

about the lawlessness of our sons and daughters, and I think great care must be taken not to create more criminals amongst our people by virtue of circumstances. We in the rural locations are afraid that any type of Native should come and settle next to us. We would sooner the bag-snatchers remained in towns, where police protection is more plentiful than in the country. The situation that would be created by bringing different types of Natives into juxtaposition to the old locations may be a very serious one. In the locations we more or less live with our sons and grandsons. It is a homogenous type of population and tradition compels respect for each individual; but as soon as you bring a stranger next door to us the stranger himself is going to look askance at the people next to whom he is living. These new villages are going to bring in a real concatenation of difficulties. For instance, industries will be built to exploit the people who will be living there. There is the question of transport, and we may have a second Alexandra Township, where you have a large Native population congregated in one place who are forced to earn a wage. People cannot earn a wage on the quarter-acre of land they are given, and all the problems of commerce and industry are going to crop up. Most of these things, I submit, are controlled by the economic situation. Our people may be put into the position of offering free labour; it doesn't matter whether to farmers or anyone else. Some farmers have had no complaints about the scarcity of labour since they have lived in this part of the country because they have the right system of treating these people. Why can't every farmer copy the system of his neighbours? If these people are going to be taken away from the farms it will make conditions worse, because those farmers who have been in a happy position about their labour are going to be forced by law to make them go and suffer the same fate. Our principal question is this: Can the Government not hold up this big change it proposes to make till we see what post-war reconstruction is going to do for Natives?

MR. D. L. SMIT: I am very surprised at some of the statements made by Cr. Jabavu. He talks about village settlements and the cure being worse than the disease. He says we must wait until after the war before we make a beginning. If you do that the patient will probably be dead. If you find a person dying you don't wait until after the war before you give him medicine. The one great cry amongst Natives is for a place outside the town where they

can get a piece of land and build their own house. That is the cry that has been raised from Cape Town to the Limpopo. Are you going to refuse this on behalf of your people? We have come forward with a scheme to provide these people with the right to acquire their own allotments. Are you going to turn it down? If you do that, the responsibility will be yours — not the white man's. We may have another Government, and I would impress the need of being circumspect. If you turn down these settlements it will not be easy to get the scheme restarted. At the present moment we have a Minister, who is sympathetic and prepared to push this thing through, and a Government that is prepared to approve of it. Turn it down if you like; the responsibility will be yours, not mine. That is all I have to say with regard to the argument that this policy should be put off until after the war. After the war economic conditions will be worse than they are to-day. It will be very difficult to go to Government and ask for money then. The Government has promised to help us in this thing and has committed itself to certain expenditure. The position may be the reverse after the war. I leave it to Cr. Jabavu to say, on behalf of his people, that these schemes should be delayed until after the war. A great responsibility rests on you. As enlightened people you should think twice before you turn it down.

CR. H. TELE: What land has been made available out of the land which the Government originally provided under the Act to supply the needs of Native occupation? This refers to the first question on the list, to which you replied that the war had impeded purchase progress. But we say this matter was started in 1936 in Parliament—three years before the war. We want to know why a period of three years elapsed without Government fulfilling its promise. You have mentioned to us the land that has been purchased and that Government actually sent emissaries to inspect land in the north, and that those emissaries came back apparently satisfied, but failed to make any report. (MR. SMIT: I can't say they were satisfied. The Act did not come into force until January 1, 1937. The Government did buy land in those two years.) Why did Government start buying land in places far away and unknown to people here and before ascertaining whether people would go there? Does the Government now realise that it is enmeshed in a difficulty of its own creation by first buying where it had no assurance people would go? It was a case of



putting the cart before the horse, because we thought originally Government would find land in our midst to buy and not start by buying land in strange places which we cannot go to.

MR. SMIT: It is not correct to say that Government from 1936 to 1939 did not fulfil their promises. You can't buy farms like you buy a lot of sheep. You have to investigate the land, send inspectors out and have it valued, and have to negotiate with the owner, and that takes a great deal of time. During those two years we bought as much land as it was possible for any Department to handle. To buy 7,000,000 morgen of land takes a long time and it had to be spread over a period of years. During that short period we actually bought land to the extent of £4,000,000, so Cr. Tele's statement is not a fair statement. Even since the war the Government has bought land to the extent of over a million pounds. When you come to the second point, as to why we bought land in Bechuanaland and why we did not buy land here, I must explain that the Bechuanaland areas were in the released areas set aside by the Act and we bought land wherever it was available and where people were prepared to sell. We didn't confine ourselves to one area. Up in Bechuanaland there was a very large extent available to purchase and we bought 213,000 morgen. There is still a very large area which has not yet been bought. Here in your area there was only 80,000 morgen available under the Act. I had bought 52,000 morgen up to the outbreak of war and there is only 28,000 morgen still to be bought. So it is not correct to say we didn't buy land down here. We were buying all the time and doing our best to carry out the law. Unfortunately people refused to settle on farms in Bechuanaland. That is really not my fault, is it? I have done my best.

