

THE POLITICAL CAREER OF SAUL SOLOMON
MEMBER OF THE CAPE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

from
1854 to 1883.

A THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF M.A.

ETHEL DRUS

UNIVERSITY OF CAPETOWN.

1939.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

THE POLITICAL CAREER OF SAUL SOLOMON FROM 1854-1883

CONTENTS

FOREWORD.

- CHAPTER 1. Introductory. 1817-1854
- CHAPTER 2. His Social-Political Views
- CHAPTER 3. Separation
- CHAPTER 4. Responsible Government
- CHAPTER 5. His Position
- CHAPTER 6. The Molteno Government
- CHAPTER 7. The Sprigg Government
- CHAPTER 8. The Scanlen Government
- CHAPTER 9. Last Years.

FOREWORD.

Saul Solomon was born in 1817 and died in 1892. He was never a member of the Legislative Council, so that his political career can be said to have begun in 1854, when he was returned to the first House of Assembly as one of the four members representing Capetown. He held his seat with a break of only one year, in 1869, until 1883, when illness compelled him to retire. To my mind, prior to 1854, he was but an 'amateur' politician, using the word in no depreciatory sense, and I therefore propose to concentrate most of my attention on his parliamentary career.

The period from 1854 to 1883 falls naturally into two sections, the dividing line being in 1872. During the years of Representative Government (1854-1872), Cape politics were rather narrowly localised. The three most important political questions were all aimed, fundamentally, at constitutional amendment, in one direction or another. The Easterns demanded Separation - the Westerns (chiefly), Responsible Government, and Mr. Solomon campaigned for a repeal of Schedule C of the Reserved Civil List Ordinance of 1853(1), providing for religious grants out of the public revenue. Of course, it is not possible to draw a rigid line of demarcation between the periods prior and subsequent to the introduction of Responsible Government, for the Eastern agitation flickered on for another few years and the Voluntary Bill was only enacted in 1875 - yet unmistakably 1872 marks the end of one period and the beginning of another.

(1). Eybers, p. 57.

The increase in area (1) of the Cape between 1872 and 1883 is a significant indication of the broadening of the political questions confronting the Cape Parliament. (2). The most important of these go far beyond the frontiers of the Colony in their implications. The agitation for 'Confederation' is obviously of South African interest. So is the political organisation of the Dutch in the Boeren Beschermings Vereniging and the Afrikaner Bond, coupled with which, to a certain extent, though not entirely, is the issue of Imperialism versus Colonialism. At this time too, native affairs receive a maximum of attention from the Cape Parliament.

Another distinguishing feature is that in the first period, the various issues are much more loosely intertwined than is the case in the second.

Consequently, the two sections have been handled differently. The part played by Mr. Solomon in the movements for Separation and Responsible Government, respectively, has been related in distinct chapters. Another chapter examines his views on 'Social-Political' questions, for which the close concentration on domestic affairs during the period of Representative Government, has furnished ample material.

With the introduction of Responsible Government, the centre of the stage is occupied by the Administration of the day. By this time, Mr. Solomon's views are in no doubt and the interest is then to estimate his influence on the different ministries.

Newspapers were the main source of information. From them I obtained reports of debates, (3) (Hansard only begins in 1884), editorial reviews, and accounts of meetings, banquets, and the like. The Imperial Bluebooks were not very useful, but whenever I could find them, I drew upon the notes of contemporaries. Unfortunately, I have not been able to obtain any private letters, written either by or to him. It is disappointing, but no real obstacle to a consideration of his political career, since he was a most conscientious parliamentarian and never neglected a suitable occasion to express his views.

However it is true that the lack of private information is a serious drawback in the attempt to reconstruct the pre-Parliamentary period, whose main interest is as a prelude.

-
- (1). In 1871 Basutoland was annexed and held till the Cape voluntarily handed it back to the Imperial Government in 1883. In 1879 Fingoland and Griqualand East were annexed to the Colony. A Bill was passed to annex Griqualand West in 1877, but did not become operative till 1880.
 - (2). As late as 1880, R.F. Statham described Cape politics as the 'small dog with the three inch stride'. Blacks, Boers and British, Page 45.
 - (3). For this purpose I used the 'South African Commercial Advertiser and Mail' up to 1863, and after that the 'Cape Argus' except where otherwise stated.

During this time he occupied no recognised political position so that his views might be recorded in an official journal and further, for a considerable part of the period, he was young, so that none but his intimates knew or cared, what he thought and did. All his contemporaries are long dead. With some of these and with Mr. Solomon's widow, Mr. R. Kilpin was in touch in 1921, but the information he put into his article (1) is meagre. Dr. Louis Herrman's chapter on the Solomon family in the 'The Jews in South Africa', contains some useful biographical material, but it needed checking on points as, to a lesser extent, did Mr. Kilpin's article. It is noteworthy that when he died in 1892, the obituaries contained very little about his life and activities before he entered Parliament. Even in 1864, R. W. Murray wrote, (2) "I desire it to be understood that Mr. Solomon's public character was, if not altogether formed in the House, but little known when he was elected to a seat in that House". Consequently, I was obliged to search through several Capetown newspapers of the time, on the offchance of finding mention of him. As might be expected, it was on the whole a fruitless labour.

I might record here the attempts I personally made to obtain private information. At the suggestion of Judge Saul Solomon, I wrote to Miss Daisy Solomon, who lives in England. She replied that she had sent what papers remained in her possession to a relative who was writing a history of the family. A few months later, I again wrote to her, but have received no reply. Miss Emilie Solomon was leaving for England when she received my letter and promised to see me on her return - she died on her arrival in England. I spoke to her over the telephone before she left and do not think that she could have helped me very much, though she could probably have related some interesting anecdotes. Advised by Dr. Herrman, I wrote to Mrs. Dick whose mother was Mr. Solomon's niece, Mary Solomon, and was well-known as Mrs. John Brown, but neither she nor Mrs. Anne Lewis, another niece, had any papers. Mr. Charles Murray, whose parents were very friendly with the Solomons, could not help me either. Mr. Allen Loxton showed me the little the Cape Argus library contained on Mr. Solomon and also advised me to write to Mr. Alan Solomon, whom he said was very interested in the family history. After twice being given the wrong address, I gave up, as it was already late in the year. Mr. Kilpin felt that the notes he had taken from contemporaries were strictly confidential and that he could not show them to me. The Rev. Hedly Parks showed me the records of the Congregational Church (I wanted to establish the date of his baptism), but none of these went far enough back for my purpose.

(1). Cape Argus. April 23rd, 1921. "Pioneers of Parliament" - "Saul Solomon" by R. Kilpin.

(2). R. W. Murray 'Pen and Ink Sketches in Parliament' by Limer. (1884) Book 2, (1864) page 47.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTORY. 1817 - 1864.⁵

The first Jewish immigrant to settle in St. Helena, was Saul Solomon, the eldest son of the twenty-one children of an Anglo-Jewish merchant Nathaniel Solomon, and his wife Phoebe, (1) In 1796, as a young man of twenty, he left London, presumably for reasons of trade, on a ship bound for India. Being taken seriously ill on the voyage, he was landed at St. Helena. On the recovery of his health, he decided to remain on the island and set about building up an extremely lucrative shipping and trading business at the port of Jamestown, so that he came, in due course, to be known as the "Merchant-King of St. Helena". As the business expanded, he took as his partner a Mr. Moss, and he was joined by his brothers Joseph and Benjamin. Saul Solomon, the Cape politician, was the second of the eight children born to Joseph Solomon and Hannah Moss, sister of the business partner. They had been betrothed in London but were married in 1815 in the Church of England, (2) at St. Helena.

The Solomon family, as a whole, is one of the most distinguished in South Africa, by reason of the outstanding ability of such a proportionately large number of its individual members. Many of the most talented were descended from Joseph and Hannah. Curiously enough, Joseph was not an especially able man. He was neither successful in business nor prominent in public life. When he died, it was merely said of him that he was 'a very old colonist and father of Mr. Saul Solomon, M.P.' and that he 'was well-known and much respected' (3). Nor is much known of his wife Hannah.

The Solomons, at St. Helena, apparently became fervent admirers of Napoleon, who was brought to Longwood in 1815. Saul, the merchant, was supposed to have tried to assist the Emperor to escape by sending him a silk-wire ladder in a silver tea-pot. Hannah Solomon, who was especially partisan, took her eldest son, Henry, then a child of five, to see the former conqueror lying in State, and he remembered that she wept. This story, (4) which Mrs. Brown, Henry's daughter, used to tell her grandchildren, is interesting, but cannot be said to be especially significant. It merely showed the Solomons to be possessed of sufficient imagination to be stirred by greatness, even though fallen.

But Hannah and Joseph possessed one undoubted trait. They were devout Jews. So much so, that rather than let their children grow up without a sound Jewish education, they sent their two eldest sons to England, to Joseph's mother Phoebe Solomon, whose orthodoxy was beyond question. She came from the De Mitz family of Dutch Jews resident in Leyden. It is suggested by Dr. Herrman, (5) that the abilities of the Solomons were largely inherited from her. She certainly possessed vitality. Married at fourteen, she had borne twenty-one children, and yet lived to the age of one hundred and four.

(1). Except where otherwise stated, these biographical details are taken from Dr. L. Herrman's book, "The Jews in South Africa". Chapter 6, on the Solomon family."

(2). R. Kilpin - Article in Cape Argus, April 23rd, 1921.

(3). Cape Argus, April 11th, 1861. Under "Local and District News".

(4). "Mrs. John Brown" by Angela James and Nina Hill, page 4.

(5). Herrman. Page 83.

Henry was only five years old when he left St. Helena in 1821, as was Saul who followed him in the next year (1). They were circumcised by the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Solomon Herschell and were sent to a Jewish elementary school conducted by Mr. H. N. Solomon at Hammersmith.

Dr. Herrman(2) makes the interesting suggestion that 'liberal ideas of racial and religious equality' were stirred in the boys by hearing constant discussions about the removal of civil disabilities based on religious grounds. By 1828(3) when they returned to St. Helena, Catholic emancipation was imminent and thus the Jews were hopeful of subsequent concessions to their own interests. In the absence of positive evidence, Dr. Herrman's suggestion must remain that and nothing more. Even more important, I think, was the training they received in these years with the specific object of awakening in them a consciousness of race. Judaism as a religion, they exchanged while still in their teens for Christianity,(4) but they still remained bound to their orthodox kinsmen by the ties of blood and consequently their 'social-political' views were profoundly influenced thereby, when they came to maturity. They could not but view with sympathy the efforts of their father's cousin, David Salomons(5) already in his late twenties when they first arrived in England, to enter Parliament as a Jew.

While still in England, Saul and Henry(6) were stricken down with infantile paralysis, and were apparently wrongly treated for "rickets and rheumatic pains".(7). Saul was ordered to wear metallic splints day and night, which caused him great pain as his lower limbs were prevented from developing. In consequence, his stature was dwarfed to some three and a half feet, and, in addition, he was lamed for life.

It is certain that he was not indifferent to his physical appearance. At the elections in 1859,(8) he caused a sensation when he cried out bitterly that he was 'a person with the soul, the heart, the affections, the passions and the aspirations of a man placed in the frame of a child'.

-
- (1). According to Kilpin's version, 'At about two years of age, he was sent to his grandmother in London to be treated for rickets and rheumatic pains'.
 - (2). Herrman. Page 72.
 - (3). Ibid. Page 82. suggests 1829, as the year.
 - (4). See further down.
 - (5). David Salomons (later Sir David) was the son of Levi Salomons a London merchant and Matilda Mitz, Phoebe Solomon's sister. According to the Jewish encyclopaedia, Vol. 10, Page 655, he was born in 1797 and died in 1873. First Jewish Lord Mayor of London in 1855. Returned as a liberal for Greenwich in 1851, he was fined £500 for illegally voting in the House although he had not taken the oath 'on the true faith of a Christian'. Although re-elected again and again he could not take his seat till 1859, the oath having been altered in the previous year.
 - (6). Herrman. Page 82.
 - (7). Kilpin
 - (8). 'S.A.C.A. and Mail', 12th January 1859.

Fortunately for himself, he very early showed that he possessed courage. While he was still at school, his master had occasion to brich Henry. Saul tried to stop him and resorted to the device of biting the man's leg till he dropped the birch. What the consequences of his action were is not told, but the incident reveals him as an unusual child.(1).

On their return to St. Helena, the boys continued their education at the Honourable East India Company's School run by Mr. John Firmin.(2). In 1831, Hannah and Joseph, with their entire family, moved to Capetown. Saul with Richard and Edward, his younger brothers, attended classes at the South African College, which had been founded two years previously. There his brief career of a year was not especially noteworthy. Dr. Changuion(3) exaggerated when he told an audience in Lausanne that Saul had distinguished himself at this time. Referring to the South African College, he said, "fter an annual public examination which had occurred shortly before my arrival, that elite of South Africa had paraded through the streets of Capetown, with their chief prizeman, Saul Solomon, a poor youth of Jewish extraction, at the head of the procession. The effect must have been very striking" Obviously Dr. Changuion did not have first hand knowledge of what he spoke. Actually, not only was Saul not the leading student, but he was not even a brilliant scholar. He was definitely not in the highest classes,(4) and, in fact, in some subjects, his younger brothers outstripped him.(5). His sole successes were the class prizes for Latin and Arithmetic. Dr. Changuion's memory of the past was coloured by Mr. Solomon's later successes, for after saying that he even then possessed 'a head which almost any man in the colony might envy him', he goes on to say 'a head which has made him the leading member of every Cape Parliament'.

-
- (1). Kilpin
 - (2). Obituary in the C.A. October 17th 1892. Note that Herrman P. 82, says that Saul was sent alone to Capetown in 1829 as a foundation scholar at the South African College, Edward and Richard joining him in the next year and the rest of the family only in 1831. But there is no mention of the names of either Saul, Edward or Richard in the 'Notice of the First Public Examination of the South African College, beginning 12th August, 1830'.
 - (3). "Introductory Discourse delivered at the Town House of Lausanne to a numerous English audience on the 28th January 1868," by Dr. A.N.E. Changuion. Herrman P.82. quotes him and consequently repeats the error.
 - (4). 'Prospectus of the Second Annual Public Examination of the South African College commencing Monday, August 15th, 1831', He was in the 2nd of four divisions for Latin and Arithmetic (he had hardly begun Mathematics) and in the 1st Division for English Literature, Geography and History.
 - (5). They were both in the third division for Classics, Mathematics and Arithmetic.

It is not certain whether financial difficulties were the reason for Saul leaving school so early. Dr. Changuion, in the extract already quoted, spoke of him as a 'poor youth of Jewish extraction' and Mr. Kilpin mentions unlucky financial speculations by Joseph Solomon. On his arrival in 1831, the latter had established a boarding-house at number 15, Heerengracht, where, he assured(1) 'Captains, Commanders of ships and passengers touching at the Cape.... they may rely on every attention being paid to their comfort'. He had also opened up 'stores near the shambles'. It does not seem as though it were a fortunate venture, for he later turned grocer(2) and then messenger of the Cape of Good Hope Bank(3) At all events, about the time of the annual examination at the College, in August, 1831, George Greig invited applications(4) for an apprenticeship in his printing works, emphasising that great physical strength was not required. 'There are vacancies in the office of the Advertiser for two or three respectable, well-educated youths, as apprentices to the lighter branch of the Art of Printing. The occupation is not laborious and it combines with the acquirement of the Art, the improvement of the Mind'. Probably Saul entered Greig's establishment in reply to this advertisement.

He quite soon worked his way up, but the stages of advancement are difficult to determine. It is suggested that Greig soon recognised his abilities and made him Manager.(5). In 1840, at the age of twenty-three, he successfully tendered, on his own behalf, for the Government printing, and stationery contract.(6). When Greig was declared bankrupt, Saul and Henry (the latter had been bookkeeper to the firm) acquired the business and began to trade as Saul Solomon and Company.(7). On losing the contract to print the 'Capetown Mail' when it was amalgamated with Fairbairn's paper in 1854,(8) he published his own advertising and newssheet 'The Cape Mercantile Advertiser'. Thus by the time he entered Parliament, he was, entirely owing to his own effort, a substantial businessman. Shortly before, when he went on holiday to England, his employees presented him with a gold ink-stand and an address, in which they mentioned his 'incessant mental labour for the last twenty years'.(9).

-
- (1). S.A.C.A. August 6th 1831.
 - (2). Kaapsche Almanak en Naamboek 1836
 - (3). Cape of Good Hope Almanac and Directory 1838
 - (4). S.A.C.A. August 3rd, 1831
 - (5). Kilpin
 - (6). Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette. May 8th 1840.
'Printed and published by Saul Solomon, the contractor'.
 - (7). In 1848 the C. of G.H. Almanac and Annual Register still cites him under 'Inhabitants of C.T. and Environs' as 'Solomon, Saul, printer'. In 1849 in the same the description is Solomon and Co., Saul, printers. But on the other hand, the Govt. Gazette of December, 30th 1847 contains a notice that the Capetown Mail' is to be printed in future by Saul Solomon and Co.
 - (8). This seems to hint that his relations with Fairbairn were not as good as formerly. Murray wrongly says he lost the printing of Fairbairn's paper as well (South African Reminiscences, P.31. From July 1st 1835 the S.A.C.A. was printed by Samuel Mollet and then George Pike - never Mr. Solomon.
 - (9). The Mercantile Advertiser, July 27th, 1835. "Miscellaneous Intelligence".

Saul entered early upon not only a business career, but upon 'amateur' politics. When he was apprenticed to Greig he was brought into contact with John Fairbairn, the editor of the "South African Commercial Advertiser", a paper printed by Greig, and either through Fairbairn or Greig, (1) with Dr. Philip. Probably it was through Fairbairn and Philip that he began to consider with care the position of the Native and Coloured peoples within and without the colony, and in general the foundations of his own behaviour. There can be hardly any doubt that the influence of these two was important in his adoption of the principle of equality of treatment for all, without distinction, although, as has already been noted, the circumstances of his environment were such as to make him readily receptive to liberal ideals.

There was no Jewish congregation in Capetown ^{before 1841} or elsewhere in South Africa, until the Reverend Joel Rabinowitz arrived about 1859. (2). Partly in consequence of this, Dr. Philip was able to convert the whole family of Joseph and Hannah to Christianity although the parents themselves remained orthodox adherents of Judaism. Henry was baptised on September 7th 1834, and Saul probably about the same time, but there is no record in his case. (3).

It was an important step in their lives, this public renunciation of one creed for another. In all likelihood the parents raised not a little opposition. Probably one can regard Saul as set in his basic principles of Liberalism from that day. Indeed, at this very time, according to Mr. Kilpin, (4) he was pelted with rotten eggs and whatnot in the streets of Capetown, because he was widely known to share the views of Dr. Philip and Mr. Fairbairn.

In the years following, he was steadily climbing the ladder of business success. The newspapers furnish practically no evidence of his political activities at this time. Most probably, he, like his leader Fairbairn, (5) desired a representative assembly, but feared the possibility of discriminatory legislation against the coloured people, unless certain elementary rights could be assured them, which was the case when the Masters and Servants Ordinance, passed by the Legislative Council in 1841 and ratified in 1842, made no reference to colour in legal questions arising out of employment contracts.

-
- (1). Fairbairn married Dr. Philip's daughter in 1831. See Kilpin's article on John Fairbairn in the C.A. March 26th 1921. Greig was one of the sponsors at the baptism of Henry Solomon on September 7th, 1834, at St. George's Church - Herrman P. 84.
 - (2). C.A. June 6th 1882. He was presented with an address and a purse of 60 guineas by the Mayor of Capetown, on his retirement after 23 years.
 - (3). Herrman pp. 71-84. An article on Saul Solomon by M. Rabinowitz pp. 231-235, in the South African Jewish Year Book, 1929, has a footnote by the editor of the religion of the Solomons. Mr. John J. Gubbins, of Ottoshoop, Transvaal had shown him a letter written by Edward Solomon on 15th August, 1835, attributing his complete conversation to Dr. Philip.
 - (4). Article on Saul Solomon
 - (5). Walker, History of South Africa. p. 243.

His attitude to another great event of the time - the Trek - is only known to us from his own statements in later years. He then declared that he had always been quite sympathetic to the trekboers, although he viewed with alarm their encroachments on native lands. 'I entirely disapproved of the interference or the extent of our interference with the emigrant farmers; - and when they were called rebels for resisting that interference, I had very great doubts whether the term could be properly applied to men in their position.'(1).

Although Mr. Kilpin declares(2) that during the Anti-Convict Agitation, 'he was soon recognised throughout the Colony as one of Fairbairn's ablest and boldest lieutenants', there is no mention of him as an organizer in the newspapers. But at the 'Grand Dinner' in March 1850,(3) to celebrate the triumph of the Anti-Convict Association, Mr. Advocate Faure toasted 'The British Press that has advocated the cause of the colonists in the late struggle', and Mr. Solomon replied with an eloquent speech, in which he expressed clearly and fearlessly his opinions. His scathing reference to the "Times" as a notable opponent of the Colony in the recent struggle, incidentally shows his sympathy with the contemporary liberal and national movements in Europe. It was a paper 'which systematically opposes every progressive movement in England and every effort for securing political reforms which has done its utmost to stifle the cries of the Hungarians for freedom - which has taken upon itself to justify the French expedition to Rome'. Misgovernment was inevitable as long as the colonies were ruled from Downing Street, but he hoped for better times. The struggle through which they had so successfully passed proved their fitness for representative government. 'Sir, we have a glorious prospect before us, and we stand upon the eve of important colonial changes. We begin now to catch a glimpse of those free institutions and that responsible government (sic) which have so long eluded our grasp'.

As the agitation subsided, he lapsed once more into obscurity, if one were to judge from the newspapers. He was not one of the five 'Popular Members' chosen by the Governor, Sir Harry Smith, with the assistance of the Municipal Councils and divisional roadboards, to fill up vacancies on the Legislative Council. In March 1854,(4) however, a number of electors in Capetown sent a requisition to Mr. Solomon to represent them in the House of Assembly. They wrote, "All who have the pleasure of your acquaintance have learned to value the energetic perseverance of your character and there are not many in this colony gifted with the clear and powerful intellect which you possess". Mr. Solomon replied that he had, with reluctance, allowed himself to be persuaded.

He assumed that since they wished him to be their representative, they were acquainted with his views, but in order that there should be no misunderstanding whatever, he

-
- (1). House of Assembly. Wed. April 30th 1856. (The newspaper report is invariably a day or two behind).
 - (2). Kilpin - Article on Saul Solomon.
 - (3). S.A.C.A. of March 16th 1850. Report of a 'Grand Dinner' by Members of the Anti-Convict Association, on Tuesday, March 12th. 'About 170-180 gentlemen sat down together'.
 - (4). P.2 of "The Election of Mr. Saul Solomon to the House of Assembly for the City of Capetown". This pamphlet (in the S.A. Public Library) contains the requisition to him, his reply, his speeches on nomination day and at the declaration of the Polb.

proposed to set out in black and white, (1) the general policy he would pursue. As a Liberal, he would regard it as 'a sacred duty' to oppose all discriminatory legislation. He would resist any attempt to restrict the franchise; On the contrary he would advocate amendment of the constitution in the direction of making it more democratic, because he considered the property qualification for members of the Legislative Council too high and the period for which both Houses were elected too long. He favoured the grant of local self-government to the East by a devolution of the Colony into two provinces, and he even looked forward to a federation of the 'United States of Southern Africa'. He objected to all grants of public money for religious purposes but believed that education, if strictly secular, might well be promoted by government aid to local councils.

He concluded by emphasising that he had no intention of making any effort to secure his own election. This indifference did not damp the enthusiasm of his supporters, however, and at the polls in May(2) he was returned, third of the four successful candidates, though with only about sixty votes less than the first candidate. Thus he entered upon a Parliamentary career destined to last for almost thirty years.

(1). Ibid pp. 2-7.

(2). Ibid p. 14.

CHAPTER 2.

'SOCIAL - POLITICAL VIEWS'

At the hustings, on nomination day, Mr. Solomon made what must have been a very stirring speech for it still reads well. On that occasion he defined the term Liberal as, 'a name, gentleman, which I may tell you by the way, is given to those who advocate justice to all, without any distinction'(1) Putting it even more positively, he asserted, 'And to me it affords an inexpressible gratification that on this great occasion, I am permitted to meet on one common platform of political equality the Englishman and the Dutchman, the rich man and the poor man, the white man and the black man'.(2). I propose to consider now the working out of his Liberal principles in the 'politico-social field' during the period, roughly speaking, of representative government.

A. 'THE ENGLISHMAN AND THE DUTCHMAN'

Mr. Solomon considered himself an Englishman, since he came from a family of English Jews and had himself been schooled for six or seven years of his boyhood in England (1822-1828). On the other hand, he had been born in St. Helena and had been living continuously in Capetown since his early youth, so that he felt himself a colonist also. In fact, when there was a clash between the British and the Colonial interests, he supported the latter. It was as an injured colonist that he spoke resentfully of Sir Philip Wodehouse's tendency to subordinate the welfare of the Cape to Imperial ends, in accordance with the demands of Downing Street.(3).

He himself recognised that for him a single loyalty was impossible. On nomination day in 1874,(4) he declared that he was an 'Afrikander'. But almost in the same breath he continued, "At the same time let me say that I have no wish to disavow my being an Englishman, and I wish ever to remain under the jurisdiction of the British Crown. So that I do not speak of being an Afrikander in disparagement of being an Englishman. I rather glory in being an Englishman".

Nevertheless, in accordance with his principle of advocating justice to all without distinction, he was absolutely impartial between the Englishman and the Dutchman, as such, in South Africa. Perhaps the fact that he was a Jew by blood, though no longer by faith, made it easier for him to hold the balance evenly between the two.

(1). Ibid. p. 10

(2). Ibid. p. 9

(3). In House of Assembly on May 22nd 1865, he carried a vote of Censure on the Governor. This point is elaborated in Chapter 4. He also opposed Lord Carnarvon's Confederation Scheme on the ground that it was designed to relieve the Imperial Govt. from its responsibilities at the expense of the Cape Colony. See Chapter 6.

(4). C.A. Saturday January 31st 1874.

He scorned the ultra-Englishness of the frontier districts led by Grahamstown and Port Elizabeth. Mr. Solomon never failed to remind the frontiersmen who plumed themselves upon their descent from the 1820 British settlers, that for all their boasting about Anglo-Saxon energy and enterprise, that the pioneers of civilisation in South Africa were the kinsmen of the Dutch, who had opened up new lands beyond the frontiers of the colony. 'The English', he declared realistically, 'follow wherever commerce is to be driven or money to be made'.(1).

Similarly, when in a debate on Responsible Government(2), he misunderstood Mr. Fairbridge's remark that the majority of the colonists belonged to an apathetic race, as an English slur upon the Dutch, he indignantly refuted it. 'But we need not go to Holland to discover these (i.e. achievements). Look at our own colony. Who are the men that sit upon your Bench, administering justice between man and man? - men of this apathetic race. Who are the men that adorn your Bar and are looked upon as authorities on points of law? - men of this apathetic race. Who are the men - 'but this eulogy was cut short by Mr. Fairbridge's denial that such had been his meaning.

However, because of his frank declarations that the hostilities between the Free State and the Basutos were fundamentally due to European encroachment on native land, there were not lacking those to call him the enemy of the Boers, the kinsmen of the Dutch in the Colony.(3). He himself denied that he was or had been, unsympathetic to the trekkers. 'I entirely disapproved of the interference, or the extent of our interference with the emigrant farmers; and when they were called rebels for resisting that interference, I had very great doubts whether the term could be properly applied to men in their position'(4). He thought the British Government was chiefly to blame for permitting the natives to be dispossessed of their land. 'I am not disposed to underrate the importance of the Boers. I consider that they have been often and very greatly misrepresented, and I consider also that many of the difficulties in which they are placed are difficulties for which we, to a certain extent, are responsible.....'(5).

He believed in a policy of European trusteeship towards the natives, and consequently the necessity for co-operation between the two major sections of the whole population seemed to him axiomatic. To him, 'the high destiny' of the Cape was 'that the sons of England and Holland met together here at the extreme point of southern Africa, should be made the agents for carrying civilisation and Christianity into the interior of this vast and unhappy continent'.(6).

(1). H. of A. June 7th 1851

(2). H. of A. April 10th 1856

(3). About a week after a debate covering Boer-Basuto relations, Molteno made a speech, accusing Mr. Solomon of being hostile and unjust to the Boers. Mr. Solomon became so angry that he told Molteno that he was 'big enough and loud enough and noisy enough.... to make an attack boldly and honestly' and indignantly denied the charge. See H. of A. May 13th 1858.

(4). H. of A. April 30th 1856

(5). H. of A. May 5th 1858

(6). H. of A. April 30th 1856.

