cost more than 25 per acre capital cost, so that where the European land is valued at £25 or £50 per acre, no Native land, as far as irrigation is concerned, would cost more than £10. Otherwise, I will not look at the scheme.

CHAIRMAN: Take the Senthulume and Kutana area ?-- They are both dry.

Are they overcrowded ?-- Yes, they are on account of the extreme dryness.

Take the Sekukune area. If the full scheme which you have put forward for getting surplus water for stock is carried out, how would that be now in regard to congestion ?-- It is one of the best in the Transvaal, because it will have irrigation sufficient for stock purposes and with the irrigation supplementing your food supplies, they will be allright. That is, for the Natives who are in a location. But if you take the Natives outside the location, that is to say, the Natives who are in the Lydenburg district, then you have more Natives than you have in the district, if I remember rightly. The Steelpoort River lies some distance away, but there is some land on the Steelpoort which I would like them to acquire. Pashlele's Location have bought a great many farms. Mafela's Location is 13,000 morgen in extent,
the population is 9,000, cattle 6,000, sheep 2,000 and goats 13,000.

DR. ROBERTS: What sort of special work do they go in for there ---?-- We are providing water there now, but there again, if you take the Natives from the outside areas, they cannot accommodate them.

CHAIRMAN: Are you thinking of European farms when you speak of Natives from outside areas?-- Yes.

The Natives on European farms are hardly likely to be squeezed back?-- I am thinking of the European-owned land which is not farmed by the European landlord.

Absentee farmers?-- Yes. If you go to one part in the Transvaal, you will find that it is nearly all company-owned land there, and if they have to shift off that section of land, then they will be in a very bad way indeed. The location in Sekukuniland is 187,000 morgen in extent. It is dry land. They have 28,000 head of cattle on that land, but the area which is known as Sekukuniland, although it has nothing to do with the location, carries 50,000 acres, 50,000 head of cattle and 87,000 head of small stock. If you have to shift that population into Sekukuniland proper, into Geluk's Location, then, of course, it has no hope of carrying it, because I cannot carry out any extensive irrigation works there.

CHAIRMAN: Why do you talk of Geluk's Location?-- There is a Sekukuniland which is Native location proper. The old Sekukuniland embraces all the land between that location and the Drakensberg on the other side.

You mentioned Geluk's Location?-- We are speaking of
it as the actual area of Crown land. We speak of Geluk's Location to separate it from what we used to know as Sekukuni-
land. We just differentiate/from what we used to know as Sekukuniland. The trouble there is that the Natives developed on farms. They are keen on irrigation and they took out small waters and immediately, if it is a Crown farm, the Europeans applied for it. I have given you the instance of Steelpoort and there has been great trouble there in that respect.

MR. LUCAS: I was told the other day that, for all practical purposes, one farm width on both sides of the Steelpoort is held by Europeans?-- Yes.

The Natives cannot get there, get near; is that so?-- They worked the farms on the South Bank. That is the land which has come into dispute! They have been definitely told by one of the ministers to get off the land. On the North Bank are European farms, but they are all worked by Natives, except two which are not worked by anyone. If any development takes place on these farms, they will naturally be applied for. I think it is a great pity that the river could not be made the boundary.

It means that the Europeans are having the river frontage all the way along?-- Yes, that is the position.

CHAIRMAN: Before coming to the next point in your statement, which is education, I want to deal with the statistics which you have been good enough to prepare about the education of Natives. I take it that the figures which are given on pages 23 to 26, have been extracted from the annual reports of the Department of Education?-- No; these figures are extracted from the figures which were supplied
By the Department of Education for the report which I prepared for Major Herbst for the Geneva Conference, as most accurate and up-to-date. These are all figures supplied by the various Departments of Education. In each case they are their own figures. I said I would not risk any figures for Geneva, unless they supplied them themselves.

Then take your figures on page 22. You say there, "N.B. The abovementioned figures are arrived at in the following way. The percentage increase on the 1921 figure was taken. This was added to the 1922 figures, giving the number of children between the ages of 1 and 14. This number was halved to arrived at the number of school children of school-going age." The percentage increase on the 1921 figures was taken. What percentage did you take for the seven years?-- I took the percentage which is used by your Department.

