

I have mentioned, it is quite unnecessary to have raids such as have been taking place in Johannesburg in the past few months. In the first place, I understand that these raids start at about 9 o'clock at night and continue until the early hours of the morning. It causes considerable unrest and disturbance to quite a large number of law-abiding Natives. Not only does it cause unnecessary disturbance to them in regard to their rest and their sleep, but it creates a feeling of hostility and resentment amongst the Natives. We think that it is totally uncalled for and I repeat as emphatically as I can, most unnecessary. If one of the main purposes is to ascertain whether there are any illegal tenants then I could suggest alternatives to the Minister. In the first place these hostels are under the supervision of the municipal authorities. Natives are not permitted to enter them after a certain hour or to leave before a certain hour. The gates are not opened until they are required to leave for their work in the early hours of the morning. If it is necessary to go into the question as to whether there are any illegal tenants in occupancy, then it is my submission that, whatever is necessary, may be done before the gates are closed or soon after the gates are opened, and these disturbances that take place to hundreds of law-abiding Natives would in effect not be caused. But there is a much more important aspect of this matter, and I should like to quote to the House an article which appeared in the *Star* of the 28th of this month.

Mr. A. STEYN: Do you believe it?

Mr. DAVIDOFF: This is absolutely true. It refers to—

Shocking conditions revealed by police raid. Natives found sleeping in petrol drums. No accommodation for thousands.

This article reads—

Recent police raids on municipal hostels in the city have disclosed a shocking state of affairs. Thousands of Natives in legitimate employment in the city and lawfully entitled to reside in Johannesburg have nowhere to go at night.

We emphasize the fact that they are in lawful employment but have no place to go to—

Many of them were discovered to be living through the winter months under the worst conditions imaginable. Quite a number of them were living in petrol drums and such like.

It appears from this article that just before a particular raid was made—

Reports were made to the police that no drastic action should be taken against any illegal tenants who proved that they were in lawful employment. It was felt in reason that this should not be done until the time came when alternative accommodation be-

came available. This concession was made in the Wemmer raid but it is understood that in other raids even legal tenants who could prove that they were lawfully employed in the city were placed under arrest.

I would like to ask the Minister in the first place whether he agreed to the concession that is referred to in this article, the concession being that if any of these Natives proved that if they were in lawful employment they would not be arrested, and then I would like to ask him if he agreed to that concession whether, in point of fact, it is true that they were arrested and if they were arrested why were they arrested in these circumstances? But to take the matter further, I would also like to refer to a statement which appeared in an article in the *Star* the following night, i.e. the 29th of last month—

Mr. Leslie B. Hird, chairman of the non-European Affairs Committee (of the City Council) said to-day that there appeared at the moment to be no foreseeable practical solution to the problem of finding accommodation for the many thousands of Natives lawfully in the city and having employment but who can find no place to live in.

Apart from the fact that the policy to have these raids at these unearthly hours is totally wrong—and I would remind the Minister of the fact that this matter was raised some years ago—if the Minister would like me to quote what he said on that occasion—I have it in front of me—the position is that that policy of raiding is in effect bad whatever time they are carried out. It is doubly bad at the present time, because we have these municipal hostels which cannot accommodate all these Natives who are entitled to accommodation because they are in lawful employment. Will the Minister tell the Committee what his attitude is going to be in the future? Is he going to continue raids of this nature, and if he does continue—we say he should not continue for the reasons I have given—if he does continue with that system, is he prepared to inform the police that under no circumstances should they lock up these Natives who are in lawful employment. If the gaols can accommodate them then I would suggest that they should be permitted free access to and from the gaols for the night because there is no other place for them to go to. [Time limit.]

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: I hope the hon. member is not going to saddle me with the responsibility of providing suitable accommodation for all the thousands of homeless Natives in Johannesburg. I have nothing to do with that. He is even suggesting that they be allowed to sleep in the gaols. May I give him some information. These raids are carried out not on the initiative of the police but at the request of the municipal officials concerned.

Mrs. BALLINGER: Do your police find that very difficult?

even before I have said anything. I am very sorry to say that that hon. member who has just spoken really said nothing beyond making political propoganda for the United Party. He said that he could name officers at Voortrekker Heights who are dissatisfied. I do not believe that there are officers in the Defence Force who would be so base. As a person who has helped to train young men, I am convinced that the system we have to-day is far better than the old one. Of course my friend there is still like the old Jingos who want nothing but a Jingo regiment, and everything Afrikaans must be crushed. Now for the first time in history the rural districts have an opportunity to have their sons trained, and after all we know that the boy from the rural districts makes the best soldier. Why should he not be given the chance to enter a regiment, and why should the hon. the Minister not send certain officers from Voortrekker Heights to train them? Why is it said that those boys' morale will be taken away? The morale of the young Afrikaner was never higher than to-day. To-day all of them are proud of their uniform. But there was a time in the past—I do not want to draw comparisons—when in the midlands, when war broke out, they asked the Afrikaans-speaking officers to resign because they were pro-Afrikaans.

