

effective purchasing power to satisfy needs from an economic point of view he has not got those needs. I have a desire for a Rolls-Royce motor car, but if I don't have the money to buy it, my needs for it are entirely ineffective.

THE CHAIRMAN : Naturally, but the effective demand of the native is small ?--- Have his needs got to be small?

And his needs are small as the result of his historical background ?--- I don't agree with you, sir.

It is no good going into what his needs may be in the future ?--- But the contact with European civilisation has opened a field of vision to those natives who are in the European civilisation, which leads to the presumption that the non-effective needs are large. You can watch a labourer between twelve and one studying very hard to acquire the European language - reading, writing and so on. And in the same way he is attracted by many of the things which obviously he has not seen, but his needs are there. He feels that he is not able to enter that civilisation to the degree he would like because he has not the effective purchasing power. (Professor Brookes): I suppose it would be

agreed that in most urban areas recreation has now become a need. The natives are spending money, which they would not have spent say fifteen years ago, on bioscopes and things of that description, as a small illustration.

But your proportion of natives domiciled in the towns is very small to the proportion of the native population. I would like to suggest that there is a very big factor, bigger than most of the others, influencing the level of native wages, and that is the fact that a very large proportion of Union natives have tribal lands from which they get a certain proportion. Secondly, that there is a very large

number of natives similarly situated who come to the Union from the High Commission territories or Portuguese territories, who also compete ?--- (Professor Frankel): In other words you want to suggest that the wages are subsidised ? Well, I disagree with that, because I took particular pains to look that point up.

DR ROBERTS : Will you give us what you think, because it has been brought before us a good deal that the man has got this extra thing to fall back upon, and therefore he is willing to accept a smaller wage ?--- Yes. Well, Professor Pigou investigated the common assertion, which the other day I heard you refer to, in listening to some evidence given by somebody else, that the Poor Law in England caused lower wages to be taken because it subsidised those receiving poor relief. And in a passage which I have here, and which I want to read to you, because it is of very great importance, he analyses ~~sh~~ that. This is from "The Economics of Welfare," by Pigou, page 745 :

"The latter of the two arguments distinguished above
 "asserts that, if any group of poor persons are accorded
 "any form of subsidy, they will, in consequence, be wil-
 "ling to work for less than the worth of their services
 "to their employer, and so will, in effect, transfer back
 "the subsidy they have received to members of the richer
 "classes. This view rests, partly, upon a priori reason-
 "ing and, partly, upon what is called experience. It
 "needs, therefore, a twofold discussion. The a priori
 "reasoning starts from the fact that a Poor Law subsidy
 "enables a person to accept lower wages than it would be
 "possible for him to accept otherwise without starvation
 "or, at all events, serious discomfort; and it proceeds

"to assert that, if a person is enabled to work for less, he
 "will be willing to work for less. Now, no doubt, in cer-
 "tain special circumstances, when a workman, in receipt of a
 "subsidy insufficient to enable him to live up to his
 "accustomed standard of life, is confronted by an employer
 "occupying towards him the position of a monopolist, this
 "inference may be valid. In general, however, where com-
 "petition exists among employers, it is quite invalid.
 "A person who, by saving in the past, has become possessed
 "of a competence, is enabled to work for less than one who
 "has not. A millionaire is enabled to work for less even
 "than a relieved pauper. So far from this ability making
 "it probable that he will strike a worse bargain in the
 "higgling of the market, it is likely, in general, to have
 "the opposite effect. It is not the fact that the wife of
 "a man in good work is likely to accept abnormally low
 "wages. On the contrary, the woman, who, for this or any
 "other reason, can afford to 'stand out,' is, in general,
 "among those who resist such wages most strenuously. *

"Let us turn, then, to the reasoning from what is called
 "experience. This starts from two admitted facts. The
 "first fact is that old and infirm persons in receipt of a
 "Poor Law subsidy very frequently earn from private employ-
 "ers considerably less than the ordinary wage per hour cur-
 "rent for the class of work on which they are engaged.
 "The second fact - given in evidence before the Poor Law
 "Commission of 1832 - is that the refusal of guardians to
 "grant relief in aid of wages 'soon had the effect of making
 "the farmer pay his labourers fairly.' From these facts
 " /" the inference

* For an illustration of this among home-working
 tailoresses, cf. Vesselitsky, THE HOME WORKER,
 page 17.