I now want to go back to page 9. At the end of that paragraph 1, you suggest that a certain very drastic change is required in the nature of education if it is to be of economic value to the Native. Will you specify please in what way the change should be made?-- I have set it out in full in this memorandum, which was submitted to the Natal Department of education, shewing the type of syllabus and the reason for suggesting the syllabus and so on. I have started too by again taking their own figures. I think ---- it is under discussion now, but we have not arrived at the final conclusion.

Very well, we shall leave the general education question alone until later. I now come to page 10 of your statement. You refer there to the training in agriculture on
along the Kenya scheme. You say there "If a big proportion of the Natives received some degree of training in agriculture along the lines of the Kenya scheme, the result would surely be increased production in Native and European areas, decreased cost of production, and a lesser number of units employed by farmers, leaving more labour available for the mines?-- Yes. That scheme is the one from which I have taken a great deal to embody for the scheme in Natal. The idea is that from the time the child enters school, agricultural teaching will form a great part of the teaching. They carry them from the sub-standards and when they get into the standards, they increase the percentage of agricultural teaching. And then they go on further. When the youngster gets to 14 or 17 years, provided he has got to the higher standard ---- because there are a great number of them who, even at that age, have not got to the higher standards ---- then they give them a greater percentage of agricultural teaching. It works out on this basis that, out of every four years of education, one year of scholastic teaching is devoted to agricultural training.

DR. ROBERTS: Not devoted daily or yearly, but according to the circumstances of the pupil?-- That is so. I have taken that system and I have used such information from the system of the United States to extend that scheme.

CHAIRMAN: Then on page 11, you mentioned, about the middle of the page, that there are many other points which can be explained verbally. Now, about this question of development of Native agriculture. That, naturally, is one of great importance to this Commission and I shall be pleased if you will go rather fully into this matter?-- We have come
back to our communal farming. The cultivated land is communal grazing land. On the word of the chief in the one instance that is very widely adhered to, the date is set when stock have to go into the mealie stalks to graze. The man who wants to go in for a system of farming and rotation crops is prevented from doing so. It is a man made obstacle in that the chief in power says, "on such and such a date the stock will go into the mealie stalks". Well, if that Native farmer wants to grow wheat or some other rotation crops, he is prevented from doing so because the cattle have to go into that land where he wants to grow his crops -- his lands then become a grazing area.

If he cannot grow a rotation of crops, he cannot bring in the maximum which the land would bring up, neither can be maintain the fertility of the land. Another obstacle is that the cultivated lands are not grouped. If those lands were grouped, you might fence them and you might still grow your crops and you might say, such and such a portion of this area will be planted with crops, you will have Summer crops here or Winter crops there, and we will still allow that corner, but in preference, we will remove the grazing outside——

The scattered nature of the lands, in other words, makes it impossible to fence them. The cost becomes prohibitive, unless I can find some hedge plant which will stand up to the stock. I am experimenting on that at present. That, of course, may remove one of the difficulties there. Whether it will pan out or not I do not know.

Now, I think that steadily, during these next few years, we shall be decreasing our production per acre, instead of increasing it, through inferior and shallow ploughing. The
man has increased the number of his stock that have to be
grazed on the land to such an extent that the animals are
not able to draw a decent plough. In the Ciskei, I have
had to cut out my heavier ten inch plough and to introduce
an eight inch one which will do inferior work. The stock
cannot draw the plough at the depth which should be done.

And there again, the human being has been responsible
for this position by overstocking the area and not giving us
stock of the strength to work. I would rather have two
good animals in the plough than six of the kind which they
usually put in. If we could do away with the communal system
which is the principal man-made obstacle and get down to
individual tenure with permanency of tenure, then we would
be able to bring about the most rapid improvement of all.

But there is a colossal difficulty, so far as those
who are responsible for the administration of affairs are
concerned. They say that such a thing is an impossible one.
That is my principal obstacle, which the human being puts
in my way of agricultural progress. I cannot get that man
to take any pride in that land, and, as a matter of fact,
that is no reason why he should take any pride; in fact, it
is an impossibility for him to do so under existing conditions.

CHAIRMAN: You speak of 8 inch ploughing. You
visualise a very considerable increase of depth over the
ordinary Native ploughing? Yes; the ordinary Native
ploughing is a scratch of 4 inches deep.