*An HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

*Mr. G. F. H. BEKKER: I shall give the name. I am not a coward. It was the Midlands Regiment. All the young Afrikaans officers were asked to resign. Who were put in their places? People with English names, although they had never fired a shot at a target. That is what they did when they were in power. We will not do that sort of thing. We give those people the best opportunity for training. This Minister had the courage to reorganize things and it has satisfied the rural districts and I challenge the friends over there who boast so much to prove that their regiments are better than those in the rural districts. The morale is there. I just feel that as far as bilingualism is concerned, why should there not be bilingualism? Why should a person not be given his training in the language he knows best? What is wrong in that? No, but an Afrikaner is not good enough. He must be uni-lingual and English-speaking to be a good officer. The officers there are to-day, the Afrikaners, can speak English better than the hon. member over there. It would be very much better if that hon. member did not drag politics in here. He says he speaks on behalf of his party. I thought it was a non-political matter. But what he said he said on behalf of the United Party. I am disappointed in the hon. member. I thought that possibly he was disappointed in his Leader. Now I see that he is disappointed in every respect. This Minister knows his job. I remember how they fought against him and asked what he knew of defence. Now they say he wants to be Chief of the General Staff. He must really

have done wonderful work to progress so far in so short a time because it takes at least seven years to take command. Now he is Chief of the General Staff already. I just want to say that if it is so, then he is a good man. But we know him and his staff know him and there is nobody in the Defence Force who is dissatisfied with the Minister. [Laughter.] Hon. members may laugh, but I challenge them to show me a man who is dissatisfied. It is just the usual gossip. Just as hon. members opposite prejudiced South Africa's name overseas, so they are persecuting South Africa once again, and they are even doing so in connection with our Defence Force. But they will not succeed. Our Defence Force and our Air Force know their duty. Those people are soldiers, and not politicians like the friends opposite. We know that if the country is in danger, they will do their duty. Judging by what one hears from the members opposite one would think that those people would run away. That is the impression they wish to give of the Defence Force built up by this Minister. No, let us be a bit more level-headed when we discuss these matters, and not just say that the hon. the Minister knows nothing; not come here with wild allegations that he wants to be Chief of the General Staff. These are childish and petty things to say.

*Mr. LAWRENCE: [Inaudible.]

*Mr. G. F. H. BEKKER: Yes, these things spring from a small mind, and when one hears the arguments of the hon. member for Salt River (Mr. Lawrence) it is clear that he has less brain than a flea. I withdraw that and say that he has a bit more brain than a flea.

Mr. BOWKER: I ask that the hon. member be compelled to withdraw that allegation.

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Cradock must not make such allegations.

*Mr. G. F. H. BEKKER: I withdraw those words. Then I wish to say that the Rifle Commandos are once again being attacked here. I wish to tell hon. members opposite that they must not forget that in the days when there was trouble on the Rand, the so-called little regiments of the Rand were not used to put an end to that trouble. No, Gen. Smuts called in the Active Citizen Force to come and restore order. In the same way the Rifle Commandos would maintain law and order in the country if the need were to arise. I wish to tell hon. members opposite that the Rifle Commandos are commanded by first-class trained men, and they can go and see how those people can shoot. The hon. member opposite tells us here that the men belonging to the Rifle Commandos are only semi-fit. They are very much fitter than he is. Even if some of them are rather old, they still are people who can hit the bull's eye. They are fit for military service. Those old chaps in the platteland shoot straight, and if their services are needed they will also see to it

that they shoot straight. Why must these Rifle Commandos always be attacked by members opposite? Sneering remarks are made about them. That is the type of man who fought right through the Boer War and who put the entire British Empire in its place. They will help us maintain the defence of the Union, and the Rifle Commandos will play their part in our country, despite the repeated attacks made on them by the members opposite.

Mr. HEPPLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take advantage of the other half-hour. It is many years since this committee discussed the financial aspects of the Defence Vote. I hope that this year we shall have an opportunity, in discussing this Vote, of going into the financial implications of it and of the money we are asked to vote. For that purpose I want to move a reduction of this Vote by £8,500,000, by the deletion of Item "T"—Korean Campaign, £2,500,000; Item "U"—Special Equipment and Reserve Stocks and Item "Q" by £1,000,000, and Contributions to Defence Special Equipment Account £5,000,000, making in all a reduction of £8,500,000.