CR. G. MANELI: Can the Government give us a guarantee that the proposed scheme will not have the effect of extending to our rural areas the conditions obtaining in urban locations where we find unemployed men, women and children making their living by dishonest, immoral and destructive means? Will the scheme not have the effect of extending those conditions to our areas?

MR. SMIT: It is a very fair question and I can definitely answer it. No, those conditions will not be permitted to develop. What has happened in the urban locations is this: A large number of people were allowed to drift in without any proper control being exercised. In other cases employment offered and

people flocked in, and there was no housing available in the town. In other cases, such as the Alexandra Township, a private company was allowed to sell land to Natives. No proper control was exercised and so very bad conditions developed. But in these villages we have in mind that state of affairs will not be permitted from the beginning. People with no right there will not be allowed to settle there, and no more people than there are allotments will be allowed to go there. You need have no fear that the state of affairs you mention will be allowed to develop—it will not. If you read these conditions well you will see that provision is made to prevent what you anticipate. We have introduced a condition that prevails in European settlements—a probationary period, namely, that a man will be placed on an allotment, in a house we will build, for a period of five years. At the end of five years when he has shown himself to be a man of good character he will be allowed to buy that land. That is done in European settlements. We must give it a trial. We don't want to start 50 settlements, but just one for trial. It is very strange that people don't want to try anything new, but just sit and sit and do nothing. We offer to build houses and allow people to buy them—your own people—and yet you say you don't want them. It is really very strange.

CR. MANELI: What provision will be made for unemployed people living in these villages?

MR. SMIT: We won't allow such to settle in the villages. We visualise a man who is earning his own living or going out to work and these allotments will be there for his family. That is the idea, and we certainly won't allow people of the criminal type to settle in the villages.

CR. H. PHOOKO: I would like you to look at page four of your statement—the paragraph dealing with the demarcation of areas, where you say that kraal sites "should be in groups in different parts of the location, within reasonable distance of the arable lands belonging to them." Does it mean that houses will be put all together?

MR. SMIT: This refers to location congestion, not to village settlements.

CR. PHOOKO: I want to be clear. If people are to be put together some of them will have to be removed.

MR. SMIT: Yes. The idea is that people should not be scattered all over the veld as they are in some places. Each man brings his stock in every night and the whole of the veld gets tramped out and ruined. We have found it better, where there is 'conges-



tion, for people to live in groups and lay out arable lands a little distance from the houses. Then you have your grazing ground and can go in for rotational grazing. If you want to do all the things contemplated you can't have houses scattered all over the veld. The people would necessarily have to move into small villages. It will all depend on the conditions in the area concerned. These committees will have to go into conditions on the spot.

CR. PHOOKO: Thank you. There is another point, on page seven—stock limitation. It is a very difficult thing to apply. On page 10 there is an appeal for co-operation. To African people stock is everything. This spoils everything. Through their minds being upset people don't want to listen to anything. They are upset in their hearts by the words "stock limitation."

MR. SMIT: We appreciate that it is very upsetting to the Native people. We understand their hearts will be very sore over this thing. But the people have learned to love their stock more than they love their land. The world is changing — there is no more land. What little land they have they have to learn to love it for their children's sake. Stock dies; the land remains. You can't sacrifice the land for the sake of your stock. You have come to a stage now that unless you make changes you are finished. I notice that in Southern Rhodesia the Government there has just issued a Proclamation limiting stock. They have not spent a great deal of time, like I am doing, talking to the people. They just issue a Proclamation telling the people they must reduce their stock. We don't want to do that. We want the people to work with us. The time will come when we will have to bury emotion and give effect to the law.

CR. PHOOKO: We are about nine million in population and 12½ per cent. of the surface is applied to those nine million. On the other side there is 87½ per cent. applicable to two million people. In all fairness and justice, when we look at these things we see there is uneven justice. Most of the land is given to the few and the smallest piece of land is given to the many, and the result is that they are grouped together with their stock, which brings about soil erosion. We admit the African people have increased but the land on which they live has not increased an inch.

MR. SMIT: I produce a map for your inspection. You will see that the portion coloured yellow is the low rainfall area. That is the Karoo. We can buy as much land as we like in the Karoo. White people are quite pre-

pared to sell it. If we give people rail warrants to go and inspect it they will come back like the people who went to Bechuanaland. Europeans have all the bad land. The Native areas are smaller, but the great bulk of them are in the rain-belt. The Transkei is the finest part of South Africa. If the Transkei was properly farmed it could carry a total population far in excess of what it carries at present. The areas coloured black belong to the Natives and a very good share is in the rainbelt area. It is land much finer than Europeans have got. The richest land in South Africa belongs to Natives.