That, of course, is very bad from the point of view
of getting a crop and from the point of view of erosion it is
very bad too?—Yes, it is.

And from the point of view of robbing the soil of its plant food?—It is worst of all.

But does it not leave you a reserve which you can ultimately get at?—You get a pan underneath; you do not get your water or air to penetrate to render the plant food soluble and you are working out just that little surface and, instead of getting to a greater depth to render the plant food soluble, you stay on top.

But you have that area below which has not been touched.

Have you not got a reserve there which will be useful for the time when you get them to plough deep?—No; because we are not getting that plant food soluble.

So even when they get down to 8 or 10 inches, some
time will have to elapse before it gets soluble?—Yes.

And when that time has elapsed, you have practically virgin soil?—That is so.

So it is leaving another six inches which ultimately may be used?—Yes, but in the/time you are robbing your crops to an awful extent. Your good wheat, for instance, will go down to 10 inches. If you get a good depth at the top, you will get your crop going. Today you are not doing that.

When you say on page 13 of your statement that Zululand is under-populated, you make that statement in regard to existing methods on Native farming?—Yes, it is the one big area which is under-populated and which would carry a far larger population than it does, even with existing methods of farming.

On page 13, you have a sentence which gives 11 or 17 million morgen. This is what you have there: "The trouble is that the conditions mentioned, which will make the available
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land sufficient, will not be carried into effect. This means that we can double the 11 or 17 million morgen, whichever is taken, and we will be as badly off in 25 years' time as we are today." I do not quite follow that. Do you mean that, if more land is made available without any question as to how that land is used, it is just putting off the evil day? -- Yes.

Has the Kenya Agricultural Commission not stated that, according to their findings, there will never be enough land? -- You must take it this way. The 11 million morgen is four times as heavily stocked as the European areas are. Even if you were to make that 11 millions into 22 millions, that land is still twice as heavily stocked as the European land is. Now, if you were to spend £100,000 a year on giving them more land, then by the time you are at the 10th year, that first land which you have bought will be worn out. Unless you buy land and impose the necessary regulations, you will simply be causing the whole country to be denuded.

The simple provision of more land is no cure at all? -- No, it is no cure at all.

MR. LUCAS: Assuming that you start with real goodwill to educate the Natives to use what land they have efficiently, would the land which they have now be sufficient in such circumstances? -- Excluding the Transvaal, for this generation, yes.

Even the Transkei? -- Yes.

Assuming you are not encouraging so many men to go out to work? -- I think that even more will go out to work.

CHAIRMAN: Owing to your rising standard of living? Yes.
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?— Yes. If you take a district like Nkutu, where we have a section of the Basuto population, they have made enormous progress. They have made greater progress in two years in the purchase of fertilizers than in 18 years in the Transkei, that is, per capita. You get more people there from that section going out to work than from any other section, even though they are producing more.

That is from the Basuto section? — Yes.

DR. FOURIE: More than from all the reserves? — Yes.

All the reserves in the Transvaal? — Yes. Yet, if I look at other parts, --- those other parts are heavily over-populated.

MR. LUCAS: Mr. Butler put in a well-reasoned paper to us and the impression which that left with me was that, unless we trained the Natives much more efficiently than we have done in the past, without a very large number going out to work to bring in money, the Transkei Natives would never live on their land? — Quite so.

So when you say that there would be enough land under the conditions which I postulated, it is only on the assumption that the income is largely augmented from abroad? — No; if we could immediately say that we were going to farm that land along proper lines, ----

You have to take practical probabilities into account? — It would be done.

So we have to face the fact that the Native has to go out to work? — Yes.

He has to face that economic pressure for a long time? — Yes. There is one point which I wish to mention. The Secretary has now agreed that where the Government buys land, the conditions of occupation of that land shall be laid down
by me. I assess in the first place the value of that land and I say, "We can pay so much for it and no more. If we pay that it will carry so many people and so many stock and these people will be able to earn so much on these lands?" That has been agreed to for areas outside the Transkei, but it does not extend to the area where the Native himself purchases, and that is where we get a severe break down.

DR. ROBERTS: Would you expect that it would? At first blush it appeals to me that you have no right to limit him?----

MR. LUCAS: You said that you are laying down conditions for land which they got from the Government?-- Yes; excluding the Transkei.