"the inference is drawn that, where a Poor Law subsidy exists
 "work-people accept a wage lower than the worth of their work
 "to their employers. This inference, however, is illegiti-
 "mate. There is an alternative and more probable explana-
 "tion. As regards old and infirm persons, may it not be
 "that the low wage per hour is due to the circumstance that
 "the work they can do in an hour is poor in quality or little
 "in quantity? As regards the old Poor Law, may it not be
 "that the unreformed system of relief, so long as it pre-
 "vailed, caused people to work slackly and badly, that, when
 "it was abolished, they worked harder, and that this was
 "the cause of the alteration in their wages? The view
 "that the true analysis of experience is to be found along
 "these lines, and not in the suggestion that relieved per-
 "sons work for less than they are worth to their employers,
 "is made likely by general considerations. It has been
 "further confirmed by recent investigations which tend to
 "show that, where two people differ solely in the fact that
 "one does, and the other does not, receive a Poor Law sub-
 "sidy, their wages are in fact the same. Thus, investi-
 "gators appointed by the Poor Law Commission of 1909, as a
 "result of their enquiry into the effects of out-relief on
 "wages, write:

"We found no evidence that women wage-earners, to
 "whose families out-relief is given, cut rates. Such
 "wage-earners are invariably found working at the same
 "rates of pay as the much larger number of women not in
 "receipt of relief, who entirely swamp them..... We
 "could find no evidence that the daughters of paupers
 "accepted lower rates than others, or earned less than
 "others, because of their indirect relation to pauperism."
 *

The gist of it is this: he shows that experience proves that many of those low wages were due to the fact that the efficiency of the poor and infirm was low.

DR ROBERTS : You accept that argument ?--- One moment: I accept the gist of that argument. I would like to make my position clear. I accept the gist of that argument, and I maintain that in certain minor cases a tribal native will for the sport of the thing, for the attraction of the urban environment, accept a lower wage. But in most cases it is not the fact that he has got the reserve that makes him accept the wage, but the fact that he is forced to work at that low wage in order to get a wage at all. In other words, his subsistence in the reserves is not sufficient, and that is what drives him out. And his inferior bargaining capacity is the final cause for his accepting, and being forced to take, low wages.

Wouldn't you say that argument, if carried out, would mean this, that State insurance and the giving of the dole in England must bring down the wages ?--- Exactly. If the previous argument is accepted, that would have the same effect.

But that is not the case ?--- No.

Now where is the thing wrong ?--- I hope we have not misunderstood each other, sir. You say that State insurance should lower wages ?

If that argument is true ?--- If that argument is true. State insurance and the giving of the dole must lower wages ?--- If which argument is true ?

The argument there ...

MR LUCAS : No, it is the argument that this writer counters. He does not accept the argument, he deals with it ?--- Pigou does not agree with that argument. Pigou says

/ that

that wages which are subsidised do not lead to a lowering of wages, and that view I accept.

DR ROBERTS : Therefore State insurance and the giving of the dole do not lower wages ?--- No. In England the giving of the dole, it is a well known thing, increases the bargaining power of the worker and makes him hold out for a higher wage.

And State insurance would be the same ?--- Depending of course on the contributions made by the State and the contributions made by the employee.

MR LUCAS : As a matter of fact I heard the same point put up in Wage Board investigations about old age pensions in South Africa, that it had enabled a substantial number of people to live on the pension plus little things they could pick up, rather than work for next to nothing, as they had previously been doing in the occupation which was being investigated ?--- I would agree with that.

THE CHAIRMAN : Your quotation from Professor Pigou seems to me either not to apply to the native population, or to involve a contradiction of some of the evidence that you have laid before us, because Professor Pigou deals entirely there with classes who are in a position to resist lower wages. Now either you have to admit that natives are in a position to resist lower wages because they have the reserves, or you have to reject your argument that the reserves are inadequate ?--- No, sir. I thought of that. The position is this: you are arguing that a person who has a competency will therefore not care very much whether he gets relatively more or less.

I never said "competency." He has got something; he has not got a competency. I think it is admitted that the bulk of the natives have not got a competency in the reserves,

/ otherwise

otherwise they would not be here ?--- Therefore he has got nothing.