When Mr. Bowker asked(1) the house to pass a resolution condemning the agitation raised in the Cape against the Free State, after the trial and execution there of an Englishman, Charles Leo Cox, for the murder of his wife and children, because it would provoke hostility between the colony and Republic, Mr. Solomon pointed out that the House could not interfere in any way in the matter. At the same time, he expressed his own opinion very frankly. 'I look upon the endeavour to stir up a feeling of race between English and Dutch as much to be deprecated and I will say, as an Englishman, that it has arisen entirely upon the side of the English'.

The Dutch in the Cape, on the whole tended to sympathise with their relations in the Free State when Sir Philip Wodehouse annexed Basutoland in March 1868, in the teeth of a Republican victory against the tribe. 'The Zuid-Afrikaan'(2) singled Mr. Solomon out for sarcastic comment because he had signed an address which congratulated the Governor on his action, and ended with the singularly tactless request, to put it mildly, that he should also extend British authority over the Free State. '... we have no hesitation in recording our opinion that it would be an appropriate close to your useful and honourable career in South Africa, to be instrumental in the annexation of the Orange Free State, as well as Basutoland to the British Colonial Empire'.(3) Mr. Solomon did not mend matters, as far as he was concerned, when he subsequently explained that while he was opposed to the incorporation of the Free State in the Colony, he was 'so satisfied of the great advantage of British supremacy in South Africa, when it can be effected with due regard to the rights and feelings of the people concerned' that he thought the Cape Parliament might well encourage such a move.(4).

The Diamond Fields controversy did far more than the Basutoland affair to stimulate the growth of Dutch national sentiment. Here again, the part played by Mr. Solomon was not especially pleasing to those who sympathised with the Free State, although no one, suggested that in his actions he was prompted by a national bias.

It is clear that Mr. Solomon never fully appreciated the merits of the Free State case, although he claimed to have studied the evidence detailed in Bluebooks and to be satisfied that Waterboer's case, which the British Government was sponsoring, through the Cape Government, was just.(5). In a debate on Confederation,(6) he admitted that the republics were hostile to Sir Henry Barkly in consequence of his annexation of the Diamond Fields. 'This feeling did exist, though he did not think Sir Henry Barkly to blame he entered upon these complications as an inheritance left him by the former Government'. ~~It is not likely that he knew that~~ Barkly had been sufficiently partial to have informed Lord Kimberley that if the Free State were allowed to retain the disputed territory, it would become the wealthiest state in South Africa, and be encouraged to hold aloof from a South African Confederation.(7).

-
- (1). H. of A. May 19th 1857
 - (2). "Zuid-Afrikaan", May 18th 1868
 - (3). C.A. May 14th 1868. Address presented to Wodehouse on his return to Capetown from Basutoland.
 - (4). C.A. February 27th 1869. Mr. Solomon's reply to his requisitionists.
 - (5). H. of A. July 11th 1871
 - (6). H. of A. June 11th 1875
 - (7). Walker - History of S.A. p.344.

8 c.508 No 87 p.4

4 C.508 No 94 p.12.

When, on July 11th 1871, Mr. Southey, the Colonial Secretary, proposed that the House should go into Committee to consider a resolution to annex the Diamond Fields, Mr. Solomon supported Mr. Molteno's amendment that the question should be temporarily shelved, as Parliament was too busy with constitutional change and the question of ownership was not yet definitely established. At the same time, Mr. Solomon made it clear that he was not opposed to the principle of annexation. Eventually the original motion, as amended by Mr. Smith to show that it was not intended to annex any territory claimed by the Free State, was passed by a single vote (27 - 26).(1).

However, by the next year many former supporters of annexation had been alienated by Barkly's premature proclamation in October 1871 of the Diamond Fields as British territory. Mr. Merriman proposed that the bill to annex Griqualand West to the Cape should be thrown out, yet Mr. Solomon still clung to his former opinions.(2). He considered that the Free State had suffered no wrong and he belittled its independence by ridiculing its request for foreign arbitration. "Whatever the merits of the question, arbitration was the only mode of settlement and this the Free State had virtually rejected by wishing to refer the matter to Kings, Emperors and other foreign potentates". But he suggested that annexation should be deferred until the disputes between the Free State and Great Britain had been settled and more information had been obtained about the area to be annexed. The Government found it expedient to withdraw the Bill, but the Zuid-Afrikaan(3) wanted the principle of annexation to be completely rejected and Mr. Solomon's motion to shelve the question temporarily, did not appease it. Mr. Advocate de Villiers was scornfully dubbed 'dien trouwen wapendrager van den heer Solomon' for supporting the latter's amendment.

Mr. Solomon was not unaware that bad feeling had been aroused among the Dutch of the Colony, and he thought it extremely regrettable. Speaking(4) as chairman, at a complimentary dinner to Mr. Ziervogel, who was retiring from Parliament to take up residence in the Transvaal, Mr. Solomon seized the opportunity to make a plea for an improvement in Anglo-Dutch relations. "There are no two people in the world that more resemble one another in their institutions, their habits, their feelings, their religion and their history than the English and the Dutch, and it would be a hard thing indeed if these two people, so intimately and closely associated, should not be able to mingle harmoniously at the Cape of Good Hope".

As far as he himself was concerned, therefore, he had no doubts whatsoever about his own impartiality, and since Mr. Hofmeyr's Boeren Beschermings Vereniging, on its formation, was prepared to back him at the elections in 1879(5) it is clear that those most concerned never seriously doubted it either.

-
- (1). H. of A. July 19th 1871
 - (2). H. of A. June 5th 1872 and C732 No. 22 Barkly to Kimberley.
 - (3). "De Z.A." 12th June 1872
 - (4). C.A. June 19th 1873
 - (5). Z.A. 28th September 1878, urged its readers to support him. See Chapter 7.

B. 'THE RICH MAN AND THE POOR MAN'

Mr. Solomon belonged, intellectually, to the school of liberal economists who subscribed to the famous formula, 'laissez faire, laissez passer'. He believed that society progressed by the effort of the individual, and that consequently only the minimum of restriction upon his liberty, compatible with the common good, was warranted. The problem of course, has always been to know where to draw the line.

When Dr. Abercrombie had protested against the principle of voluntarism, because he thought that the State should assume the position of a father, Mr. Solomon burst out passionately, "Paternal Government! I dread the very idea of it. If there is any one thing that I hate with a more perfect hatred than another, it is your paternal Government, a Government constantly interfering with your business, your religion, your domestic cares, almost your very thoughts and feelings...."(1).

Thus he objected to official restriction of the rate of interest and advocated the entire abolition of the laws relating to usury(2). In his opinion, everyone should be free to enter into a contract according to his own interest, whether he were borrower or lender, master or servant. "All that is necessary in such matters is that the law shall enforce contracts when made I hate your paternal Governments".

He even opposed legislation against unlicensed medical practitioners(3) and ridiculed the 'Zuid-Afrikaan' because it desired the Government 'to extend a paternal sway over us, and take care that we employ the right medical man and the right parson', for the Zuid-Afrikaan was an organ of the Dutch 'Anti-Voluntaries'.

The belief in self-help was certainly justified in his own case. By his own efforts he had raised himself from a mere apprentice to a printing magnate and newspaper owner. Yet Mr. Solomon cannot be said to have been a wholehearted supporter of 'Laissez faire', since he was not prepared to follow it up to its logical conclusions—that those who do not succeed are almost invariably the lazy and incompetent who consequently deserve little commiseration in the social distress that is their punishment. At least, this was the opinion of one enthusiastic supporter of the individualist doctrine. He wrote, "It is good that there should be lower regions in society for the reception of families that mis-behave. This dreadful hell is poverty!"(4).

Mr. Solomon never went nearly so far. He shrank back from such a conclusion. His humanitarian instincts forced him to admit that the relief of poverty was urgently necessary, and all he objected to was the type of ill-planned help which paralysed individual effort and so defeated its own purpose. He always insisted that where help was given at all, it should be given where it was most needed.

-
- (1). H. of A. 14th August, 1854. Debate on Mr. Solomon's resolution to abolish State aid to religious bodies.
 - (2). H. of A. March 27th 1856
 - (3). H. of A. April 16th 1857
 - (4). Charles Gide - 'Principles of Political Economy', translated by E. F. Row. On p. 21. Gide quotes Dunoyer.

When it was proposed to raise the salary of a Puisne Judge from £1,200 to £1,500 per annum, Mr. Solomon admitted that it would be justified in view of the increased cost of living, but added "we should begin with the lower grades of the service, where the distress arising from the increased price of necessaries of life must be more heavily and more powerfully felt".(1).

He persistently maintained that landed property did not bear its fair share of the public burden.(2). He thought it wrong that when revenue was needed, it should be raised by taking the necessaries of life - a measure that must hit the poor especially hard. This was not a popular opinion. In 1863,(3), when the Colonial Secretary suggested a certain date on which to read for a second time a bill to tax immovable property, Mr. Silberbauer countered with an amendment that it be totally shelved declaring, amidst cheers, "It would never be passed and its discussion would only agitate the country uselessly". Mr. Molteno who belonged to 'the country party'(4) agreed, and he and Mr. Solomon, as the leading members of the Assembly, were quite often at loggerheads on this question.

Another time, he opposed an attempt, chiefly led by Mr. Fairbairn, to obtain additional parliamentary grants for the South African College(5) notwithstanding the fact that he was personally attached to it as a former student and present shareholder. Assistance was more urgently required 'by the poorer classes in the country districts'. The conflict between his faith in Voluntary effort and the inescapable recognition of the need for State aid is very well illustrated in the following extract from his speech; 'We want education for this Colony; but I say, let the people work it themselves. We will give them education, but not for nothing. What right have the people of this Colony to ask for reading, writing and arithmetic for nothing, at the expense of the Government, for their children, more than they can ask Government for their bread?'. The modern conception of the Government of a state as, at least ideally, a huge public-welfare agency, gives such views a harsh sound. But it is as if he himself immediately realises this, for he continues with the rather lame qualification - "You should supply the starving with bread, not the well-to-do, those who are well able to obtain it for themselves".

Mr. Solomon's impassioned protests against 'unnecessary'(6) Government restriction upon the free action of the citizens have been observed. There was one notable instance in which he actually welcomed such intervention. He favoured the enactment of legislation to prevent men from leaving their property to a single heir, instead of dividing it equally among all the children. He particularly objected to the development of huge entailed estates'..... he did not wish to see an aristocracy here, unless it was an aristocracy of virtue and intelligence. He did not want to see an hereditary or landed aristocracy... a state of society in which the mass of the people are poor and a few are millionaires.(7) It seems as

(1). H. of A. 25th May 1855

(2). H. of A. April 7th 1858. Mr. Molteno moved 2nd reading of a Bill to reduce the auction dues.

(3). H. of A. May 20th 1863

(4). Fuller, a contemporary, wrote in his monograph of Cecil Rhodes, p.11, 'the country members swore by him'.

(5). H. of A. March 22nd 1858.

(6). My Italics

(7). H. of A. June 5th 1861. Debate on the Testamentary Disposition Bill.

though Mr. Solomon was rationalising a certain hostility to landed power, for he himself was ranged on the side of the comparatively new, upstart, commercial interests.

He is not consistent, of course. The competitive system was and is, as much productive of a few rich and a mass of poor - a state of affairs which he professed to deplore, - as a system which accepts the hereditary principle as its basis. According to the Massinghams, who edited a collection of studies of eminent Victorians, 'the Victorian bourgeois tried to give his earthly objective spiritual wings'(1) - perhaps an unnecessarily cynical description. It cannot be doubted that Mr. Solomon was sincere in his concern for the poor. Like many others he was not a callous man - probably, less so than most - so that their misery touched him, but nevertheless he prospered under the system which produced it, and from his place among the rich he was content to urge palliation.

C. 'THE WHITE MAN AND THE BLACK(3) MAN'

As a Liberal, Mr. Solomon refused to recognise distinctions based on colour, and he was adamant on this point. His views did not win him popularity. The numerical preponderance of the natives over the colonising whites had developed in the latter and their descendants the psychological necessity 'to see black' in order to preserve their own social group. The natives were on a lower rung of civilisation than the Europeans, but colour, not culture, was the easiest and most convenient mode of discrimination.

In a memorial service in the vestibule of the Houses of Parliament, in 1894, at which a bust of Mr. Solomon was unveiled, the speaker, Sir David Tennant, said "But if there was one trait in his character which endeared him more than anything else to the people, it was his persistent efforts in regard to the protection of the natives"(3). This was sheer illusion. Mr. Solomon's consistency in recognising no distinctions of class, colour or creed, together with his great knowledge and ability in clearly presenting the case against discriminatory legislation won an involuntary respect, but it was generally felt that this attitude in regard to the natives was an undesirable eccentricity. The Zuid-Afrikaan(4) probably expressed the opinion of a large section of the Colony towards Mr. Solomon. 'Well, there is Mr. Solomon, a most able member of Parliament to be sure, and one whose influence is perhaps scarcely equalled by that of any other member, but who has a singular predilection for the position of advocate for black versus white, and certainly does not improve his position in the House of Assembly by that predilection". Actually the supposition that Mr. Solomon had more sympathy for a black man than a white was absolutely unfounded. As a Liberal he was obliged to hold the balance evenly between the two, but the Zuid-Afrikaan apparently regarded it as a case of 'those not for us are against us'.

-
- (1). The Great Victorians. Edited by H.J. & Hugh Massingham (Introduction P.14).
 - (2). Dr. J.S. Marais in 'The Cape Coloured People' p.256 points out that from the 1840's the problem of administering the Bantu 'took precedence over the mere question of the poor, which was all the coloured people seemed to present'.
 - (3). C.A. September 7th 1894
 - (4). Z.A. July 12th 1858.

Mr. Solomon was no sentimental believer in the 'noble savage'. It is important to remember that he had been a successful business man and brought to the task of legislation, the abilities of the successful businessman, clear thinking, practicalness(1). He realised that the numerical disproportion was an important factor in the relations between black and white in South Africa. He therefore urged the Government to encourage large-scale European immigration, believing, probably, that if the whites could be assured of their security, they would act more humanely and justly towards the natives. "Let us introduce European blood. That is what we want. I think I am not likely to be suspected as unfriendly to the coloured races. I don't want to see the blacks shut out, but we have enough of them - sufficient for all purposes"(2). It should be noted though, that in 1874 Mr. Fronde received the impression that Mr. Solomon was averse to European immigration for fear that the whites would turn aggressive as soon as they felt themselves stronger"... he seemed generally afraid that if the white race became more numerous, the natives might be handled less scrupulously"(3).

He recognised that the native was culturally inferior to the European. He did not, however, attribute this to any innate incapacity, so he pinned his faith to the policy of trusteeship. He believed that "the sons of England and Holland met together there at the extreme point of Southern Africa" were destined to be "the agents for carrying civilisation and Christianity into the interior of this vast and unhappy continent"(4).

Nevertheless, as a realist, he did not think the natives' path to civilisation could be other than a slow and laborious one, nor did he despise hard manual labour as an instrument of civilisation. Sometimes, the House found his honesty embarrassing, as when he objected to the preamble of the Kaffir Employment Bill which stated that the object of the Bill was the relief of destitution in Kaffirland, consequent on the 'National Suicide' of February 1857. In his opinion it had been chiefly framed to meet the demand for labour in the Colony. 'That was a good thing in itself and there was no need to disguise the truth with hypocrisy'. His proposed amendment was supported by only three others!(5). In 1869 in reply to a requisition, he stated that he thought it advisable, in spite of the continued depression, to keep up a well-considered scheme of public works, in order to utilise the cheap and abundant native labour at their disposal and thus to set the natives upon the path of civilisation. 'This is in my opinion, our greatest work and our highest duty..'(6).

Although he had obviously no sentimental objections to a relationship between black and white as master and servant, respectively, he did demand the legal safeguard for the latter that both should be subjected to the same type of punishment

-
- (1). 'Linner' - Pen and Ink Sketches in Parliament. Cape Monitor, May 9th 1855. in a study of Mr. Solomon said "he would deal with law making as with any other matter of fact business...."
 - (2). H. of A. May 6th 1857
 - (3). J. A. Froude-Short. Studies on great subjects (3rd Series) p.346.
 - (4). H. of A. April 30th 1856.
 - (5). H. of A. May 15th 1857.
 - (6). C. A. February 27th 1869.

for similar offences.(1). He naturally differed on this question from Molteno, who had been largely responsible for the Act of 1856,(2) which replaced Ordinance I of 1841 and added very stringent rules for the conduct of servants and apprentices, in the interests of the master.

✓ Mr. Solomon was well aware of the very real problem of numerical predominance combined with cultural inferiority, for he himself pointed out the strain to which their constitution with its low franchise would be subjected, should British Kaffraria be incorporated in the Colony. 'Of the population in British Kaffraria, about one in eighty are Europeans, the other are natives, and it is proposed by this Bill to bring this community of uncivilised savages under the enjoyment of the freest constitution, the most enlarged suffrage which any community in the world possesses'. He preferred the federal solution, and regretted that Grey had not been permitted to introduce it in 1859, and that Wodehouse was opposed to it.(3).

Nevertheless, with all this, he insisted that trusteeship should be sincere. He understood perfectly the fundamental cause of the native and European clashes on the eastern border of the colony and also across the Orange, in the cornlands of the Caledon River. He tried to show his contemporaries that the whole problem hinged round the struggle for land. At this time, the Cape's 'foreign policy' really amounted to policy in relation to British Kaffraria and the Transkei in the East and the Free State and Basutoland in the north east, and is best understood from the vantage point of 'native affairs'. It was the fear of trouble spreading across the borders on to Colonial soil, that caused the Cape to view with concern the events in these physically contiguous countries. Mr. Solomon saw that it was 'out the day of small things', (4) as he expressed it, and with the patience characteristic of him was content to leave to natural evolution the Confederation of the United States of Southern Africa.(5).

Soon after the British abandonment of the Orange River Sovereignty, he had expressed his disapproval of it, believing that its effect would be 'to surrender the prestige of British power and influence, and to roll back, it may be for many years, the tide of civilisation and religion in Southern and Central Africa'.(6).

Two years later, the events north of the Orange were debated in the Assembly, in consequence of a message sent on the 23rd April, by the Governor, reporting the disturbed state of the native tribes on the eastern and north eastern borders. On the 28th of April, Mr. Painter suggested that the House express its anxiety to co-operate with the Governor in his attempt to maintain peace and prevent aggression upon the colonists, Mr. Pote proposed a motion which went further than

(1). H. of A. July 10th 1868. Vain attempt was made to amend the masters and servants Act of 1856.

(2). Dr. J. S. Marais-~~The~~ Cape Coloured People. p.205. Saul Solomon and John Fairbairn opposed the motion to amend the Ordinance of 1841.

✓(3). H. of A. June 27th 1862.

✓(4). H. of A. June 7th 1861. Separation Debate

(5). Election of Mr. Saul Solomon. p.4.

(6). Ibid.

Mr. Painter's. It declared that the border disputes between the Free State and Basutos threatened to end in war, which would have an unsettling effect on the native tribes on the Cape Eastern Frontier, and thus ultimately involve the Colony. Therefore the House should request His Excellency the Governor to mediate personally. The Debate began on the 30th.

Mr. Solomon(1) was for keeping the original resolution and adding a few words of substantially the same import as Mr. Pote's amendment.

He condemned the British Government's Northern Border Policy in no uncertain terms, "for a policy more vacillating more injurious, and in some cases, more unjust, has, I believe seldom been heard of in colonial history". The native Chiefs had been treated with great injustice. There had been a complete volteface by the British Government, "the object being to make an alliance with the Boers and to throw overboard the natives with their interests and their (need for) protection". The present troubles North of the Orange were chiefly the fault of the British authorities who had neglected to settle the boundary disputes between Moshesh and the Free State before withdrawing. His remark that in merely asking Sir George Grey to act as Arbitrator, 'they would not be violating the principle of non-intervention' shows clearly the isolationist temper of the House. The proposals of Mr. Solomon and Mr. Pote were rejected by 30 votes to 6, and Mr. Painter's innocuous measure which threw the onus for intervening upon the Governor himself, was passed.

On the eastern frontier, also, there was alarm towards the end of 1856 and the beginning of 1857. But on the 18th(2) February 1857, the plan of the chiefs in British Kaffraria and the Transkei, probably inspired by Moshesh, to throw a starving horde in hunger-maddened attack upon the Colony, had ended in disaster - for the natives. For twenty years to come the Colony was to be free from native wars although 'scares' persisted.

Grey's settlement(3) thereafter involved the confiscation of some tribal land in British Kaffraria, which he began to colonise with German Legionaries. In August 1857, hearing of the Indian Mutiny he began sending away to the assistance Imperial troops stationed at the Cape. About the same time there were fears that Kreli of the Galekas was planning an attack of the Colony. To forestall any such possibility, Grey took drastic action. The chief and his tribesmen were driven from their lands to beyond the Bashee River,(4) the Cape Frontier Police being used for the purpose and then stationed there to prevent the natives from returning. In the emptied area and in Nomansland, between the Basutos and the coast tribes, Grey intended to settle Europeans.

In the next session of Parliament, Mr. Solomon moved(1) what was tantamount to a vote of Censure on the Governor. His main concern, of course, was the expulsion of Kreli from his land, but the question could only be raised by moving that the

(1). H. of A. April 30th 1856

(2). Theal History of S.A. since 1795, Vol.3 (1908) p.195.

(3). Walker, History of S.A. p.299

(4). Theal History of S.A. since 1795 Vol. 3.(1908) p.201

He was expelled on 25th February 1858 into Bomvanaland.

Cape Frontier Police, a force for whom Parliament voted money, had been wrongly employed. They had been organised for the preservation of law and order in the Colony. If it was argued that they might be required to take action outside the Colony for this same purpose, he replied that he had studied everything detailed in the Bluebooks, and was convinced that Kreli had not been an aggressor and that there had been no immediate danger. He went so far as to say that even if it were true that Kreli was responsible for the affair of the Kaffir prophet, in February 1857, 'it was nevertheless a tremendous punishment for so trifling an offence, for it cannot be supposed, it cannot be imagined, that whilst Kaffirs are human beings, we can thus hope or expect, to extinguish from their breasts, the desire to get back their country, if they see a possibility of doing so' Coming on to wider issues, he remarked on the demoralising effect of constant extension of the country. 'How long do you think our frontier people will be a settled people if they are constantly looking to fresh grants'. He himself foresaw that the Colony must inevitably extend its jurisdiction over the territories east of the Frontier, right up to the southern border of Natal. 'I have not a shadow of doubt of it, and I don't regret the day; but what I say is this - don't force and precipitate measures unnecessarily. Let civilisation roll on gently".

The Government's case was that it was a question of strategy. According to the Colonial Secretary, Kreli had been watching for an opportunity to take aggressive action. With the departure of the troops for India, their military position was weakened and it then became imperative to force the issue. Eventually, Mr. Molteno's amendment, (for living at Beaufort West Molteno was physically and hence mentally nearer the frontier than Solomon), to the effect that His Excellency had been justified in the employment of the police in the particular circumstances, was carried by a large majority.

Shortly after, on May 5th, a message was received from the Governor, informing the House that the President of the Orange Free State had requested him to intercede between the Republic and the Basuto, and he desired the House's opinion. Mr. Solomon's proposal(2) as to the address was accepted. It expressed the House's desire that the Governor should offer to mediate between the Free State and the Basuto, to end the war raging across the Orange River, but such mediation should only be with the full consent of both parties, and the Colony's neutrality should not be compromised in any way. He could not resist reminding the House that in 1856 he had been far-seeing enough to propose a similar resolution, but only six members had then supported him. With the memory of the division on his motion against the expulsion of Kreli still before him, he remarked sarcastically, 'We were then exceedingly fearful of compromising ourselves by allowing the Police Force to be employed in Frontier wars...'. He stressed the fact that hostilities between Boer and Basuto had their origin in encroachments on native land and that the British Government, by permitting it, was largely to blame.

It was at this time that the 'Zuid-Afrikaan'(3) came to the conclusion that he had 'a singular predilection for the position of advocate for Black versus White'.

-
- (1). H. of A. April 27th 1858
 - (2). H. of A. May 5th 1858
 - (3). Z.A. July 12th 1858.

Although Mr. Solomon could not tolerate Sir Philip Wodehouse's attempts to reduce Parliament to the position of a Legislative Council, he was at one with him on native policy, as he had not been with Gray, who could not appreciate the importance to the natives of a secure possession of adequate land.(1). In(2) 1870, in a speech attacking Sir Philip Wodehouse for lack of sympathy with representative institutions, he said, "He was sorry for this, because he must say that they never had a Governor who had a greater hatred for jobbery and was fairer in his treatment of the native races".(2)

But at first, he did not understand the arrangements that Wodehouse proposed to make after the false 'scare' in 1864, in consequence of which the British Government ordered the complete abandonment of the Transkei. In the vote of censure(3) he moved in 1865, he not only attacked the Governor's subservience to Downing Street, and his unconstitutionality, but also his native policy, with a peevishness and pettishness that is amazing in him. He complained that no consistent policy had been followed towards the natives. He objected to Krelt being restored to his former lands because in 1858 he had been told that his expulsion had been necessary to preserve the peace. Considering that he himself had vehemently disagreed at the time, it was a queer argument to produce against the present Governor's action. He felt that the constant shifting of the natives back and forth could only have a disturbing effect upon them. However, at Prorogation(4) the Governor explained that his actions had been determined by a recognition of the fact that the Tembus, Fingoes and Galekas were pressed for want of land and thereafter Mr. Solomon raised no further objections.

While Wodehouse was thus inaugurating a new native policy on the Eastern Frontier, the second Free State-Basuto war broke out, in June 1866. This time the Free State looked like gaining the victory. Wodehouse realising anew the importance of securing to the natives an adequate extent of land, annexed Basutoland to the British Empire in March, 1868. Mr. Solomon fully approved of the Governor's move. At the elections in 1869(5) he explained his attitude. 'For my own part, I very cordially approved of the interference of the British Government in the war between the Free State and the Basuto. I think that that interference was both necessary and opportune'. Many years later, in a debate on Mr. Sprigg's proposal to alienate part of Basutoland in compensation for the expenses of the Basuto War, Mr. Solomon revealed(6) that "when Basutoland was being taken over, he had occasion to see Sir Philip Wodehouse upon the subject more than once He believed that Sir Philip Wodehouse did the best he could for the Basutos. . . . For the Basutos to lose a portion of their territory was inevitable under the circumstances of the case".

Although in the Responsible Government debate in 1871, Mr. Solomon admitted that while supporting the movement, he

-
- (1). C.W. de Kiewiet - British Colonial Policy and the S.A. Republics (1854-1872) p.95.
 - (2). H. of A. February 21st 1870.
 - (3). H. of A. May 22nd 1865.
 - (4). Prorogation C.A. October 10th 1865.
 - (5). C.A. February 27th 1869.
 - (6). H. of A. June 30th 1880.

was apprehensive of its effects on native policy(1), he did not oppose the annexation of Basutoland to the Cape(2). He said(3) that he should have preferred to leave control of native affairs with the British Government, but he realised it was not possible. Someone had objected to the lowness of the franchise in view of the preponderance of the natives. He personally considered that in the eighteen years of Representative Government no harm had been done. No coloured man had been elected to Parliament, but if he were, nothing but good could result. Stung by Mr. Merriman's 'off-shoot', he ^{he} exclaimed sarcastically, 'why, what a pity it is the Almighty even made a black man!..... You talk of sentiment. Why, if I thought that the sentiments of this House agreed with the sentiments of the honourable member for Aliwal North, I would rather die than vote for Responsible Government'. Merriman had said that if his (Solomon's) views on native policy were applied, they would cause a conflagration. He denied this. There would be trouble only if the natives should perceive that there was a policy of "applying the lash to black backs, not white, for the same offence".

The Responsible Government Bill did not pass that session. Next year there was again a debate. Mr. Solomon expressed(4) the same views. This time he described Mr. Merriman as 'a fitting mouthpiece of the extermination policy', but he hoped and believed that Merriman's views were not shared by the majority in the House. Rather more realistically, he comforted himself in the thought that the numbers and power of the natives would prevent their oppression by the Europeans(5).

Thus the Colony's entry upon a Responsible Government found him especially alert to champion native rights and denounce native wrongs.

D. LIBERALISM IN RELIGION - THE VOLUNTARY PRINCIPLE

The Voluntary Principle was the equivalent in the field of religion, of Mr. Solomon's Liberalism in politics. It took him twenty-one years (1854-1875) to secure the equality of treatment by the State of all religious sects, by the grant of financial assistance to none, and during this time he displayed the greatest ability and strategy as a leader.