I move this as a token of our attitude towards the whole of the Defence Vote. I move it in the hope that hon. members of this House will discuss the present situation as affecting our Budget for armaments instead of dealing with the smaller matters of the administration of our Defence Department. My motion to delete the item "Korean Campaign", £2,500,000, speaks for itself. The hon. the Minister of Finance, in reply to the Budget debate, capitulated to our demands that he should withdraw the increase in the price of bread in South Africa, by stating that the new situation with the armistice in Korea made it possible for the Government to make that saving. We are claiming merely what the hon. the Minister of Finance has said is available, by moving the deletion of this item.

In so far as the deletion of the item "Contribution to Defence Special Equipment Account", £5,000,000, is concerned, you will remember that in 1952, Mr. Chairman, this House established a Special Defence Equipment Account of £40,000,000 in order to enable the Government to acquire necessary armaments and to pay for them as and when they were delivered. There was no disagreement in this House on the setting up of that fund, and last year we voted £7,500,000 towards this special account.

The MINISTER OF DEFENCE: [Inaudible.]

Mr. HEPPLE: I shall deal with that in a moment. May I remind the Minister that this Vote is for the coming financial year? This Defence Special Equipment Account has received one amount and now we are asked to vote another £5,000,000 to it. I want to say that this additional amount which we are asked to vote was in the light of the war in Korea continuing, as though the world situa-

tion had not eased and as though the threat of war was looming just as seriously as it did before. I want to make it quite clear to this House, as we have done in the past, that the Labour Party, like the other parties, are very anxious to see that South Africa has sound and strong defences. We want to be prepared in case of aggression from whatever source it may come. But at the same time we have to draw attention to the fact that this Budget that is placed before the House this year has been compiled in the light of the tension that existed three to six months ago. We must also look at this amount in the light of its being a non-productive item. It represents more than ten per cent of our Budget.

Mr. LAWRENCE: What does?

Mr. HEPPLE: This amount of £23,000,000 that we are asked to vote this year for defence, represents more than ten per cent of our total Budget, and I say that we cannot afford it. We would have to afford it if we were faced with the threat of immediate war. This country has shown before, and will probably show in the future, that in time of war the people are prepared to make any amount of sacrifices, but I say that in voting this money we are encouraging the Government to continue making wild expenditure. However, there are very many other facets to this question. In addition to the special amounts that have been voted by this House to meet the increased expenditure which arose as a result of the war in Korea and the general threat of war there has been a general tendency to increase the normal amount of our Defence Vote. I would like to illustrate this point by pointing out that in 1952-3 the total Vote was £25,579,000. That was after the outbreak of war in Korea, and that was a jump of £12,000,000 over the Defence Vote for the previous year. This amount of £25,000,000 includes the provision of £2,500,000 for the Korean campaign, £9,500,000 for the modernization and replacement of existing stocks—under sub-head "U"—which included the following items: "Modernization and Replacement of Existing Equipment, £1,500,000; Reserve Stocks £3,000,000, and Contribution to Defence Special Equipment Account £5,000,000. And sub-head "V," "Special Projects," £250,000; making in all £12,250,000.

Mr. Chairman, if that amount is deducted from the normal Vote it will be seen that there is a general increase over the Defence Vote itself, which naturally means that inside South Africa, on our normal internal expenditure on Defence there has been a considerable increase. I know that there have been increases in the emoluments paid to the staff; there have been other increases in the costs of maintaining the Defence Force, but at the same time there seems to be an indication here that there is an overall increase in the money which is being spent on armaments in South Africa. The danger that faces South Africa—and that is a danger which must concern this House—is the fear that South Africa may accumulate

stocks of armaments and military equipment that may become obsolete before we need to use them. That is a danger which is not easily dealt with. I quite appreciate the difficulty of the hon. the Minister, but at the same time I think that the Minister should exercise the most extreme caution in the expending of these huge amounts of money.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE: That is a difficulty that every Western power has. It is a risk that every Western power has to run.