When you calculate what that land can carry, do you calculate at the same time that they can only make part of their living and that some of them must go outside to earn money so that the family shall have something to live on?-- What the present generation can live on. That is the point which one has to take into consideration. You have these families living on that land. There are certain conditions in regard to stock which have to be laid down.

Do you lay down conditions as to fencing, etc.?-- Yes, just as we have done for Middelton.

Surely you are able to control it?-- Yes; it has this great advantage, that I fix the rent value. It is no use the Government saying, "This is a particular friend of ours who wants to buy that land and we want him to have it". I must say that, up to the present, the present Minister has turned down any unlikely propositions that I have reported on as such.
CHAIRMAN: Coming back to our old friend, overstocking. In order to save some of these over-stocked areas, it will be necessary to close them for a time?-- Yes.

And to take away the stock?-- Yes.

And the population as well?-- Yes.

So that, for some areas, it will be necessary to have what, in Europe, they refer to as internal colonisation?-- Yes.

In a case like that, have you considered the question of tribes splitting away and going to live away from other members of their tribe?-- They will not do that.

That is a big practical difficulty?-- Yes, it is a very big practical difficulty.

What is the solution?-- I say, fence the area. They are getting nothing more from it. In most of these areas we can fence, leaving the homestead out. I say, fence definitely. Today, you are making your stock poorer and poorer and your stock is getting nothing. It is getting nothing from that land in that already congested area. To go on like that will increase the rapidity with which they will starve.

They will have the alternative of breaking away or staying in the remaining area and losing their cattle?-- Yes. Look at the Ciskei and the way they lost their cattle in the 1919 drought. They lost half of it and more. Had we taken the matter in hand then, we could have done a lot, but now they are breeding up rapidly again.

You might pray for another drought?-- Yes, although it would seem an inhuman thing to say.

DR. ROBERTS: If someone went to reason with them, with these men, do you not think that some of them might
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accept it?-- I have this from two councillors in the Middeldrift area. I discussed that with the conference at King William's Town and they came to me afterwards and said, "If you will impose compulsory fencing, our people will be against it, but we will support it outside. We cannot say 'you must do it', but we will support it outside." If I could fence those cattle off at no cost to these men and demonstrate to them and say, "Alright, now you can put up your limited number of stock---" these councillors would be willing to consider the limitation. If that could be done, then I am perfectly certain that it would succeed. I wanted to impose my wool levy, but they would not let me.

MR. LUCAS: Who would not let you?-- The Agricultural Department would not.

Which council was this to which you referred just now?-- The Council for the Middeldrift area.

MAJOR ANDERSON: On page 13, you say "Zululand is under-populated and can, with the cane areas of Natal and Zululand, if developed, absorb (if desired or required) all Natives now resident on Crown and private lands in Natal and Zululand". Are you there contemplating the taking over of the existing cane areas under your system of share-farming?-- Yes. There are 20,000 acres of cane. It is Crown lands. 10 acres of cane would give a man a good living. It is equivalent to 400 acres of European cane land.

MR. LUCAS: Taking his standard of living?-- A better living than he is making now. I can only take the 30 that we have as examples, where we have much better conditions on ten-acre allotments.
Will you tell us about that please?— That was the first section which was cut up. We took 300 acres and cut that up into 10-acre allotments, each family working one allotment. Last year, they made an income off that land, clear, after deducting certain costs, of over £40. Over two years, they had an income altogether of £20.

MAJOR ANDERSON: What tonnage did they get?—
I think it averaged out at 27 tons.

Some 10 acres would be more than others?— No, they were all round about the same.

Of course, that would be one of the first conditions of the success of the scheme, that it must be even land and that the one 10-acre lot is as good as the next?— No. As far as our big scheme is concerned, we reduce the amount which the man has to pay. Here we say a man is only going to pay 10/- an acre because he is only going to have half a crop. I leave a big margin. I left it open for us to assess the value. I did not want to have the same thing as they have on European settlements, where every man pays the same, irrespective of whether the land is good or bad.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Did you have 20 tons an acre; at how much?— 14/- a ton.