Mr. Solomon belonged to the Congregationalist sect, which relied largely on its own efforts, so he was naturally not to be found among the upholders of a privileged position for the Church of England and the Dutch Reformed Church. But his attitude was not solely dictated by the resentment of the unprivileged. It went further than that. As a genuinely religious man, he believed that the various sects should be vital enough to be able to support themselves, independently

-
- (1). H. of A. June 6th 1871.
 - (2). H. of A. August 10th 1871.
 - (3). Responsible Government Debate. June 6th 1871.
 - (4). A. Wilmot History of Our Own Times in S.A. Vol.1 p.16.
The copy of the Cape Argus in the S.A. Public Library is defective. Wilmot gives some useful resumés of the principal speeches on both sides.
 - (5). It seems as though Mr. Froude's impression already referred to, that Mr. Solomon was not enthusiastic about European immigration was correct.

of external aid. "There is sufficient vitality in our own most holy religion to secure its propagation by its own peculiar and divinely instituted means"(1). He further considered the then system of State grants to be 'in a political view most inexpedient'(2). When Government assisted certain sects and ignored others, it laid itself open to accusations of political bias, since it could not very well claim to be upholding Truth, there being no absolute standard in such a case. In consequence, 'sectarian jealousies and sectarian hates' were stimulated(3) He was willing for the State to assist local councils in promoting education, always provided that the instruction given was purely secular(4).

The most outstanding speech of the first session was that of Mr. Solomon on the Voluntary Principle(5). 'This resolution affirms, Sir, that the time has come when ...the different religious communities of the Colony should be left to their own efforts and resources for securing the means for religious worship and instruction'. It is worth examining this first speech in some detail, as all the subsequent ones followed the same general lines.

He gave them facts and figures to show that wherever it had been tried, the Voluntary system had been a success. Evidence was drawn from England, Scotland, Australia, America. He cleverly sought to interest the Dutch members who might be expected to offer a formidable opposition on behalf of the Dutch Church by informing them that in New York, under Dutch rule, ministers were supported entirely by Voluntary subscription. After the English annexation New York obtained a State-paid Church, but it was the Episcopal Church.

At the Cape, the position demanded a review, since the expenditure for ecclesiastical purposes was steadily rising. From £10,500 in 1847 it had mounted to £16,000 in 1854. He gave certain striking instances of the working of the Voluntary Principle at the Cape. All the churches in the Colony, except two Dutch Churches in Capetown, where the Government had contributed £1,000 out of a total of £35,000, and except also a few Episcopal churches, had been built entirely by Voluntary effort. He claimed that amongst every Christian community in the Colony, the system was working beneficially. As an advocate of equal treatment for all creeds, his reference to the Dutch Reformed Church as most suited to be the Established Church, if there had to be one seems rather pointless unless read in terms of strategy. The English Church under Bishop Gray, likewise came in for some judicious praise with regard to its use of the Voluntary Principle. Observing these attempts at conciliation, one begins to appreciate Linner's remark, that 'he possesses the full confidence of the House, excepting in the matter of State grants to religious denominations. Even on this, the House listens to him with deference and no inharmonious feeling exists between him and the majority, in consequence of the difference of opinion.....'(6).

-
- (1). 'Election of Mr. Saul Solomon....' p.6.
 - (2). Ibid
 - (3). H. of A. 14th August, 1854, 'Voluntary Debate'
 - (4). 'Election of Mr. Saul Solomon....' p.5
 - (5). H. of A. 14th August 1854
 - (6). Cape Monitor, May 9th 1855. Pen and Ink sketches in Parliament.(They were also collected in a book).

He was obviously hoping to convert the primary beneficiaries, the Dutch Reformed and Anglican Churches, to a Voluntary relinquishment of their privileges, but it was a forlorn hope, and he was realistic enough to know it. He fell back upon another line of tactics. State support was advocated mainly on the grounds of the necessity to provide for the poor. Yet a glance at the Estimates showed that those were aided who least needed it. There were Dutch Churches at Paarl, Stellenbosch and Malmesbury which received Government grants, although they had balances out at interest.

Personally, he favoured the solution of leaving each group to its own devices. The only other just alternative - of helping every single sect - was not really practicable, as it would be extremely difficult to find a basis for a just redistribution.

Mr. Solomon did not, however, press the motion to a division, being satisfied that the question had been publicised. Mr. Pote who thought it the best speech ever made in the House remained unconvinced, but made a significant remark, 'I need not point out how much men's minds have been unhinged during the last few days by agitating the question'.

In the next session, Mr. Solomon again moved his resolution(1). The same points were made, but the system of grants was analysed in greater detail. £16,060 was reserved by Schedule C of the Reserved Civil List Ordinance of 1853 for Public Worship. Of this the Dutch Reformed Church and the English Church together absorbed, £13,000. Capetown and Grahamstown received almost one-quarter of the total amount, although the principle of State-aid was justified on the necessities of the country districts. The motion was lost on a division by 25 to 13 votes.

The initiative was not again taken by Mr. Solomon till 1860. Nevertheless the question was discussed almost every year in Parliament, Mr. Solomon seizing every opportunity to expound his views. The campaign to introduce the Voluntary Principle began to assume major political proportions. In the last session of the first Parliament, Dr. Abercrombie complained that the address by the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church to the Governor had not been referred to a special committee but to the one already sitting to consider ecclesiastical petitions to the House. Mr. Solomon, in the course of a lengthy speech, remarked that some of the Dutch clergy had openly threatened to use their clerical influence against 'Voluntary' candidates at the ensuing election and he challenged them to do so(2).

In the first session ^{of} the new Parliament(3) Mr. Walter suggested that a sum of £150 be voted towards the salary of the Dutch Reformed Church minister at Oudtshoorn. Mr. Solomon moved, as an amendment, the introduction of the Voluntary Principle. The result of the division, 27 Noes to 11 Ayes showed no gain for the Voluntary party. But in the next

(1). H. of A. April 4th 1855. According to the Cape Monitor of Saturday, April 7th 'the public Gallery was very early packed and the speaker's gallery was likewise full, several visitors were accommodated with seats in the passage leading to the body of the House....'

(2). H. of A. April 6th 1858.

(3). H. of A. May 11th 1859.

year,(1) when Mr. Solomon himself opened up the debate, for the first time since 1855, the measure was defeated by an appreciably narrower margin than previously. The division 22 - 16 pointed to a clear gain of five.

In 1861(2) Mr. Solomon introduced a Bill embodying the Voluntary Principle, but he found it expedient to withdraw it, in view of the strength of the Eastern demand for Separation. Most of his 'Voluntaries' came from the East, and he could not be sure that they would not vote against his Bill in revenge for his lead of the Anti-Separationists. This same reason, coupled with the financial depression, induced him to abandon, though not completely, the campaign for a few years. Then, in 1866 the Bill was introduced again but lost on the second reading, though only by 3 votes(28-25). In that year West and East combined to promote retrenchment and there was no talk of Separation(3); in 1867, after thirteen years, the Bill was passed in the Assembly, but rejected in the Council. The same fate overtook it in the next year. Not till 1875 did it finally pass through both Houses and became Law.

In securing the passage of the Bill, Mr. Solomon had shown the qualities of a great leader. He had chosen a worthy object, and though he had encountered formidable opposition from powerful vested interests these same never once questioned the purity of his motives, even Anti-Voluntaries attending the Voluntary dinners.(4). Coupling zeal and ability in pressing his cause with patience and perseverance, he inevitably triumphed in the end. When Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr contemplated a long and difficult struggle to secure official recognition of the Dutch language, he wrote in the Zuid-Afrikaan, "who is there that desires to give his life to the cause as Mr. Solomon gave his to the Voluntary Principle? Let him say the word and we shall follow".(5).

(1). H. of A. June 4th 1860

(2). C.A. June 17th 1875 - an account of a public banquet attended by about 70 people to celebrate the enactment of the Voluntary Bill. Mr. Solomon reviewed in detail the fate of the measure in each Parliamentary session right up to the end. I have taken the subsequent details from 1861 onwards from his own account. The following rather bald facts might be noted here: In 1869, after a general election in which he lost his seat, Mr. Porter took charge of the Bill, but it was lost by a large majority in the Assembly. At the end of the year, a fresh election was held, Mr. Solomon was returned, and in the following (1870) session, the Bill was defeated by a narrow margin of 29-27. In 1871 it was shelved by being referred to a select committee which was instructed to consider the possibility of meeting the object of the Bill on a principle of commutation. In 1872 and 1873 the Bill passed the Assembly but was lost in the Council. In 1874 it was lost in the Assembly. Only in the next year, was it at last enacted.

(3). See Chapter 4.

(4). C.A. September 18th 1869. Report of a Dinner in honour of Mr. Solomon on the 15th. 'The company was principally composed of Voluntaries, but there were also present others, who though opposed to the Voluntary Bill, are admirers of the general political conduct of the late member of Capetown.

(5). J. H. Hofmeyr - Life of J. H. Hofmeyr, p.222

CHAPTER 3.

SEPARATION.

Under this term will be considered the agitation from the East for either a federal devolution of the Colony into two provinces or complete separation from the West. Other demands were for a removal of the seat of Government and Legislature from Capetown to somewhere nearer the East, if not to the East itself, and for parliaments held in alternate sessions at Capetown, on the one hand, and Grahamstown, or some other Eastern town, on the other.

It has been seen (1) how Mr. Solomon objected to 'paternal Government', one aspect of which or so he feared, is the over-centralisation of the Executive. As a democrat, he told his requisitionists in 1854 that he was in favour of a devolution of the Colony into two provinces for all local purposes and a union for all general purposes (2). He reiterated his belief in this solution all along, though later he insisted that the division should be into three, to respect the wishes of the Midlands districts (3). Yet he led the Western party against the Easterns in the Assembly. This was because he would not hear of complete separation. He was a man of large views, who felt that it was 'but the day of small things' (4). He hoped in time for a federation of the United States of Southern Africa, (5) and any further 'Balkanization' (6) seemed to him retrogression. As the financial depression deepened in the 1860's, the differences between East and West became sharper and sharper, and thus he stands out primarily as the leader of the Western party.

The question of Separation was first broached in the second session of Parliament (1855). On March 27th, Dr. Tancred moved that separation was desirable and that each Province should be made responsible for its own frontier line. Mr. Solomon, (7) of whom Murray wrote about this time, 'he is in every respect the leading member', (8) denounced the motion as 'a very strong exhibition of Western Province selfishness and exclusiveness'. The Eastern frontier was the concern of the entire colony. He was personally in favour of 'federation' (that is, devolution) and thought that the sooner it was granted, the better.

At the same time Mr. Solomon was sufficiently a Western man to oppose the equalization of representation between West and East in the Assembly which stood at 24 to 22 respectively, as was implied in the proposal to declare Queenstown an electoral district. (9).

In the very next session of Parliament, (10) Mr. Pote, member for Grahamstown, introduced a motion demanding complete separation of the Eastern and Western Provinces, to secure to the inhabitants of the former, "all their rights, privileges and immunities, of which they have been so long

-
- (1). See Chapter 2B
 - (2). 'Election of Mr. Saul Solomon...' p.4.
 - (3). H. of A. June 7th 1861.
 - (4). Ibid
 - (5). 'Election of Mr. Saul Solomon'. p.4.
 - (6). Walker, History of S.A. uses the expression. p.278.
 - (7). H. of A. March 27th 1855.
 - (8). Cape Monitor, May 9th 1855.
 - (9). H. of A. 18th May 1855.
 - (10). H. of A. May 27th 1856.
 - (11) member for Clanwilliam

deprived, but which can only be guaranteed to them under a separate constitution". The wording of the resolution was unfortunate. The West could hardly be expected to agree that it had been unjust to the East. Mr. Solomon, as a Western man, was stung by these allegations of discriminatory treatment. Besides a separate, independent Government was an entirely different thing from a federal devolution. He proceeded to demolish the arguments of the Separationists, and present the case of the West.

Separation or removal was demanded in the interests of the military defence of the frontier. This reason was no longer valid as the military headquarters were already stationed there. The presence of the Governor would be no asset since he was now a civilian.

It was claimed that owing to the unequal representation of East and West in Parliament, all measures beneficial to the East were rejected by the West. He pointed out that in the Assembly the West really only had a majority of one, since the Speaker was a Western man and had no deliberative vote. In the Legislative Council it stood at 8 to 7, in favour of the West. Such a majority was in neither case overwhelming. In his opinion considering the respective 'wealth, population and intelligence' (sic) of the two provinces, it was the western province which laboured under the disadvantage, the only justification for which was the distance Eastern members had to travel to the Legislature and the difficulty to them of regular attendance.

He asserted that there was no unanimity among the Eastern representatives, and supported this contention by an analysis of division lists. Even where some of the bills were of peculiar interest to the East, none showed any unity on provincial lines. "No, Sir, the legitimate operation of free representative institutions, where we meet face to face to discuss all subjects, and with the whole colony as lookers on, is to break down and destroy all national and all sectional distinctions".

The Eastern Province seemed to consider itself peculiarly English and interpreted Western opposition as the hostility of Dutch against English. The fact was that there were 30 English and 16 Dutch representatives in the Assembly, and of the 30 English, 13⁵ came from either Province.

Coming back to the particular proposal of Mr. Pote, he noted that it was proposed to make the West contribute to the defence of the frontier, although it was to be excluded from the control of border policy. The West would be very foolish to agree to that, for while he would not accuse the frontier colonists of deliberately provoking war, "the insatiable desire for land, which is exhibited so strongly in the extreme frontier districts" militated towards that end.

He was absolutely opposed to another proposal emanating from the frontier, namely that the seat of Government should be removed from Capetown to Graham's Town. He believed that the seat of Government had an important influence on the Executive. He recognised the shrewd and enterprising business abilities of the people of Graham's Town, but he thought they constituted a single class, whereas in Capetown would be found all the classes that composed the colony, in about the same proportion in which they existed throughout the country. "The public opinion of Capetown is the public opinion of the colony and a

Government adopting these opinions will secure the support and sympathy of the colonists".(1). It was an ingenious argument with which to counter the demand for a more centrally situated capital, even if Grahamstown's claims should be dismissed. It should be noted that Mr. Solomon was a Capetown man and moreover the Government contractor for stationery and printing. There were not lacking contemporaries, notably R.W. Murray(2), who believed that on this score he was influenced by personal, monetary considerations. On the other hand, Murray was a hot protagonist of the Eastern cause when he wrote to that effect in 1864.

Mr. Solomon concluded his speech by hoping that they would hear no more of 'this senseless cry for separation'. He proposed as an amendment, that when the Eastern Province clearly indicated its desire for separation, this should be granted, upon terms just to both provinces. He obviously hoped to thwart the Easterns by the difficulty of securing 'clear' proof.

Mr. Pote did not press the motion to a division. Neither in the 1857 nor the 1858 session was the matter raised again. In the latter year(3) Mr. Solomon tried in vain to induce the House to agree to the commencement of railways in the Eastern Province. He was not in the least concerned about the rival merits of Grahamstown and Graaff-Reinet as termini. 'I care nothing about the Eastern province.....' that is, of course, as an Eastern Province, though as fellow colonists I esteem them very 'highly'. Chiefly owing to divisions among the Easterns themselves, his motion and even Mr. Watermeyer's suggestion for a mere commission of inquiry was lost by 15 Noes to 14 Ayes.

General elections began in January 1859. On nomination day according to the custom of the time, the various candidates gave an account of themselves and their views. In connection with this particular question, Mr. Solomon proved himself but a poor prophet, for he gave it as his opinion that the demand for a separation of the Provinces or a removal of the seat of Government would not be raised for a very long time to come(4).

In spite of this prediction, Mr. Clough moved, soon after Parliament met, on April 21st, a resolution in favour of the introduction of an 'efficient resident Government' on the frontier. The onus of drawing up such a measure was to be thrown on the Governor. Mr. Solomon(5), as was usual by this time, led the opposition. His speech was rather scrappy, and he felt 'so exceedingly unwell' that he would not have spoken at all had not the others hung back. He complained of the ambiguous terms of the motion. As far as he understood it, complete separation was demanded. He still maintained that Eastern Province opinion was not unanimous on the subject. The Easterns, he added, seemed to imagine that the Province was peopled solely by descendants of the 1820 settlers. Actually, he estimated that nine-tenths of the population of the East came from the West. He remarked that it was curious that the East should hope to escape Kafir wars by separation, whereas the Free State thought to achieve the same end by Union with the Colony, - a reference to Grey's federation scheme.

-
- (1). Ibid
 - (2). 'South African Reminiscences'. p.53.
 - (3). H. of A. May 20th 1858.
 - (4). S.A.C.A. January 12th 1859.
 - (5). H. of A. April 21st 1859.

He suggested as an amendment, that the select committee appointed to consider the annexation of British Kaffraria should at the same time examine the alleged desire for separation in the East. Originally this committee had been intended to report on a federal union with the Free State as well as British Kaffraria, in accordance with Grey's recommendation in his opening speech in Parliament, (1) but soon after, on the 28th March, the Governor had sent down a message that the British Government was opposed to the federation plan, though it still required Parliament's opinion on the incorporation of British Kaffraria in the Colony.

On June 9th, Mr. Solomon, as chairman of the British Kaffraria and Frontier Government committee, brought up a report against enlarging the present limits of the Colony by annexing British Kaffraria and on June 14th, he introduced a resolution to the same effect. His first reason was that the Colony was large enough, as it was. In his opinion, if any further territory was to be brought under British jurisdiction, it should be constituted as a separate colony and he therefore regretted that the possibility of federation had been shelved by the British Government. But he admitted that he chiefly opposed the measure, because it would destroy the existing constitutional balance between East and West, not so much in the Assembly, where it could be remedied by increasing the representation of the West, as in the Council, where it would neutralize or even destroy the influence of the Midland districts. His motion against annexation was passed.

The 1860 session saw another request for Separation. Mr. Solomon's amendment (2) was an amusing and clever parody of Mr. Painter's motion. The old grievances and replies were again heard. It was pointed out by Mr. Solomon that the much-vaunted material progress and prosperity of the East was as good an argument against, as for, separation. Mr. Solomon still maintained that public opinion was not yet clearly in favour of separation. His amendment was again carried (29-14) that whenever the Eastern Province should indicate its desire for Separation, clearly and unmistakably, the House would take suitable steps to bring it about.

It almost seems as though Mr. Solomon tempted fate when he predicted in 1859 that they would not be troubled by the Eastern agitation for some time. During the 1860's the struggle became ^{keener} heavier than ever before. The financial depression that settled like a blight upon all South Africa in 'the dismal sixties' (3) was probably largely to blame.

Separation, in its various guises, dominated the attention of the Cape Parliament in 1861. On June 7th, Mr. Harriets moved the second reading of a Bill to provide for a separation of the Eastern and Western Provinces. Mr. Solomon began by acknowledging that the agitation in the East had received 'a great spirit', but he pointed out that the recently formed separation League owed its existence largely to the mistaken idea that a suggestion in the previous session to levy a half-penny tax on wool, was a Western measure specifically directed against the East. The fact was that the Westerns had voted with Easterns to reject it.

(1). 'S.A.C.A. Supplement' March 17th 1859.

(2). H. of A. June 7th 1860.

(3). Phrase used by Walker, History of S.A. p.307.

As to the allegation of the unfair appropriation of revenue to Western interests, he could scarcely trust himself to speak. However, he so far recovered himself as to be able to go into minute details to prove that the phrase 'milch-cow' was more generally applicable to the West than to the East.

He denied that he was the enemy of the East, but he had been driven into opposition because the House had always been asked to agree that the West had grossly ill-treated the East and he felt it incumbent upon himself to point out the facts. He admitted promising that when the East clearly demanded separation, no difficulties would be raised, but he pointed out that the petitions which had been received, though numerous, were of doubtful value, as the genuineness of signatures attached to them had been definitely queried in the Council. Further, he insisted that the views of the Midlands should receive attention for it held half the wealth of the Eastern Province and produced four-fifths of the wool that was exported. It was definitely opposed to Separation.

When he had agreed to an eventual Separation, he had never understood anything more than local self-government. He urged them to realise that it was 'but the day of small things', and to take a wider view. In the future lay the federation of all South Africa. His amendment for the Bill to be shelved was carried.

Shortly after, Mr. Harries moved a resolution, (1) in favour of the removal of the seat of Government, 'to such a place in the Eastern Province as His Excellency the Governor may appoint', this discretionary power being doubtless in the interests of unity in the Eastern ranks. The Cape Argus remarked that 'the honourable member very clearly and ably, though evidently without much heart or hope went over the ground that was so well-trodden in the Separation debate'. Mr. Solomon was apparently not in the House. Mr. Ziervogel, taking temporary charge of the opposition advised the members of his party not to bandy words, but simply to intimate their opinions by vote. After a few Easterns had spoken the motion was defeated by 26 to 14, and another for a dissolution of Parliament fared similarly.

Thus fizzled out the great Eastern agitation of 1861 for the time being. In 1875, (2) at the last Voluntary banquet to celebrate the passing of the Voluntary Bill, Mr. Solomon revealed that in 1861 he had been compelled to withdraw his Bill, since the majority of his supporters came from the East, and as Separationists, resented his leadership of the Western opposition so that there was a distinct possibility of their voting against him on the Voluntary question in revenge.

Although Sir Philip Wodehouse told the Cape Parliament, in his first address, (3) to it, that he was opposed to separation, federation and removal, the Easterns did not yet abandon their efforts. In fact, the struggle became sharper than ever before, largely owing to the gloomy financial outlook.

The first important measure which the new Governor sent down was a Bill to annex British Kaffraria, (4). Some of the constitutional changes proposed in it were quite sound, such as

-
- (1). C.A. June 20th, gave a resume of the debate on the 18th.
 - (2). C.A. June 17th 1875.
 - (3). Supplement to the Cape Argus, April 24th 1862.
 - (4). H. of A. June 26th 1862 to 30th. Mr. Solomon spoke on the 27th.

the reduction of the period for which Legislative Councillors sat from ten to five years, and an elective President of the Legislative Council instead of the Chief Justice.(1). But, as in 1859, Mr. Solomon opposed the measure because it would equalise the representation of West and East in both the Councils and the Assembly,(2) and thus strengthen the Easterns against the Westerns, in their attempt to carry a resolution in favour of Separation. He scored a strong point, even with the Easterns, by observing that the natives of British Kaffraria outnumbered the Europeans by 80 to 1 and would be entitled to the franchise in due course on the same terms, as any other colonist. In the circumstances, he thought that federation was the only solution. On June 30th, the Governor's Bill was lost by 19 to 14 votes.

The Governor next proposed to assemble Parliament occasionally in the Eastern districts, and the Colonial Secretary introduced a resolution to that effect. Mr. Solomon (3), leading the opposition, admitted that the Governor had the legal power to summon Parliament wherever he thought fit, but he thought that, acting constitutionally, there was no sufficient reason to move it from Capetown. As far as inconvenience was concerned he calculated that the nett result was the same for the Legislative Council and in the Assembly more people suffered inconvenience if Parliament met in Grahamstown and not Capetown. (He discounted the fact that different people would be suffering inconvenience). Capetown he reiterated, as the seat of Government, based its claim on its superior wealth, population and intelligence. He believed that the result of alternate Parliaments would be that legislation passed in one session would be repealed in the next. The motion was rejected.

In the next session,(4) owing to the slackness of the Western members, Mr. Harries succeeded in carrying by a single vote, (15 - 14) a motion requesting the Governor to summon the next session of Parliament in the Eastern Province. When Parliament was prorogued,(5) Wodehouse announced his intention of convening Parliament in Grahamstown next year. He observed that of the supplies requested, scarcely a quarter had been granted, and the Government was left with a deficit. Though he did not actually say so, it was obviously hoped that an Eastern Parliament would be more generous.

X In 'South African Reminiscences', (6) Murray recalled that Wodehouse confidentially told him of his intention to convene Parliament in Grahamstown. His difficulty was that he could not be sure of a paper to back him there. Murray had previously sold one-half share in the Argus to Mr. Solomon, who had the contract to print it since it came out in 1857, and he decided to sell out to him altogether and establish a paper in Grahamstown - namely the 'Great Eastern'.

Capetown, to whom the Parliament was worth at least £20,000 per annum did not view the proposed session at Grahamstown with equanimity.(7). On August 17th 1863 a public

-
- (1) Theal History of S.A. since 1795. Vol.5 (1908) p.25
 - (2) Ibid. The number of members in the Leg. Council to be increased to 9 for each Province and in the Assembly equalisation would be result of giving the West and East four new members, and British Kaffraria two.
 - (3) H. of A. July 1st 1862.
 - (4) H. of A. July 14th 1863
 - (5) C.A. July 30th 1863. Prorogation on July 28th.
 - (6) S.A. Reminiscences. p.48
 - (7) Ibid. p.53.

meeting was held in Capetown at the Town House to consider what could be done with regard to the proposed removal of Parliament to Grahamstown. Mr. Solomon was one of the principal speakers. It was with this protest meeting in mind that Murray wrote that Mr. Solomon's indignation was partly due to his fear of losing the Government contract for printing!... and it was no wonder that Mr. Solomon who was the Government and Parliamentary printer, was more outraged than his neighbours(1).

Sir Philip Wodehouse refused to grant the petition passed by the public meeting of the 17th that Parliament should not be moved from Capetown, and another was held on August 31st at the Town House. Mr. Solomon was asked to explain why he had not attempted to rescind the resolution in favour of removal. He replied that he did not think that the Governor had been guided by the resolution so much as the need to obtain the taxes which a Capetown Parliament had refused him. To that extent he sympathised with the Governor. "I regret, and everyone who saw my course in Parliament, unpopular as it may be to be, to be an advocate of taxation, will understand that I deeply regret that more taxes were not laid upon the people, for I believe they are absolutely necessary for the Government to carry on its business efficiently".

It seemed to him that the East had abandoned separation for the time being and were^{was} now advocating removal. That being the case, the West must send to Grahamstown the very best representatives it could. He was apparently in bad health, for he spoke of a difficulty 'entirely personal and peculiar.... which it is impossible for me to overcome', which would prevent him from offering himself for election to the next Parliament.

It is interesting to note the attitude of leading Eastern newspapers to him, reflecting and moulding, as they do, the opinions of a considerable section of the people. 'The Eastern Province Herald' in an editorial resumé of the Protest meeting at Capetown regretted that Mr. Solomon would not stand. "For readiness in debate, for shrewd business tact, for a thorough knowledge of the colony and for moral courage in the defence of any question he has espoused, he stands 'second to none' in the House of Assembly" ...(2).

When Mr. Solomon subsequently changed his mind and allowed himself to be nominated, the 'Grahamstown Journal', in an editorial headed, "Saul Solomon is Coming", expressed its satisfaction. "Mr. Solomon is not generally bebved on the Frontier.....We should not be surprised to be told that in the rural districts the name of Saul Solomon, like that of Bonaparte in the good old days at home, is used to frighten children..... But we believe that the Frontier people have the same sort of noble bravery which induces the British seaman to seek out and grapple with the ships carrying the greatest number of the very biggest guns".(3).

However, continued ill-health forced Mr. Solomon to alter his plans once more. In a letter published in the Cape

(1). Ibid

(2). Eastern Province Herald. August 25th 1863.

(3). Grahamstown Journal. December 11th 1863.

Argus, (1) he informed his requisitionists of the necessity of a sea voyage to restore his health. He could not be sure when he would return from England and he thought it best to withdraw his candidature definitely.

While in England, Mr. Solomon spent a few days at Norwood in February 1864, where John Henry de Villiers, then a young law-student, was also staying. Mr. Solomon advised him to complete his studies and return to the Cape as soon as possible, as there would probably be some good openings for barristers in the near future. De Villiers recalled that when they walked together, the small boys would shout out, "There is the little man".(2).

Meanwhile, at the Cape, Mr. Solomon had been nominated in spite of his refusal to stand and on March 16th, there being only 4 candidates for the 4 seats in Capetown, all were returned unopposed. As soon as the news reached him in England, he hurried back to Grahamstown, as he told in a later election (1869), (3) when he recounted what sacrifices he had made on behalf of his electors.

Murray has left us a biased portrait of him at this time. He pictured Mr. Solomon as bowed down under the strain of fighting, practically singlehanded, to keep off the fast-gathering influence of the growing East. "His devotion to Parliament has been excessive..... he read half the night and spoke half the day.... He is irritable, impertinent and illogical... if he had laid down his political weapons even last session, he might have been always remembered as the leader and chief ornament of the Assembly, instead of the spiteful and uncompromising enemy of the East".(4).

Parliament was reopened on the 27th April, 1864. On June 21st Mr. Solomon took the oath and his seat as a member for Capetown, and he immediately resumed the leadership of the Western party. On his arrival, he found that notice of a motion in favour of removal had been given by Mr. Harries. As the days passed without the resolution being moved, Mr. Solomon began to suspect that it was deliberately being held back till the majority of the Western members should have left. Since Mr. Harries evaded fixing a day for the debate, although specifically requested to do so, he placed a counter motion on the paper in favour of retaining the seat of Government in Capetown. When the resolution came on, the Eastern members, finding themselves in a minority, left the Hall in a body so that the motion was carried without any opposition. That question settled, Mr. Solomon and several other Westerns, felt free to return home.(5).