MR. HEPPLÉ: I agree with the hon. the Minister that that is a risk that every Western power has to run, but my arguments are being put forward in the light of changed conditions in the world to-day, in the light of the fact that there is no immediate danger of war. South Africa, which is just now beginning to receive its stocks of armaments from overseas, may be beginning to accumulate armaments which might be almost useless to us in time of need. As an example, we have recently landed the first Centurian tanks in this country. Most of them are going into cold storage. A few are going to be used for the training of personnel. However, in the general picture, I feel that we are facing the danger of wasting money that could be well used in other directions if we spend this money on armaments at the present time. It does not mean that South Africa will be completely unprepared if war should come. We have spent in the period 1st April 1948 until the 31st March 1952, £55,000,000 on Defence. For a small country like South Africa that is a lot of money. But in addition to that, last year we voted £25,579,000, and this year we are being asked to vote £23,300,000. That makes over £100,000,000, which is an enormous amount of money for a country the size of South Africa, and that amount of money is having a very serious impact on the economy of South Africa.

MR. LAWRENCE: Should you not really move a reduction of the Minister's salary because of the way in which he is mispending the money?

MR. HEPPLÉ: In reply to the hon. member for Salt River (Mr. Lawrence), I want to say, as I stated at the beginning of my speech, that I am specifically moving the reduction of those items not because I want them particularly and entirely removed, but as a token of our attitude towards the whole of the Defence Vote. I move it in order that this House might discuss the vast amounts of money which are being spent on the Defence Vote.

MR. LAWRENCE: Yes, but we have commitments that we must honour.

MR. HEPPLÉ: In reply to the interjection made by the hon. member, that question was raised earlier by the hon. the Minister of Defence, that we have commitments. But I should like to remind hon. members of this House that we have at our disposal the machinery to deal with those commitments. If

it becomes a necessity, and if after we have removed these amounts from the estimates it is found that we require this money, we can quite easily make it available through additional estimates. There is no danger in removing the items.

I would like this committee to consider the fact—and it is a very important fact—that our defence expenditure, as with other countries of the west, has increased enormously over the last four years. But I say that South Africa has the advantage at this particular time that it can avoid the expenditure of unnecessary monies by reviewing the position. We must consider the fact that in the financial year 1948-9 we spent £10,000,000 on Defence. That amount increased in 1952-3 to £25,500,000, and this year we are asked to vote a sum of £23,000,000. When the Minister of Finance introduced his Budget he pointed out the necessity for all sections of the community of South Africa to make sacrifices. He said that the time has gone when it can be left to those of the higher income groups to carry the entire burden of the State, and when he called upon South Africa to make these sacrifices he said that the money was very sorely needed to meet the needs of the nation. I do not want to deal with all the aspects of the Budget now—I am not permitted to—but I do want to remind this House that a very large portion of this burden which the people have been asked to bear is made up in this Defence Vote. I feel that we owe a duty to the people of South Africa and that when we see the slightest opportunity we must take advantage of it to lessen that burden. We must lighten that burden and we must see that we use this money for other purposes until such time as we are compelled by force of circumstances to spend the money on armaments.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then it will be too late.

MR. HEPPLÉ: I have referred to the changed world circumstances and I think that the very fact that both of the major powers in the world to-day, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, possess those ghastly weapons, the atom- and the hydrogen-bombs, that that in itself is bringing about a new approach to international affairs. The possession by those major powers of these powerful destructive weapons is forcing the nations of the East and those also of the West to remove the danger of war. The danger of war must recede when the two major powers of the world are in possession of these terrifically destructive weapons. But, more than that, we have seen recently a desire both in the East and in the West for peace.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you sure about the East?

MR. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member asks if I am sure about the East. No, I am not sure about the East, but I do want to say that in the international discussions that have taken place, and particularly since the death of Stalin,

there has been a gesture from the East to show a more peaceful attitude in its relationship with the West. We know that there is a great campaign for peace going on among the Eastern powers to-day.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Must we not continue to negotiate from strength?

Mr. HEPPLE: Yes, I say we are negotiating from strength. The amount that we are spending on armaments to-day is not going to be a token of our strength. Strength does not lie in armaments alone. I am sure that hon. members will agree with me.

Mr. DURRANT: It lies in fire-power.

Mr. HEPPLE: Strength does not lie in armaments alone. I think that this outmoded idea that the greater your stock pile of armaments the greater your strength, is being dissipated. I think experience in Korea should be a lesson to us.

The MINISTER OF DEFENCE: That is why we are spending more on training.

Mr. HEPPLE: To the hon. the Minister I would like to say that I see no evidence in the Budget that this money is being spent on training.

The MINISTER OF DEFENCE: I say that we are spending more on training to-day than we spent in previous years on training.