No, he has got something, but it is not a competency ?--- There is only a misunderstanding between us which I think we will agree to in a moment. The fact that he leaves the reserves shows that the reserves, to him, do not give him that standard of life, or that protection from starvation, which he needs. Right. He is therefore forced to find other work. You argue if he goes out to get other work

DR ROBERTS : Contributory work ?--- You argue if he goes out to get other work, he will regard that as contributory, and he will hold out in the labour market for as much as possible, irrespective of the reserves ? The reason he gets little is because the pressure on the urban labour market is so extreme. And if he cannot get more -- let me put the contrary view -- if he cannot regard that as a contribution only, you would really be arguing that he is really not a competitor who tries to make the best bargain. And there is no reason to assume that the native does not try to make the best bargain.

THE CHAIRMAN : In actual practice, according to the evidence given before this Commission, the bulk of the natives only go out when they must have money ?--- You mean they are incapable of bargaining ?

He may be quite capable of bargaining, but you cannot bargain on an empty stomach ?--- To make my point quite definite. Let us assume that there is a shortage of urban labour, and that there are the same conditions in the reserves as at the present moment, and that the shortage has had its natural effect and has raised wages. Would you insinuate

/ that the

that the tribal native would actually take a lower wage because he says, "No, I don't need as much as that; I have got something in the reserves" ?

I don't see the immediate relevancy of that. That is not the position that arises in the Union. The position that arises in the Union is that, firstly, a certain number of people who are supposed to make their living from tribal lands, do not do so. They come in and compete with the others who have definitely thrown in their lot with the urbanized population, and under-cut them. I think we have a very large indication of that ?--- You are using that word "under-cutting" again. It is a meaningless term, from an economic point of view.

MR LUCAS : What word would you suggest in its place ?--- It is simply the fact that there is an over-supply of a particular kind of labour, or it may be commodities, which therefore are sold at a cheaper price. This person under-cuts because he cannot find work; he does not do it on an ethical or moral plane. He does not want to under-cut. It is not his fault; it is not because he has got tribal reserves that he under-cuts. It is because he has not got sufficient tribal reserves that he under-cuts.

DR ROBERTS : Is it the immoral implication in the word that you object to ?--- I object to the immoral implication in the word; I object to the idea that he is doing something which he should not do.

MR LUCAS : Is your point that if all those tribal natives come with no intention of going back, or getting anything they can send to them from the tribes, and living in the towns, that the mere presence of their numbers would keep the wage down, and not any intention to take a lower wage ?--- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN : I did not try to make any moral implications: I try to avoid that as much as I can ?--- (Professor Frankel): I agree.

That stirs up a certain feeling. I meant it as a neutral word; I meant it to describe a state of affairs, not to bear a moral implication ?--- But you will realise, sir, that word hides the state of affairs that you are trying to describe. The real reason for this process which you describe as under-cutting, has nothing to do with the desire to under-cut; it comes about through the fact that external forces make these people accept a wage which they really themselves don't want to accept, if they could stand out.

DR ROBERTS : You give an objective quality to the word, rather than a subjective ?--- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN : I used the word entirely in an objective sense; I avoid moral implications whenever I can. But it is a fact, whether they like it or not, those natives, that are drifting in to compete with the labour market ... ?--- (Professor Brookes): May I just interject one sentence here, Mr Chairman, from a rather different point of view. Let us assume that hypothesis which you have been putting forward is correct, instead of challenging it, for the moment -- I don't think it is: I agree with Dr Frankel. What would be the remedy ? I take it that the mere remedy of trying to keep natives out of towns won't help. The remedy in that case would, I take it, be to develop the productivity of the reserves and make it easier for a man to live there. But now, if that is going to be done, you will have to have less people in the reserves than you have at the present time. They would not only have to be taught to use their land better, but they will have

to have plenty of land to use.

MAJOR ANDERSON : How would you make the reserves more productive ?--- Well, as far back as 1910 -- I was reading last night, as it happened, in quite a different connection, from the Report of the Cape Native Affairs Commission of that year - the question of encroachment of natives on the commonage. There you have the question already twenty-one years ago being discussed. And all the Commission at that date could do was to make a kind of hopeless gesture: "Let them go on encroaching on the commonage. We cannot suggest anything else for the moment. Even that process will come to an end sooner or later." I believe that at the present time you have already got a very large number of surplus natives every year, and with the move towards individual tenure in other parts of the Union, you will have more and more surplus natives. So even if the assumption is correct, I don't think it will materially affect the future economic development of the country as regards wages, because the phenomenon will grow less and less. You will have more and more natives who have not got anything to fall back on in the reserves; whereas it is rather owing to the progressive policy of our Native Affairs Department agricultural section that they will be making a living on the land.