A year had elapsed since the people of Capetown had held excited meeting against 'removal' and undoubtedly they were in a happier mood. A dinner was held in the Commercial Exchange on Thursday the 18th of August, in honour of the Western Province members. With some satisfaction a Capetown editor(6) remarked, "When Mr. Solomon reviewed the leading events of the session, characterised its history and results,

-
- (1). C.A. December. 22nd, 1863.
 - (2). Walker - "De Villiers" p.26.
 - (3). Speech on Nomination day. - C.A. May 11th, 1869.
 - (4). 'Pen and Ink Sketches' Book 2. p.49.
 - (5). C.A. July 21st, 1864. 'Monthly Summary of Cape News'.
 - (6). S.A.C.A.' August 20th, 1864.

and hit hard, as no man in his position could help doing, at the baffled attempts and disappointed ambition of the Grahamstown party, all cheered enthusiastically, of course, but it was the good-humoured cheering of men who could afford rather to laugh at their antagonists than to bitterly decry them".

Western smugness did not last long. In the following session Wodehouse requested Parliament to pass an Act annexing British Kaffraria to the Cape, but if they refused he would promulgate an Act of the Imperial Parliament, which he had specially secured to meet that contingency. The West was alarmed and determined to forestall any such possibility, for the British Act provided only for the representation of British Kaffraria and it was feared that the Kaffraria representatives would throw in their lot with the Easterns and so strengthen the latter.

On May 16th Mr. Solomon supported by Mr. Molteno, carried a motion that the British Kaffraria Annexation Act should be amalgamated with the Representation Act in order to ensure that the former was not passed without the latter, and that the existing constitutional balance between East and West in both the Assembly and Council would be maintained. Thereafter the West was favourably disposed towards annexation.

Nevertheless, on May 22nd, Mr. Solomon moved a vote of censure on the Governor, on the one hand, and the British Government and Parliament on the other, the former for requesting the latter for passing, an Act vitally affecting the Cape without the slightest attempt to consult the Colonial Parliament. It is here(1) sufficient to note that the resolutions, as amended by Mr. Rutherford, member for Graaff-Reinet, in the direction of toning them down, were carried with only one dissentient, a Mr. Boyes. The Grahamstown Journal(2) approved of Mr. Solomon's action, although it professed to regard it as nothing more than an unpleasant duty. Remarking that Colonial Governors were very average men "... of course, there is the abstract dignity of the office; but the colonial mind is incapable of being impressed with abstractions".

The unanimity of East and West was of very short duration. The West supported the amalgamated Annexation and Representation Bill. The East hoped to defeat the same and secure the introduction of the Annexation Bill alone. There began a dreary period of obstruction, lasting in the Assembly till the 4th August, when the Bill passed its third reading, and in the Legislative Council further opposition held it up till the 14th September, when it scraped through by 7 votes to 6.(3).

In his prorogation speech, (4) the Governor referred to the Vote of Censure, and justified his action by pointing to the events of the session, when the question had not been discussed on its own merits, but had resolved itself into a trial of strength between East and West.

(1). See Chapter 4.

(2). Grahamstown Journal, 29th May 1865.

(3). Murray gives an entertaining account of the obstruction in S.A. Reminiscences, p.68. 'Sir Christoffel Brand was a man of marvellous physical endurance or he could never have stood it'. Also Kilpin - The Old Cape House, pp. 41 - 42.

(4). C.A. October, 10th 1865.

The year 1866 saw South Africa sunk deeper than ever into financial depression and in the Cape Parliament the wrangling between East and West ceased temporarily before the more urgent question of balancing the budget.(1). On July 16th, 1867, it began all over again, when Captain Mills proposed that the Governor be requested to summons the next session of Parliament at a town in the Eastern Province. Mr. Solomon objected that it was Separation in a different guise and his motion to adjourn was carried by 22 Ayes to 20 Noes. On the next day, learning that the Legislative Council had agreed, by the casting vote of the speaker, to the same resolution as the Assembly had rejected, he secured by 19 to 14, a motion in favour of continuing to hold the parliamentary sessions at Capetown. That was not the last of the Easterns. A month later, on August 15th he moved the adoption of a series of resolutions in reply to those of the Council, which had in turn been directed against the original resolution of the Assembly. The Legislative Council voiced the old complaints that Parliament was dominated by members resident in or near Capetown; that as a result, Legislation had been detrimental to the interests of the whole colony; public money had been spent on public works chiefly in the Cape area, to the neglect of the Eastern districts; the permanent majority granted the West in the Legislature was unfair to the East, which it was alleged, had outstripped the West in population, wealth and trade; the East was handicapped by the distance from Capetown and thus the members arrived late and left early. The Legislative Council recommended not only in the interests of the whole colony, 'but also of the Imperial Government', a removal of the seat of Government and the Legislature to a central place, and equality of representation in Parliament. The Governor was asked to transmit the resolutions to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. Solomon presented the Western case with exquisite clarity. He carefully considered each and every argument, and with the aid of facts and figures from official returns, demolished it. His resolutions were passed on the same day as they were introduced by 20 to 3 and were likewise presented to the Governor for despatch to England.

In his prorogation speech,(2) Wodehouse remarked judiciously that both sets of resolutions merely indicated the hostility existing between East and West. He could not recommend removal, but as a sop to the East, he thought that possibly representation might be equalized, and Parliament assembled occasionally elsewhere than in Capetown. Mr. Solomon's organ, "The Cape Argus", remarked sarcastically that the Governor favoured moving Parliament about, "but then he would cut down the Legislature until he had made it a portable machine".(3).

No more was heard in Parliament of Separation in whatever guise until 1871. On June 1st shortly after the meeting of Parliament, Mr. Molteno moved a resolution in favour of Responsible Government, and for a commission to investigate the possibility of a division of the Colony into provinces, under a federal Government. Then to win over the Easterns, it was agreed to amend the motion so as to state that devolution was desirable and that the commission was to

(1). Chapter 4.

(2). C.A. Saturday, August 17th, 1867. Prorogation on Friday.

(3). Ibid. Editorial.

consider how to achieve it.(1). When he gave evidence, in due course, Mr. Solomon said he had no objection to a division of the Colony into three provinces, for purely local purposes, though he should have preferred to wait for a wider, South African Confederation.(2). The new Governor Sir Henry Barkly, mentioned both as possibilities, in his opening speech.(3).

Most of the Westerns were in favour of the Responsible Government Bill, and as soon as its passage was secured in 1872, no objection was raised to the equalisation of representation between East and West in the Assembly by the creation of Wodehouse as an electoral district.(4). Mr. Solomon suggested, at the same time that there should be a reform in the mode of election of the Legislative Council.

A month later, he moved,(5) but on behalf of the Reverend John Brown, a further amendment of the Constitution Ordinance, so that the country should be divided into five or more circles for Legislative Council elections. He himself fully agreed that a change was necessary. In the West, Capetown, and in the East, Grahamstown and Port Elizabeth exercised an undue influence under the present system. He could not resist the parting shot that "Capetown was more truly representative of the Western Province than Grahamstown and Port Elizabeth of the Eastern Province". The Motion was carried by 26 to 11.

Accordingly, in the next session, the Attorney-General, de Villiers, moved(6) the second reading of a Bill to reform the Legislative Council by reducing the tenure to seven years and dividing the Colony into seven circles each returning three members. Mr. Solomon naturally supported it, though he would have preferred a tenure of twelve years, one-third retiring every four years. The Bill was lost in the Council however.

After an early dissolution of Parliament on this issue it was passed, though not without some difficulty. Mr. Molteno secured its passage through the Council by promising that it should not take effect immediately, but only at the next general election. In the Assembly, an amendment by Mr. Sprigg that its operation be immediate was carried by a majority of one. Molteno frightened several members into repentance by threatening to resign, but although Mr. Solomon was in favour of the Bill, he was not in the majority that voted in favour of expunging Mr. Sprigg's amendment(7).

In the same session as this first serious attack upon the division into East and West was made, Mr. Paterson proposed(8) a resolution for a devolution of the Colony into three provinces for local government, subject to a central Government and Legislature. This represented a large modification

-
- (1). Theal History of S.A. since 1795(Vol.5) 1908. p.125.
 - (2). Cape of Good Hope. Appendix 2 to Votes and Proceedings of Parl., 1872. Federation Commission's Report. Evidence of Mr. Solomon on 12th February. p.94.
 - (3). C.A. Supplement Thursday, April 18th, 1872.
 - (4). H. of A. June 14th 1872. The 'Responsible Government' Bill was read a third time in the Council on 12th June (Theal History Vol. 5. (1908) p.136).
 - (5). H. of A. July 11th 1872.
 - (6). H. of A. May 12th 1873. Eybers pp. 64-65.
 - (7). Molteno, Vol. 1 pp.241-248. The relevant pages in the Argus were torn out. There is however a record of the final division - H. of A. July 10th 1874.
 - (8). H. of A. June 3rd 1873.

of the former Eastern demand for complete Separation, and was what Mr. Solomon himself had advocated all along, even to the Federation Commission in 1872. But he now argued that that commission's report had been a failure. Specifically appointed to consider a scheme of devolution, the members had differed too much to produce a really workable plan. Rather different, however, was his further contention that 'his idea of federation had always been the bringing in of the outlying states - the Transvaal, Natal and the Free State, and if there was no prospect of that being done within a reasonable time, there was no advantage in dividing the Colony'. He moved, as an amendment, that the question should be shelved till Responsible government had been firmly established and that any such measure should be introduced by the Government.

One cannot avoid the impression that Mr. Solomon was no longer in favour even of devolution. When in 1875 the agitation for a South African Confederation began with Lord Carnarvon's despatch and the arrival of Mr. Froude, Mr. Solomon(1) accused the Easterns of supporting Confederation for the sake of obtaining a division of the Colony and he ridiculed the expectation that a South African conference would interest itself in such a domestic affair. He forgot that he himself had said that only under such circumstances could the question be considered. The truth was probably, that after eighteen years, he was tired of Eastern and Western rivalries. That is clear from the fact that he had taken the initiative in inducing the Molteno Government to break up the political divisions into East and West by blurring the territorial distinctions in Legislative Council elections.

There is ^{this} much to be said for him. Firstly, as he himself pointed out, the report of the Federation Commission had been a failure. But even more important, by this time, the main Eastern grievances had been redressed. Molteno's Cabinet was a coalition of Easterns and Westerns and in the Legislature representation had been equalised. Time, bringing improved communications, must inevitably work to lessen the distances physical and mental, between the extremes of the Colony. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that such a change of attitude is disconcerting in one whose consistency was his proud boast.(2).

(1). See Chapters 6 and 7 for a discussion of the Confederation campaign.

(2). H. of A. June 25th 1880. Confederation debate'....for I am not ashamed of what I do, politically or privately. I have at least a character for consistency to sustain'.

CHAPTER 4. RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

As a Liberal, Mr. Solomon had no "morbid dread of innovation", (1) but he promised his electors that he would be cautious in advocating changes. "Rashness or precipitancy on the part of the new Parliament in the introduction of organic or extensive changes, would in my opinion be far more injurious to the interests of the Colony than the adoption of a system of legislation which might appear to be marked by extreme or unnecessary caution". (2). While his refusal to grant the wishes of the Eastern Separationists, may not seem particularly meritorious in a Western man, one cannot fail to be struck by his reluctance, time and again, to force on a measure, such as Responsible Government, in which he himself had faith, when many, a large minority, were against it.

In the second Session of the first Parliament, Mr. Paterson^c carried, by 23 votes to 9, a resolution affirming that 'the immediate introduction of Responsible Parliamentary Government into this colony is both expedient and necessary'. A committee consisting of Messrs Fairbairn, Solomon, Molteno, Meintjies and Paterson was appointed to consider what alterations would have to be made in the Constitution Ordinance, in consequence of such a change of Government. (3).

About a month later, (4) Mr. Fairbairn proposed that the Report of the Committee on Responsible Government be adopted. It is merely stated that Mr. Solomon spoke at length in favour of the motion. In the evening he replied to some objections. He realized that the Easterns were afraid that if Responsible Government were introduced, federation or separation would never be obtained. He was favourable to federation but assured them that it could best be considered after, rather than before, the change was made. Although the House had virtually accepted the principle of Responsible Government by passing Mr. Paterson's resolution, Mr. Fairbairn found it wiser not to press the adoption of the Report and the question was shelved for the time being.

A week after the opening of the next Session, (5) there was some discussion on the implications of the second paragraph of the address drawn up by a Select Committee in answer to the Governor's opening speech. It was rather involved, but the import was that the House would welcome action taken by the Executive, to introduce Responsible Government. Mr. Solomon objected to putting such a highly contentious question into the address. 'I hope to see Responsible Government carried but not by a side-wind'. It was finally agreed to modify the clause in accordance with his views.

(1). 'Election of Mr. Solomon'. p. 7.

(2). Ibid. p. 6.

(3). H. of A. 5th April 1855. From here onwards, for the rest of the Session, the S.A.C.A. for some unaccountable reason no longer printed detailed reports of the debates.

(4). H. of A. 9th May 1855.

(5). H. of A. March 20th 1856.

c. member for Port Elizabeth.

Not long after, Mr. Fairbridge moved(1) a resolution to the effect that the introduction of Responsible Government should be delayed as a premature measure. While Mr. Solomon was not prepared to force on the change until the time was ripe he did think that the various objections to Responsible Government as a principle were unsound. Some were of the same kind as had been raised against Representative Government. It had then been argued that no qualified men would be found to represent the people and that the East would be unable to send any representatives at all. That had been disproved and he did not think there would be any difficulty in finding sufficient suitable men to form a Cabinet, nor that the ambition for office was, in itself, contemptible. Parliamentary Government was said to be unsuited to a country which was not nationally homogeneous, but he believed that complete political equality was the only solution in such cases. The Easterns further feared that the troops would be withdrawn, should Responsible Government be introduced, but he thought that the Imperial Government would appreciate that the position in the Cape was far different from that obtaining in Canada and Australia. It seemed to him that if a Kaffir war broke out, the Executive, although compelled to take immediate steps, would be uncertain of Parliamentary support, and hence its actions would be dilatory. This was a very weak argument, because a successful military action against possible aggression on the frontier, would invariably be approved by Parliament, even if the Executive neglected to consult it till afterwards. Thus in 1858, the Assembly condoned Grey's rather arbitrary use of the Frontier Police between the Kei and the Bashoe, against Krelli.(2). Again in 1877 troubles arose owing to a division of opinion between the Governor and his Ministers, as to the conduct of the Galka-Galeka Campaign, and the House sided with the Governor.(3).

Observing the strength of the "Anti-Responsibles", Mr. Solomon produced an amendment, which was in the nature of a compromise, for it proposed to establish Responsible Government gradually by providing that the members of the Executive should offer themselves for election to either House, though if defeated at the polls, they might take their seats in the House, ex-officio, without the right of voting, as at present. His amendment was defeated by 24 votes to 16 and the original motion passed by the same majority of eight.

No further direct attempt was made to introduce Responsible Government till 1860, but Mr. Molteno was not above trying to force it through by 'side-winds'. Murray described him as "very apt to be led away by an excessive zeal for anti-Government attacks"(4) and Mr. Molteno often differed from Mr. Solomon on the question of procedure. He was so hotly in favour of Responsible Government that he could not brook any delay, and he therefore tried on occasion, to obstruct the normal business of Government. Thus, in 1858,(5) when the Road Bill was being discussed, he said he did not consider it a very great improvement on the present system, and was content to leave things till Responsible Government was carried. Mr. Solomon, on the other hand, admitted that the Road Bill could be improved and that

(1). H. of A. April 10th 1856.

(2). See Chapter 20.

(3). See Chapter 6.

(4). "Pen and Ink Sketches in Parliament". by Limner, Book 1. p. 7.

(5). H. of A. March 16th 1858.

Responsible Government was very desirable, 'but I am not prepared to say that we should delay every important measure till we get it'. Mr. Solomon's views prevailed and the Bill was enacted.

In 1860 Molteno introduced a motion in favour of Responsible Government.(1). The public, particularly women, crowded in to listen - "The Speaker's gallery was entirely occupied by ladies".(2). Mr. Solomon did not speak till late in the evening, after the Attorney-General, Mr. Porter, had delivered an eloquent peroration in favour of the measure. Mr. Solomon's speech attracted attention for a rather different reason. Quite early in his address, he began to disagree with several of Molteno's arguments - a fact which said a great deal for his honesty but little for his strategy.

Solomon
Molteno claimed that they were not able to control expenditure at the present time. Mr. Solomon doubted whether they would be in any better position under Responsible Government. He quoted from the English 'Times' to show that in the House of Commons a committee had recently been appointed to check extravagance. In fact he believed that under Responsible Government they would probably have a much greater expenditure than they then had.

He had never thought of Representative Government other than as a transitory stage in the Colony's political development, but the Executive was making that system work tolerably well. Molteno exaggerated in saying that Parliament was falling in the public estimation, and he chided his impatience. "Can we suppose that representative institutions, the creature of a day among us, will be productive of all the advantages likely to result from them, before they have existed six or seven years?"

His main ground for advocating the change was based on the deplorable irresponsibility of the opposition, which could only be sobered if it realized that it would have to take over the Government. He accused Molteno of hindering the Government by cutting it short of supplies. If he (Molteno) had been Treasurer-General, he would not have proposed a reduction of the transfer duties by a half, which resulted in a loss to the public revenue of £40,000.

"It is not, sir, that I advocate Responsible Government because this House is too weak, but because this House is too strong - not because I hold that the present Government have too much power, but because I believe the members of that Government have far too little power". He could foresee no difficulties arising out of Responsible Government between the Imperial and Colonial Administrations. It was quite simple to him. "We want a Governor appointed by the Crown for Imperial interests and an Administration enjoying the confidence of the Colonial Parliament for Colonial interests". Yet in 1865 he himself was to remark resentfully that Sir Philip Wodehouse neglected the interests of the Colony in order to serve Imperial ends.

At the conclusion of the debate, Mr. Thomson's amendment which admitted the need of some constitutional changes, but held that the time was not yet ripe for them, was carried by 20 votes to 18. It seems probable, considering the narrow margin of defeat, that Molteno might have carried his motion

(1). S.A.C.A. May 22nd 1860.

(2). Ibid.

had Mr. Solomon spoken more strongly in favour of it.

✓ In 1863 Mr. Molteno again proposed the introduction of Responsible Government.(1). By this time the financial depression was beginning to make itself felt and the relations between parliament and the Executive were becoming more strained than during the prosperous fifties. In the circumstances, Mr. Solomon gave a less qualified support of the motion. In the previous Session the House had rejected two or three very important Government proposals, such as alternate Parliaments and the annexation of British Kaffraria,(2) and in the present Session it seemed extremely unlikely that the Government would obtain a sufficiency of supplies to prevent an increase of the public debt.

Mr. Solomon did not think that the Governor's experiment of introducing bills no longer on his ^{sole} responsibility but with the advice of the Executive Council as a body, would be a success. Only an Executive formed from a parliamentary party could be expected to act collectively. The present officers were in politics as professionals and would not resign if they disagreed with the Governor.

What he had said previously of the opposition was even more applicable at the present time. He gave an interesting picture of the situation in the Cape Parliament; - 'It was a dangerously strong and irresponsible opposition - an opposition that has nothing in common, that is broken up into individualities, every man doing what is right in his own eyes, without being disposed to follow any leader..... the consequence being that every measure of importance which the Government brings in, is thrown out, and the Parliament itself is unable to bring in anything in its place'.

He stated firmly that he had no ambition for office. "I have a great dread and apprehension of any such trial and anxiety being fixed upon me". It was improbable that he and Molteno would ever be in the same Cabinet. "And it seems too, to be taken for granted that the honourable member for Beaufort and myself are always to be in the same ministry, which I think a very unlikely thing."

He again suggested that Responsible Government might be introduced gradually by giving officers the opportunity of offering themselves for election, but both this amendment and the original motion were rejected.

Since Parliament opposed the new system of Government it seemed to Mr. Solomon only logical that the existing Government should be supported in every reasonable way. The main difficulty of Wodehouse's Government was to get adequate supplies. Molteno was in the forefront of those who opposed any taxation whatever. Thus, for example, when the Treasurer-General said he estimated a deficit of £130,000 and asked the House to consider raising the transfer duties(3) Mr. Molteno objected that no taxes were necessary if the Government would be economical instead of extravagant. Mr. Solomon thought the fact that the Governor requested the House's authorization to borrow £15,000 to pay salaries due the next day, made it quite clear that the Government was really in a straitened position. Their first concern should be the safeguarding of the public credit, no matter what they

(1). H. of A. May 28th 1863. Mr. Solomon spoke on the 29th.

(2). See Chapter 3.

(3). H. of A. June 26th 1863.

might think about extravagant expenditure and the necessity for retrenchment. He intended to vote for all the Government's measures to raise revenue.

However, by the end of the Session, the House had by so far followed Molteno's lead that the Governor received only about a quarter of the taxes he had asked for, and had to resort to the expedient of summoning Parliament to Grahamstown to obtain there the necessary supplies from grateful Easterns.(1).

Mr. Solomon drew a distinction between the duty of support of the Government and of the Governor, although under a system of representative Government as then existed, there was not such a great difference between the two. In the 1865 Session,(2) Mr. Solomon secured the passing of a vote of censure on the Governor for obtaining an Imperial Act to annex British Kaffraria, to hang as a threat over the Cape Parliament, if it did not pass an Act to the same effect locally. It has already been noted(3) that Mr. Solomon objected to the Imperial Act because if promulgated, without any further redistribution of representation, it would turn the balance in the Assembly, in favour of the East. But he also objected, as a constitutionalist, to this extreme action of passing an Act very deeply affecting the Colony without the least effort at consulting the Cape Parliament. In the course of his speech, Mr. Solomon attacked the Governor for subordinating Colonial interests to Imperial ends. "The Governor states his anxiety to meet the wishes of the Home Government, but he overlooks entirely the interests of the Colony he is appointed to govern,"

He thought that Wedehouse carried his submission to Downing Street to ludicrous extremes as when, in a despatch to the Duke of Newcastle in 1863, he asked whether, in the event of Separation, Colesberg and Graff Reinet should be included in the Eastern or Western Province! In his opinion, it was impossible to rule the Colony from Downing Street, - "They have their own party questions to fight for, and would sacrifice the Cape Colony tomorrow, if it would lead to a party triumph".

Three years later, on the eve of a new Parliament,(4) the Governor, while yet maintaining himself justified in taking the action he had, owing to the bitter feud between the East and West which prevented Parliament from considering the question on its own merits, said, "I admit that I strained to the uttermost the powers vested in me by the Constitution, and did violence to the feelings of those who attach a high value to your Parliamentary privileges". but excused himself simply, "I did not think myself at liberty to shrink from the odium of effecting the change".

Mr. Solomon, however, continued to support the Government. He was so sure of his own consistency that he never feared to be even apparently acting inconsistently. At the beginning of the 1866 Session, the Governor informed parliament that the deficit for 1865 had been £94,600 and would probably be greater in the next year.(5). All other questions faded into insignificance beside the all-important question

(1). Prorogation Speech July 30th 1863.

(2). H. of A. May 22nd 1865.

(3). Chapter 3.

(4). Prorogation Speech September 2nd 1868.

(5). C.A. Supplement September 1866.

of making the budget balance. The mood of the House was in favour of retrenchment.

After the Colonial Secretary had made his Budget speech and proposed going into committee to consider the Estimates, Mr. Rutherford, the member for Graaff Reinet, who first took his seat in 1864 and was immediately hailed by Murray(1) as the leader of the Easterns, suggested a select committee to consider a scheme of retrenchment.(2). Mr. Molteno advised that the Estimates should be referred back to the Government for it to make the alterations. Mr. Solomon elected to support Mr. Rutherford, rather curiously, since he thought that the select committee would achieve nothing. On the other hand, the continued financial depression was beginning to effect him too. He pointed out that Wodehouse was wrong in saying that ever since he had been in the Colony he had been faced with a deficit. In 1862, Mr. Rawson, then Colonial Secretary, congratulated the Colony on an excess of revenue over expenditure. In 1863, there was a deficit, but next year the Governor thanked the Graham's Town Parliament for restoring the balance. In 1865, the previous Session, the Colonial Secretary in his budget speech declared the revenue to be in a satisfactory state. He began to fear that the Government was extravagant and to believe that only under Responsible Government would Parliament be able to control the expenditure. (In 1860, he had ridiculed this idea of Molteno's.)

Two days later, however, after the Attorney-General had indicated that the Government would be prepared to introduce a suitable scheme of retrenchment, Mr. Solomon moved that the House ask the Governor to do so, as soon as possible, but his motion was rejected by 29 votes to 15, and Rutherford's, for a select committee was carried (32-12).

After about six weeks,(3) Mr. Rutherford brought up the Report of the Retrenchment Committee and made a speech. No one had as yet had a chance to study the Report for printed copies had only been given out that very morning.(4). Mr. Solomon became almost incoherent in his praise of Mr. Rutherford. "The honourable member had made a most able speech, and he trusted that when the honourable member was called upon to assume the office of Prime Minister of the Colony...." he would do as well, which was anticipating events somewhat, because, when the Report was studied carefully, it was found to be full of errors.

Mr. Solomon said (5) that the Resolutions drawn up by the Retrenchment Committee were mere truisms and would be of little assistance to the Government. The report was in places directly contradictory to the resolutions. It must be evident that the country could not be governed by select committees. 'As long as the Government existed, he should continue to give it his support, for that was the principle upon which he had always acted, and should continue to act'.

The resolutions and report were, however, adopted and sent to the Governor with a request that he would frame the estimates for 1867 in accordance with them. The Governor

(1). 'Pen and Ink Sketches' by Linnar Book 2. p. 44.

(2). H. of A. September 25th 1866.

(3). H. of A. November 7th 1866.

(4). H. of A. Nov. 12th 1866. This was Mr. Solomon's justification when Mr. Rutherford accused him of inconsistency.

(5). H. of A. Ibid.

replied(1) that he would certainly bear in mind the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee, 'but the scheme to be submitted will be such as it (the Government) can itself conscientiously recommend'. If they continued to differ on the subject of balancing the budget, they should consider the introduction of Responsible Government. It is not unlikely that the Governor hoped to frighten thereby the Easterns from their alliance with the Westerns, since, generally speaking, the former were opposed to it.

On the next day, Mr. Solomon suggested a revival of the Retrenchment Committee to consider the message of the Governor. Mr. Rutherford objected that it was not necessary and Mr. Solomon replied that the Committee seemed to be passing a vote of no confidence on itself. "The honourable member for Graaff Reinet has held the reins of Government for six or seven weeks, and he brings up a proposal, which when he is asked to apply, he says he cannot do it, and abandons the reins". But Mr. Rutherford's amendment to consider in committee of the whole House was carried without a division.

At this time, the Zuid-Afrikaan,(2) discerning a consistency behind an apparent inconsistency, warned its readers in an editorial on the relations of the Executive and Parliament that, "however tortuous and however well-disguised his political schemes might be, his steady object was so to muddle and confuse the existing Governmental arrangements and so to embarrass the present Executive as to drive both the Parliament and the Government to the adoption of a form of Government which would in all probability result in the elevation of himself and party to seats on the Treasury benches". Ignoring for the moment this allegation of desire for office, it does seem that Mr. Solomon rather resented that the House should choose to follow Rutherford and Molteno rather than himself. With justifiable egoism, he believed that his own views were sounder, though superficially less attractive.

It has been noted how he taunted Mr. Rutherford with having abandoned the reins of Government. Mr. Kilpin gives a wrong impression when he says, "He thought more of leading the House in what he considered the right direction, than of being its leader, and during the financial depression of the sixties virtually handed over the leadership to Rutherford for a couple of years".(3).

After Mr. Rutherford's retrenchment plans had rather collapsed, Molteno took the lead of those who still insisted on extensive retrenchment. When Mr. Bedford asked (4) that Parliament should declare against the imposition of any tax on any exports of the Colony for the Session, the East apparently fearing a tax on wool, Mr. Molteno agreed, being opposed to export taxes as such. Mr. Solomon said he would support the motion as the House was definitely against any such tax this Session, but he did not believe, like Mr. Molteno, that an export tax was objectionable on principle. He then completely diverged to attack Mr. Molteno's general economic theories. He complained that 'many honourable members had come to regard the honourable member for Beaufort as a most economical member, and himself as a very extravagant one'.

(1). H. of A. Nov. 15th 1866.