Mr. HEPPLE: There is no objection to that. But I do want to say to the Minister that in conjunction with training we must build up not only the morale but the physical well-being of our people. We had a threat to the physical well-being of the people of this country earlier on in the Session when we had the proposal by the Government to increase the price of bread, the staple commodity of the mass of the people. I say that if we want to build up our armaments, if we want to build up our striking power and our defences, we must not only look to steel, we must look to human beings as well. I say that there is a great need in South Africa for that, and it is the view of myself and of the Labour Party that the money that can be saved on this Vote this year could better be spent in building up the physical and moral well-being of the people of this country.

There is a danger in that members of this Committee follow the orthodox thinking in relation to armaments and defence. I think that the world has reached a stage when there has to be a reorientation in the thinking of the people of this country, as well as with other nations. We have to realize that we must not only think in terms of war, we have to think in terms of peace. In thinking in terms of peace we shall build up the strength and the morale of our people so that they will be able to resist when the need comes to resist any aggression.

Mr. ABRAHAM: Who are you going to resist?

Mr. HEPPLE: I don't know.

Mr. ABRAHAM: We know.

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member says that he knows. Well and good. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that when this Budget was brought before the House one of the most serious requirements of the country was capital. The hon. the Minister of Finance was forced this year to impose a compulsory savings levy upon the people as one of the means of obtaining this sorely required capital. In addition, he had to impose taxes to finance capital expenditure. Now that was an extraordinary step to have to take. We need that capital very much indeed. If we want that capital then we have to look for some sources in our present Budget from which to draw that capital. The Labour Party, in my amendment, is proposing a means of obtaining a small part of that capital. I do want to remind hon. members of this House that if we can save on this Defence Vote it will mean that we shall have more money available for other services. We shall have more money available for irrigation, we shall have more money available for education, for public health and for all of these other needs. . . . [Interjections.]

An HON. MEMBER: And "Chocolate Soldiers".

Mr. HEPPLE: It is most amusing to hear interjections from the Government side of the House. Am I to understand from these interjections that hon. members believe that South Africa should and must continue blindly spending these enormous amounts on defence?

Mr. P. W. BOTHA: Not blindly.

Mr. HEPPLE: Without seriously considering the effect of that expenditure upon our economy? Hon. members must understand that when they call upon people to make sacrifices the people must know what that money is being spent on. If the nation was at war the people would, as they have done in the past, accept the position. But not only are we at peace to-day but the world tension has eased very considerably, and if it was necessary to spend £25,000,000 when the country had armed forces in Korea, why is it necessary to spend that amount of money this year when we have no forces fighting anywhere? I want to say to hon. members on the Government side of the House that if they are intent upon spending this money in order to accumulate a lot of equipment that may become obsolete, a lot of tanks that might rust in storage, a lot of . . .

An HON. MEMBER: Like the Labour Party.

Mr. HEPPLE: A lot of 'planes that will not measure up to the conditions under which they will have to fight: those are all very serious matters that have to be considered.

The MINISTER OF DEFENCE: Do we get some credit for reducing the Budget by £2,250,000?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Yes, I want to tell the hon. the Minister that at the second reading of the Budget I mentioned that the Government had reduced the Budget by £2,250,000 odd. I commented upon that and I also said that the Government was taking a step in the right direction, although hon. members on the Government side of the House had no criticism to offer of that. But I want to say to the hon. the Minister of Defence that I am quite sure he appreciates the arguments I have put forward. I am quite sure the Department of Defence are sorely tried under present conditions. They do not know whether to go backwards or forwards. They do not know whether the money they are expending to-day will be wastefully spent or a good investment. One has to take a certain amount of risk. One must examine the position to-day in the light of placing the country in a position of greater advantage twelve months hence. I am quite sure that it is within the power of the hon. Minister and that it is within the power of the Government to lop off some of this enormous amount spent on defence. The Minister need not worry about it, because he knows very well that in time of need this House will come to his assistance and will not hesitate to give him the money for which he may ask in time of need. I want to say to the hon. the Minister that we of the Labour Party are very reluctant to vote this money at the present time because we feel that it is an encouragement to waste, to accumulate stocks that will not be of great value to the country in time of need, and may in the future prevent South Africa from training its fighting men with the latest and most modern equipment. I move—

To reduce the amount by £2,500,000 being the item "T.—Korean Campaign" and by £6,000,000 from the item "U.—Special Equipment and Reserve Stocks", £6,750,000.

