

MR. NEVELING

MAJOR ANDERSON: Sometimes due to the land being too hard to plough?-- Yes, and often as a result of inefficient work. Then again, where they have to go in and out, it is much easier for them to go over the banks. On such bits of ground where he is on the banks, it speaks for itself that your crop will not be as good there as it may elsewhere. That is one big factor which has to be borne in mind.

Breakage of implements is another factor?-- Yes. I have already touched on the question of inefficiency in regard to machinery and implements, but I may mention that here, too. There is this breakage of implements and the high depreciation on implements. Another factor would be in connection with planting -- take mealies again. It is possible with an inefficient labourer that you may find all sorts of things being done as they should not be done and that, of course, would reduce your production. In harrowing, for instance, some parts may not be properly harrowed.

CHAIRMAN: Without supervision, is the ploughing always done at the depth that is postulated?-- No; and that is another thing, the depth of ploughing. You may have a bit of ground in the lands through which a man does not find it too easy to plough at once.

Is that where the Native ploughs with the farmer's plough and the farmer's oxen -- in those cases, does he not see to it that he ploughs to the right depth?-- It is much easier for him just to plough anyhow. It is not necessary for him to take much trouble about driving the oxen. All he has to do is to inspan the oxen and to make them go and he need not take any further trouble and that is why he so often does not go to the right depth.

MR. NEVELING

It is easier for the man who holds the plough tail not to go to any depth?-- Well, I will not say it is easier for the man who holds the tail. If he ploughs more deeply, he would go more easily.

A man can set his plough at one particular depth?--
yes.

MR. LUCAS: The table which Professor Brooks and Dr. Frankel put in shewed a very much lower yield in these areas than in other countries, in the United States, for instance, and in other countries. Now, is there any other cause to which that can be attributed, excepting the cause of inefficient labour?-- Yes. One very important cause is in regard to the climate. We have not got the right climate. You see, our climate is rather up and down. One year you will not get your rains at the right time for ploughing. You have to get your rain regularly for your young plants, you have to do everything at the proper time.

CHAIRMAN: In a good year, you may get from the same land a crop two or three times as large as you might get in an average year?-- Yes. You say it is an average for the maize producing districts, this figure which Dr. Frenkel quoted?

No, I think it is for the Free State only?-- In taking all the average figures of maize production, I think a very much better figure would be got, a very much more reliable figure, if you took the actual maize areas and not only the districts.

They refer to the maize triangle?-- Even then it is still too large. You take a district like Vereeniging; there is just one particular circle which is a maize area, but in order to arrive at the average figure for Vereeniging,

MR. NEVELING

you take that, plus the outlying areas in the district, which, of course, reduces your average. My idea is that you must take the average for the actual maize belt in the district.

MR. LUCAS: Have you done that at all?-- No, I have not.

CHAIRMAN: You have not got the facilities in the Department?-- No.

MR. LUCAS: Take the areas that are strictly speaking mealie areas. Are you able to compare the standard of work there with the standard of work and the standard of production in mealie areas in other countries?--, I cannot do that really, because I have not got sufficient information as to the mealie production in a country like the Argentine or the United States of America. Still, I know that the Argentine production, that is, the average production, is 19 bags to the morgen. In some parts of our maize area, in the Ventersdorp area, for instance, I know of farms where they obtain from 20 to 30 bags to the morgen, and then Ventersdorp is not considered to be our best mealie area. If they can do that, then surely we can do that in other parts of our maize area. It is simply a matter of introducing the necessary amount of phosphates and even kraal manures when it comes to that. But, in the other countries, they work on a more intensive system and they are supplying the necessary artificial manures and fertilizers.

DR. ROBERTS: Have you not got a very regular climate in the Argentine, with considerable mists coming down at the very time when the mealies come up?-- The Argentine climate is certainly more regular than ours is. The maize belt there

MR. NEVELING

8502

is a bit to the interior and it is not as regular as the wheat area, for instance, but it is certainly better than the rest.