THE CHAIRMAN : In other words if the development takes place, the pressure from there would diminish ?--- I don't think it is a consideration that should seriously influence us in formulating an economic policy for the future.

But it is rather an important point in a diagnosis of the present position ?--- It is a rapidly changing position, and the change is all in that direction. Assuming it is definitely a bad thing, which I don't accept, still every

year the position changes from that point of view for the better.

I am very much afraid it is not changing fast enough, but perhaps we don't mean exactly the same thing ?---

(Professor Frankel): Professor Brookes means that it is rapidly growing worse, and the amount of the subsidy he gets in the reserves is becoming negligible. (Professor Brookes): My point is this: if the Government's policy of enabling natives to make a living on the land by better agricultural education is properly carried out -- and for its proper carrying out you will have to have larger plots, in my view, than they can get at the present time -- then you will have a number of natives with no bargaining power of that kind, if it is a bargaining power.

You think larger plots are a prime essential ?--- I would not say it is the prime essential, but I think it is a very important point. I think the prime essential is agricultural education, but the size of the plot is not a negligible point by any means.

MR LUCAS : You said the plots they have got, even with better agricultural training, are not sufficient to maintain them ?--- I think we have to expect that every year the wants of the native will increase, and I don't think we have any right to bank on the fact that in fifty years' time what is produced on a five-morgen plot will supply his wants.

MAJOR ANDERSON : Do you rule out the possibility of better agricultural development of the reserves ?--- One hopes there will be some possibility of that kind, but I am afraid there has not been anything of it so far.

(Tea adjournment.)

THE CHAIRMAN : We are on the main proposition. I think the position is rather at this stage, that removals,

/ as far

as far as they can be made by legislative action, for example, of limitations on the native, will ultimately work out right. Well, I think if that is all we can say, we will achieve nothing, because while we may have every confidence that that is right, people are not going to throw away all their safeguards unless they have rather more than the hope that ultimately things will be right. We have to face the immediate practical problem of the inter-action of these races. Now isn't it a fact that the brunt is felt by only a comparatively small class at the present day, of natives ?--- (Professor Brookes): I would agree with this, that the problem is much more acute with the comparatively small class. I think all natives are feeling the effect of our low wage economy, but the problem is much more acute with a small number. The particular difficulty is that the small number is the articulate few, just the very people who need most, who are most conscious of what they are suffering and what they are missing; just the few who are in a position to be agitators. I am using that word as you used "under-cut", in the purely objective sense. Just as the few, in short, who are likely to be the points of danger in any contact for the future. Now I think that our whole policy at the present time - also illustrated very strikingly in the Native Administration Act of 1927 - is to assimilate those few to the majority. We think that policy is mistaken, politically as well as economically.

Why economically ?--- I am leaving Dr Frankel to answer that point - the main question - because I wanted to make this point specially.

I don't think that is quite fair: you believe it, and Dr Frankel has to answer ?--- I will do my best to drop my own bricks in a minute or two. Why I have brought in

/ this

this word "politically": we cannot draw a hard and fast line like that between politics and economics, particularly with regard to trade union movements, movements like the I.C.U., for example, and other similar movements. Leadership in those movements is provided just by precisely this particular class which our legislation tends to overlook. And what has always been a problem with me, and is still a problem, is to understand the reason for differentiation; not between the white man and the small class of detribalized natives, but between the coloured man and the small class of detribalized native. I cannot understand why, for example, the coloured man can be completely exempt from the pass system, and established detribalized natives living in town, not; and so on with other examples. My answer to the point that a certain small group feel the pinch more acutely than the other, is that the small group is a peculiarly important significant group at the present time. And even economically it is an important significant group because anything at all in the way of trade union organisation, agitation for higher wages, the utilisation of any constitutional machinery that is provided, will be availed of first of all by those people, and not by the bulk. They are the people who are the baanbrekers, as far as rising wages and the native standard of living is concerned.

You think that group of detribalized natives are economically more of a unity with the coloured man and with the lower groups of Europeans than with the big group of tribal natives ?--- Yes, I do.