Capt. HENWOOD: I am certainly not supporting the amendment. I say that at once because if there is one thing we ought to do in this country it is to build up our Defence Force and our defences. That is very necessary with the unsettled conditions prevailing in the world to-day. After the speech of the hon. member for Cradock (Mr. G. F. H. Bekker) we realize that he is worthy of his coronation medal. I would like to ask the Minister if he will make a full statement in relation to this question of the number of volunteers to be allowed as against the ballot system in the A.C.F. Is it his intention to limit the number of volunteers to 400 for the whole of the Union? That is the figure that has been mentioned in the newspapers and we would like to know if there is any truth in that statement. At this stage I do not want to make any criticism of that policy because we do not know if that information is correct.

The MINISTER OF DEFENCE: The figure is correct, so you may carry on with your criticism.

Capt. HENWOOD: I think it is a shocking state of affairs that from the whole of the Union only 400 volunteers are to be allowed—people who are interested and who want to serve as against people who do not want to serve. [Interjections.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will hon. members please remain silent; we cannot hear what is going on.

Capt. HENWOOD: I would like to know from the Minister what his policy is in the event of war breaking out in relation to conditions of service not only in the A.C.F. but also in the permanent force. What is going to be his policy in relation to men serving outside the borders of the Union? We do know that some of the key positions in the Defence Force to-day are men who refused to serve outside the boundaries in the last war. I think I am correct in saying that the present Adjutant-General and the present officer-in-charge of Citizen Records at Defence Headquarters both refused service outside the borders of the Union in the last Great War. What can you expect from the rank and file when they see promotions given to men who will not fight for South Africa outside the boundaries of this country? It is admitted by the Minister of Defence now that he has commitments as far north as we went in the initial stages before we crossed the Mediterranean and went into Italy. At that time we were criticized by Government members when they were in Opposition for sending people up north into East Africa and Abyssinia. I want to know what the present policy of the Government is. I say again that if the rank and file see that it is the policy of the Government to promote to key positions people who were not prepared to serve outside the boundaries of the Union, what can we expect from the rank and file, especially when the rank and file consist of people who were brought into training under a ballot system and not a volunteer system. We do know that those who volunteered to serve will at least come forward and defend the country in time of war. I think it is essential that we should get the very best type of volunteer in preference to people brought into the army under a ballot system. We know that cases have been put up to the Defence authorities by people who do not want to serve. We know that the sons of farmers, for example, have applied for exemption and they have been told that they have to stand by the ballot. I had one case myself which I took up where the farmer was an invalid, but they insisted that he should go away for training. In the event of war that man would not want to go outside the Union; and as far as our farmers are concerned, the large-scale farmer is probably more useful on the farm. But in the same area there are probably hundreds of volunteers who wish to serve but who cannot be trained under the present ballot system. We know that the strength of the regiments in most of the areas in Natal to-day could easily be kept up under the voluntary system. I would like the Minister to

reconsider that and I would like to ask him if he is going to meet the members of the Comrades Associations of the different regiments to discuss these problems with them. For instance, take a regiment like the Umvoti Rifles. There are men there who wish to serve in the Umvoti Rifles; their families have served in that regiment in the past and they are now being told that they are going to be registered with other A.C.F. units in other areas.

Then we go further. Take the question of the S.A.A.F. A.C.F. training in Durban. Is that S.A.A.F. training to be stopped altogether in Durban? I understand that is the position but I would like to be sure before I make any criticism in that regard. To take a few people to some central air school for a short while does not, I submit, give them the same esprit de corps, the same interest in the regiment, as when they are trained at home over a long period, I think the S.A.A.F. Squadron in Durban was very highly thought of and there was no difficulty in obtaining recruits for that squadron. I think it would be a pity to introduce centralization. Then another matter is this question of bilingual regiments. There are many of us who were not fully bilingual in the past and during a period of war that presented some difficulty. But to-day you are doing away with these bilingual regiments. Is this Government introducing a new principle of apartheid between English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking? Does the Minister want to separate them?

The MINISTER OF DEFENCE: Are you speaking for your party?

Capt. HENWOOD: I am speaking for myself. You see, Mr. Chairman, the Minister immediately approaches this matter from the political point of view. I have served in two wars.

Mr. P. W. BOTHA: You are using a political argument.

Capt. HENWOOD: No, I believe in bilingualism which is not political. That was the basis on which we built up our regiments in the past. You can look up the war memorials wherever you go and you will find that in every regiment we had English- and Afrikaans-speaking people. There was no question of unilingualism.

The MINISTER OF DEFENCE: Were there Afrikaans-speaking regiments in your time, under my predecessor?

Capt. HENWOOD: At military headquarters, as the Minister knows, they were trained in both languages. We had to pass out in both languages. But what do hon. members opposite know about it? How many of them served in the war?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Caught in the slips.