CHAIRMAN: It appears also --- it depends also, when you take an average in a country on the quality of the marginal acre. If a marginal acre is of a higher quality in the one country than in the other, then the yield must be higher?-- The production is more concentrated.

The marginal would be a better acre?-- Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Is a higher marginal value there due to the fact that they have to pay more for their labour - what is the reason?-- I say that climatic reasons would account for a very great deal.

What is the principal reason?-- I should say the climatic reason is the principal.

MAJOR ANDERSON: The South African yield could be improved by more efficient methods?-- Undoubtedly.

MR. LUCAS: Have you been able to form any opinion as to the extent to which wage labour has been able to replace the labour tenant? have you been able to form any opinion as to the change from labour tenancy to wage labour?-- I can only say that there has been a certain amount of displacement of cash wages for wages in kind, but on the whole, as I say in my memorandum, the Native is very much averse to accepting a cash wage.

You mention two reasons in your memorandum; the one is that he cannot buy as cheaply as he should be able to, and the second reason is his cattle?-- Yes, and then there is another reason. He wants a certain piece of land which he wants to be able to call his own and where he can grow things.

MR. NEVELING

He prefers that very much to a cash basis.

Do you see any way of tackling the first point, that is, enabling him to buy his goods at a reasonable figure in view of the wages which he will get?-- Well, the only way would be to enable him to obtain his requirements direct from the farmer, but even in cases where farmers have offered their Natives so many bags of mealies at threshing time, the Natives have refused to give up their lands. They want their lands. You will find, therefore, that it is mainly the Native who holds out for land. The farmers, especially in our maize areas, are to a large extent willing to pay cash wages instead of giving land, because they realise that they can produce the amount which the Native would cost them in cash on that particular bit of land.

MAJOR ANDERSON: So it comes to this, that the opposition lies more with the Natives than with the farmer to go in for cash wages?-- Yes, I think I can say that that is very definite, although I must qualify that to this extent, that, in the grazing areas, you find the farmers do not mind giving land because the risk is also on the Native. Let me explain that. If he has to pay a Native a cash wage and he himself has a bad crop, it may come rather hard on him. If he supplies the Native with land and the Native bears part of the risk, then it is better for the farmer. In the more extensive grazing areas, some of the farmers would prefer to give the Natives land rather than giving them cash.

MR. LUCAS: Now you make a point that, as the Native's holding of cattle becomes less, so his means of investing, his means of saving money become less?-- Yes. I say that, as the opportunities for keeping cattle become less, so his opportunities for saving become less and for

MR. NEVELING

INvesting.

And he will have no encouragement to save ?-- Quite so.

DR. ROBERTS: You do not think that he might drift into the desire to save money ?-- Well, I do not know whether I mentioned it here, but it seems to me that the Native is not yet educated to the point of actually saving money.

Except in very rare cases ?-- Yes, that is so. I came across one particular instance where a Native had saved £600 and he had put that money into the bank.

MR. LUCAS: But as you point out, that is of little value to the man, except in the reserves ?-- Yes. For investment purposes, the money is only useful in the reserves.

CHAIRMAN: I do not know, he has £30 per year from that £600 and he can do pretty well on that?-- Yes, but the £600 must remain in the bank. He cannot invest that money, - all he can do is to leave it in the bank and for that he gets an interest of $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4%.

MAJOR ANDERSON: He could buy Union Loan Certificates ?-- I wonder how many Natives know about that.

A man who had saved £600 would probably be capable of grasping that ?-- Yes, I suppose so.

MR. LUCAS: Now, you make a point about the importance of giving the Native more scope to advance. You think that that would have a material affect on his efficiency as a labourer if such opportunity were given to him ?-- Yes, I think so, for the reason that you give him something to work for. That is a great point.

Do you know of any instances where he has that now, where you can point to the improvement which has taken place through his having that opportunity ?-- I know that they have that opportunity in some parts of the Cape, but I do not

MR. NEVELING

KNOW that area sufficiently well to be able to point out to cases where improvements has taken place, but theoretically it seems to me that it is very possible.