They will not necessarily get that?— That is what they got last year. As I say, they got round about 27 tons. I hoped that we would get 30 tons. Of course, we have approximately 100,000 acres of suitable land in Zululand.

You have to allow for occasional bad seasons?— Yes. But we have not got to allow as much as we have to do
for our ordinary crops. You get one bad year, perhaps, out of ten and with our ordinary crops you get perhaps one good year in five.

I am afraid the average is more than one in ten. It is more like one in five? -- Not an absolute failure.

If you average 20 tons an acre over 10 years, you do well, and I doubt very much whether, with Native cultivation, you will do that, unless you have very close supervision? -- Yes, close supervision is contemplated, that is laid down.

You insist on a man keeping his cane clean? -- Yes, absolutely. We can send a man away if he does not do the work properly. If you look at the proclamation, you will see that that is done - it is also laid down in the lease. I actually wanted to specify the number of supervisors for each number of Natives, but the Secretary said, "Why put that in; you may even want to increase the number; that is left to you to decide as the work progresses." I said, "Alright, so long as I can deal with the matter as the work progresses". There will be very strict supervision.

MR. LUCAS: You have to see to it that, if you should be transferred to some other work and you cannot attend to this yourself, that a proper scheme is laid down for your successor? -- Yes, that is so.

Now, you referred to Mkatu district where the Basutos are. Did you work out any details to support your statement that, with the improvement in their economic conditions, they want out more freely to work elsewhere? -- I have the figures from the district and I shall get them for you. I have the details for both Mkatu and Glen Grey,
taking Glen Grey as being one of the oldest civilised districts.

And are you satisfied that, as a result of your investigations there, as a general statement you can say that the raising of their conditions will make more want to go out to work?—Yes; I think that, if you take the general trend in the other more progressive districts, you get the same thing everywhere. Take some of these unprogressive districts. As soon as they have plenty of food, they want to stay at home. It is a feast or a famine with them. The man who has once learned that he must wear a pair of trousers and a jacket does not want to go back from that, so he goes out to get the wherewithal to acquire these articles. In the Transvaal, you get this feast or famine business in certain areas. Where you have their wants steadied and continuous, you get away from that, but the point is, if they cannot satisfy their wants at home, they go out to work.

Do you think it is their want—or is it their desire to raise their standard of living, which drives so many out from Sekukuniland?—Well, they did not suffer any want last year—and they will not this year, because they have put away a good deal. But there is a big rise in the standard of living in many locations. The reds of Zululand or Xesaland are unknown in the Transvaal. The standard of the whole people has been raised.

It was put to us in Sekukuniland that at least 50% and even 60% of the people had to go out in one year to work—in any one year, and this, it was said, was due to economic pressure?—Yes, that is so, that is largely so. They cannot produce because the area is so dry. But I
think also that their standard of living has increased enormously. The clothing question alone has had a very great influence. They want things today which they never thought of in the past.

Does their clothing cost them more than the blankets of the red Native?-- Not with the blanket tax.

So, really, you have the same pressure for the red Natives?-- Yes, only the one has some additional small wants, -- wants which the red Native has not got.

CHAIRMAN: On page 14, referring to the question of the concentration of residential plots and the economic grouping of arable and grazing lands, it seems to me that there are two points which now and again seem to run into one another. The one is that where the Natives have themselves, without any influence of the Europeans, gone in for the system of villages, of living in villages, that has been the result of higher development?-- Yes.

From that you seem to argue that if we make them go into villages, a higher development will accompany it and the conclusion seems to me not to be warranted by the preface?-- If we put them into the villages, then we introduce that higher development, because they are living inclose touch, the one with the other.

Yes, I follow that; you are referring to higher social development?-- Yes; what gives rise to this general conservative temperament of the landowner, all over the world, Black or White, -- it is the fact that he lives by himself. If you bring people into a community, you develop the community spirit. They rub the corners off one another and the result is that you get less suspicion. You get a
higher mental development and I think that, if you bring those scattered nomadic pastoralists together, you will hasten that process which has been achieved with the more advanced people in the North.

You recommend this system for the social advantages which it will bring? -- For the social as well as the economic advantages which it will bring.