DR ROBERTS : Are you sure ? What leads you to hold that even the higher class of native has anything whatever in common with the coloured man, except that he is in a very

/ unhappy

unhappy state, whereas with the man out in the reserves, it is his brother ?---I think there are always points of contact naturally between the detribalized and the tribal native. There is the point of contact of language, which however lessens with the length of residence in town. There is a certain community of tradition, and some community of sentiment. But as far as the most important economical factors are concerned, he seems to me to go much more naturally with the coloured group; that is to say, speaking now of the small group to which the Chairman referred - I take it, the permanent residents in the town, he has no reserve to go back to; he has no chief under whom he stands effectively. Very often his language is greatly changed, and sometimes he loses it altogether; always he is able to speak one or both European languages. His outlook on life is essentially the outlook of the town dweller. Miss Maud the other day spoke of her work at Sophiatown saying she had asked some natives a very simple problem about oxen, that any native ought to know, but none of them could give her an answer. When she came to investigate she found it was because those boys had been born in the town, and their parents had been in the town so long that there was no tradition of the country things in the family at all.

DR ROBERTS : Your coloured man has no great area of thought or even of sentiment. His view must always be economic. He has no great body of people surrounding him, perhaps at a distance, but they are there - this great native background. My own feeling is that even with that group of which you speak, his ties are very much stronger with the great area from which he came than with the coloured man ?--- May I give an illustration of what I mean ? In the field of taxation and education, we limit our native

/ education

education, including the education of the detribalized native, by the amount of money which the native pays in. We do not limit the education of our coloured children, but we give a grant, and you have got the same grant to Europeans. I fail to see why the sentiment of linguistic connection of the native in the town with the native in the tribal reserve should operate in that very disadvantageous way, so that he gets I think about one-quarter of the amount per child for education that the coloured man gets. That is the sort of point I have in mind. (Professor Frankel):

On your previous question, Mr Chairman, I think what is basically wrong with that attitude - of course speaking quite impersonally - is that you regard the native as a liability, and I say he is the biggest asset that in reality this country has got. You say, "Why bring him up?" "It will cause a lot of inconvenience." I say if you leave him down it will cause a disaster. That is what I mean. And I refer there as much to the urbanized native as to the native in the country. I am firmly convinced that immigration into this country is restricted by the low standard of the native population throughout the country. If we do not develop -- and this is the argument I think the Commission should bring out in its Report; if we do not develop that asset, it is keeping immigrants out. That I shall show in a moment more clearly. We, as I say, are courting disaster, because we are having a working population which (a) we do not use in part, (b) we use wastefully, and (c) we do not develop to their full capacity, in any case. That is the basic difference, sir, between the popular attitude to the native, and the economic. And when you ask, "What shall we do," to suggest, I put forward strongly the point that this Commission must advocate an intensive

/ campaign

campaign of education in the narrower sense, that is to say, I mean propoganda, to teach the inhabitants of this country that if they don't alter their whole attitude towards the use of this asset, they are, as I say, courting economic and eventually social disaster. So that the point I would stress in regard to the question with which we began this morning, and which as I can see is worrying the Commission, is that this Commission must take a positive attitude; it must say, "This is not an academic discussion about the long run and the short run. This is a very immediate problem. We are not able to compete in the economic race between nations because we are failing to use the only population we have got as workers. We have got no other working population but the native." Now you will perhaps wonder where I get the connection between immigration and this low strata. In the Southern States it has been proved that the immigration into the Southern States has been less than into any of the other States of America, and not mainly on account of climatic reasons or fertility.

DR ROBERTS : They count - the climate counts ?---
It would count, but not mainly on that ground; it would count to a certain degree. The climate is good in the Southern States of the United States, and it is fertile, and it is well served by rivers. The reason has been the presence of the negro. I hope you don't mind my going on, because it will save time. I put all my cards on the table here. The immigration into the Southern States has been retarded for partly the same reason that definitely retards our immigration, which is that an immigrant

is a poor person. He would not emigrate from his country if he would not try to better his position; he needs a ladder in the country of his adoption from the bottom, where he must start, to the top at which he aims. And in this country he has not got a ladder. He has to compete with an enormous black mass. And if we argue that we want immigrants with £2,000, which I have seen advertised in South Africa House, we are making a statement that has already aroused the laughter almost of very eminent writers overseas. I refer to Warren S. Thompson who in a recent book, which I will quote in a moment, points out the absurdity of this "gentleman idea," that you can get gentleman immigrants with £2,000. Now, sir, if we are not going to use our own working population, and as I firmly hold, if we are not going to get the immigrants, instead of that working population, what is this country going to do? And that is my answer to the main question. We have to preach the doctrine that we are making a basic mistake, that we are not using to the full extent that asset, and of course the use of that asset will mean change, and that change is undesirable to people because it is upsetting. But that has simply got to be faced.