We had oge or two instances in practise. I just wanted to add to them if I could get them from you. Now, your proposal is to recognise share farming, to legalise it, and then ultimately go over into rent-paying?-- Yes, but quite remotely.

Yes, but you visualised that as a possibility?-- Yes.

What limits would you put on share farming, because the old system had a very bad effect on the Whites?-- Yes, that system had a bad effect on the Whites because of the fact that they had plenty of land. It paid a farmer who had a big farm, a man who had three or four thousand morgen of land, to have that farm altogether farmed by Natives. His return was still sufficient for him to make a fair living. Today, farms are 500 morgen and less, and it is not possible under the present economic conditions for that farmer to hand over his whole farm to Natives.

Can I put it this way. What sort of conditions would you stipulate for share farming, to get a feeling of security and the prospect of advance for the Natives, which would give you the advantages which you want?-- I am afraid I have not gone into that question to any extent, as to the actual form that tenant farming has to take, which the share system has to take. As far as I can see, it would simply be a question of laying down that share farming is possible.

But do you think that it will be necessary to lay down too that the contract must be for a certain fairly lengthy period of, say, from 5 to 10 years?-- I would not say a lengthy period, but we do want a certain amount of security

MR. NEVELING

of tenure. Up to now, and it is still the general practise also among the White, that is, among the Bywoners, for the contract to be for just one year. Then, of course, it depends on the extent to which the individual cultivating that land makes good, which means that a farmer always has a certain weapon in his hands. The farmer may find that, instead of appreciating the land, the share farmer really depreciates the value of his holding, and if the contract goes for a long period of years, it would simply mean that he would be in the hands of that particular individual, and that is the very thing that they want to avoid.

So that you want protection from that point of view for the farmer?-- Yes. That is necessary.

But do you not also want protection for the farmer, so that he can be encouraged to fertilise, the fertilisation not being used up in the same year in which it takes place and also to encourage him - that is, the Native, the share farmer, to use his lands properly and make various improvements, ----- in that way, you would also protect and encourage the Native?-- Yes, but you see, if we make the system so very intricate, it may defeat its own object. It is a question of residual values of fertilizers and such matters forming part of the contract, which is the case in England and such countries, but I do not think that we have reached the stage here where we can lay down very definitely any specific lines in that particular regard.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You are prepared to leave it entirely as a matter of arrangement between the farmer and the tenant?-- Yes, for the immediate future, I think so. I certainly think that that would be best.

CHAIRMAN:

MR. NEVELING

CHAIRMAN: You want to safeguard against share farming deteriorating into robbery farming?-- Yes, exactly; and in the case of the Native who we know is rather inclined towards poor methods of production, it is rather to the advantage of the farmer and the country that the farmer should have some hold over his tenant farmer.

MR. LUCAS: Are you not lessening or losing the main factor in your scheme, that is, giving the Native some incentive to advance?-- You are giving him the incentive and it is up to him to make use of it.

He may do well for a couple of years, say, on one third share, and another Native may see how well he is doing and he may go to the farmer and offer half and then the first Native will get turned out. The tenant will only improve his property if he has some security of tenure. Now, is not that going to be a serious danger if that security of tenure is not there?-- It may be a danger, although I cannot see it. You may get such cases, but on the whole I think you will find very few Natives making use of the share system, because there will not be any opportunity to make use of it.

We are told that there was a large number using the share system in the Free State before 1913 and that they were turned out in large numbers when the Land Act came into operation. Do you think there would not be as large a number to go back to the share system and able to do so if the law were altered?-- There are quite a number who would like to go back to the share system, but I think, from my knowledge of Native conditions in the rural areas, that I cannot see that too many of them actually

MR. NEVELING

would have the opportunity. There are fewer opportunities today than there used to be in the past.

You mean, conditions have changed to such an extent that Natives would not be able to avail themselves of such opportunities, even if the law were amended?-- That is so.

