

is obvious, that we cannot allow such a system, and therefore if we have to break it down, we have to break it down.

MR LUCAS : There are quite a lot of natives on farms squatting who have no cattle; the percentage may be low, but the number we have been told about must be quite large in itself. I would like to ask you in connection with your proposals what sort of tenancy you would call adequate ?--- I think first of all you cannot lay down conditions by law, but you should have them watched by magistrates or other juniors to see that there is no exploitation. There should be a clear-cut tenancy contract, and there should be the possibility of easy mobility for tenants from those employers who do not give them good terms to those who give them better terms; and by "easy mobility" I mean adequate compensation for everything they have done in their previous place of employment. In other words, the tenancy system should be drawn up on the lines of all improved modern tenancy systems.

Security of tenure ?--- Security of tenure; adequate compensation; compensation for improvements; and above all the possibility of terminating the tenancy in a certain approved manner.

DR ROBERTS : Would you have it that the tenant could not be dismissed without some definite charge against him, and have a committee to deal with that so that he would have certain occupation ?--- Yes, absolutely.

That to my mind is more important than either of the other two ?--- That is what I mean by adequate machinery of controlling the system, that there must be the possibility of fairly judging the compensation that is to be given, and fairly judging whether the terms of the contract on either side have been carried out or infringed. That is also the

way in which it is done in other countries.

MR LUCAS : It has been suggested to us that one way of meeting the various points is giving the farmers accessible labour, giving the native an opportunity to farm for himself and to keep cattle, and that scattered throughout the country there should be islands of native land. Have you thought about any such scheme ? When I put it to you, Professor Frankel, I mean of course that Professor Brookes also can answer it ?--- (Professor Brookes): I should like to say, if we went so far as to set aside definite islands of native land, I think we might go further and withdraw the operation of the Land Act altogether. Let the islands form themselves naturally. I mean, there is not much point in the view of dividing the country into two sets of areas, European and native, if the native areas are scattered about, just dotted about, for the purposes of labour.

DR ROBERTS : You would have to safeguard them, surely, those native areas ? You would not allow any European to have occupation in them, that the native would sell ?--- We say in our main evidence that we don't want to destroy existing native reserves. I took the question to refer to native areas.

THE CHAIRMAN : Dr Roberts' point is with regard to any of the new areas, would you give them the free right to sell to Europeans ?--- Oh yes, provided it was reciprocal. I would have a guaranteed minimum of the present native reserve, which is very largely protected by treaty - a solemn promise, anyhow - which could not be taken away; and as regards the rest I would have perfect freedom. It seems as if the bargain was in favour of the native, but we all know well it is not, because he is not in a position to

/ buy

buy more than a very small fraction of the rest of the land. If the situation ever arose that the native might be able to buy out the European, then would be the time for further restriction. I don't think it is necessary now.

DR ROBERTS : Don't you think he is much more unwise in his buying and selling, and that in a moment of emergency he might part with a considerable portion of what he has bought ?--- I don't see how we can give him special protection in regard to any new areas unless we exclude him from the rest of the country ~~ias~~ except those areas. The two things seem to me to go together.

You would not be prepared then to accept the idea in that proposed land measure, that when he does buy in this new area, whatever you call it, he may only sell to a native ?--- If our policy is definitely to create new areas, then I would agree with that. But my suggestion is, if the new areas are to be dotted about as islands among the white areas

That is not my view ?--- That was the original question.

The native cannot buy except adjoining a native area ?--- If we have that policy, if we restrict the areas for the native, then I would agree that for the present there should be restriction of re-sale, as laid down in the Act. But my point in answer to the question which suggested native areas dotted about all over the Union was, if we have that system, it does not seem worth while to have that machinery in special areas at all. Rather let us have a natural segregation.

MR LUCAS : I take it from the evidence you have given to-day, you are opposed to what is generally called the segregation policy ?--- (Professor Frankel): Yes.

It is quite impossible to reconcile it with the views you have put forward to-day ?--- Yes. (Professor Brookes): Yes, that is so.

MAJOR ANDERSON : Would you be opposed to it if it was feasible ?--- (Professor Brookes): I am not sure that I should. I began my thinking on this subject as a moderate segregationist and ...

DR ROBERTS: You were one of the first prophets ?--- Well, Mr Chairman, in reply to that, I might quote Mr on the broomstick: the difference between a broomstick and a fig-tree is that the fig-tree can put forward new shoots.

A broomstick is sometimes more handy, though ?--- That is so. What I was going to say in answer to the original question was that I personally have been driven away from looking for any hope in segregation, because I realise that the majority of people don't mean what they say when they say they are in favour of segregation. I wonder if I would take up the time of the Commission too long if I went back into history and referred to a very interesting Commission, the Natal Commission of 1852-1853. Now that was a Commission of twenty-three, of whom nineteen were farmers. There were only four officials on it. I think it is the most representative Commission we have ever had: there were nine Afrikaans-speaking, eight English-speaking, and two Germans on that Commission. So that they had a free hand to say what they wanted; it was a Commission of the average man. Now they said that they wanted segregation. They wanted to limit the natives in Natal to a fixed number, and no more were to come over the border. And they also had their ideas in 1852-1853 of a white labour policy, in that they wanted to introduce youngsters from the "ragged / schools"