(2). Z.A. Nov. 26th 1866.

(3). Kilpin, Article on Saul Solomon.

(4). H. of A. December 4th 1866.

On the 28th of December, the estimates for 1867 were introduced, and on the same day, Mr. Molteno moved that, as the Government scheme of retrenchment was most unsatisfactory the House should merely vote supplies for the first six months of 1867. Mr. Solomon objected that they could make such alterations as they pleased in committee. In any case, exactly the same questions would crop up on a six months estimate as on one for a full year. These estimates had been sent down at the House's specific request although the Governor had asked it to leave over the matter till the next Session. But Molteno had his way, and an appropriation bill for a half year was sent down next day, and passed without further ado. On January 13th 1867 the Governor dismissed Parliament in a few, rasping sentences. '.... with cocked hat and sword, he met them on Saturday, gave them one short sharp kick, and told them to go'.(1).

Parliament was convened again about three months later.(2) The Governor announced that in spite of retrenchment in various directions, there was still a deficit of £59,129. Further taxation was therefore imperative and he proposed a constitutional amendment in the direction of reducing Parliament to a single Legislative Chamber of 18 Members in which the Executive should have three seats. Molteno tried to forestall the Governor by introducing Responsible Government(3) and Mr. Solomon supported him with the usual arguments, but the motion was lost by 29 to 22. About a week later,(4) there was a debate on the Budget speech. Mr. Solomon took exception to the Attorney-General's tactless remark about economising by 'lopping off the cumbrous machinery of Parliament'. The country would not allow him or anyone else to deprive them of their parliamentary institutions, - a declaration which was greeted with loud cheering. The feeling of the House with regard to the Governor's proposal was thus unmistakable. On June 12th, the Colonial Secretary withdrew the 'Reform Bill', amid cheers and laughter, with the lame excuses that so far there was harmony between Parliament and Government - other urgent matters needed attention - the Session was far advanced.

The following Session was quiet. There was still a deficit, but it was less than half that of the previous year,(5) and no new taxes or loans were required, so that the relations between Parliament and the Executive were quite pleasant for a change.

At the general elections in 1869, "the unexpected happened".(6). Mr. Solomon was defeated(7) - partly, because of the large-scale bribery to which his opponents stooped, but more especially, because of the misguided enthusiasm which Mr. Solomon himself encouraged, which sought to secure for Mr. Porter, who had resigned the Attorney-Generalship in 1866 and had been prevailed upon to stand for Capetown in the Assembly, the largest number of votes.⁹ (The cumulative vote was used in the elections for Capetown, where there were four seats available). Mr. Solomon had only eleven votes less than the fourth successful candidate. Though Mr. Porter wished to retire in his favour, he would not hear of it.(8).

(1). C.A. January 15th 1867.

(2). 13th April 1867.

(3). H. of A. May 28th 1867.

(4). H. of A. June 6th 1867.

(5). C.A. May 21st 1868.

(6). Kilpin's phrase.

(7). Official declaration of the poll on May 20th 1869.

(8). 'S.A.C.A.' May 21st 1869 and also C.A. May 18th 1869.

9. C.A. Tuesday May 18th, 1869.

The new elections gave the Retrenchment party a majority, and in the 1869 Session, partly in consequence of the absence of the moderating influence of Mr. Solomon, Parliament and the Executive were again at loggerheads. Mr. Rutherford had retired in 1868 (1) and Mr. Molteno was the leader of the opposition to the Government. 'Mr. Molteno has a majority, and he has whipped and spurred them into a pace to suit his race for the parliamentary prize'. (2). Mr. Solomon watched the course of events with interest from without the House. In September, (3) a dinner was given in his honour, chiefly by Voluntaries, but also others who admired 'the general political conduct of the late member for Capetown'. The chair was taken by Mr. Frank Reitz, M.L.A., who in proposing Mr. Solomon's health, said, 'He was quite sure, if the history of South Africa was ever written, it would contain a great deal about their guest, Saul Solomon, the true friend of the Colony'. Mr. Solomon's speech was taken up chiefly with a discussion of the position of the Voluntaries but in concluding, he proposed the toast of the Parliament of the Colony. He was thankful that the people of Capetown had not re-elected him, for he had thus been spared a very unpleasant and unprofitable Session. He disapproved of the extremism of the Retrenchment party. 'If he had been in the House, he had no doubt he would generally have been, where he had before oftenest been found, in the minority', but he most heartily agreed with the rejection of the proposal to cut down the Parliament.

Shortly after this, on September the 28th he wrote an open letter to the Cape Argus on the Reserved Schedules and the Retrenchment Resolutions. The House, or the majority in it, led by Molteno, seemed to think that, on a simple resolution, the Governor could and should reduce the salaries contained in the Reserved Schedules. Mr. Solomon believed that an Act of Parliament was required. If the House rejected action by Bill for action by resolution it would be over-riding the Constitution, and 'such attempts are in my opinion, as much to be deprecated when they come from the House of Assembly, as are attacks upon the Constitution when they proceed from the Governor'.

Since the deadlock between the Executive and Parliament continued, Sir Philip ultimately decided to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the country to support his plan for a single-chamber legislature. At the elections, (4) Mr. Solomon declared that without talking wildly about despotism, he was opposed to the Governor's Bill to amend the constitution, because he believed in government by colonists, for colonists. He was returned to the House of Assembly, second only to Mr. Porter, (5) whose personal popularity was very great.

The Graham's Town Journal (6) was glad to know that Mr. Solomon had been re-elected. It expressed the belief that his sounder and more moderate views on questions of finance would prevail against Mr. Molteno's. "Mr. Solomon's views on these subjects are safe and correct, because they are not empirical, but based on well-established principles and not animated by a spirit of violent opposition to the

(1). Molteno. Vol. 1. p. 121.

(2). S.A.C.A. September 29th 1869.

(3). C.A. September 18th 1869. Dinner at the Institute and Club, Burg Street on the 15th.

(4). C.A. Dec. 9th 1869. Nomination Day on 7th.

(5). C.A. Dec. 11th 1869.

(6). Graham's Town Journal Dec. 21st 1869.

Government..... Should they (Eastern members) obey the dictates of sound judgment in acting with the honourable member for Capetown, we hope they will not be taunted by their constituencies here with Solomonism".

Yet when the new Parliament was opened in 1870, Mr. Solomon went into opposition against the Government. Though he had deprecated Molteno's endeavour in the previous Session, to secure a reduction of salaries on the Reserved List, by simple resolution, he had not expressed himself as opposed to the idea of such reduction. When Parliament returned this Session, it was found that the Governor had placed a number of other salaries on the List, that had never been there before - this in spite of the House's unmistakable feeling in favour of retrenchment. He moved(1) that in tampering with the Reserved List the Governor had acted improperly, a resolution which was carried by 32 votes to 17.

Shortly after, the Governor's Reform Bill', the cause of the recent election, was introduced.(2). Mr. Solomon, as might be expected led the attack upon it. As was customary with him, he sketched the history of the measure and remarked on the inconsistency shown by the Governor in his plans for constitutional amendment. In 1865 both Houses had been largely increased in membership, but in 1867 the Governor proposed a single House of 18 members and 3 officers; in 1869 a House of 12 members and 3 officers. He discerned in these different proposals a common element - hostility to representative institutions. He had himself always advocated an increase in the power of the Executive, but in such a way that the influence of the Legislature upon it would be real and effective. If the Governor's plan were accepted, Parliament would be reduced to the position of the old Legislative Council 'which had lost the respect of the country and never occupied an independent position of opposition to the Government except on an outburst of popular indignation'. He regretted that Sir Philip had shown so obvious a lack of sympathy with representative institutions, for he admired his personal integrity and just attitude to the natives.

Amid scenes of great enthusiasm, the motion was, however, rejected by 34 votes to 26. 'As soon as Mr. Speaker declared the numbers, the majority cheered repeatedly and the shouts of triumph were taken up by the occupants of the strangers' gallery.(3). A reporter declared that 'Mr. Ziervogel skipped down Grave Street like a young lamb, and Mr. Solomon popped into his carriage like an industrious flea".(4).

Wodehouse had thus cleared the way for the introduction of Responsible Government by Sir Henry Barkly, who definitely commended it to Parliament, in his opening speech.(5). Molteno opened the debate on June 1st, 1871 and on the 6th Mr. Solomon spoke. He had always supported the movement but he did not regret the delay in its introduction because it was a great political change and it was as well that the people should be educated to appreciate it. He made his old point about the irresponsibility of the opposition under the present system, and brushed aside the objections that the Eastern Province was too far away to benefit, that the best men could not be sent, that they could not remain for long. He confessed that only

(1). H. of A. February 10th 1870.

(2). H. of A. February 21st 1870.

(3). C.A. 'Parliamentary Notes' February 26th 1870.

(4). Kilpin, 'The Old Cape House'. p. 20.

(5). C.A. April 27th 1871. Opening of Parliament on same day.

one thing troubled him and that was native policy. He should have preferred the Imperial Government to retain charge of it, but he realized that this was impossible. He referred to Mr. Merriman's remark that if he were Prime Minister or had control of Native Affairs, there would be a conflagration. 'Happily I do not need the emoluments of office, and its routine and restraints are distasteful to me I would rather take my seat as an independent member, free to have a fling at any party that I might think deserved it. (He preferred others to submit themselves to party discipline).

The Responsible Government Bill, introduced by the Government immediately after the resolution was passed in the Assembly, was however, lost in the Council.

Next year it was revived, and after a stormy passage, particularly in the Upper House, it was ultimately passed and sent to England for the assent of the Queen.(1). According to Wilmot,(2) Mr. Solomon attacked the arguments of the Executive, which had been sent in memoranda to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Referring to the race argument, he declared that the people of Dutch, French, British and German stock had become so united by intermarriage and common interests that there was not the slightest danger of clashes between them on racial lines. As for the natives, he hoped that the colonists had developed a sense of justice and humanity. In any case he thought that the power and numbers of the natives would prevent European oppression of them.

Soon after the receipt of Lord Kimberley's despatch of the 24th August, transmitting to the Governor the new Commission and Instructions from the Queen, necessary to enable Barkly to set the principle of Responsible Government in operation, he set about forming a Ministry. Mr. Scutney, till then Colonial Secretary, refused because he had been an 'Anti-Responsible', right up to the end. Mr. Porter felt too old and too ill but recommended that Moltene and Solomon should be invited to form a joint Ministry. 'As Mr. Solomon expressed disinclination to enter office at present, especially without Mr. Porter' he ultimately entrusted the task to Mr. Moltene alone.(3).

It would be useful to estimate here the position Mr. Solomon occupied at this turning point in the Colony's political history.

(1). Wilmot - Vol. 1. pp. 17-20. The pages covering the Responsible Government debate are missing from the copy of the Cape Argus in the South African Public Library.
(2). Ibid. p. 15.
(3). C. 732 No. 60. December 2nd 1872.

CHAPTER 5. HIS POSITION.

Almost from the beginning, Mr. Solomon occupied the leading position in the House. The general expectation had been that Mr. Fairbairn would fill that place.(1). He had played a great part in securing the freedom of the press, in agitating against the introduction of convicts at the Cape, in demanding representative institutions, and generally, in stimulating a liberal political opinion in the Colony. Yet Murray, writing in 1855, expressed the opinion that Fairbairn was not the man he had formerly been. "His policy is, and has always been Anti-Government. His meddlesomeness and inconsistency has destroyed a great share of the popularity he once enjoyed. He has grown irritable and pettish, and many of those who were his friends have now little confidence or sympathy with him".(2).

Of these latter was Mr. Solomon. From the very first session of Parliament it was evident that there had been political differences between Mr. Solomon and Mr. Fairbairn. Mr. Solomon indeed, advocated the claims of Mr. Fairbairn to be elected as Speaker.(3). Nevertheless one can detect an undercurrent of hostility between them, which seemed to go deeper than a mere Parliamentary opposition. Mr. Solomon as a young man, had been a junior lieutenant of Fairbairn's and had learnt much of his Liberalism from him, as well as from Dr. Philip. On various occasions in the Assembly, Mr. Solomon showed that he considered Fairbairn to be a renegade from true Liberalism. He held up to scorn Fairbairn's inconsistency. "He would trust Government with your morals, but not with your money"(4) for Fairbairn was a leading opponent of Voluntaryism, though he objected to State control in banking. In 1858 he remarked scornfully, 'I am happy to say that the honourable gentleman has lived sufficiently long to recant almost every opinion and every principle he has ever held'.(5). As for Mr. Fairbairn, a personal animus seems to run through his attempt to arraign Mr. Solomon before the Bar of the House for a delay in printing the Government Estimates.(6).

In Murray's opinion, the undoubted leader was Mr. Solomon. The qualities he attributed to him explain his differences with Mr. Fairbairn. 'There is no member more consistent or more liberal and whilst he holds very strong opinions and urges them with all the might and ability at his command, he knows how to respect the opinions of others.... He is in every respect the leading member.....'(7).

Shortly before, Mr. Porter had expressed a similar opinion at a meeting of the Mechanics Institution. Mr. Solomon had been asked to second a motion, and he did so, very formally and briefly. He was loudly applauded and a speech was demanded from him. He announced curtly that he, a small man, did not intend to stand in the way of the great Mr. Porter,

-
- (1). 'Pen and Ink Sketches' by Linnar Book 2 p. 47.
 - (2). Ibid Book 1. p. 6.
 - (3). H. of A. June 30th 1854. Advocate Christoffel Brand, however, secured more votes and was chosen.
 - (4). H. of A. April 7th 1855. Debate on Voluntary Principle
 - (5). H. of A. May 5th 1858.
 - (6). H. of A. August 9th 1854.
 - (7). Cape Monitor May 9th 1855 Study of Mr. Solomon by Linnar.

who was about six feet tall and due to follow with a speech. That warm-hearted Irishman impulsively declared that there were other ways of measuring men 'than by the six-foot rule'. According to those Mr. Solomon was one of the tallest men in the community ".... in Saul Solomon, we have, mentally and morally considered, one of the greatest men in the community".(1).

It is difficult to appreciate how short Mr. Solomon was. In order for his head to be seen above his desk in Parliament, when making a speech, he had to stand on a stool, and he had to climb to his seat in the House by special steps.(2). Froude wrote that he was no bigger than Tom Thumb.(3). Anthony Trollope described him thus:- 'He is a man of very small stature, so small that on first seeing him, the stranger is certainly impressed with the idea that no man so small has ever been seen by him before. His forehead however is fine and his face full of intelligence'.(4). Dr. Changuion told an audience in Lausanne that he was 'no bigger than a walking stick'(5), and Mrs. Merriman used the phrase, 'the little imp'.(6).

Ranged against this tremendous handicap were certain undeniable assets. He was a good speaker. Murray described his style '... free, easy and impressive. He tells the House all he knows, all he feels, all he thinks, without attempting to be eloquent'.(7). The description of his voice as shrill and even squeaky is not entirely accurate.(8). In 1861, he was said to have a voice "of considerable power and clearness though sometimes too highly pitched and shrill in tone. His delivery, while far from that of a first-rate orator is good" (9). Statham's description was vivid:- "You hear that thin, clear somewhat strident voice, that is now being listened to in breathless silence? You hear fact piled upon fact, argument upon argument, the keen cutting sarcasm alternating with the stern denunciation?"(10). One begins to appreciate Murray's remark that when he spoke the attention of the House was directed away from him to the debate.(11).

There were three reasons why Mr. Solomon should have been the leader. The first two were his mental and moral pre-eminence and the third was the more prosaic fact that he worked hard. In the first requisition to him it was stated that his 'clear and lucid intellect' was 'a byword in the Colony'.(12). He held fine Liberal Principles, to which he consistently clung, but no one realised better than he the futility of relying on truisms. He gave his audience facts, culled generally from Bluebooks, which he studied assiduously. 'When the honourable member rises, the House expects to be instructed, and is never disappointed He would deal with lawmaking as with any other matter of fact business'.(13).

-
- (1). 'S.A.C.A.' 19th April 1855 - meeting on the 14th.
 - (2). Kilpin's article on Saul Solomon.
 - (3). Froude 'Short Studies on Great Subjects'(3rd Series) p.345.
 - (4). Anthony Trollope - 'South Africa' Vol. 1. p. 96.
 - (5). 'Introductory Discourse... delivered on 28th Jan. 1868'.
 - (6). Merriman Collection.No. 51. Aug.29th 1881. Agnes to J.X. Merriman.
 - (7). Cape Monitor, May 9th 1855.
 - (8). Kilpin's article - 'but worse still he had no delivery. His voice was shrill almost squeaky and he spoke too fast'.
 - (9). Cape Monitor August 8th 1861. 'The Mirror of Parliament'.
 - (10). F.R. Statham 'Blacks, Boers and British' p. 46.
 - (11). Cape Monitor, May 9th 1855.
 - (12). 'Election of Mr. Saul Solomon'. p. 2.
 - (13). Cape Monitor, May 9th 1855.

Mr. Solomon took pride in maintaining an independent position in Parliament and delighted in the knowledge of his own personal integrity. While no one received any substantial monetary compensation for Parliamentary services, (1) Mr. Solomon claimed that he was even indifferent to the honour attaching to the title of Member of Parliament. When he was asked to stand for the Assembly, he at first refused, (2) but being strongly urged to reconsider his decision, he finally consented. His reply to his first requisition began with a statement of his reluctance to enter Parliament and concluded with a profession of indifference. "I have no intention myself of making any effort to secure my own election". (3). When he was elected, he admitted to being rather elated but he felt his position "to be the more honourable, as it was not only unsolicited but was, until a few days ago, unexpected and undesired by me". (4).

At the next election he even maintained that it was 'a tremendous sacrifice' for him to enter Parliament. It was a great strain on his health and involved the neglect of an extensive business. He only consented to enter Parliament because it was his duty to serve Capetown in which he had built up all that he had. (5). Not till 1874 did he abandon this attitude of indifference. Then he said 'I do not pretend that this is not an honour, which I covet. It is an honour which I always coveted.....' (6).

Being elected against his own will, as it were, he occupied a strong position in the House. He was free to act according to his conscience, and did so. "He is never careful about securing the support of a party, or the approval of the House...." (7). "He is without a rival in the House, in truth it would be a farce to institute a comparison between him and any of his colleagues. His probity and independence are above suspicion...." (8).

His intellectual and moral qualities commanded respect. So did his industry. Right at the beginning, he told his electors "I go into Parliament to work, work, work hard, and with no expectation of finding that which awaits me there to be mere child's play or holiday sport". (9). Murray commented on his conscientiousness as a Parliamentarian. "He is always in the House, from the time of its opening to its adjournment His whole mind seems to be devoted to the work he had undertaken". (10). Ten years later, having become an ardent protagonist of Separation, and in consequence, prejudiced against Mr. Solomon who led the opposition, he still remarked on his industry, and attributed his ill-health to overwork. "He read half the night, and spoke half the day". (11).

-
- (1). Eybers p. 55. Section 90 of the Constitution Ordinance of 1853. Every member who had to travel more than 10 miles to the meeting place of Parliament was entitled to £1 per day for not more than 50 days and a further sum of 1/- for every mile he travelled to and from the Session.
 - (2). Election of Mr. Saul Solomon pp. 2-3.
 - (3). Ibid. p. 7.
 - (4). Ibid. p. 14.
 - (5). 'S.A.C.A. January 12th 1859.
 - (6). C.A. January 20th 1874. Report of a Political meeting on January 17th.
 - (7). Cape Monitor, May 9th 1855.
 - (8). Ibid, August 8th 1861.
 - (9). 'Election of Mr. Saul Solomon'. p. 21.
 - (10). Cape Monitor, May 9th 1855.
 - (11). "Pen and Ink Sketches" Book 2. p. 47.

For all these reasons, Mr. Solomon won a spontaneous respect from even his political opponents. When it was learnt in the East that he would not be coming to the Grahamstown Parliament, sincere regret was expressed. "The Eastern Province Herald" wrote that 'For readiness in debate, for shrewd business tact, for a thorough knowledge of the Colony and for moral courage in the defence of any question he has espoused', he was pre-eminent.(1). When requisitions were sent to him, they were signed by people who did not share his political views, as the South African Commercial Advertiser' once pointed out. "The list of requisitionists proves very clearly the general conviction of the necessity of having Mr. Solomon returned as one of the members of the city, signed as it is by a considerable number of those who are opposed to his political creed".(2). At a Voluntary dinner in his honour in 1869 there were also present others 'who though opposed to the Voluntary Bill are admirers of the general political conduct of the late member for Capetown".(3).

In consequence of this general recognition of his qualities, Mr. Solomon was a very influential man. The Zuid-Afrikaan(4) became rather unfriendly to him in 1866 and for some years thereafter, because it blamed him for trying to keep out Mr. Hare, an 'Anti-Responsible' from the Legislative Council, by arranging a coalition of the Committees of the three other candidates, all Capetonians and 'Responsibles'. (There were four candidates for three seats). He was charged with exercising a dictatorship! "We cannot account for the fact but it is so - when Mr. Solomon speaks, Capetown ^{Provinces} ~~Provinces~~, and the Western Province generally concurs". He was further accused of having 'a steady and fixed eye upon the Premiership.....'

He was freely spoken of as an extremely likely candidate for Cabinet office under Responsible Government, and even as the future Prime Minister. The Zuid-Afrikaan, in particular, used to warn its readers, that he was striving, by tortuous paths, to arrive at Executive rank. That charge Mr. Solomon specifically denied. He declared that he had no ambition for office whatsoever - rather a dread of it. He emphasised this point in 1863 and on the eve of Responsible Government.(5). Significantly enough, he admitted in 1874 that while he was not eager for office, he was 'not indifferent to power'.(6). Having confidence in the soundness of his views, he naturally wished to see them prevail. Hence it was not without resentment that he had watched the House, on occasion, follow Molteno or Rutherford, rather than himself.(7).

Mr. Molteno's son and biographer has revealed that when Mr. Solomon was urged to enter office with Mr. Molteno, he made three conditions. He was willing that Molteno should be Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary, but he insisted on almost equal powers, for he claimed the right to choose his own portfolio, to have a voice in the selection of their colleagues and he specifically insisted that Mr. Sprigg should be included in the Cabinet.(8). Eventually the task was

(1). 'Eastern Province Herald', August 25th 1863.

(2). 'S.A.C.A.', March 1st 1869.

(3). C.A. September 18th 1869.

(4). Z.A. May 17th 1866

(5). See Chapter 4.

(6). C.A. January 20th 1874. Report of an address at a political meeting.

(7). Chapter 4.

(8). Molteno. Vol. 1. p. 110.

confided to Mr. Molteno alone. He suggests that it was as well, that Mr. Solomon's peculiar qualities debarred him from office. "Solomon had greater quickness, more ready wit, greater appreciation of humour and command of language, yet whether from a physical defect or a certain subtlety of mind was less fitted to lead the Assembly, to gather friends around him, to inspire their confidence and at the same time to work with them".(1).

I think myself, that Mr. Solomon's chief reason for refusing office was his continual ill-health. His professions of indifference to office may be analogous to his professions of indifference to Parliament, and this latter by his own confession, as it has been seen, was not entirely sincere. His denials were probably inspired by the assertions of 'Anti-Responsibles', such as the Zuid-Afrikaan, that he himself was not disinterested in working for Responsible Government - frankly, that he hoped for office for himself.

There are indications that if Mr. Porter had been able to form a Ministry, Mr. Solomon would have accepted office with him(2). With Molteno he was not on such good terms,(3) yet he might have entered the Cabinet - upon conditions. To talk of a 'subtlety of mind' is to ignore his business-like practicalness. He was, of course, idealistic, and few people sympathised entirely with his ideals. His views upon Native Policy, for example, were not popular. Yet the fact remains, that Mr. Solomon, in spite of inconvenient principles, was the acknowledged leader of the House. He was on good terms with the members. Murray said that even when the House differed from him, there was not the slightest bad-feeling.(4). He was fond of entertaining at his home "Clarensville", (5) and in the course of his political duties was in constant demand at public banquets. None of this suggests the voluntary recluse. Even more untenable is the argument that he realised that his native views would have been embarrassing.(6). That would not have deterred Mr. Solomon. He never hesitated to express openly his opinions, which he certainly believed to be eminently practicable. In the event, Mr. Molteno found it advisable to follow Mr. Solomon's advice, and that he did so, was an open secret.(7).

The reasons for Mr. Solomon not taking office in 1872 seem to me quite simple - bad health which made even normal Parliamentary work a strain, and a certain lack of sympathy between Molteno and himself, which was only broken down when Molteno submitted to his influence. At the time he was unwilling to do so.

Thus, though under the changed conditions, the Government of the day occupied the centre of the stage, it will be seen that much real power was held by Mr. Solomon.

(1). Ibid.

(2). Barkly's despatch to Kimberley. C.732 No.60. Dec. 2nd, 1872.

(3). According to Kilpin (article on Saul Solomon) 'Personally outside the House, Solomon and Molteno were close friends.

(4). Cape Monitor May 9th 1855.

(5). Kilpin.

(6). Molteno. Vol. 1. p. 190.

(7). See Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 6. THE MOLTENO GOVERNMENT

There had never been complete unanimity between Mr. Solomon and Mr. Molteno, in the days of Representative Government. Mr. Solomon, as a constitutionalist, had, on occasion, deprecated Mr. Molteno's attempts to override the constitution, in order to carry through any measure he was interested in, such as Responsible Government or Retrenchment.(1). Further, Mr. Molteno took the lead of the 'social-political' group of the 'country party' and advocated a policy of raising revenue by taxing imports, that is, the necessaries of life, in order to relieve landed property. To this, Mr. Solomon was foremost in opposition.(2). But in particular, Mr. Molteno had not shown himself sufficiently liberal in native affairs for Mr. Solomon's liking. He had been mainly responsible for tightening up the Masters and Servants Ordinance of 1841 in the interests of the former.(3).

At the beginning of the very first Session of the new Ministry, about a week after Parliament met, Mr. Merriman, who had been a leading 'Anti-Responsible', and was now a prominent Government critic, moved what amounted to a vote of censure on the new administration for sending the Secretary for Native Affairs across the Kei, the Eastern Frontier, to mediate in a dispute between two independent native chiefs, Kreli of the Galekas, and his son-in-law, Gangeliswe of the Tembus.(4).

Mr. Solomon supported the action of the Government in the particular case, but his speech showed the uncertainty of his own views. As a colonist and a believer in trusteeship, he thought it natural and inevitable that the Colony should extend, by annexation, its jurisdiction over the territories beyond its borders. At the same time, as the friend of the natives, he had great doubts as to whether his contemporaries genuinely appreciated their responsibilities, and he consequently felt that the tribes might gain more if they were left in independence.

On this occasion, he expressed the opinion that it was impossible for the Government to ignore events among the natives beyond the frontier, but he was opposed to any unnecessary intervention. "All I hope is that the policy will be one of as little interference as possible with the disputes of the native chiefs, and that it will, moreover, be one of strict justice, though it may be one of firmness". On the other hand, in reply to Mr. Merriman's suggestion that the Imperial Government should be requested to define the respective powers of the Governor and the High Commissioner, he said that any such request would assuredly be refused. He believed, however, that gradually the Imperial Government would relinquish all control of native policy, and hence there would be a diminution of the High Commissioner's power - a prospect which he seemed to view with equanimity, in spite of his own admission (5) that he would have preferred to leave control of Native Policy with the Imperial Government.

-
- (1). See Chapter 4.
 - (2). See Chapter 2B.
 - (3). See Chapter 2C.
 - (4). H. of A. April 29th 1873.
 - (5). See Chapter 2C.

Mr. Solomon was uncertain not of himself - he was constant in his Liberalism - but whether the new administration could be trusted to govern the natives justly. The Cape Ministry's action in the Langalibalele affair (1) confirmed his doubts. When this Hlubi native chief, of north-western Natal, was ordered to send in eight men to have their guns registered, he hesitated and then sent five. Mutual suspicion caused the chief, on the one hand, to search Native Government messengers, and then the Natal Government, on the other, to send an armed party to arrest him. He fled to Basutoland and the pursuing party had a brush with some tribesmen, which it was feared, was the start of a large-scale native war. There had been clearly, no original intention on the part of the chief to take aggressive action, but "white" Natal, always apprehensive, received a bad scare, and although the Basuto chief, Molapo handed over Langalibalele without much ado, the most drastic measures against the Hlubi chief and his tribesmen were taken. He was tried in a most irregular manner, convicted as a matter of course, and the tribal land was confiscated. In addition, the Natal volunteers took cattle and apprentices from a small tribe which had sheltered Hlubi women. It was in these circumstances that the Cape Government was asked by the Natal Government to receive Langalibalele and his son for imprisonment on Robben Island, and professed itself ready to agree.