CHAIRMAN: Would there be very much land, not taking the Backveld, but in the developed agricultural areas where farmers would take on Natives on a share basis?-- I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

MAJOR ANDERSON: It is partly governed by the question of which would pay him best?-- Yes.

Mr. Thornton said yesterday that, under present economic conditions, it would probably pay him better to share out his land than to try and cultivate his land himself?-- Yes, in some cases that may be so, but it is not so everywhere.

The Native can cultivate at lower costs?-- It depends on the individual farmer. It is not only an economic question, it is a social question as well. You will find some farmers who would actually refuse even if they found it to be economical.

You mean that they would refuse on principle?-- Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thornton also postulated a system approximating very closely to the metayage system, with supervision by the farmer?-- Yes. It seems to me that, in granting such provision for share farming, you must leave a certain weapon in the hands of the farmer - you must leave the whip hand with the farmer. That is how it appeals to me.

MR. LUCAS: Is not the whip always in the hand of the landowner?-- Not always. Not if you are bound hand and foot by a contract.

The farmer has a pretty strong whip anyway?-- (No answer).

MR. NEVELING

CHAIRMAN: Would not a problem of residual values emerge at a later stage, when the Native has already developed to the stage of getting the best out of the land?-- Yes, exactly, that is what I said.

You would not have the problems of residual values in the early stage of the metayage system?-- You will have the residual value from the start if the Native fertilises.

If the farmer gives the fertilisers, the Native does not contribute?-- That is a different matter. Under the share system, it is possible that you may find the farmer giving the fertilisers in order that he may be able to increase his own income. That, of course, would be quite logical. I can see that that may happen in such instances.

Well, then, the farmer has put in the residual value?-- Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Is not the way in which he could save his land, if you had a five years or 10 years contract and if he were to insist that fertilisation should be applied and fertilisers be used in the way that he directed?-- That would be taking the actual onus out of the hands of the worker. You must leave a certain amount of freedom in the hands of the man who actually works the land. If you stipulate by contract that the farmer must supply the fertiliser, you may find a number who would not be prepared to enter under those conditions.

The farmer can stipulate that himself. I do not say that the law must lay it down?-- No, I see. Yes, that may be allright then.

You say here that the prohibition under the 1913 Act is frequently evaded. Have you any knowledge of that yourself?-- Yes, I have definite knowledge of that.

MR. NEVELING

Could you tell us the ways in which it is evaded ?--
I will not mention any names, if you do not mind.

No, we do not want any names; but can you give us any instances of the way in which it is evaded ?-- Yes, one way in which that is done is this. The farmer perhaps draws up a contract with the Native - a contract by law. He registers that and then he goes back and allows the Native to work on the share system. If anything crops up, he simply refers to the contract.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Which he has actually ignored?--Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It means that there is collusion between the farmer and the Native. The contract is a screen behind which they can hide their collusion ?-- Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: Is not that immoral and illegal, both ?-- It is illegal, and of course it is immoral, too. Any evasion of the law is immoral.

MR. LUCAS: Have you come across any other forms of evasion of the Act ?-- The main evasion which takes place is as a result of a mutual understanding between the farmer and the labourer, but there are various other ways of getting behind the Act as well.

Do you very often come into contact with cases of evasion of the law, or are you going now on what you have been informed ?-- I am mainly going on what I am informed, but of course I try and probe such matters as much as possible. One particular instance came to my notice, where a Native was farming on the share system and, at the time of the harvest, the farmer told the Native to bring his share of the crop to a certain barn. This the Native refused to do. The farmer went to an attorney and had a letter

MR. NEVELING

sent to the Native in which the Native was instructed to hand over the stuff. But, of course, the Native was well informed and the result was that he went off the farm with the total crop, - he took the total crop with him.

MR. LUCAS: The farmer could not proceed in Court?-- No.

In any of these instances where you have tried to probe into the circumstances, have you found that the Natives have been working any better when there has been the share system than they have done on^a neighbouring farm?-- No, I cannot say that they have been working better, because, in those instances_x where there has really been an evasion of the law, I do not think that the Native has gone all out to produce as much as possible.