"schools" of England to work on the farms. But while saying they were in favour of segregation, they wanted the natives in Natal put into smaller locations. They wanted them to pay rent for their plots, and they wanted them to be taxed in order to make them come out and work. And finally they said that the great object of native policy ought to be an "abundant and continuous supply of Kaffir labour for wages." Now this was a most significant Commission, and that combination of lip loyalty to segregation with the fact of wanting as much labour as possible, at as low rates as possible, is perfectly innocent of trouble in itself. That is what has influenced me about segregation: the minute you get to restricting native labour, it is all right in some other Colony, but not in the colony of which you are speaking. Hence I have been driven away from segregation as impracticable and as a policy which is preventing us from thinking out other remedies. (Professor Frankel): On this point I would also like just to mention, following up the last matter mentioned by Professor Brookes, if you have islands and limited areas, I am afraid when it comes to practically demarking them, you will have enormous difficulty. If you give the native permission to buy, then he can buy from any seller, and it is not a question of a democratic decision by people on race lines. I think this economic relation between the two peoples is a very useful one. In the Southern States, since the negroes buy motor cars and other things on the hire purchase system, you hear much less invidious remarks against them. He has become a consumer, and he is rated in quite a different capacity. I think it might be a desirable thing in

/ this

this country.

DR ROBERTS : Who sells him the motor-cars - usually coloured people ?--- No, whites and negroes. The negroes in business are not so numerous as in other occupations. There are a large number in Harlem, but I believe, as far as my information goes, in general negroes have not taken as well to commerce as to other occupations, especially farming. On this point of tenure, I would like to hand in to the Commission this United States Department of Agriculture bulletin, which contains statistics of the average value of farms, the size of farms, the number cultivated, and so on, which I think are extremely illuminating. If we can only get to the same level of productivity in this country, we would increase the national income, I should think, by as much as the whole of that part of the national income which comes from agriculture at the present time.

MAJOR ANDERSON : Do you think with our climate it is possible to reach that level of productivity ?--- I am afraid, Mr Anderson, I should very much like to answer that question, but I dare not do so. I am not an agricultural expert. I would only like to express the warning that I do not think we realise in this country yet what can be done in it. (Professor Brookes): I see that Dr de Kock in his "Ekonomiese en Handelswyse in Suidafrika" discusses that question, and he says that with American methods we ought to be able to increase our capital production to double what it is at the present day. I also am not an agricultural expert, but I quote from that.

I quite agree there is room for tremendous improvement, but you cannot eliminate the factor of these periodical droughts ?--- (Professor Frankel): There is one point that is overlooked, that is, surely with increased

/ knowledge

knowledge we may discover that in certain areas the wrong crops are being grown to-day; we would adapt ourselves better to the climatic conditions.

That is a possibility ?--- That is a possibility. I always feel you cannot compare the statistics of production and yield per acre, as I have done in our evidence, with other countries without feeling that there is some other factor than climate which is militating against our productivity. If you compare for instance the maize yield from the maize belt, that is to say, from the best maize districts, and you find that the yield is much lower than other countries, there must be something wrong somewhere, and it cannot all be climate.

There are natural factors of soil and climate which you cannot eliminate altogether ?--- Yes, but I maintain that we have never yet in this country had an adequate study made which would prove to us that it is really the climate which is the main cause; and therefore that is only an assumption.

We have got highly qualified experts working on this problem ?--- But they have not compared it with other countries, so far as I know. I may be wrong: I have not seen any definite comparisons which alleged that it is the climate that is hampering this country, and which have proved that in relation to other countries.

I don't see how you can ever eliminate those factors altogether ?--- Quite right: I agree with that, if those factors exist to the degree which you suggest.

MR LUCAS : I would be glad if you could give me the reference to the quotation from Sir George Grey on page 7 of your memorandum ?--- (Professor Brookes): That is a letter from Sir George Grey to the Lieutenant-Governor in Natal in I think the year 1846, which I got out of the archive

I see in page 13 you say the 1913 Act was really fore-casted as a recommendation from the Commission of 1903-1905 ?--- Yes.

I wish you could give me the references to the sections ?--- Paragraphs 184 to 199 inclusive. It is in Vol.I., the main Report.

On the next page, your reference to the same Commis-sion, Minority Report ?--- It is included I think in the same paragraphs. It is on page 88.

On page 14 you speak of the Glen Grey legislation as being far-sighted. Have you considered the effects of the Glen Grey system to-day ? The native is tied down to one four-morgen plot and cannot acquire more except in the rare case now of his having more than one wife; and no expansion can take place without the consent of two-thirds of the holders to an encroachment on the commonage. Isn't that now a very severe restriction to advancement ?--- There are of course objections to the Glen Grey system. That is one of them, but I think where one is justified in calling it far-sighted is in this sense, that nothing more advanced than that would have been accepted by either the Government or the natives as the first step in the direction of individual tenure. If we did want to go further and to allow free exchange, and larger plots, well, we have got so far already, we have only got to legislate to the contrary. And we could not have done that without taking that first step.

You regard it as an advance by having that which can now be used as a foundation ?--- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN : We will, I fear, have to arrange for another day on which to continue the evidence. Will Monday morning suit you ?--- (Professor Brookes): It goes without

/ saying

saying we must fit in with the Commission. If there is no choice, it must be Monday, but Monday is a particularly bad day for me.

DR ROBERTS : Would Saturday suit you ?--- Saturday is all right, as far as I am concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN : Will Saturday morning do ?--- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN : The Commission will continue with your evidence on Saturday morning, at 10 o'clock.

THE COMMISSION adjourned at 4.30 p.m. until Friday, May 15th, 1931, at 10 a.m.

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.