Mr. Molteno accordingly introduced the Natal Criminals Bill in the Assembly, and moved its second reading on June 8th. Mr. Solomon (2) was utterly opposed to the Bill and proposed instead that it be read that day six months. He observed that the official evidence was far from conclusive about Langalibalele's guilt, but he concerned himself mainly with pointing out the glaring irregularities in the trial of the chief. He censured Molteno for disregarding these objections and for neglecting to obtain all possible information on the subject from the Government of Natal. He himself could speak with some authority, as he had managed to obtain a copy of the Bluebook presented to the Natal Legislature. In view of the obvious miscarriage of justice and the fact that the case had been taken before the Natal Executive Council on appeal, he begged the House at least to postpone consideration of the measure till the appeal was decided. However, the House by a crushing majority of 33 - the division being 41 to 8 - decided to support Mr. Molteno.

Mr. Solomon understood that he had been deceiving himself as to the advanced attitude of Parliament generally, on Native affairs - basically it was the same as it had ever been.

His distrust of the Molteno ministry was fully aroused. In the next Session, the Government's Vagrancy Bill aroused his opposition anew.(3). The main proposal was that anyone without any visible means of support should be sent down to the public works. Mr. Solomon said bluntly that he suspected that the sole purpose was to bring down the price of labour and he further objected that the Bill was directed primarily against coloured and not European loafers. The reactionary character of the measure can be gauged from the fact that Mr. Merriman himself complained that if it were passed 'one half of the community would be engaged in arresting the other half', and seconded Mr. Solomon's amendment to read that day six months. With such formidable opposition, the Bill was shelved.

(1). Walker History. pp. 359-360.
(2). H. of A. June 8th 1874.
(3). H. of A. May 3rd 1875.

Meanwhile the attention of the Imperial Government had been drawn to the plight of Langalibalele by Bishop Colenso and other philanthropists. Lord Carnarvon therefore requested the Cape Government to repeal the Natal Criminals Act of 1874, and as a compromise measure, remove the chief to better conditions on the mainland.

Mr. Froude, who visited South Africa towards the end of 1874, reported that 'Mr. Solomon spoke in terms of the strongest reprobation of what had been done (i.e. the Cape Government's imprisonment of Langalibalele on Robben Island) but he was shy of promising any help in the Cape Parliament should the Imperial Government desire Langalibalele to be released. He seemed satisfied to think that the Imperial Government was in a mess and must get out of it as well as it could.'(1).

Such an impression was rather curious, as in the debate on the Bill to repeal the Act of 1874 and remove the chief to the mainland, Mr. Solomon very definitely took it upon himself to justify the intervention of the Imperial Government.(2). He considered that, on the whole, Molteno's behaviour had been deplorable, for he appeared to think that Langalibalele had had substantial justice done to him. He had even written in a memorandum that all the fuss was due to 'the nicely-balanced judicial minds of a few enthusiasts' and had refused to allow Bishop Colenso, when on his way to England to petition the crown for mercy, to interview Langalibalele, because he personally, objected to any attempts to set the chief at liberty.

He had no sympathy with the Ministry's complaint that Lord Carnarvon's intervention was an infringement of their self-governing powers. As, Mr. Solomon saw it, Lord Carnarvon's attitude was that the Cape Government, in obeying Natal's request without first asking the Imperial Government's consent, had exceeded its powers and acted unconstitutionally. He thought it very tactful of the Imperial Government to invite the Cape Parliament to repeal its own Act instead of simply over-riding it. To those who objected that there had been an unwarranted interference with 'Colonial affairs' he answered "I am not one of those who maintain that the Home Government has no right to express an opinion, or say a word, on colonial questions".

It has been observed before,(3) that Mr. Solomon was not careful about appearing consistent, at least to outer view. He did not hesitate to declare, about a month later,(4) that Lord Carnarvon's despatch on Confederation was an interference with the Colony's domestic affairs. It may be noted here that the effect of the subsequent agitation for Confederation was to divide the political parties in the Cape into two main groups, for and against, on this now all-important question. As a price of Mr. Solomon's support on this issue, Mr. Molteno had perforce to moderate his views on native policy. This becomes quite clear within a year and will be commented on in passing.

Lord Carnarvon's proposal was to summon a local conference of the Colonies and republics of South Africa to discuss a

-
- (1). J. A. Froude - Short Studies on great Subjects. p. 346.
 - (2). H. of A. May 7th 1875.
 - (3). Chapter 4.
 - (4). H. of A. 11th June 1875.

common native policy for the country. He put this as his chief reason, though everyone knew that an even more potent cause was the Imperial Government's difficulties in Griqualand West. The idea of Confederation, which was suggested as a likely sequel, did not startle Mr. Solomon by its novelty. He had been the first politician, as far back as 1854, (1) to talk of a United States of Southern Africa and when the Easterns had demanded complete separation of the two provinces, he had always led the opposition and urged them to realize that it was 'but the day of small things'. (2). But he had great patience and could leave things to develop naturally. When in 1869 some enthusiastic annexationists talked rashly of annexing the Free State to the Cape, he said that while the extension of British rule might well be encouraged, he would oppose a Free State union with the Cape, even if the former made the first overtures - because the time was not yet ripe. (3). In 1871 and 1872, convinced of the justice of the British claims on behalf of Waterboer to the Diamond Fields, he welcomed annexation though he preferred that for the time being, the new territory should be erected into a separate Crown Colony, as there was still much uncertainty as to its boundaries and population and as the Cape was busy with major political changes. He spoke then (4) of a federation, as he also did to the 'Federation Commission'. (5).

It is interesting therefore, to consider his reasons for opposing the Carnarvon Confederation Scheme. It was about a month after the debate on Langalibalele that Mr. Sprigg moved (6) that, without expressing an opinion on the question of a conference itself, Lord Carnarvon had acted unconstitutionally, in not first consulting the self-governing Cape on the matter. The implication was naturally, that the Cape should not agree to the proposal, since it would be condoning a lowering of its status.

Mr. Solomon seconded the motion. He agreed that Lord Carnarvon's action had been unconstitutional. It was an interference with the domestic concerns of the Colony, and he regarded it as significant that Mr. Froude, who in his writings advocated restrictions on the powers of the self-governing Colonies, should be the Imperial Commissioner. It was of course flung at him that a month previously he had welcomed the intervention of the Imperial Government, but he replied firmly that the circumstances were entirely different. In the matter of Langalibalele it had been the Colony which had acted unconstitutionally, and to him that was just as reprehensible.

He was angered by the blunder of awakening the Separation agitation by naming the delegates - Mr. Moltene for the West and Mr. Paterson for the East. "I cannot understand it, except it be that Mr. Froude wrote the despatch, and persuaded Lord Carnarvon to sign it, and that Lord Carnarvon had so much faith in Mr. Froude, that he scarcely read it."

He thought that a conference to discuss a common native policy for South Africa would achieve nothing. Lord Carnarvon had praised the Cape Policy in a despatch to Governor Pine of Natal, but he was convinced that the Free State and Transvaal would never agree to follow the Cape model, and as for Natal, the Imperial Officer there, Sir

(1). 'Election of Mr. S. Solomon'. p. 4.

(2). Chapter 3.

(3). C.A., February 27th 1869.

(4). H. of A. July 11th 1871. See also Chapter 2A.

(5). Federation Commission Report. p. 94.

(6). H. of A. June 11th 1875.

Garnet Wolseley, had full powers to make whatever changes he pleased. Considering the question of Confederation, which Lord Carnarvon hoped would be a probable sequel to such a conference, he himself was not so sanguine. It was a scheme which could not be hastily adopted, for an attempt to federate Sovereign states with British Colonies would immediately raise almost insuperable difficulties.

It might be argued, with some truth, that a genuine Federationist would have at least tried some quicker method than the natural work of time. Mr. Solomon was conscious of this objection, for he remarked, "It is said that we are only asked to discuss these questions, but it was worse than a waste of time to raise and agitate questions which are not ripe for practical settlement". Possibly the real reason behind Mr. Solomon's opposition to a conference was that, at the time, the Cape stood to profit very little. When the choice lay between the interests of South Africa, as a whole, and the Cape, Mr. Solomon's sympathies were with the latter. Mr. Hofmeyr (1) claims for "Onze Jan" that he, practically alone, viewed the question from a South African point of view. Mr. Solomon decidedly did not. He had told the Federation Commission, early in 1872, that if any State were in trouble, he did not think it should be permitted to enter the confederation. He believed that the Imperial Government's proposal was solely due to an attempt to relieve it from various responsibilities and obligations incurred in South Africa, and that the Cape should be careful of having these same shunted upon itself. If Mr. Froude had said in this context that Mr. Solomon was "satisfied to think that the Imperial Government was in a mess and must get out of it as well as it could" it would have sounded truer.

Mr. Sprigg's motion was carried by 52 votes to 23, so that when Mr. Froude arrived on the same day, (2) there was no conference over which he might preside. He betook his way through the Cape up to Natal and back again, making propoganda for confederation, saying different things to different men, and raising an agitation in the Cape against its own Government.

In consequence, a special Session of Parliament was held in November. (3). Mr. Molteno asked the House to condemn the agitation raised in the name of the Imperial Government against the Colonial Government and to agree that the time was still not suitable for holding a conference. In the midst of the discussion, another despatch from Lord Carnarvon, dated 22nd October, arrived. It stated that he was satisfied with the discussion raised and cancelled the request for a conference in South Africa. The House adjourned to consider the new position, and when it reassembled, Mr. Solomon (4) proposed a very subtly worded amendment, which really retained the pith of Mr. Molteno's motion, and was to the effect that since the proposal for a conference had been withdrawn, it was no longer necessary for the House "to record its continued objection to the holding at the present time of such a conference; or its condemnation of the unconstitutional agitation carried on in the Colony in connection with this

(1). J. H. Hofmeyr. p. 133.

(2). Walker History, p. 365.

(3). H. of A. November 12th 1875.

(4). H. of A. November 19th 1875. Walker gives an erroneous impression (see p. 367) in writing that "... after a long debate, the Assembly rejected Molteno's motion condemning 'the agitation created.... in the name of Imperial Government'".

question", but the Government and Parliament should offer to assist in settling the difficulties arising out of the annexation of the Griqualand West.

He still maintained that a conference to discuss the extradition of criminals, the restriction of the sale of guns and gunpowder, and native policy was unnecessary. They already had laws providing for the extradition of criminals in all Colonies and States of South Africa, except the Free State, and even in the latter case it was entirely due to an oversight and was being remedied. Only Griqualand West had no laws restricting the trade in guns and gunpowder, and that territory was entirely under Imperial control. Disarmament of the natives had been mentioned, but he thought it would be a very dangerous proceeding and was glad that the idea had been dropped.

He again emphasised that the idea of a Confederation did not stagger him, but the Cape should be careful about accepting burdens which even the Imperial Government found heavy. He was certain that the Free State, and the Transvaal, would not join in, at least not till their differences with Great Britain had been settled, and the prospect of union with Griqualand West and Natal was not attractive in the present state of both those territories, particularly the latter, in which a native war was feared to be imminent.

The agitation had attained to such a pitch that there was a strong desire to oust the Molteno Ministry. He thought that, on the whole, Molteno had acted rightly. "Though this Colony had not a baronetcy to dangle before his eyes, he was faithful to what he believed to be its best interests and constitutional rights."

In the next year, Mr. Solomon naturally supported Mr. Molteno's request (1) that the House should authorize him, while in England, to discuss the question of Griqualand West and any other questions which Lord Carnarvon might wish, Mr. Molteno, however, accepting Mr. Sauer's amendment that he should confine himself, officially, to Griqualand West and giving an assurance that he would not take part in any confederation conference. Mr. Solomon, in his speech, revealed the effect that collaboration with Mr. Molteno on the question of Confederation had had on Native policy. "He admitted that in the past, more than now, he had differed from the House on the subject..... and although it might seem vanity and egotism on his part to say so, yet he thought that the House now came nearer to his views on the subject, than it did when he joined it". It was tactful of him to generalise in this way, and not mention the change for which he was responsible, in the policy of the Molteno Government itself.

About two weeks later, the House was asked to sanction the annexation of Tembuland. Mr. Solomon now quite approved of annexation 'if judiciously and not hastily carried out.' He thought it 'a policy likely to be advantageous not only to the Colony but to the natives', and he added, "We might well be satisfied with the way in which affairs were proceeding on the frontier." (2).

All during 1877 and right up to the outbreak of the Gaika-Galeka war at the end of the year, Mr. Solomon continued to support Mr. Molteno, for the very excellent reason

(1). H. of A. June 9th 1876.

(2). H. of A. June 22nd 1876.

that Mr. Molteno was conforming to his views. At a farewell banquet to Sir Henry Barkly, Mr. Solomon declared that the Molteno Government had, on the whole, been a success. "... above all ... the natives of the country are showing more and more confidence in the Government and an increased desire to be incorporated within its limits".(1).

In the Cape Parliament, in the 1877 Session, a serious crisis arose, when after delivering the Budget Speech on Thursday, June 14th, the Colonial Secretary proposed to go into committee of supply on the next Monday, and the opposition led by Mr. Sprigg and Mr. Paterson insisted on a delay. Mr. Sprigg demanded that the Burgher Force Bill which was down for the 25th, should be discussed immediately, on the plea that to secure adequate defence measures, larger means would be necessary than those set down in the Estimates. Mr. Paterson, for his part, complained that for a coming year there would be a deficit of £60,000. It seemed to him that the Government intended to rely on borrowing, an expedient of which he disapproved. He too refused to go into Committee of supply till the Government had reshaped the Estimates so as to make revenue and expenditure balance. For the Government to have consented to a delay would have been tantamount to passing a vote of no confidence on itself and it could hardly have remained in office. This was the position Mr. Molteno took up. Mr. Solomon supported him.(2). He considered that the opposition was trying, in an underhand fashion, to oust the Ministry and he thought that the time had not yet come for a change of Cabinet. There was deadlock till eventually on June 22nd, the House went into committee of supply and the Government remained in office.

One action of the Molteno Government roused the anger of Mr. Solomon at this time, but he was appeased by Mr. Molteno's willingness to make amends. On July 12th, Mr. Solomon moved what was really a vote of censure on the Government because it had proposed to appropriate the surplus revenue of Basutoland, a sum amounting to £10,000 for the payment of the Frontier Armed and Mounted Police. Mr. Molteno, however, agreed to withdraw the item from the Estimates. Nevertheless, Mr. Solomon again began to waver. His attitude on annexation is always a good indication of the degree of his confidence in the Government's native policy. He said rather gloomily that "He looked with some degree of apprehension at so much annexation as was now going on, but we were shut up to it, and it seemed to be our manifest destiny." But, on the whole, he thought that Molteno was sufficiently amenable to his views to act fairly towards the natives.

One other aspect of Mr. Solomon's influence upon the Government, deserves consideration. The Molteno Government was accused by the opposition of allowing the natives to arm and of slackness in taking proper defence measures. It seems highly probable that for this, as for other aspects of native policy, Mr. Solomon was indirectly responsible. As early as 1875 (3) he had remarked that he was glad that the idea of discussing disarmament of the natives at a conference had been dropped, because it would only have had 'a disturbing effect on the natives'.

In the Session preceding the outbreak of the war, Mr. Frost asked for a return to be laid on the table of the House

-
- (1). C.A. Wed. April 4th 1877. Banquet on the 3rd.
 - (2). H. of A. June 14th 1877. Confederation
 - (3). H. of A. November 19th 1875. Conference Debate.

showing the number of permits issued for the purchase of arms and ammunition in the district of Cradock.(1). Mr. Sprigg supported him and quoted evidence given before the Defence Commission of which he had been chairman, to show that Government agents had induced natives to come out and work by permitting them to acquire guns with their wages. He definitely accused the Government of condoning and even encouraging the arming of the natives.

Mr. Solomon countered that there was a difference between giving the natives guns and allowing them to buy them. 'Government would not allow the natives to buy either wives or land, and what then were the natives to buy?' In his opinion, every man should be free to spend his earnings as he pleased. He believed it unlikely that there would ever be a united rising of 'blacks' against 'whites' unless the latter did something particularly outrageous. "The Basutos and the Fingos desired guns chiefly to trade in them which destroyed the idea that they wanted to attack us with them" - a rather superficial argument ignoring the fact that fundamentally trade depends upon the desirability of a particular commodity in itself.

Mr. Solomon and Mr. Sprigg had formerly been at one on native affairs, as well as on other matters, but they had by this time clearly diverged. Mr. Sprigg lived on a farm near Kingwilliamstown (2) and hence he shared the trepidation of the frontiersmen at the prospect of universal armament among the natives. This became evident in the discussion on the Frontier Defence Bill.

Mr. Sprigg urged that comprehensive measures should be forthwith taken for the defence of the Colony. Mr. Solomon (3) disagreed - the subject was a large one, needing time, and he personally should not have regretted if it were shelved for the Session. He attacked the Defence Commission's proposal (it is worth remembering that Sprigg was the Chairman) to exclude every coloured man from the defence forces of the Colony and even to disarm the Fingos, whose loyalty was not on the whole, questioned. He was aware that there was unrest on the frontier owing to the desire of Krelli for more land, but he thought the Colony was quite safe, since it would be impossible for the chief to obtain more land, except at the expense of the tribes in his immediate neighbourhood.

At the end of the year, inter-tribal jealousies between the Gaiikas and Fingos flared out into open hostilities and the Colony had to go to the assistance of the latter, its allies.

In spite of Mr. Solomon's predictions, the matter did not end there, for the Gaiikas living within the border-line broke into revolt, and there was panic in the Colony which had last known a native war in 1853, a generation back. Frere (4) considered that his Ministers conducted the campaign with unnecessary ruthlessness and desired that the Imperial Commander should be supreme over all troops, including the Colonial forces. Since his Ministers disagreed, he took the daring step of dismissing them, and telegraphed to Carnarvon on February 5th 1878, "A ministerial crisis has occurred.

(1). H. of A. June 19th 1877.
(2). Martineau. Vol. 2. p. 211.
(3). H. of A. June 22nd 1877.
(4). Walker, History. p. 375.

Mr. Sprigg has undertaken the task of forming a Ministry."(1).

The most important thing here is not to discuss the constitutionality or otherwise of Sir Bartle Frere's action. In regard to a Ministry whose advice he could no longer take, he was justified if he could find another to bear the responsibility. True enough, Molteno had had a majority in the previous Session, but there were no real political parties in the Cape Parliament at the time, so much as groupings and regroupings on a particular question. Professor Keith has said that the position was difficult and complicated by the fact that Frere was not only Governor but also High Commissioner.(2).

It is interesting to consider why Mr. Solomon failed to support the Molteno Government, when Mr. Merriman moved what amounted to a vote of Censure on the new Ministry for accepting office and consequently the Governor for putting them there.(3). Molteno's biographer makes much of the fact that he publicly praised Molteno's policy almost right up to the dismissal.(4). That is true enough. On the other hand it must be remembered that Mr. Solomon himself was behind Mr. Molteno's policy. This is provedly an interesting interchange between Mr. Solomon and Mr. Sprigg in 1880.(5). The latter lost his temper when Mr. Solomon kept interrupting him with queries, as he was making a speech on the disarming of the Basutos.

Mr. Sprigg: 'He would not submit to the dictatorship of the honourable member for Capetown'.

Mr. Solomon: "Yes, he sought my opinion and advice often enough!"

Mr. Sprigg: "It is true enough that the honourable member was the confidential adviser of the last administration. The honourable member was something worse than that; he was the master of the last administration."

Again, in 1881, Mr. Solomon accused Mr. Sprigg of having changed his opinions for the worse". "The Colonial Secretary had formerly supported Molteno's native policy, for which he had been given the credit".(6).

Then it is also important to remember that Merriman played a leading part in the conduct of the campaign. He had been hotly attacked for his native views by Mr. Solomon in the Responsible Government debates in 1871 and 1872.(7). Mr. Solomon had gone so far as to say that if Merriman's views should prevail, "He would rather die than vote for Responsible Government", and had referred to him as "the chief mouthpiece of the extermination policy." Yet Merriman, as Minister of Crown Lands and Public Works, acted in the capacity of Minister of War.

It is true that he believed in Frere's philanthropism.(8). At the farewell dinner to Sir Henry Barkly,(9) Mr. Solomon said that grief at his departure was tempered by the arrival of the new Governor, who had expressed the most liberal views on

(1). C2079 No. 24. Feb. 5th 1878. Frere to Carnarvon.

(2). A.B. Keith - Responsible Government in the Dominions Vol. 3. p. 1261. (1912).

(3). H. of A. May 23rd 1878.

(4). P.A. Molteno. Vol. 2. p. 368.

(5). H. of A. June 1st. 1880.

(6). H. of A. April 21st 1881.

(7). Chapter 20.

(8). Point made by P.A. Molteno. Vol. 2. p. 368.

(9). C.A. April 4th 1877.

Native Policy to a deputation which interviewed him before he left England. "It has been a pleasure to see that in reply to the deputation which waited upon him in Great Britain he said that he believed the principle on which the Government of this Colony should be conducted was the principle on which India was governed; namely, equal justice to people of all creeds, all classes and all colours". Mr. Solomon thus believed Frere to be a man of his own kind.

Another reason for Mr. Solomon's withdrawal of support from Mr. Molteno, suggested by the latter's biographer, is not so sound - namely, that he was partial to Sprigg.(1). He points out that Mr. Solomon insisted on Cabinet rank for him in 1872, as one of the conditions of his own acceptance of office. To this it may be objected that a serious rift had for some time been developing between Mr. Solomon and Mr. Sprigg, precisely because the former continued to support the Government and the latter lead the opposition to it. In the 1877 Session, the difference in their outlook on native policy was unmistakable, as was seen in the discussion on disarmament and general defence measures. In this connection, it is useful to note the evidence of an independent source - the Zuid-Afrikaan,(2) which thought Mr. Sprigg too extreme in his demand for strong action on the frontier but Mr. Solomon on the other hand, too liberal in his views. The Molteno Ministry was only dismissed in February 1878, but early in December 1877, the Zuid-Afrikaan was commenting on the divergence of opinions in the following terms:

'Er was een tijd toen de heeren Sprigg en Solomon werden beschouwd als een Castor en Pollux, als een soort van tweelinggoden in onze Parlementaire mythologie... De schoone dagen van vriendschap en eensgezindheid zijn nu echter ten einde... Prijs het orgaan van den heer Solomon het beleid van der Regering, hij verzekert dat zij de Grensboeren met rassche schreden ruineert door hare onbekwaamheid, domheid en dwaasheid....' with more in the same vein.

It is, of course, possible that Mr. Solomon did not appreciate the extent of Mr. Sprigg's divergence from him, and what was later found to be the implications of a 'vigorous' native policy. Be that as it may, he was pre-occupied with a single question - the action of the Molteno Ministry. In his opinion the Government deserved to be censured.

A lengthy debate(3) ensued upon Merriman's motion of censure upon the new Ministry for taking office under the peculiar circumstances. It was alleged that the Governor had acted unconstitutionally in insisting on subordinating the Colonial forces to the Imperial Commander against the wishes of his Ministers.

Mr. Solomon(4) believed that since the Galeka outbreak was simply due to an inter tribal feud, it could easily have been suppressed. The Molteno Government owing to 'gross mismanagement' were responsible for the spread of the rebellion to the Gaikas.

Mr. F. A. Molteno has complained (5) that Mr. Solomon

(1). Molteno. Vol. 2. p. 368.

(2). De. Z.A. December 12th 1877. "De Heer Sprigg over den toestand de Grenzen".

(3). H. of A. May 23rd - June 6th 1878.

(4). H. of A. June 3rd 1878.

(5). Molteno. Vol. 2. p. 395.

concentrated upon the aspect of native grievances and neglected the constitutional side of the question. However, Mr. Solomon stated very definitely that he did not believe the Governor had acted unconstitutionally. "... I must candidly say, if you ask my opinion, that in this case, I consider that Sir Bartle Frere has been the real defender of our constitutional rights and liberties, and not the honourable member for Beaufort". It is not improbable that he remembered at this time Mr. Molteno's contemptuous reference a few years back to the 'nicely-balanced judicial minds of a few enthusiasts' - a remark which he himself had then not suffered to pass in silence. In his opinion, the Government, as much as the country generally had been assailed by panic, when, about the middle of December, the Gaikas who were believed to have been utterly routed, returned to their ancestral lands, so that hostilities had to be resumed, and when, at the same time, the Gaikas rose in rebellion.

The Government then welcomed the idea that the military should take control of the forces on both sides of the Kei. Only when the tide turned, did the Ministry regain its self-confidence, and begin to express resentment of Imperial Supremacy. He thought it was the Cabinet which had acted unconstitutionally, in attempting to direct the campaign without consulting the Governor.

With Mr. Solomon and his powerful Cape Argus lined up in opposition, it was little wonder that on June 6th, Mr. Maasdoorp's amendment was agreed to: "That this House..... is of opinion that under all the circumstances of the case, the removal from office of the late Ministry was unavoidable". Mr. Molteno's son suggests(1) with some satisfaction, that Mr. Solomon repented his share in the overthrow of Molteno when he saw the subsequent actions of the Sprigg Administration, and that he then realised, too late, that Molteno was the true philanthropist.(2). But this is unlikely. It would seem to prove that two wrongs (which was how Mr. Solomon saw it) make a right.

(1). Molteno. Vol. 2. p. 368.

(4). Ibid - "One whom he had known all his life and could rely upon".

CHAPTER 7. THE SPRIGG GOVERNMENT.

When Parliament was opened on May 10th 1878, the Governor announced that the Gaika-Galoka war, 'which unhappily found the defensive resources of the country without organisation' was not yet ended, and that the Government intended to take elaborate measures to safeguard the Colony from future attacks and to establish an efficient defence force.(1).

A few days later(2) the Attorney-General, Mr. Upington, moved the second reading of the Peace Preservation Bill. The Colony had received a bad scare, and the measure was agreed to without any dissension. It provided that the Government could, in an emergency, call upon the inhabitants of a disturbed area to surrender their arms, in exchange for compensation. Only Mr. Merriman spoke at all. His sole objection was that the measure seemed to him merely permissive and not effective enough. Mr. Solomon was content to give a silent vote. The Attorney-General had emphasised, however, probably for his especial benefit, that the Act would apply to all alike, without distinction based on colour, and that the sole criterion would be loyalty or disloyalty. As a matter of fact, two or three years later, in the debate on Mr. Fuller's motion which censured the extension of the Act to Basutoland, Mr. Solomon revealed(3) that 'a gentleman' - apparently a member of the Government called upon him at his office at this time (1878), and asked for his views on the proposed measure. He had promised his support on condition that it did not discriminate against non-Europeans, as such. A draft of the Bill had been sent him for his approval. "He had objected to certain clauses and the Colonial Secretary promised to have them omitted".

In order to meet the increased expenditure resulting from the war and the new defence plans, the Government secured an excise tax upon wine. It was a measure which had very important political repercussions, for it led to the formation of the Boeren Beschermings Vereniging, by Mr. Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr(4) who since September 1871 had been editing the 'Zuid-Afrikaan', with which 'De Volksvriend' had been combined.(5). The immediate object of the new organisation was to secure the repeal of the levy upon the wine-farmers, but it was intended by its founder to do more than that.(6).

The Vereniging began to use its influence at the elections in 1879. Although Mr. Solomon had voted for the Excise tax, the Zuid-Afrikaan(7) yet urged its readers to support him, because the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877 had turned the Dutch in the Colony hostile to Federation and Mr. Solomon was a prominent opponent of that measure. "De heer Solomon is een man van uitstekende bekwaamheid, en zijne inzichten over inboorling- aangelegenheden en dergelijke zaken al niet to onze, hij is desniettemin gezonde constitutionele

-
- (1). C.A. May 11th 1878.
 - (2). H. of A. May 15th 1878.
 - (3). H. of A. May 27th 1880.
 - (4). Hofmeyr. p. 147.
 - (5). Ibid. p. 71.
 - (6). Ibid. p. 149.
 - (7). Z.A. 28th September 1878.

beginnselen toegegaan, on een man die de belangen der Kolonie in die discussie over Federatie niet zal opofferen aan de wenschen van Downingstraat".

Mr. Solomon was probably not unaware of the Vereniging's attitude to him, when, about three months after this article appeared, he replied to his requisitionists.(1). Since he asserted that he was definitely in favour of the principle of an excise tax on wine - "I have always considered such a duty a legitimate and desirable tax and that it could be imposed without injuriously affecting the interests of those engaged in the industry" - one suspects him of being rather ingenuous when he praised the forbearance and self-restraint of the Western wine-farmers. Short of resorting to physical violence, they were offering very active opposition indeed, yet Mr. Solomon said he doubted 'whether any class of the Community, equally numerous, influential and powerful as those who believe themselves specially affected by this taxation, would have borne the imposition of a similar tax with more patience and with less opposition than they have done'.