When you speak of share farming being adopted ---- I am referring to what you say at the bottom of page 9 of your statement. You say here, "share farming such as I am pleading for here, will only come when the Native himself has control of the means of production. The Native will remain a wage worker until he has saved enough money to enable him to lead a semi-independent existence. As he improves his position as a share-farmer and as he is being trained under the supervision of the owner in the application of better methods of production, the Native farmer will eventually reach a stage when it will be^{more} profitable to him to pay a fixed amount for the use of the ground than to hand over part of the crop, but for this he will probably not be ripe for the next two generations." Now, what do you mean by saying that, by saying that share farming will be the only way by which Natives will have control of the

MR. NEVELING

means of production ?-- Well, I mean that the Natives must have sufficient capital to be able to buy his own implements and his own oxen. He must not be dependent on the farmer for these means of production.

That, of course, is one of the main differences between the ordinary share farming and the metayage system which Mr. Thornton was referring to, because there he wanted the farmer to provide everything ?-- Yes. That is what is happening today. We have not got the actual system, but the farmer is at present supervising his Natives working on his farm, some of them working for themselves and some of them working for the farmer, so, as far as the actual incentive to work is concerned, you may not have made very great advances.

MR. LUCAS: I think there is a very great difference between what we have today and between what Mr. Thornton is recommending?-- Yes. Under that system, the individual is working for himself and he is giving a share of that to the farmer under the supervision of the farmer. Under the share system, it would, of course, mean that the Native is altogether independent of the farmer, but, under our conditions, where the Native must still be dependent on the farmer for advice, there would still be a certain amount of supervision from the farmer. Under the share system as well.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thornton, in his suggestions, provides for very close supervision ?-- Yes.

DR. FOURIE: OpOblads. 9, in die tweede paragraaf, daar se U dat die naturel wat op die plaas woon geen besondere neiging het om onder die stam organisasie terug te keer waarvan hul reeds so lank ontvreemd was nie. U wil

tog nie se nie, dat dit algemeen is dat naturelle wat op boereplase is, ontstam is?--Nee, dit wil ek nie se nie.

U bedoel dit seker net vir naturelle wat veraf van hul stam is. Wat byvoorbeeld 'n naturel van Sekoekoenieland wat in Ventersdorp woon?--Nee, hy is nog nie heelmaal ontstam nie; hy beskou hom nog as lid van die stam, maar vir alle praktiese belange is hy tog nie langer lid van die stam nie.

U meen sy stam organisasie is verbreek?--Ja.

Maar ons moet versigtig wees. In dele van die Transvaal het ons woonkaffers wat nog suiver stam kaffers is?--Ja, maar ek denk tog dat 'n baie groot deel van ons plaas kaffers voel hulself nie ontstam nie; hul voel hul is plaas kaffers want hul woon al jare lank op die plase.

Ja, hul woon op 'n plaas; maar die blote feit dat hy op 'n plaas woon, ontstam dit hom?--Nee. Nie wat die sosiale betekenis betref, of die historiese verband, maar vir doeleinde van regering of van belasting, daar voel hy homself wel degelik ontstam en neem hy ook die houding in, dat hy ontstam is. In die opsigte is sy posisie totaal verander as wat dit was.

Dit mag wees, maar ons getuigenis het vir ons getoon & daar is nog plaas kaffers wat nog belasting opbring vir hul kaptains wat by die stam is?--Daar sal sulke gevalle wees.

Dit is nie net uitsonderings, daar is baie sulke gevalle deur die hele land?--Ja, dit mag wees.

Daar is nog baie kaffers wat, alhoewel hul weg is van die stam, nog altyd die stam verband volg en die stam gewoontes in swang hou?--Ja, hul voel die historiese verband, en ook die sosiale verband baie sterk, maar ek sou se, dat die suiwer ekonomiese ding--dit is te se die suiwer besittings gewoontes wat nog in die stam bestaan, nie aantreklikheid vir die plaas kaffers het nie. Dit is net die sentimentele verband....

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.