What economic advantages are there, apart from the social advantages? -- The economic advantages are first in connection with agriculture. There perhaps I should take first the economic advantages in connection with the human being. You will get better medical attention because you have the people grouped. You will get better educational facilities because the people are grouped. You will get better sanitation or better conditions of sanitation. You will appoint sanitary officers and then you will get the arcadian condition of people living outside. And that spreads to the point of view of livestock. If all these obstacles and human foibles can be put out of the way, my poultry and my pig and cattle farming can go ahead.

You want to abolish the pig and the fowl as sanitary inspectors? -- Yes. Then I get a definite group of my agricultural operations as separated from my pastoral operations.

That last point you could get without grouping your villages? -- It would be very difficult. If you have individuals, living one here and another there, you find that a man is living on land very often which you want to cultivate. That you find in many instances.
There is better supervision if he is close to the next man?-- Yes, and he is not living on land which you want to cultivate. You get your lands grouped and you get your grazing areas grouped. Then, if ever my dream comes true, you can establish commercial undertakings. You can have your industries, such as you have in the Northern Territories, in Nigeria, Egypt, etc. You can have definite markets, a definite marketing place where the Native can market his products for his own people. You can definitely establish industries, because you have everything on the spot. I am now taking it up with my Department. If I take people who have been trained at a place like Tiger Kloof, for instance, and I take a big location like Mafeking, one could say, "We shall start a carpet-making industry here. I have the people all living around." That industry may start in a small way, but out of that I can grow into a bigger one. In Egypt they have done that sort of thing. Start industries in that way and they will develop. We have our schools in all the towns and we can develop these things there. We can introduce the necessary amusements among these Native people. There would be nothing to prevent us having bioscopes in a Native town. We can have our sports fields for the schools and for those who have left school, just as we have them here in Johannesburg.

That is the direction in which one must work. Give these facilities for industrial, commercial and hygienic enterprise. A water supply can be organized, everything complete. Of course, the medical people will at once say that it is the worst system in the world, because there is
no hygiene, and it is so. In any of these Native towns today, after the rain you have to walk about with your handkerchief to your nose, but that is the fault of the administration of the system, and not of the system itself. It is a tiptop system to have one man here and one man there, but it leads you nowhere, and, as I have shewn, it is wasteful.

MR. LUCAS: Surely that hygiene question is not so difficult?-- No, it is not difficult at all. I am thinking of a man named Isang, one of the Bagatha tribe in the Bechuanaland Protectorate. Now, his father used to live in the Transvaal, but he himself established his home in the Protectorate and he built himself a really nice rondavel house. He was the first man to build a closet as we know it, such as the Europeans have, right by his house, and he shewed his people what they should do.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Did he have a bucket or a pit?-- He had a bucket, because he was on top of a rock.

CHAIRMAN: How would that community simplify the system of the cane proposition?-- Here is the area which I want to demarcate for a cane area ---- I dare not let them live in the cane area, because there is the danger of fire, so I want to put them all into a nice little village just outside, so that they can all work the cane area from that, just in the same way as the Frenchman or the Belgian goes out from his village. But the Native does not want that. He wants his kraal here or there where he is working, which increases the fire danger.

MR. LUCAS: Could you start a thing like that in
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the Mafeking district, for instance?-- There is nothing to prevent it.

They have the tradition there?-- Yes, and they have their staff all ready. The same in the Zeerust and the Rustenburg districts.

I take it that, by encouraging visits of Natives from other parts of the country to these parts, you will foster the system and it may spread to the others?-- That is my idea; to take Natives from other parts. I have now asked to be allowed to take Xosaas and Zulus right into the Protectorates and let them discuss these things and see them for themselves and then they can later on tell their own people about it.

MAJOR ANDERSON: There is some difficulty about educating the Zulu to live in villages?-- Yes, and yet they lived in villages to a greater extent in their original conditions than they do today. You still have their family groups living together, but do not try and bring another family in there.

DR. ROBERTS: How do you account for the breaking up of the old village system which you see in the old pictures in Zululand. In these pictures, you see the whole of the hillside covered with huts?-- That is since Chaka and Dingaan. They brought them together like that, to have them ready and at hand when they wanted them. Now they have broken back from that to this open system of families living together.
REVEREND JOHN WILLIAM ALCOCK: appearing on behalf of the Joint Council of Europeans and Natives, called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: I see in your statement, in dealing with over-crowding, you allow one room per house as a general living room. Does that mean that you have subtracted that? Yes. Say any house where there are three rooms, instead of three bedrooms make two bedrooms and a central one a living room.