Capt. HENWOOD: The Minister of the Interior knows such a lot about it; let me ask him whether he served in the war? In the last war there was no question of Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking men; we were South Africans and we fought for South Africa and we were prevented by people on that side from doing the very best we might have been able to do.

Mr. G. F. H. BEKKER: You are running away now.

Capt. HENWOOD: No, we are not running away; my hon. friends on that side are running away.

Then I would like to ask the Minister what is the calibre of the guns used in training in heavy artillery at Potchefstroom. He said last year: "Leave it to us; our training is backed by the very latest, most modern artillery." I would like to know what the calibre of that artillery is and what quantity and quality he has of the latest heavy artillery.

The MINISTER OF DEFENCE: Surely you do not want me to give that information here.

Capt. HENWOOD: That information is known to everybody and probably I could give the Minister that information but I want to know officially from him what it is. When we got one of the new types of training aircraft, the Vampire, that information was publicized throughout the press in South Africa before we even knew it in this House, and the Minister was boasting of what he had and what aircraft flew past on Van Riebeeck Day. We even knew how many of that aircraft we had in this country, although the Minister merely referred to the names of the modern aircraft we had without giving the numbers. In relation to this type of aircraft I would like to ask the Minister whether it is his intention to go on training the advanced training service personnel on Harvards. I understand that no Harvards can be obtained new as they have ceased manufacturing Harvards and those that we are getting are second-hand. The acquisition of second-hand aircraft is not a good proposition from any point of view, and in fact in America they are now using nothing else but the Beach Craft T 34 Mentor, which is to replace the Harvard altogether. We know that no Harvards are being manufactured, so I would like to ask the Minister why he is continuing to use this obsolete aircraft for training purposes. We have not got one four-engine bomber in this country to expand our air force training in the event of any outbreak of war.

*Mr. SCHOLTZ: The hon. member opposite who moved the amendment a moment ago (Mr. Hepple) wants a reduction in the expenditure on the Defence Vote. He says that if £2 million or more were deducted, that money could be far more effectively spent on the

{ Wage Incentives }
 { Banning of T. U. Unions }

HEPPLÉ Com. of Supply
Labour Vote

House wants a reply. If a party so lightly plays with the most important interests of the workers as that party is doing, then the question to be answered is whether such a party is not guilty of unjust and dishonest action. Just let me say that the workers outside, the workers with whom we came into contact and who returned the Nationalist Party in urban constituencies to power, that those workers regard this inconsistency of the United Party as nothing less than political fraud. The United Party owes an explanation to those workers, to those people to whom those promises were made and those guarantees were given three times, and that party must be held responsible for this inconsistency, for these various charters which are published every day.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim privilege of the second half hour. There are two matters which I want to take up with the hon. the Minister of Labour. The first is the question of wage incentive schemes and the second is the action of the Minister under the application of the Suppression of Communism Act.

In regard to wage incentive schemes I would like the hon. the Minister to make a statement in order to give the country some better understanding as to what his objectives are in wage incentive schemes, and to tell the country how far he has progressed in its application so far. We remember that two or three years ago the hon. the Minister made it a major matter to try to press upon workers of South Africa the acceptance of these wage incentive schemes. He even went so far as to refuse to publish Industrial Council agreements in which there was a prohibition against wage incentive schemes. On 8 September I got a reply from the Minister to a question which I put to him. I asked the Minister—

- (a) How many Industrial Council agreements contain provision for wage incentive schemes and,
- (b) to which industries or occupations do they apply, and
- (c) in how many establishments are wage incentive schemes operating in terms of such provisions.

The reply I got from the Minister was that there are 46 Industrial Council agreements containing provision for wage incentive schemes, and he named approximately 20 different industries. What interested me most was the fact that the Minister said that he was unable to give information as to in how many establishments these wage incentive schemes are operating because—and these are his words—

This information is not available as statistics concerning this matter are not kept by my department.

Because the hon. the Minister was always so emphatic that the need to increase production

in South Africa hinged upon workers accepting these wage incentive schemes, I would have assumed that the Minister would have set up machinery to test and examine the application of schemes already in working and those which were applied as a result of his expressed desires. I would have expected the Minister to have set up machinery to watch the progress of these schemes in order to test to what extent they had increased production and to what extent they had affected industry as a whole in this country. I have noticed recently that the Minister is having written into Industrial Council agreements the clause which he proposed a couple of years ago on incentive work. This clause includes the provision "that any wage incentive scheme shall guarantee the employees the minimum prescribed wage and shall enable a worker of average ability to earn at least 20 per cent in excess of the prescribed wage". Also, that "any employer who wishes to introduce an incentive scheme shall set up a joint committee of representatives of the management, officials of the trade unions and the employees".