THE CHAIRMAN : Your answer, in other words, is the main problem in connection with the native is to raise your margin, raise it degree by degree to a higher level?--- First of all to a more productive level.

That improves the statement, but on general principles I don't think there is much difficulty in this thing. Where the great difficulty comes in is in the practical details.

/ MR LUCAS :

MR LUCAS : Dr Frankel, in effect you have said there ought to be propaganda to push this idea that you have mentioned ?--- Yes.

If there is to be propaganda, there must be arguments supporting it, and those arguments must be based upon facts which are to-day feasible and ascertainable ?--- Yes.

Could you at this stage give us in brief those arguments and those facts, because in the end we have to come down to the practical question which will appeal to the Europeans who govern us to-day. I will mention some of the difficulties that are put to us. One is that, if you raise the native you are going to injure the white man. Another is that, if you raise the level of the natives, you are going to reduce the number of natives who will be available for low paid jobs; you are going to make the tribal natives work for shorter periods and stay at home for longer periods, because they will have the same amount of money that they are getting to-day with a shorter period of work. And generally there is the view of a large number of people in South Africa who think that it is necessary that they must have the largest number of low paid natives that they possibly can get. Those are the practical questions, as they appear to me, that are being put up to us from time to time, and when we make our Report we must deal with those questions. It is when we get gentlemen like you and Dr Brookes before us that we want all the assistance we can get for countering those arguments and substituting with supporting arguments the correct position ?--- Yes.

DR ROBERTS : May I make another suggestion which perhaps you would regard in your reply: that is, instead

of this propaganda to get the truth into European heads, which is rather a difficult business, consider instead of that an active propaganda to bring education to every native kraal so that you will have say in the next fifty years -- it is not long to look forward to -- an educated class right over the country of natives, and not the ignorant class that we have to-day ?--- (Professor Frankel):

I entirely agree with that; I think that process of education goes hand in hand with all the measures which we suggest must be taken to increase the productivity and the efficiency of this working class. I think every kind of education is absolutely essential. There is one point I would like to make in reply to your question, Mr Lucas: I think there are two points that stand out here, as far as the Commission is concerned, which are worrying me a little. The one is, first of all the Commission has got to face the facts, which means that the Commission, irrespective of what it thinks will be the effect of its Report, will report absolutely without regard to what is

DR ROBERTS (interpolating): Have you any thought that the Commission will not ?--- No, there is no insinuation. It may be thought that there is a danger in that certain people who have come to certain conclusions, wish to see those conclusions realised; certain people may feel that the time is not yet ripe for the statement of those conclusions. I gather there is a danger there. Therefore I first of all maintain that as far as we are concerned we are giving evidence to a Commission which is going to face the facts themselves as to the problem, the practical problem of how to get those facts instilled into

/ the

the European population so that they will be accepted. There is no personal insinuation against the Commission, but there is a big difference there between the two points. I think Professor Brookes will agree with me. In our evidence we have indicated very largely why we think that this fallacious popular belief is not in the interests of this country. First of all, I should say it retards the national income. I think we have made that point clear in the evidence. Now in regard to the popular view which you say we will be up against, that to raise the native will retard the white man, it seems to me a view that is based on the simple fallacies with which this country is working the whole time, that by keeping part of your population in an inefficient condition, you can keep the other part of the population at a certain level. I maintain that you cannot do that. I want to point out that there is nothing new in this: the Economic Commission of 1914, the Wage Commission of 1925, they all emphasised this very impossibility. They have already been approaching the problem which you have been referring to; they have been showing that it is impossible, that you cannot keep this country at the present national income - that is to say, for all the future inhabitants of this country, that the same per capita income for the whites should be continued in the future -- if we do not increase and bring up the native. There is one other matter. I think it is exaggerated - the competition between the white and the natives is exaggerated. A certain amount of increased competition there will be, but in certain directions there will be no competition. The whole of the agricultural part of the

/ national

Collection Number: AD1438

NATIVE ECONOMIC COMMISSION 1930-1932, Evidence and Memoranda

PUBLISHER:

Collection funder:- Atlantic Philanthropies Foundation

Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive

Location:- Johannesburg

©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations, held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.