As it happened, Mr. Solomon had done well to conciliate the Vereniging. Before the polling day arrived, Sir Bartle Frere precipitated the Zulu War. The general tendency was to regard it as a matter of white versus black, and to take it as axiomatic that all whites should support the Governor's action. In Mr. Wilmot's opinion, for example, "Sooner or later one of the great decisive battles between the white and black races had to be fought. Possibly the day might have been postponed, but whether that would have been wise, is a question".(2). Mr. Solomon became an extremely unpopular man, because he dared to say that Sir Bartle Frere was virtually an aggressor. At a public meeting held at the Commercial Exchange in Capetown to record confidence in Frere, after several men had spoken, Mr. Solomon, who was in the audience, was called for, but such a pandemonium broke out when he ascended the platform that he was unable to open his lips.(3).

In an address to his friends and supporters in May,(4) he remarked that it had been asserted that he should not be elected because he was opposed to Sir Bartle Frere's policy, but he maintained that the Governor had no right to have one at all. He objected to the too close association between the Governor and the Ministry - a phenomenon upon which the Zuid-Afrikaan had commented as early as a month after the new Cabinet assumed office. "Er is nu geene botsing en geene oneenigheid meer tusschen Gouverneur en Ministerie.... Het publiek meent te vreezen dat de heer Sprigg met al zijn vertoon van onbuigzame gehechtheid aan constitutionele beginselen, al te buigzaam is geworden in de handen des Gouverneur".(5). Possibly, Mr. Solomon's objection was partly due to disappointment because Mr. Sprigg did not choose to submit rather to his own influence, as Mr. Molteno, in his time had done.(6). It has been noted that he loved power and had confidence in his ability to wield it well. A more likely reason is that Mr. Solomon's high hopes of Frere as an advocate of justice to the Natives had been 'rudely dispelled', on his own admission,(7)

-
- (1). C.A. January 7th 1879.
 - (2). Wilmot, History of our Own Times in South Africa. Vol. 1. p. 359. He devotes pages 358-367 to a 'Defence of Sir Bartle Frere'.
 - (3). C.A. March 25th 1879.
 - (4). C.A. May 13th 1879, meeting on the 12th.
 - (5). De. Z.A. 9 Maart 1878.
 - (6). See Chapter 5.
 - (7). H. of A. June 25th 1880.

so that he did not consider the Governor's influence upon Mr. Sprigg to be a wholesome one. It had probably been his conviction that he and Sir Bartle Frere between them could set the Sprigg Government upon the path to Liberalism. At any rate, Martineau(1) dismisses Mr. Solomon's change of attitude towards Frere and Sprigg much too lightly. "Solomon was an influential politician who had at first professed to be friendly to the Government, but for some personal reason, he changed his ground..." The expression 'some personal reason' sounds altogether too trivial.

The result of his hostility to the Sprigg-Frere alliance was that though he was re-elected, he obtained the fewest votes of the four successful candidates,(2) whereas in the previous election he had headed the poll. The support of the Vereniging in securing his return at all was probably valuable. The Cape Argus, in an editorial, remarked on the lengths to which his political opponents had gone, to contrive his defeat. "For months past, Mr. Solomon has been subjected to the grossest misrepresentation.... His physical appearance was drawn for the delectation of 'gentlemen' with all the malice that undisguised hate could inspire."(3).

The 1879 Session saw Mr. Solomon alert for native interest and revealed that the breach between Mr. Sprigg and himself was irreconcilable. A useful indication of his distrust of the Government's native policy was his objection to any further annexation by the Colony.(4). It has been seen that about three years previously, he had come round to the belief that it was 'a policy likely to be advantageous not only to the Colony but to the natives'.(5). Now he swung back to his original attitude that the Colony should interfere as little as possible, and he therefore advocated that diplomatic agents, rather than magistrates, should be stationed with the tribes. He agreed with Mr. Orpen's suggestion(6) to the effect that any further extension of authority over extra-colonial territory should be undertaken by the British Government through the agency of the High Commissioner. In Mr. Solomon's opinion, it was very desirable that the Imperial Government should take the responsibility of governing the native tribes from the Kei eastward and beyond the Orange River'. He described talk about invading Pondoland as 'a monstrous proposal', and urged the Government to withdraw from Damaraland. '.... he saw no necessity whatever of annexing this arid and inhospitable country'. Few people envisaged then a German Colony in South-West Africa and Mr. Solomon retired from politics about the time when the scramble for territory began in earnest. Possibly he might have revised his views. He had long before expressed his conviction that the extension of British supremacy in South Africa was 'a great advantage'.(7).

To get back to 1879, the Vagrancy Bill introduced by the Sprigg Government strengthened his hostility to it. Mr. Solomon denounced it as useless and retrogressive and when it came on for the third reading he took the opportunity of recording his objection to it and of commenting upon the change in Mr. Sprigg's outlook. When the Molteno Government

-
- (1). Martineau - Life of Sir Bartle Frere. Vol. 2. p. 331.
 - (2). C.A. May 20th 1879.
 - (3). Ibid.
 - (4). H. of A. August 12th 1879.
 - (5). Chapter 6.
 - (6). H. of A. August 12th 1879.
 - (7). Chapter 2A. In a reply to a requisition in 1869.

had attempted to carry a similar measure, Mr. Sprigg had supported him in securing its rejection. "The Colonial Secretary had changed his opinions for the worse".(1).

Five days later,(2) Mr. Solomon initiated a debate on the Government's native policy by requesting that certain petitions to the House with regard to disarmament, should be referred to a select committee. Already in January 1879,(3) he had written to his requisitionists that he feared that the Government, contrary to its promises, was attempting to widen the scope of the Peace Preservation Act, to secure the disarmament of all natives.

Mr. Solomon asserted that the author of the disarmament policy was the Governor and not the Ministry, because when Mr. Sprigg was chairman of the Defence Commission, no definite proposal to that effect had been made. He was not quite fair to Mr. Sprigg. It has been shown(4) that in the Session before the outbreak of the war, Mr. Sprigg had roundly denounced the Government for allowing the Natives to acquire arms, so that the question of disarmament must have been even then in his mind.

Mr. Solomon's chief complaint was sounder - that the Government were widening the scope of the Peace Preservation Act. As he had voted for it, it merely gave the Government the power to disarm all inhabitants in a disturbed area, regardless of their colour. Instead of that, the Government appeared to have embarked on a policy of universal disarmament of natives. Besides the injustice of such a course, he believed it would be impracticable, since it would encourage an extensive smuggling trade. There was talk of applying the Act to Basutoland and he warned the House that this would be a very dangerous step, as well as a most unpolitic one, since the majority of the Basutos were loyal and had recently fought on the side of the Colonists against a rebellious chief, Morosi.

Most of the members, however, expressed approval of disarmament, so that Mr. Sprigg felt himself free to proceed with his plans.

If Mr. Solomon needed anything further to confirm his dislike of the Government, it was the discovery(5) that a sum of £12,000, the surplus revenue of Basutoland, had been quietly appropriated and that the House would have been left in ignorance of this interesting fact, had not Mr. Sauer proposed that the Government should expend a certain sum on roads in Basutoland. Thereupon Mr. Sprigg had to confess that the money had been used to pay the cost of putting down the Morosi rebellion, thus disregarding the services the Basutos themselves had rendered.

The year 1879 closed for Mr. Solomon, as it had opened, with much unpleasantness. His open criticism of the Sprigg-Frere alliance brought retribution in its wake. The Government printing and stationery contract, which he had held since 1840, was terminated in this year. When the matter was discussed in the Assembly,(6) it became clear that the

(1). H. of A. August 21st 1879.

(2). H. of A. August 25th 1879.

(3). C.A. January 7th 1879.

(4). Chapter 6.

(5). H. of A. August 28th 1879.

(6). H. of A. September 10th 1879, and editorial in C.A. September 11th.

Government had not accepted, in accordance with business principles, the lowest tender, though by an inaccurate publication in the Gazette, such an impression had in fact, deliberately been created. Mr. Sprigg seeing that the opinion of the House was unmistakably against the Government on this matter, lost his head and declared that not only the present but the former administration had been gravely embarrassed by the too close connection between Mr. Solomon's commercial and political interests. The charge was, of course, not a new one. In 1864 Murray had suggested that Mr. Solomon objected to 'removal' because it would mean the loss of the Government printing contract.(1).

Mr. Solomon's answer to Mr. Sprigg threw an interesting light on his relations with the Sprigg and Molteno Governments. "He would venture to say this, that during the short time the present Colonial Secretary had been in office, he had done him the honour to consult him ten times more frequently than the late Colonial Secretary did. Except on one or two occasions, the late Colonial Secretary never consulted him, although it was said that he had been influenced by him to a great extent.

But the contract was lost and it was undoubtedly a great financial blow. In addition, the 'Cape Times' which was first published in 1876 was already proving a serious rival to his own older-established paper, the 'Cape Argus'. He was beginning now to worry about provision for his young family, for he had married in 1874 Miss Georgiana Margaret Thompson, who had come from Scotland with her mother to start, under the aegis of the Dutch Reformed Church the Good Hope Seminary for Girls.(2).

Nor was this the end of his trials. In the last week of December, Mr. Upington, the Attorney-General of the Colony, sued Francis Dormer and Saul Solomon and Company as editor and publishers, respectively, of the Cape Argus each for £10,000.(3). About a year before, some farmers were reported to have butchered a small party of Bushmen on the Northern Border at Koegas and the accused were put upon their trial in September 1878 at Victoria West Circuit Court. Judge Dwyer, however, sent Mr. Solomon a ^{private letter} ~~secret letter~~ expressing the opinion that Mr. Upington would ^{secure the acquittal of} ~~acquit~~ the prisoners in order not to alienate political supporters in the district. Mr. Dormer happened to be with Mr. Solomon at the time and he showed him the letter,(4) with the result that the Cape Argus published an editorial or two in the same vein. Mr. Upington in consequence sued them both for libel. The trial began in the Supreme Court on the 16th December. On the 22nd, Chief Justice de Villiers, whom the Zuid-Afrikaan had a few years back described as "dien trouwen wapendrager van der heer Solomon", (5) gave a verdict of 1/- damages without costs against the publishers, but £5 with costs against the editor, though there had been some hesitation on the latter point. Obviously Mr. Solomon's financial worries were not lightened by the expenses of this case.

-
- (1). See Chapter 3.
 - (2). March 20th 1874. See Cape Argus and Kilpin.
 - (3). C.A. December 23rd 1879.
 - (4). Mr. Solomon explained the circumstances in the H. of A. July 6, 1880.
 - (5). Z.A. 12th June 1872. Walker in his J.H. de Villiers. p. 66, relates that Mr. Solomon begged de Villiers to refuse the position of Chief Justice 'and prove thereby that a politician could rise superior to 'self and self'.

Although Mr. Sprigg had secured a majority for his disarmament policy in 1879, he preferred not to rely upon it, but to present Parliament with a fait accompli and thus force its hand. Shortly before the opening of the 1880 Session, the Government issued a proclamation calling upon the Basutos to surrender their arms by April 1880,(1) and promising to pay compensation within a month. The Basutos, however, showed signs of resistance. For this, the Government had an explanation. According to Martineau,(2) Frere blamed Mr. Solomon to a great extent. "The amount of sedition preached by their friends, from Saul Solomon, at Sea Point, up to the Reverend Frenchmen on the skirts of the Drakensberg is enough to inflame a much less excitable population".

Probably it is true that criticism of the Government policy encouraged the Basutos to hold out, but on the other hand, even men like Hofmeyr and Merriman, who favoured disarmament in principle, went into opposition, because they considered the Government was proceeding rashly.

The 1880 Session was characterized by several efforts to oust the Sprigg Ministry. First Mr. Fuller moved a vote of censure on the Government for its action in applying the Peace Preservation Act to Basutoland without prior consultation of Parliament. It was pointed out that no special emergency warranted such a step, which had in fact been taken on the eve of the meeting of Parliament. The debate began on May the 21st and lasted till June 2nd, no less than 45 out of 67 members speaking.(3).

Mr. Solomon(4) naturally supported Mr. Fuller's motion entirely. It was not only that he could not tolerate a policy which discriminated against the Natives as such, but as a Constitutionalist, he objected to the Government's action '.... it is the most extraordinary invasion of Parliamentary rights and privileges which I ever heard of in my life(cheers). I say that the action he has taken was calculated to embarrass Parliament from taking free action in the matter....'.

Not so popular, probably, was his vindication of the attitude taken up by the Basutos. According to Mr. Solomon, they had behaved in exemplary fashion. Without resorting to violence, they had asked the Colonial Secretary to postpone the proclamation till they could petition the Queen and the Cape Parliament. Mr. Sprigg had broken faith with them, for although he had agreed to this, he had, on hearing that Morosi had been defeated, immediately ordered the proclamation to be enforced. He declared that the Basutos were a peace-loving tribe. They were tillers of the soil and the cultivated area of Basutoland was far greater in proportion to its extent, than in the Cape Colony. "Yes, they fought against Sir George Cathcart, but I suppose Sir George Cathcart went there to fight them?"

Mr. Solomon pointed out that Mr. Sprigg himself realised the impracticability of his proposal, for at the Pitso he had acknowledged the assistance given by the Basutos in the Border troubles and had actually said that if the Colony were again in danger, they would once more turn to them for help.

(1). Walker, History of S.A. p. 387.

(2). Martineau. Vol. 2 p. 382. Quotes a letter from Frere to Captain Mills of April 27th 1880.

(3). Hofmeyr. p. 181.

(4). H. of A. May 27th 1880.

In short the Sprigg Government advocated a despicable policy of injustice tempered by fear.

The Vote of Censure was, however, lost on the 2nd June, by 29 Ayes to 38 Noes. But in the Confederation debate, (1) initiated by Mr. Sprigg himself, the Government sustained a very severe blow, when it was forced to accept "the previous question", meaning that the matter should not have been introduced at all. Mr. Sprigg's attitude on Confederation was also sharply criticized as a proof of his subservience to Sir Bartle Frere, and it might be as well to review the events leading to that situation in 1880.

When Mr. Molteno was in London, he made it quite clear to Lord Carnarvon, with the sanction of the Cape Parliament, that the Colony was not prepared to consider Confederation for some time yet. Nevertheless the Secretary of State still clung to his pet idea, (2) and he commissioned Mr. Shepstone, who was in London to represent Natal, to annex the Transvaal, probably in the hope of forcing the recalcitrant Cape to enter a Northern Union. The annexation of the Transvaal, not unnaturally, caused a revulsion of feeling among the Dutch of the Colony, who with the Eastern Separationists, had till then been the leading agitators for a Confederation. Their one aim now was not to lend themselves to any scheme that might look like a condonation of Mr. Shepstone's action. Molteno sympathised with them and dissociated himself from the Imperial Government's plans, refusing even to initiate in the Assembly a debate on Carnarvon's Permissive Federation Bill. (3).

Sir Bartle Frere, expected that Mr. Sprigg would be more accommodating and he was not disappointed. At the opening of Parliament on May 10th 1878, there was a rather long-winded reference to the desirability of "a joint and friendly investigation of such a basis as may provide a sound foundation for a satisfactory measure of confederation".

Encouraged by the prospect of Government support, Mr. Paterson introduced a resolution (4) that the House should express its opinion in favour of Confederation, and should authorize the Government to summon a conference for that purpose. Mr. Solomon objected that the time was not ripe. In the Cape it was necessary to consolidate the changes arising out of the war on the frontier. The Transvaal was restive under the British yoke, though he himself thought that the annexation was 'an immense benefit' to the Transvaalers themselves, and would be to South Africa generally'. In addition, there was a serious boundary dispute between the Transvaal and the Zulus and a Zulu war seemed imminent. He proposed as an amendment, "the previous question". Mr. Sprigg also agreed that it would be advisable to shelve the question temporarily and Mr. Solomon's amendment was carried.

He told his requisitionists (5) that in a Union of the South African States and Colonies, he calculated that there would be about twenty natives to one European, not counting the natives outside the borders. He thought that United South Africa would be unable to provide for its own defence without Imperial aid and hence Responsible Government would not be able to operate successfully as Imperial control over

-
- (1). H. of A. June 22nd to 25th 1880.
 - (2). Walker History of S.A. pp. 368-372.
 - (3). H. of A. July 31st 1877.
 - (4). H. of A. July 16th 1878.
 - (5). C.A. January 7th 1879.

policy would follow almost inevitably - a prospect which did not seem pleasing to him, curiously enough. I think that this argument, which if accepted must put Confederation off almost indefinitely, was just a rationalisation of his objection to Confederation. It probably sounded ungenerous to him to say bluntly that the Cape should keep out because it would gain practically nothing, but that such was, in fact, the real reason, is apparent from the statement that "He did not want the Cape to be thought selfish, but there was a limit to state sacrifice". Incidentally, although he wished to stave off Union for some time, he wrote that he preferred that when it did come, that it should take the unitary rather than the federal form.

It has before been noted that the very fact of his opposition to Confederation won for him the support of Mr. Hofmeyr's Vereniging. "Hij is een man die der belanger van der Kolonie niet zal opofferen aan de wenschen van Downingstraat."

In 1879, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Secretary of State for the Colonies in succession to Carnarvon, sent a despatch to Frere, urging him to consider with his Ministers, the possibility of raising the question of Confederation in the Cape Parliament, soon after it assembled.(1). According to Frere,(2) not until the debate on Disarmament, which Mr. Solomon had initiated, had ended in a triumph for the Ministry, were the latter assured of their position in the new Parliament. By that time it was too late in the Session to consider the matter. He also wrote that his Ministers preferred to wait and observe Sir Garnet Wolseley's course in Natal, Zululand and the Transvaal.

Already in the previous year Mr. Solomon had begun to realise that the Transvaalers were hostile to the British annexation. In November 1879, he with Merriman, Hofmeyr and a number of other prominent public men led a deputation to Sir Bartle Frere to urge him to summon a convention of Transvaalers to ascertain whether or not the majority were in favour of British rule. If they were, the Convention might discuss "the present and future position of the Constitution" and if not, "the independence of the country should be restored under such guarantees as will ensure its future good Government and the maintenance of peaceful relations with its neighbours", to quote Mr. Stigant M.L.A., who was the first speaker.⁴

Mr. Solomon⁵ invited by the Governor to express his views, said that he believed that the annexation took place "under a great misapprehension". He does not seem to have contemplated a complete withdrawal by the British for he spoke of granting the Transvaal 'larger power' and at the same time imposing some restriction on them in regard to their external policy. Apparently he was unsuspecting of an ulterior motive for the annexation, taking it that the British Government's primary object had been the restoration of order north of the Vaal.

Frere in his report to Hicks-Beach, threw cold water on the proposal. To him it "did not... seem sufficiently definite to furnish a basis for discussion of any practical value".(3).

-
- (1). Imperial Papers, C2374. p. 142, Hicks-Beach to Frere 12th June 1879.
 - (2). C2482. No. 100, p. 291. Frere to Hicks-Beach. September 23rd 1879.
 - (3). C2482. p. 444. Frere to Hicks-Beach, November 11th 1879.
 4. Ditto p 446
 5. " p 447

Thus not till 1880, after the Vote of Censure had been rejected, did Mr. Sprigg think that he could safely raise the subject of Confederation. Mr. Solomon spoke(1) after he had already announced his Government's intention to withdraw its proposal. The opposition of Mr. Jan H. Hofmeyr, who had entered Parliament in the previous year, was probably the deciding factor. According to his biographer, '.... for some time it appeared that there would probably be a small majority in its favour, but on the fourth day Hofmeyr spoke against it. His speech, induced the Government to accept the previous question.'(2). Mr. Solomon's speech was quite insignificant. It was chiefly devoted to a justification of his own actions. He had been accused of sending 'a lying message' to England that a Basuto war was imminent. The phrase had been used by the Cape Times. 'I think every member of the House and most people out of doors can understand its bitterness against me. It was a Government organ'. He spoke proudly of his public reputation, comparing it, by implication, with that of Sprigg's. '.... for I am not ashamed of what I do, politically or privately. I have at least a character for consistency to maintain. I have been more than thirty-five years a public man, and I do not know that I have ever yet forfeited the independence of my position for the advantages of place or power.....'.

The defeat of the Government on this question accounted for the rather futile resolution moved by Mr. Fleming on June 29th, that the Government had the confidence of the House. The opposition did not trouble to contest it, but vacated their seats in a body. About a month later,(3) however, another attempt was made to oust the Government. Mr. Merriman introduced a motion of no confidence. He was the only speaker. He declared that the Government had found its way in 'by the backdoor'. In spite of enormous expenditure the Colonial defences were little better than they were three years ago. Their native policy had been a failure. Railway extension had been abandoned. The financial condition was unsatisfactory and a loan bill for £200,000 had been proposed. The resolution was immediately put to the vote but defeated by 32 to 24, Mr. Solomon naturally voting with the minority.

By the time Parliament met in the next year, the Transvaal had risen for its independence, and with such success, that the British Government was soon eager to negotiate a peace. On December 24th 1880,(4) shortly after hostilities broke out Mr. Solomon accompanied a deputation of about twenty to Government House, to interview the Administrator(5) with reference to the State of the Transvaal. Mr. Merriman, as spokesman, said, "Every shot fired in the Transvaal will find its echo down here in the Colony", and read a resolution, which requested that a special Commissioner be sent to the Transvaal "to find out what arrangements would be most advantageous to the country and most likely to reconcile the inhabitants to the Government of the Queen". Chief Justice de Villiers was suggested as best qualified for the office. The Administrator could do nothing, though he promised to transmit the resolution by telegraph to the Secretary of State but it was already too late.

(1). H. of A. June 25th 1880.

(2). Hofmeyr. p. 170.

(3). H. of A. July 23rd 1880.

(4). C.A. Dec. 25th 1880.

(5). Sir G.C. Straham Acting Gov. Sept. 1880 - Jan. 22nd 1881.
Walker. p. 346.

In consequence of these developments in the Transvaal, early in the next Session, Mr. Hofmeyr requested(1) "that a select committee be appointed to draft an address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, expressive of the humble thanks of this House for the gracious terms of peace which have been accorded to the people of the Transvaal lately in arms, and to express their conviction that these terms will be received in the same spirit of moderation and wisdom...." and more in the same tone. Such expressions sound rather fulsome and unnecessarily grateful from one who had been constant in deprecating the annexation and in urging retrocession. His biographer explains(2) this motion as a tactical stroke. It was designed, partly to clear himself from the charge of being anti-British, and partly to conciliate Englishmen who felt themselves humiliated in the eyes of the Dutch by the concessions to the Transvaal.

Mr. Solomon was not influenced by any such considerations. He chose rather to support Mr. Watermeyer's amendment which curtly stated, "that this House, without discussing the terms of peace which are not before it, desires to record its satisfaction at the cessation of hostilities in the Transvaal". He certainly did not scruple to say what he thought. It is said that Rhodes declared, "Solomon would shatter the Empire for what he is pleased to call his principles".(3). Mr. Solomon(4) did not blame the Gladstone Government for not having acted in accordance with its election promises before the storm broke, so much as Sir Bartle Frere and Mr. Sprigg, who had deceived the British Government as to the true state of affairs in the Transvaal. By a succession of telegrams they had jockeyed Lord Kimberley, the new Secretary of State for the Colonies, into believing that abandonment would not only be fatal to confederation but would probably lead to a civil war in the Transvaal. When the last telegram from Lord Kimberley, commending confederation, was read out in the House, the Government conveniently omitted to explain the circumstances leading up to it. Mr. Solomon was convinced that Sir Bartle Frere, knowing that an address in favour of Transvaal independence, signed by several thousands of Cape Colonists, was to be sent to Mr. Gladstone, tried to anticipate it and secure a positive statement from the Home Government against abandonment.

Ultimately, Mr. Fuller's amendment was adopted unanimously. It was of substantially the same import as Mr. Watermeyer's motion, but less frigid in tone.

This matter of the telegrams did not enhance the prestige of the Sprigg Government. The opposition determined to redouble its blows. A week later, Mr. Fuller(5) called a meeting at his house to choose a leader of the temporarily combined anti-Sprigg groups, since he himself, though leader hitherto, was not prepared to take over the Government, should the present Cabinet fall. All the most prominent members of the opposition, and therefore Mr. Solomon, were present, but each for different reasons, declined the responsibility. Eventually, Mr. Scanlan agreed to accept it.

(1). H. of A. March 31st 1881. Parl. opened on March 25th.

(2). Hofmeyr. p. 185.

(3). Kilpin. He does not indicate when or where Rhodes said this

(4). H. of A. April 4th & 5th 1881.

(5). 'Cecil Rhodes - a Monograph and a Reminiscence' by Sir T.E. Fuller. pp. 3-5. According to Hofmeyr, p. 184, the caucus was held on the 31st March 1881 in the Mutual Buildings. Mr. Fuller was member for Cape Town - Mr. Scanlan for Coedoek.

By this time, the Basutos were in open rebellion and the Colony was finding it almost impossible to subdue them effectually. In these circumstances, Mr. Scanlen on April 11th moved a motion of no confidence in the Sprigg Government. Mr. Solomon, (1) in spite of having been accused of inciting the Basutos to sedition, said he considered it a most disastrous thing for the Basutos themselves, to break out into rebellion. Nevertheless, Mr. Sprigg was chiefly to blame since he had broken his promise given at a Pitso, not to apply Disarmament suddenly. He advised the House once more to consider the policy he had advocated, though without much hope, on the eve of the Responsible Government, and at the beginning of the Sprigg regime, after the Gaika-Galeka war - namely that the Imperial Government should be requested to assume responsibility for administering the native tribes east of the Kei and north of the Orange.

On the vote being taken, Mr. Scanlen's motion was defeated by three, owing to the fact that the Griqualand West representatives who came down for the first time in this year, held the balance. Rhodes made his maiden speech on this occasion, declaring himself an independent man. He sided with the Government because he did not believe the time had come for a change. (2). Mr. Fuller had previously solicited his support for the anti-Sprigg group, but he had answered, "Don't try and birdlime me on to a party stick". (3).

Already in February 1881, the Basutos had sued for peace, but the war dragged on because Mr. Sprigg's terms were too harsh, but in April, both sides agreed to arbitration, and on the 29th, Sir Hercules Robinson's Award was published. The Basutos really had the best of it because though required to pay a fine in cattle and compensate European traders whose stores had been looted, they were permitted to retain their rifles on the payment of a licence - the crux of the war. (4).

The Government's ^aAcceptance of the Award estranged some of its supporters. Mr. Sprigg was further weakened by the resignation of his Attorney-General, Mr. Leonard, a fact which he had neglected to announce for a fortnight. The final cause of the fall of his Government was the loss of the backing of Rhodes and his colleagues from Griqualand West, because the Government could not promise them a railway to Kimberley. (5).

When on May 6th, Mr. Scanlen gave notice of a further motion of no confidence, Mr. Sprigg decided not to face it, but moved the adjournment of the House, and then resigned. The new Cabinet took office on the 9th. It was to be headed by Mr. Scanlen and to include Merriman and Hofmeyr, but Mr. Solomon was ignored.

-
- (1). H. of A. April 21st 1881.
 - (2). Hofmeyr. p. 186.
 - (3). Fuller - 'Rhodes'. p. 6.
 - (4). Hofmeyr. p. 183.
 - (5). Hofmeyr. p. 186.

CHAPTER 8. THE SCANLEN GOVERNMENT.

There is evidence from two independent sources that Mr. Solomon's failure to be consulted in the construction of the new Cabinet was a bitter blow to him. According to "Veteran", (1) apparently a journalist on the staff of the Cape Argus, "... early in 1881 the Argus had the modified joy of seeing its political protégés come into office in the person of Mr. (later Sir) Thomas Scanlen's Ministry. For the unexpected happened. Mr. Saul Solomon, who had sacrificed his time and money to the cause, was not so much as consulted, much less offered a portfolio. Mr. Merriman dominated everything, and the relationship between himself and Mr. Solomon had never been entirely cordial. The result was that the Argus was not nearly so enthusiastic for its old friends, as it had been bitter against its old enemies".

The above must be read with some caution. Firstly, Mr. Solomon must have realised when he refused the offer of the leadership of the opposition in March 1881, (2) that he thereby forfeited the chance of becoming the next Prime Minister. Secondly, the Argus was sold to Francis Dormer, as from July 1st 1881, less than a month after the new Ministry assumed office. Part of the purchase price was paid by Rhodes, though at the time this was kept a secret. (3). Undoubtedly the change in ownership explained the change in tone. Thirdly, Mr. Scanlen pursued a moderate policy in regard to Basutoland, of which Mr. Solomon approved. Later when 'letting time work' proved ineffectual, Mr. Solomon advised Mr. Scanlen to hand over Basutoland and the Transkei to Imperial control. This was in direct conflict with the policy advocated by Mr. Hofmeyr of Colonial self-defence or 'colonialism' but Mr. Scanlen preferred to follow Mr. Solomon's views. Consequently, it would have been surprising if Mr. Solomon had not supported the Scanlen Government.

