

# NATIVE TAXES NOT TOO HIGH

Del C  
Mrs. Deneys Reitz

Gives Figures  
9/11/36

JOHANNESBURG, Friday.

Mrs. Deneys Reitz, M.P., who this morning refuted the statement that native taxation was too high, elaborated on her point in an interview with Reuter this afternoon and quoted some interesting figures not published hitherto.

The direct taxation payable by natives consisted of a general tax of £1 a year payable by every male native between the ages of 18 and 65 years and a local tax of 10s. a hut a year payable by the occupier for every hut or dwelling in a rural native location or reserve. The latter tax was not payable in respect of land held on quitrent tenure.

Three-fifths of the general tax went to the consolidated revenue fund, while the remaining two-fifths was paid into the native trust fund for education and native development.

The proceeds of the local tax and quitrent collected within their respective areas of jurisdiction were paid to the various native local councils established throughout the Union, while the local tax and quitrent collected in areas in which there was no native local council was paid to the trust fund.

## STATUTORY GRANT

In addition to the amounts credited to the native development account (the trust described above), that account also received a statutory grant of £340,000 a year from the Union revenue, which formed part of the grants to Provincial Councils for native education.

The following figures for the last financial year (1935-36) should, she thought, be a fairly convincing reply to the statement that the native got little or no return for the heavy burden of direct taxation:—

Revenue: General tax, £1,275,166; local tax and quitrent, £273,699; total revenue, £1,548,865.

Expenditure: Grants to provinces for native education, £672,784; agricultural education, £36,479; equipment, livestock and buildings, £5,611; irrigation and boring operations, £4,581; grants to hospitals, £8,193; payments to native local councils, £208,634; dipping of stock, £28,855; roads, bridges and irrigation, £1,610; location fencing, £1,216; miscellaneous, £1,461; total, £969,424.

To this had to be added the cost of administering the Native Affairs Department in the interests of the native, which amounted to £467,488; the purchase of land for native settlement, amounting to £68,371; special grants for the relief of distress, £50,000, making a total of expenditure of £1,555,283.

## DEBIT BALANCE.

This left a debit balance of about £7,000, which had to be made good by Parliament. Then there was a further additional item voted by Parliament for anti-soil erosion, the actual amount spent on the reclamation of native reserves being £36,595.

This year the Union was spending far more and Parliament had voted additional sums of £35,000 for education and £1,000,000 for the purchase and development of land and the amount they received from native taxes would not nearly meet the expenditure they were incurring.

The position was that today the white population was spending nearly as much again as the natives themselves had paid in any taxation, concluded Mrs. Reitz.—Reuter.

(See page 13, columns 1 and 2.)

Collection no: A1655

Collection: HUNT, Donald Papers

**PUBLISHER:**

*Publisher:*- Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand

*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.