Statistics for housing are generally made on the basis of all the rooms, and not in the way that you have done? Yes, but I think it is undesirable that people should sleep in the same room in which they have been living all day and cooking.

The way in which you have prepared the figures here does not make them comparable with ordinary housing statistics. I wonder if you could give us the figures on which your conclusions were based? At the moment, I cannot. Could you send us the number of population and the number of rooms? Yes, I could do that.

Now, all these people are housed in ordinary dwellings? Yes.

There is no sort of compound? No.

All the people in the town must live in these rooms? Yes.

This medical expenditure figure, is that expenditure by way of engaging ordinary medical services? Yes, the ordinary doctor's fee and medicines.

There is no insurance fee, such as they have in Johannesburg? No. There may be one, but I do not know of it.
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Now, you express the view here that the proportion devoted to rent is rather high. Do the Natives express any views on that point, or the Native members of your Council?—

Yes, they regard it as a high rent in proportion to the income of the Natives. They have to build a house according to the location requirements and then, in addition, there are the Municipal charges for sanitation and so on. It makes the total expenditure very high in relation to their income.

That is, in regard to Marabastad?—Yes, and the same with Bantule. At Bantule the houses are Municipal houses, but there, too, the rent is very high, I think. The houses were built by European labour and the Municipality cannot let them at a cheaper rate economically than they are doing.

Mr. Lucas: Are Marabastad and Bantule both Municipal locations?—Bantule is the new location, a Municipal location. Marabastad is an old location where, I think, there are today people living of the third generation. They are living there now under town conditions and it is the third generation who are living under such conditions.

Dr. Roberts: Do you find much change in the outlook and thought of these Natives of the third and fourth generation at Marabastad, or are they a good deal still Native in their outlook?—I should say that the change is rather marked, especially with the youngsters as compared with the old men, the fathers and the grandfathers. The old tribal restraints and customs are being largely set aside and a better discipline has not been imposed upon them.
Would you think that there is anything commensurate with that loss in the way that they have a better outlook on life and things?— I should say so. If their means of subsistence were a little more ample, then I should say that it is a much fuller life which they lead today.

So it is not all loss?— No.

MR. LUCAS: This 4/- at Marabastad for rent, is that a ground rent?— Yes.

Have they included— have they calculated what that represents in value of land. I do not know what the size of the plots is?— The plots are not large plots. As land values go in Pretoria, I should say that it is quite equitable.

Of course, one cannot check that. You say that the root of the liquor evil is in the economic question and will not be eradicated while wages remain at their present low level. Do you think that, if wages were to provide a better standard of living, the drink evil would be less?— I think it would be substantially less, although perhaps it would not be entirely eradicated.

On what do you base that opinion?— On the fact that people in the location, who are very poorly paid, in order to augment their livelihood, brew and sell this illicit liquor.

Have you any experience of the conditions in England, because the same argument used to be employed there, and it seems to be borne out?— Yes, I have had about 30 years' experience of central mission work in England, and a good deal of that in the slums.

The point I was getting at was that poverty causes
drunkenness?—Yes.

What is your view about that, quite apart from the Natives?—Yes, I should say so, but it does not cover the whole question, there are contributory factors.

DR. ROBERTS: Is it not that, in the slums, you have far more public houses than in the West End of London?—Well, it is a very big question, this drink question in England, and I say myself that abundant facilities dispose people to a bigger drink habit. To put it another way, reduce the facilities, increase the price, increase the taxation and shorten the hours, then you will probably reduce the drink evil very considerably.

Do you not think that what you have to do further is to ameliorate and improve the conditions of housing? Take the working men coming home to a dirty house and his wife at the washtub and the smell of soap everywhere, what else can he do but go to a pub?—I do not think the location is quite a parallel with the slums at home.

Some of the houses that I have seen are very dirty?—Yes, they are very bad indeed, there is no doubt about it.

There is nothing in them in the way of cleanliness that is conducive to a sober life?—No, that is so.

THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED AT 5 p.m. UNTIL 10 A.M.
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