CR. PHOOKO: I am not concerned with the quality of the land but with quantity, because I contend that in the area devoted to us we are more than the ground. You can reform it any way you like: we will trample it down and erode it. Let us look at it in the form of a human being. The land voted to us is insufficient; yet a small number of people are living on a larger portion of the ground. These are the problems that are really working in our brains. We know your difficulties. You can't help it; you have to do it. We want these points to be brought to the notice of the Government. I think that is the reason why we have come to the conclusion that we must leave these schemes. If we reduce the stock we deprive the people of food and milk and they will be left emaciated skeletons. What will happen to them? That is why African people are dying like flies. There should be a real solution of this problem, and the African should be included when an investigation is made. It is a sore point with us that whatever is being done by the Government in the way of investigation we are ignored. There is Pass Law rehabilitation, segregation rehabilitation, colour bar rehabilitation, but we find we are always excluded. How can we be content when you are doing this thing?

THE CHAIRMAN: I want you to ask questions, not to make a speech.

MR. SMIT: We have a big meeting at Stutterheim to-morrow and we must confine ourselves to these issues, not to general questions and complaints.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard what Mr. Smit said. I want questions, not long rambling statements. You had the whole of yesterday afternoon to frame questions and you put down seven on paper. We adjourned yesterday for the reason that we did not want people jumping up and asking unnecessary questions. If we go on as now we shall be here a week. I want definite questions.



CR. S. J. PETENI: I am thankful for the information given us by the Chairman. I will be as brief as I can with my own question. In the origin of things our life was this: In locations we had to pay 10/- local tax and on surveyed lands 12/6 yearly tax. I would like to know what the Government is aiming at in regard to the released areas. People who are settled there are being called upon to pay £1/10/-. I would like to know how long they are to continue paying £1/10/- in released areas, because we were told in the first instance that the object of the Government was to increase the land on the lines of people paying £1 poll tax and 10/- local tax.

MR. SMIT: When Government bought land in released areas the people were told by the Minister and the Native Affairs Commission, who travelled right throughout the country at that time, that they would have to pay a small rental on the land which was set aside for them which would have some relation to the money Government was investing in buying the land. But the Government said they did not want that money, which would go into the South African Native Trust Fund for the benefit of the African people. The £1/10/- charged as rental is much lower than it used to be. It used to be £2 on Crown land; now it is £1/10/-, but it is a contribution to the Native Trust Fund which we use for the development of the African people.

CR. W. MAJOLA: Everything contained in the statement of policy is designed to lead us towards this village settlement scheme — of making miniature Native locations within townships — which will bring us down from the original view that we were getting new land and also bring us down to the compound system or sub-locations. Otherwise we would say it looks like a good scheme, but we who have plots of commonage now are uncomfortable. What has prejudiced the proposals contained in the statement is the proposal of village settlements. We can appreciate all the other good points mentioned. What is vitiating the schemes is the proposal of village settlements, with the conditions under which we are to settle. In the Keiskama Hoek area we have an instance of this. People have been uprooted from the commonage and made to live in a congregated place so that land can be opened up for grazing. We have exactly the same thing in the Burnshill area. It is quite a good thing because we see the cattle given open commonage. Sheep feed in a different camp. That is a good thing, and there are other good things

in the statement. Then there is a chapter on village settlements. We are afraid of this one thing and the people are afraid too, and we have been sent here to make that clear to the Government. We can't make a location that will correspond to an infant school in a secondary school, because the people in the beginning haven't the money to pay the costs.

MR. SMIT: What costs?

CR. MAJOLA: The charges laid upon occupiers.

MR. SMIT: Only £3 a year for rent! If you lived in a town you would pay that per month.

CR. MAJOLA: We can't speak of what a man would pay in town. His expenses are regulated by the ambition to build his own home in the location with his own hands. Even if he goes to a village settlement he goes with the idea of building his own habitation. At the same time we see that in town locations women are able to get some cash through dealing in illegal liquor. It is the same in every location — illicit liquor. That is the very thing that alarms us in the proposal of village settlements. It will be a training ground for that very kind of life led in town locations — just as the infant school leads to the secondary school. Cannot Government make us view the thing from a different angle? What is alarming us is that we may get a repetition of conditions under which children run to town locations and become a nuisance there. These settlements will produce just the same conditions. If we go home and say we have agreed to this thing the people will say you are taking us to school to train us to become like the demoralised town locations.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was not a question. I will allow only one more question.

CR. A. NGXOWENI: My question is in regard to this thing that is not wanted. The statement says that if a person is found to be undesirable after a probationary period of five years he will be evicted.

MR. SMIT: You are wrong. We don't allow a man to purchase if he is undesirable. We would evict only a man of bad character. We want to get rid of the criminal type of people.

CR. NGXOWENI: What I say is that we are going to have a new practice in rural village settlements — doing what is done in town locations were undesirables are evicted and told to leave the municipal area. What is to become of them when they are evicted?

MR. SMIT: Each case will be dealt with on its merits. The point is that the man who does not behave himself