

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

comply with definite regulations. Your lessees will have to cultivate the land in the same way as the crofters do in Scotland. The crofters in Scotland are given a very definite status.

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

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

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

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

Why not? I look at it from this point of view. When we speak of segregation, we speak of a mass of the population who want to put them aside, but I do not consider that the five Natives who live on my farm should necessarily be taken away from my farm and put into a bigger reserve. Segregation means taking the mass of these people.

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

There are some people who have the idea that all the Natives should be taken, even those small numbers on individual farms. Col. Stallard, for instance, has that idea, and he says, "You must take all the Natives and put them into a reserve. Well, to my mind, that is quite impractical?-- You want your labour left with you?"

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

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

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

FOR Labour. I am really worried by the way in which agriculture is losing the best of its labour.

I do not think agriculture is losing the best of its labour. Where we are losing, we are losing the rich Natives. You may perhaps call them the best. I am referring to the man who has 50 head of cattle and who has a difference with his employe~~t~~, with his master. If he comes to my farm today, I have to tell him that I cannot take him?-- The opinion which I got all over the country from farmers and magistrates and people who are really in touch with the situation is that the best types of Native are leaving the land for two reasons. The one reason is that they must get cash in order to satisfy their needs today, and secondly, owing to the uncertainty of their relationship, the relations between themselves and the farmers, they are not content to remain on the land. These are the two main points, but there are lots of others. These are the points given to me all over the country, as to why agriculture is losing the best of its labour. Well, I want agriculture to be able to retain its labour supply as against the rather extravagant wages of town life.

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

On the High Veld it is rather better. I think the Native labour is scarce. Mr. Mostert, who is a member of

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

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

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

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

He will require the whole of his family on his own behalf ?-- We do not contemplate a large farm, only a small

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

tenant farm. It depends, of course, on the nature of the land and on the area. Some such thing as you have in the Transkei; not larger than 10 or 12 acres.

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

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

Where are you going to draw the line? If I

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

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

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

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

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

Even in Scotland, the crofter has someone over him ?-- Well, I do not know whether it is to the advantage of Scotland to have that kind of person. I think it is to the benefit of agriculture. Agriculture by Natives would

MR. RHEINALL/JONES

benefit by a progressive European developing his area to the best advantage. That is what I have in mind.

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

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

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

But that will be the effect?-- It takes some time to get new ideas into anyone's head and probably a Native agriculturist will take some time to get into it,

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

but from my own discussions with Natives and Native groups, I can say that they are so terribly hungry for land under decent conditions, that you will have any number of competitors for your leases on your farms.

No, Mr. Jones, you will not. All farmers are conservative and the Native is also conservative. If you go to the poorer class of White man today, you will get ten applicants for land on your farm, but if you say to them, "I want you to pay me £25 per year for that land," they will say "No." ?-- One can only go by experience, and I know in certain areas of the Cape where there are Native tenants what the position is. There are districts in the Cape where there are tenants, 709 tenants, and I made investigations and found that the average rental which they tenants pay is somewhere about £60 per year each and they are only too glad to get that land.

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

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

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: You say in your statement that conditions on the sugar estates are very bad, and there they have the cash basis, have they not ?-- Quite. But the mere word "cash" is not like "blessed Mesopotamia", it does not give you heaven at once. But it is a way by

MR. REYNOLDS JONES

which you can reach salvation, and that is all I say; and when I use these terms, they are very categorically used and you have all sorts of conditions attached to them and all sorts of degrees when you work up to these conditions of cash basis. Your land worker today -- hardly anyone of them get sufficient cash to meet their needs, and I can speak of scores of cases when I say that. That is an experience which I have come across practically all over the country.

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

I would like someone to make that experiment and cut up his farm into ten-acre plots for twenty Natives and depend on the labour which he would get?-- He would probably have a bad experience in individual cases, but what

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

we are discussing is this. In what direction shall we turn our faces? We have bad traditions and one of those bad traditions is this, that it is not worth while working at all. I have heard Natives saying over and over again that working on the tenant labour basis is working for a dead horse. Well, we have to get away from that and we have to rectify the view which they have, that it is not worth while working at all.

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

That is where our difference is. You want to turn South Africa into decent farming for the Native ?-- No, Mr. van Niekerk, not only for the Native. I have in mind the White bywoner as well as the Native squatter. My heart aches for him. I find them pouring in here. I talk to

MR. RHEINALLTJONES

the boys and say "will you not go back to the land" - and the things they tell me of the reasons why they will not stay on the land -- for one thing, they say there is no future for them.

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

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

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

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

his rent, he loses his lease.

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

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

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

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

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: My difficulty is this. I shall give you a concrete case. Say that the average land which the farmers give to the Natives as labour tenants works out at 2 morgen. Now, if he has to lease the land to the Native, in order to make him a self-contained man, the least you would give in dry land would be 20 morgen of land. He would not be able to exist on anything under that and you would have to give him some grazing, too. Take

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

my case, for instance. Any farmer employs 10 labour tenants. He will probably give 20 morgen of his land for cultivation by these Natives. That is 2 morgen to each. Working on the system which you want him to do, the farmer will have to give these Natives 200 morgen of land. Your Transkei Native has proved today that he cannot exist on that land as a pure farmer, even with a huge communal grazing?-- In the Eastern Transvaal, it was reckoned that the Native required 4 morgen of land for cultivation and 14 for grazing.

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

That is a very low rate of existence - can a man exist on  $4\frac{1}{2}$  morgen of land - he cannot do it. The idea of three acres and a cow has exploded, and that was not dry land?-- No, that is so.

My difficulty is that if you really want the Native to be a self-supporting man on the land by itself, then you have to give him a good deal of land?-- Of course, I would not for one moment dream of arguing on a point like that with you, because you know more about that than I do; I am just arguing the principle. You are discussing the suggestions which I have put forward as if I were proposing to impose this thing with one catastrophic stroke. If your land is not suitable for allowing leasing to Natives, then obviously you would not go in for that sort of thing. My point is that if we are going to make a transition from the present system, we have to provide the means whereby that transition can easily be made, and without disturbing

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

the social or economic position of the country, which I say the 1913 Land Act, by its very final prohibition of leasing land to Natives has done -- it has done a great injustice to agriculture as well as to the Native. I say cancel that prohibition and then use common sense in each district and, if the Land Committee in that district says "Here is land which is very suitable for the farmer to have one or two or three Native tenants on", these tenants can be put there under definite conditions and I am sure that slowly and satisfactorily we would transfer our agricultural organization from the present unsuitable position to a much more suitable and progressive state of affairs. I am pleading for commonsense instead of hard and fast lines in legislation.

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

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

"persons, this would give 22 morgen per family -- a little over one fifth more than the figure of  $18\frac{1}{4}$  morgen per family recommended in the Eastern Transvaal Report.

Allowing for a natural increase of 2% per annum, (the rate of increase which Mr. Cousins, in his census report, sets down for Europeans, alleged to be less than the Native rate), the saturation point would be reached in just over ten years. The Beaumont report was based on 1911 figures, so that the saturation point was reached in 1921.

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

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

The Commission set out to set apart and recommended that a total morgenage of 8,365,744 morgen, making a total of 18,300,000 morgen of guaranteed Native areas. This would have given an average of 8.08 morgen per head or 40.3 morgen per family of five in respect of the  $\frac{2}{7}$ ths of the Native population in Native areas. But what about

**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.