Yet it is probably true that Mr. Solomon was disappointed at not being consulted, or even offered a portfolio. That was the opinion of Mrs. Merriman. On August 29th 1881, (4) she wrote her husband an account of a luncheon with the Solomons at "Clarensville", Sea Point. (A very good lunch, no fuss and nonsense, and everything done in a gentlemanlike way").

"....little Saul has been very poorly, 'depressed and altogether knocked up', but the poor little imp seemed to be all there yesterday..... Saul also said in a very bitter way that he is amused at seeing how popular you are in the Eastern Province, and said 'what it is to be in office and to be able to give appointments, et. etc.".

Curiously enough, Mrs. Merriman also received the impression that Mr. Solomon would oppose the Scanlen Government. "Nothing can divest me of the idea that he is going against your Ministry next Session, he and I.I. will form a party of their own, mark my words, and your cue will be to try

(1). The Argus Christmas Number. Dec. 13th 1913. p. 16.
(In the Mendelsohn Collection).

(2). See previous Chapter.

(3). According to "Veteran" - in same article.

(4). Merriman Collection. No. 51 from Agnes to J.X. Merriman.

and conciliate Saul as it is no use making more enemies than you have, and a bore is a bore. He goes round by Friday's steamer and I should be pleased to hear of your going to call on him on Monday or so".(1).

She also corroborated Veteran's assertion that the relationship between Mr. Solomon and Mr. Merriman was not quite cordial. That was of course, seen in the Responsible Government debates and has been commented on. "I do hope you will get Mr. Richard Solomon in for Aliwal, and that Mr. Scanlen will take him as your Attorney-General, he is such a nice little fellow, and very intelligent, and let me tell you that there will be no more fear of his uncle Saul guiding and directing him than there is of his doing so to you. Mr. Scanlen need have no fear of his being ruled by his Uncle. I think Mr. Solomon thinks of his respected Uncle in exactly the same way as we do."(2).

It is doubtful whether Mrs. Merriman's exhortations to her husband to conciliate Mr. Solomon greatly affected the Scanlen Government's policy. A course of moderation was the only practicable alternative between the two extremes of a resumption of the war to subdue the Basutos and abandonment of the territory. The Sprigg Government had made a failure of the former and the general temper of the country was against either a reopening of hostilities or abandonment.

Mr. Solomon, it is true, scarcely two weeks after the Scanlen Government took office, advocated a form of withdrawal.⁽³⁾ He proposed that the Imperial Government should be asked to take over the control of native territories east of the Kei and north of the Orange. The Secretary for Native Affairs, Mr. Sauer, asked for the motion to be postponed, so that the Ministry might have time for mature consideration. Mr. Solomon was willing to do so, but several members objected, and in consequence, the resolution had to be debated.

As in 1862,⁽⁴⁾ Mr. Solomon remarked on the strain to which the constitution with its low franchise was submitted, by the preponderance of natives in the annexed territories, and he argued that if the Cape relinquished control in favour of the Imperial Government, it would benefit financially thereby. They would save directly, the cost of native administration and about two-thirds of the defence vote. Yet he was chiefly concerned about the position of the Natives themselves. ".... for they were nothing else but serfs - under an entirely despotic Government without the protection of the Supreme Court and entirely without any voice in the Parliament of the country, and under the peculiar circumstances of the case it did not appear likely that they could have any representation for years to come".

The motion was negatived and Mr. Solomon was content to relinquish temporarily, his efforts in this direction.

In 1882 Session commenced on March 17th. According to a reporter, Mr. Solomon was not looking well.⁽⁵⁾ After the Cape Times came out as a rival to the Cape Argus, and particularly after the loss of the Government printing contract in 1879, he was overwhelmed with money troubles. His health

-
- (1). Ibid.
 - (2). Ibid.
 - (3). H. of A. May 19th 1881.
 - (4). Chapter 2C.
 - (5). C.A. MARCH 18th 1882.

had never, since his earliest years, been good, but it received a shattering blow when his little daughter Margaret was drowned in the Sea Point reservoir, together with the governess, who had vainly attempted to save her.(1). A valve of his heart was later found to have been injured.(2).

The Governor announced that Parliament had especially been summoned earlier to consider the affairs of Basutoland. The Government proposed to recall both the Disarmament Proclamation and the Robinson Award. It would ^{never} abandon the territory nor resume the war on a large scale. Only a force large enough to support the authority of the magistrates and protect the "loyal Basutos would be maintained in the territory. The pacification of the rebels was left to time. Hofmeyr, apparently, suggested this policy.(3). Mr. Solomon approved of it, but as he did not feel well, he did not take such an active part in the discussions in Parliament as he might otherwise have done.

Mr. Solomon gave a silent vote for the Government against Mr. Laing's motion of Censure(4) on the ground that 'the cancellation of the proclamations applying the Peace Preservation Act to Basutoland and Fingoland will be detrimental to the interests of this country'. The motion was defeated by 37 to 18. He acted similarly in another attack on the Government's policy, when on April 12th, Mr. Upington proposed the second reading of his Bill to repeal the Annexation of Basutoland Act of 1871. He did not think it necessary first to ask the Imperial Government to take over, because he argued, no legislation of the Cape Parliament could deprive the Basutos of their character as British subjects. Thus if the Cape withdrew, the hand of the British Government would be forced. Mr. Merriman announced that the Government would oppose the Bill and moved that it be read that day six months. Mr. Solomon seconded the ^{amendment} but did not speak. The original motion was defeated, though by a small majority than Mr. Laing's - namely 34 - 23. It has been observed before that Mr. Solomon disapproved of attempts to force through measures by what he called sidewinds.(5).

A month later, Mr. Sprigg obstructed the proposal to go into committee of supply on the Estimates.(6). He complained that the Treasurer-General had not made it clear in his statement whether or not they would have a surplus a year hence. He also demanded an explanation of the Government's Basutoland policy and made the rather sweeping statement that with regard to Basutoland the Government had 'entered upon a course of vacillation, concession and tergiversation, probably unparalleled in the history of any Ministry in any part of the British dominions, since Parliamentary Government was established at Westminster, nearly two centuries ago.' Mr. Sprigg's belief was that the Basutos were rebelling against civilisation itself and it was the duty of the white man to meet that challenge.

Mr. Solomon moved the adjournment of the debate, but the motion was negatived and he then made a speech in which he showed clearly that he supported Mr. Scanlen's Government. He said that Sprigg imagined that he alone was in favour of

-
- (1). C.A. Sept. 24th 1881. Drowning on the previous afternoon.
 - (2). Kilpin.
 - (3). Hofmeyr. pp. 219-220.
 - (4). H. of A. April 3rd-5th 1882.
 - (5). Chapter 4.
 - (6). H. of A. May 15th 1882.

the extension of civilisation. He also was in favour of 'a forward policy', but not in such a way as to destroy all the natives in its path. He remarked sarcastically, that Mr. Sprigg really behaved as if he himself were not the author of all their present troubles. 'The reason he supported the present Government was because they adopted a waiting policy. Their policy was one of peace'. After some further discussion the House went into Committee of supply.

Owing to ill-health, Mr. Solomon was content to remain in the background in Parliament, and the Cape Argus, in a sessional review observed, perhaps with a certain partiality for its former patron, that "Mr. Solomon has not made many great speeches this Session, because no member has had the opportunity but he has never appeared to greater advantage as the master of the wisdom of the House".(1). After Parliament had been prorogued, Mr. Solomon made a trip to England, in an effort to recover his health. In England influential men, including Mr. J. A. Froude and Mr. Forster, gave him a handsome reception. There was a rumour that he would be knighted, but it is not clear whether an offer was in fact made, or whether Mr. Solomon refused it.(2).

Mr. Solomon returned in time for the special Session of Parliament in January 1883. A Cape Argus reporter observed that he still looked ill, 'but it has always been noticed that a few days of Parliament acts as a wonderful tonic to his constitution, and takes ten years off his head. One feels that Parliament is duly constituted when he takes the seat which has so long been his own'.(3).

Serious disturbances were reported(4) in the Leribe district, arising out of disputes between two rival chiefs, Joel and Jonathan for the succession to Chief Molapo. The Government proposed 'withdrawing from the management and responsibility of their internal affairs, whilst retaining that control over their external relations which is necessary to the maintenance of order on the Free State Border'. To carry out this policy, 'a cordial understanding' with the republic would be cultivated. Mr. Scanlen's Ministerial statement(5) was very brief, lasting about a quarter of an hour. The Government would merely retain an agent in Basutoland. The Magistrates would cease to function as such, but might be retained for political work as sub-agents.

On January 29th, Mr. Upington led one section of the opposition by moving a vote of no confidence in the Government's policy in relation to Basutoland and proposed that the best solution lay in the Repeal of the Basutoland Annexation Act. On the next day, Mr. Hofmeyr produced an amendment that the Government should enter into negotiations with the Imperial Government to obtain permission for the Colony to act jointly with the Free State, whenever serious difficulties with the natives should arise in these territories and that no change in policy should be made till the result of such negotiation was learnt.

Mr. Solomon(6) objected to Mr. Hofmeyr's proposal to

(1). C.A. July 1st 1882.

(2). C.A. Nov. 11th 1882. 'Saturday Sallies'.

(3). C.A. Jan. 20th 1883. 'Saturday Sallies'.

(4). Gov's. address at opening of Parl. on 18th.C.A. Jan. 20th 1883.

(5). H. of A. Jan. 22nd 1883.

(6). H. of A. Feb. 1st 1883.

obtain the Imperial Government's sanction to enter into an alliance with the Free State which should operate only in the case of a war or disturbance. "Surely we could not go to the Basutos with an offer of self-Government in one hand and a war alliance in the other". If it came to the worst and they could not manage Basutoland, they could still call in the aid of the Imperial Government. Mr. Solomon seemed to fear that aggressive action against the natives would be the result of such an understanding, and he tried to pour cold water on the scheme by suggesting that the Free State might not agree to such an alliance, for it did a great trade with the Basuto and was at no expense for the defence of its border. He preferred to support the Government's plan of giving the Basutos larger powers of self-Government, though he cautioned the Government not to go too far in that direction. He favoured the amendment of Mr. Vintcent(1) (the brother-in-law of Merriman) that the House should accept the general principles of the new policy towards Basutoland, provided that the detailed provisions thereunder were not carried into operation until the House had first considered them.

Mr. Hofmeyr's motion was rejected by 50 votes to 12, even his own supporters voting against it because they feared the Government's defeat, and Mr. Vintcent's was passed, with the approval of the Government, "then apparently under the dominance of Mr. Solomon and his followers".(2).

The policy of 'Colonialism' is not entirely to be regarded as based on hostility between Dutch and English. The majority of Hofmeyr's followers were naturally Dutch, but it was Rhodes, an Englishman, who urged the elimination of the Imperial factor(3). Certainly Mr. Solomon did not approach the question in that light. It merely seemed to him that the administration of the extra-colonial native territories was too heavy a burden for the Colony, and short of complete abandonment, the only reasonable solution was to hand over to the Imperial Government.

He was otherwise on very good terms with the Dutch. Any hostility to him because he did not oppose the annexation of the Diamond Fields was dispelled by 1879, when Hofmeyr's Vereniging supported him at the elections. His bold condemnation of Sir Bartle Frere's attempt to prevent the retrocession of the Transvaal was doubtless not displeasing to them.

The Excise Tax which had led to the formation of the Vereniging was regarded by Mr. Solomon as an economic matter, and he opposed its repeal when Mr. Hofmeyr moved to that effect in 1882, simply because he was on principle, opposed to protection(4). The motion was lost but about a month later Mr. Myburgh secured a Bill to repeal the Act.(5). However, the Vereniging had supported him in 1879, knowing very well that he favoured the Excise duty.

A much more important measure of Hofmeyr's secured the support of Mr. Solomon - although not whole-hearted. In 1881, about a month after the Scanlen Government took office with Mr. Hofmeyr as Minister without Portfolio, the Reverend

(1). H. of A. Jan. 30th 1883.

(2). Hofmeyr. p. 234.

(3). 'Vindex' - Cecil Rhodes. His ^Political life and Speeches pp. 66, 153.

(4). H. of A. April 6th 1882.

(5). H. of A. May 17th 1882.

W. P. de Villiers moved a resolution that the use of Dutch should be permitted in Parliament.(1). Hofmeyr had previously put the motion on paper as a purely private one, but as his opposition was misunderstood, he withdrew it, and the Reverend W. P. de Villiers then took charge. Mr. Solomon supported the motion as a matter of natural justice considering that it was the language of two-thirds of the population.(2). Yet he admitted(3) that he was not really in favour of it, because he believed it would be attended with great inconvenience and that it was 'a backward step'. However, he thought Sprigg exaggerated in his talk of agitation for a Dutch Republic. He believed the whole of the Dutch population was in favour of British rule. Mr. Fuller's motion, seconded by Mr. Rhodes, that the lateness of the Session demanded that the question be left over to the next year, was, he thought, not sincere. He produced another amendment, "That this House, if assured by next Session that the feeling of the country is in favour of the change of the Constitution in the direction indicated, will be prepared to make such alteration". Mr. Hofmeyr supported Mr. Solomon's amendment. He remarked significantly that if he really wanted a Dutch Republic, he would keep one or two grievances against British institutions unredressed. Parliament was, however, prorogued suddenly and the question thus lapsed for the time being. In 1882 (4) it passed without a division, only Mr. Sprigg raising some objections, based on expense, inconvenience, and the rival merits of literary and colloquial Dutch. The Government supported the measure and hence its passage was very smooth indeed. It is rather amusing to think that Hofmeyr once visualised a struggle needing as much perseverance and patience as Mr. Solomon's campaign for his Voluntary Bill.(5).

When Parliament was opened for the regular Session in June Mr. Solomon was ill and he retired shortly after, but he had the satisfaction of knowing that Scanlen was following his advice, for it was announced(6) that the Commissioner of Crown Lands and Public Works (Mr. Merriman) had been sent to England to ask the Imperial Government to take over Basutoland. Hofmeyr from this time definitely agitated for a 'Colonial' policy and even joined Upington in a motion approving abandonment but condemning the handing over to the Imperial Government. It was lost by 39 to 27.(7). Not till the election of 1883-4 did he obtain a party powerful enough, as the largest minority, to enable him, in collaboration with Rhodes, to guide the policy of Parliament in the opposite direction to that advocated by Mr. Solomon.(8).

It is therefore obvious that Mr. Solomon's influence only waned with his disappearance from the scene, though whether he would have been able to continue effective opposition to the Rhodes-Hofmeyr alliance is another matter altogether. Certainly it is not accurate to say, as Mr. Kilpin did, that 1881 'marks the fall of "the most sagacious Parliamentarian"'(9). He was a power to be reckoned with to the very end.

-
- (1). H. of A. June 14th 1881.
 - (2). Ibid.
 - (3). H. of A. June 21st 1881.
 - (4). H. of A. March 30th 1882.
 - (5). See Chapter 2D.
 - (6). C.A. June 28th 1883. Parl. opened on 27th.
 - (7). Hofmeyr. p. 237.
 - (8). Ibid. p. 242.
 - (9). Kilpin.

CHAPTER 9. LAST YEARS.

Little remains to be told. Immediately after the opening of the second Session of 1883, Mr. Solomon became too ill to attend. In the report of the proceedings in Parliament(1) there is a bald statement that a notice of motion was given by Mr. Lewis, on behalf of Mr. Solomon, for the appointment of the Select Committee on Standing Rules and Orders - this although a paragraph above, in a list of members present, Mr. Solomon's name appears. Mr. Kilpin, whose article is the most valuable source for this period, gives an explanation '.... he rose when called upon by the Speaker. But he rose as a man who has staggered through a storm, and been blinded by its fury. He forgot what he had risen for. Sauer(sic) prompted him and a scene was averted.' This account conflicts on a point of detail with the newspaper version but is probably substantially correct.

Shortly thereafter Mr. Solomon left on another trip to England to seek medical advice and as early as July 7th the Cape Argus remarked, in its 'Saturday Sallies', that "Mr. Solomon's empty chair is all the more noticeable, because he was always in his place, no matter how dry the committee work, or how dull the debate". Before his departure the printing business conducted by himself and his brother Henry in partnership, was transferred to the management of the sons of the latter, Henry Junior and Charles Solomon.(2).

The general opinion was that Mr. Solomon's political career was ended. According to the 'Lantern', 'an admirable portrait in oils, by Mr. W. Schroeder has been purchased by Mr. Irvine, M.L.A., with the intention of presenting it to the House of Assembly.(3).

Again, the Cape Argus in a review of 'the Dead Parliament' wrote, "No one has arisen to fill Mr. Paterson's place, while the loss of Mr. Solomon, for there can be no indelicacy in regarding him as lost to Parliament.... appears likely to be irreparable for many years". Nevertheless, in the way of the world, the article went on to hail Mr. Hofmeyr and Mr. Rhodes as the new leaders.(4).

There was some talk of floating a requisition for Mr. Solomon, but in the absence of any hope that he would be able to stand, it was held to be 'an unmeaning compliment'.(5).

Mr. Solomon remained in England for two years, receiving medical treatment from Sir Andrew Clark. He then returned to the Cape from which he had formerly been taken weeping bitterly, 'like a heartbroken child'.(6).

Apparently he yet cherished hopes of returning to public life.(7). He was greeted with the news that the business in

-
- (1). H. of A. June 27th 1883.
 - (2). The Lantern, July 14th 1883.
 - (3). Ibid.
 - (4). C.A. September 28th 1883.
 - (5). C. Times October 19th 1883.
 - (6). Kilpin.
 - (7). Ibid.

which he still had a considerable interest had been woefully mismanaged and was unable to meet its pressing debts. He decided to sell out completely and to save as much as he could, along with the other creditors, for the future needs of his dependents.(1).

Disheartened he returned to England for the last time - the date of his departure is uncertain. Shortly after his arrival his second son, George, died from blood-poisoning.(2). During the remaining years of his life he was very ill indeed and the rumour was current and even found expression in the obituaries, that his great brain had become beclouded. This was not true, however. He died before dawn on Sunday, October 16th 1892, at a summer villa at Kilcreggan on the Clyde, and was buried in the Ocklynge Cemetery, at Eastbourne, "in a quiet corner screened by an evergreen hedge".(3). The spot is marked by an obelisk bearing the simple inscription, "Saul Solomon, born at St. Helena, 25th May 1817, died 16th October 1892.(4).

When the news of his death was received at the Cape, a Memorial service was held at the Congregational Church, Caledon Square, and was attended by members of the present and former Ministeries and Parliaments, as well as other high dignatories.(5). Yet significantly enough, the Cape Argus began its obituary thus:- "Mr. Solomon had been so withdrawn from the life of the Colony, not to speak of the sad beclouding of his once brilliant faculties(sic) which prevented correspondence with old friends and associates, that the news has a pathetic touch of remoteness".(6),

Tributes were showered from all sides, upon the memory of this man who for thirty years had been a dominating influence in the political life of the Colony. The 'Cape Times' commented on the great life-handicap under which he had laboured. "Mr. Solomon's position among the leading men of this country was one of peculiar distinction. A physical disability which only a courage and perseverance of heroic type could have surmounted, invested him in the end with all the dignity belonging to a supreme victory of mind over matter".(7).

In the words of the Zuid-Afrikaan, 'Saul Solomon was een merkwaardige verschijning'. Its praise was generous, and particularly noteworthy, as it came from a section which had at one time accused him of having 'a strange predilection for the position of advocate for Black versus White'(8). "Altoende hij zich hier een negervriend, in der daad was hij een vriend van armen en verdrukten, een vijand van heerschappij, bezielde met het geloof aan den mensch als zoodanig en aan de vrijheid en gelykheid die dien mensch toe zullen komen".(9).

(1). C.A. Nov. 14. 1885. "Saturday Sallies".

(2). Kilpin. Mrs. Solomon wrote an account of the deaths of Maggie and George in 'Echoes of Two Little Voices' but it was written for children and is rather "Sunday-schoolish".

(3). Kilpin.

(4). Article on Saul Solomon by M. Rabinowitz in the S.A. Jewish Yearbook (1929) pp. 231-5.

(5). C. Times October 23rd 1892.

(6). C.A. October 17th 1892.

(7). C. Times October 18th 1892.

(8). See Chapter 20.

(9). De Z.A. 'Ter Gedachtenis' 18 Oktober 1892.

Two years later, at a Memorial Service(1) in the vestibule of the Houses of Parliament (in which he never sat, although he had been the first to suggest their construction)(2) Sir David Tennant, the Speaker, unveiled a marble bust of Mr. Solomon, executed by a Scottish sculptor and presented by Mrs. Solomon. Among others, Mr. J. W. Sauer added his tribute. In this thesis, Mr. Solomon's actions have been critically examined and inconsistencies noted, but it should be emphasised that they were really minor ones, so that it is possible to confirm the declaration of Mr. Sauer, which has, indeed, a modern ring, that "the reading of a history of the life of Mr. Solomon will impress every mind with the great qualities which he possessed, and will be good seed sown in these days of more than pressing expediency".

(1). C.A. September 7th 1894.
(2). H. of A. 29th August 1854.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

KEY: S.A.P.L. indicates that the newspaper, book, or pamphlet is to be found in the South African Public Library, Cape Town.

M.L. similarly, is the Mendelssohn Library, contained in the basement of the Houses of Parliament.

PRIMARY SOURCES

A. OFFICIAL PRINTED PAPERS. (ARCHIVES)

1. C 508 No. 87. August 15th, 1871. Barkly to Kimberley re the annexation of the Diamond Fields.
2. C 508 No. 94. August 30th, 1871 re the British Government's views on the subject of South African Federation.
3. C 732 No. 22. June 17th, 1872. Barkly to Kimberley re Griqualand West.
4. C 732 No. 60. December 2nd, 1872. Barkly to Kimberley re the formation of a Ministry.
5. C 2079 No. 24. February 5th, 1878. Telegram from Frere to Carnarvon re the dismissal of Molteno.
6. C 2374. 1st June, 1879. Hicks-Beach to Frere re Confederation.
7. C 2482 No. 100. September 23rd, 1879. Frere to Hicks-Beach in reply to above.
8. C 2482 No. 162. November 11th, 1879. Frere to Hicks-Beach re deputation about the Transvaal.
9. Cape of Good Hope Government Gazette 1840, 1847.
10. Cape of Good Hope. Appendix 2 to the Votes and Proceedings of Parliament, 1872. The Federation Commission Report.

B. NON-OFFICIAL.

1. Letter from Agnes to J.X. Merriman. August 29th, 1881. No. 51 in the Merriman Collection. (S.A.P.L.).
2. Echoes of Two Little Voices - Georgina M. Solomon. (M.L.).

C. NEWSPAPERS. (S.A.P.L.)

N.B.

In the footnotes to the text, some obvious abbreviations for the newspapers have been used, as "Z.A." for Zuid-Afrikaan; "C.A." for Cape Argus; and "S.A.C.A." for South African Commercial Advertiser - also "H. of A." naturally indicates House of Assembly. It may again be noted here, as it has already been in the foreword, that the reports of debates were taken from the "South African Commercial Advertiser & Mail" up to 1863 and subsequently from the Cape Argus. The newspaper date was not given for the sake of avoiding confusion. It is generally a day or two after the actual debate.

I. 1831-1854.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER. 1831-1854.
DE ZUID-AFRIKAAN. 1831-1854.
THE CAPETOWN MAIL. 1841-1853.
THE CAPE MONITOR. 1850-1854.
THE CAPE MERCANTILE ADVERTISER. 1852-1854.

II. 1854-1883.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER & MAIL. 1854-1869.
DE ZUID-AFRIKAAN. 1854-1883.
THE CAPE MONITOR. 1854-1862.
THE CAPE ARGUS. 1857-1883.
THE CAPE TIMES. 1876-1883.
THE GRAHAM'S TOWN JOURNAL. 1854-1883.
THE EASTERN PROVINCE HERALD. 1854-1883.

III.

THE CAPE ARGUS. 1883-1886; 1892; 1894.
THE CAPE TIMES. 1892.
DE ZUID-AFRIKAAN. 1892.

SECONDARY SOURCES.

A. CONTEMPORARY or NEARLY CONTEMPORARY.

(a) PAMPHLETS & ARTICLES.

1. "PROSPECTUS of the First Annual Public Examination of the South African College, beginning 12th August, 1830." (S.A.P.L.)
2. "PROSPECTUS of the Second Annual Public Examination of the South African College, commencing Monday, August 15th, 1831." (S.A.P.L.)
3. INTRODUCTORY DISCOURSE delivered at the Townhouse of Lausanne to a numerous English audience on 28th January, 1868, by Dr. A.N.E. Changuion." (S.A.P.L.)
4. KAAPSCHE ALMANAK EN NAAMBOEK. 1836. (M.L.)
5. CAPE OF GOOD HOPE ALMANAC & ANNUAL REGISTER, 1838, 1848, 1849. (M.L.)
6. ELECTION OF MR. SAUL SOLOMON to the House of Assembly for the City of Capetown, Cape of Good Hope. (S.A.P.L.)
7. THE CAPE ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE. Vol. III. 1892-3. pp. 70-1. An article in memorium. (M.L.)
8. "THE LANTERN", 1883. (S.A.P.L.)

(b) BOOKS.

1. R. W. MURRAY - ('Linner' of the 'Cape Monitor') Pen & Ink Sketches in Parliament. The edition published in 1864 contained a collection of studies made in 1855 (Book I.) and in 1864 (Book II.). (S.A.P.L.)
2. R. W. MURRAY - "South African Reminiscences". (S.A.P.L.)
3. F. R. STATHAM - Blacks, Boers & British. (1881). (S.A.P.L.)
4. ANTHONY TROLLOPE - South Africa. Volume I. (S.A.P.L.)
5. J. A. FROUDE - Short Studies on Great Subjects. 3rd Series (1877) contains 'Leaves from a South African Journal'. (S.A.P.L.)
6. JOHN NOBLE - South Africa. Past & Present. (1877). (S.A.P.L.)
7. SIR JOHN KOTZE - Biographical Memoirs and Reminiscences.
8. SIR T. E. FULLER - Cecil Rhodes. A Monograph and a Reminiscence.

B. MODERN WORKS.

(a) PAMPHLETS & ARTICLES.

1. RALPH KILPIN - "John Fairbairn", Cape Argus, March 26th, 1921.
2. - "Saul Solomon", Cape Argus, April 23rd, 1921.
3. "SAUL SOLOMON by M. Rabinowitz in the South African Jewish Year Book 1929. pp. 231-235. (M.L.)
4. THE CAPE ARGUS XMAS NUMBER. December 13th, 1913. p. 16. "Cape Town's Oldest Daily" by 'Veteran'.
5. THE JEW IN SOUTH AFRICA - by Rabbi Dr. J.H. Hertz. (M.L.)

(b) BOOKS

1. DR. LOUIS HERRMAN - The Jews in South Africa.
2. A. WILMOT - History of Our Own Times in South Africa.
Vol. I. 1872-1879 (1897).
Vol. II. 1880-1889 (1898).
3. ANGELA JAMES & NINA HILL - Mrs. John Brown.
4. J. H. HOFMEYR - The Life of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan).
5. E. A. WALKER - Lord de Villiers and his Times. South Africa. 1842-1914.
6. P. A. MOLTEÑO - The Life & Times of Sir John Charles Molteno. (2 Vols.)
7. SIR PERCIVAL LAURENCE - The Life of John Xavier Merriman.
8. B. WILLIAMS - Cecil Rhodes.
9. "VINDEX" - Cecil Rhodes. His Political Life & Speeches.
10. J. MARTINEAU - The Life of Sir Bartle Frere. Vol. 2.
11. R. KILPIN - The Old Cape House.

(c) MISCELLANEOUS.

1. THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPAEDIA. Vol. X.
2. G. W. EYBERS - Select Constitutional Documents illustrating South African History. 1795-1910.
3. E. A. WALKER - A History of South Africa.

(c) MISCELLANEOUS (Contd.)

4. THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.
Vol. VIII. (South Africa).
5. G. M. THEAL - History of South Africa since
1795. Vol. III. (1908).
6. - Vol. V. (1908).
7. J. S. MARAIS - The Cape Coloured People -
1652-1937.
8. C. W. DE KIEWIET - British Colonial Policy and
The South African Republics. (1848-1872).
9. A. B. KEITH - Responsible Government in the
Dominions. Vol. 3. (1912).
10. C. GIDE - "Principles of Political Economy",
translated by E. F. Row.
11. H. J. MASSINGHAM & HUGH MASSINGHAM (editors) -
"The Great Victorians".