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: What are you quoting from?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I am quoting from one agreement. This appears in several agreements.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Which?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: This particular one I am reading from is for the Sweet Manufacturing Industry in Port Elizabeth, but I have read it in several other agreements. This is the Minister's own clause and it came from his Department a year or so ago.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I am not denying it.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: No, I want to commend the Minister on that. I like that. I do not want to quarrel with the Minister on the wording of this clause, but what I do want to know is what progress the Minister has made? The reply that I got to the question which I raised, in which the hon. the Minister says that his Department keeps no statistics, makes me wonder how the hon. the Minister is able to examine whether the assertions that he made so emphatically over recent years are being proved or are being disproved. I want to know, for instance, in some of these industries which he has mentioned—the leather industry, the hairdressing trade, the building trade, the engineering trade—whether there have been definite improvements and a step-up in production as a result of these schemes? I want to remind the hon. the Minister that not only do these schemes vary from industry to industry, but they also vary from establishment to establishment. I think it is most important for the Minister to keep comparative figures in his Department. After all, this is his baby and he should be able to tell the country not only how the system is working in industry gene-

rally, but in different establishments. This is the hinge upon which depends the success or failure of wage incentive schemes in South Africa. It will not be sufficient for the Minister, or for any other individual to come in the future and to quote isolated instances of what is happening in one industry or another, or in one establishment or another. What is needed is to see what the overall effect is in the application of these schemes. I hope that the hon. the Minister will give us a reply to this question.

The second matter which I want to raise with the hon. the Minister concerns the role which he is playing in the application of the Suppression of Communism Act. The Minister of Labour fills a consultative capacity under Section 5 (3) of the Act. The hon. the Minister of Justice, before placing the names of trade union officials upon the Liquidators list; or, the Liquidator before placing these names upon the list has to refer to the Minister of Justice who then consults with the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour is then supposed to state his standpoint in protection of trade union interests. It is most interesting to note that the Minister of Labour has been unable to protect a single trade union from the raids that are being made by the Department of Justice. On 21 July this year I asked the hon. the Minister of Justice how many names had been placed on the Liquidator's list since the passing of the Suppression of Communism Act, and I asked him in how many cases he had consulted with the Minister of Labour in terms of Section 5 (3) of the Act. I also asked how many cases were not pursued on the recommendation of the Minister of Labour. The reply I received was that in all cases where trade union officials were concerned the provisions of the law were carried out, and that in no cases did he not take action as a result of recommendations of the Minister of Labour. This indicates that the fears that were held by the Labour Party and by the trade movement generally, that the Suppression of Communism Act was going to be applied ruthlessly against trade union members who were not good members of the Nationalist Party, are being borne out. It has now been shown that there is a war of persecution, a war of execution against these leaders of the trade union movement because they have been hostile to the Nationalist Party. In other words, the Suppression of Communism Act is being applied strictly on a political basis.

Mr. MENTZ: That is nonsense.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: It is true.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: It is not true.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: It is true. The terms of the Suppression of Communism Act which removes the operation and the examination of the law from the Courts of the land leaves it in the hands of, virtually, a Gestapo to deal with these trade union leaders. On their records

not as bad trade union leaders, not because they have let down the members of their trade unions, not because they have betrayed the trust put in them by the trade union members themselves, but because they did not measure up to the standard required by the Nationalist Party; they are being hounded out one after the other.

Mr. MENTZ: Nonsense.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member for Westdene (Mr. Mentz) can raise his usual cry of nonsense, but these are the facts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: They are not the facts.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: They are facts. Perhaps I should withdraw. I am not able to establish whether they are facts or not, because the Minister keeps the whole thing behind closed doors. This is a Star Chamber that makes these decisions, and only the Minister can say

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must point out to the hon. the member that it is not the Vote of the Minister of Justice we are discussing, it is the Vote of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. the Minister of Justice has tried to defend these actions.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: I tried to give you the truth.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I want to say that the latest act that has been referred to by the hon. member for Florida (Mr. Tighy), a report of which appeared in this morning's paper, shows the line being followed by this Government. It is reported in the Cape Times of this morning's date that—

The national organizer of the 15,000-strong Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers of South Africa, Mr. Piet Huyser, has been ordered to resign his position by the Minister of Justice, Mr. Swart.

The action was taken under the Suppression of Communism Act.

I presume it was taken only after consultation with the hon. the Minister of Labour, therefore the Minister of Labour put the stamp of approval on this act before it was put into execution by the Minister of Justice. The report goes on—

One order instructs Mr. Huyser to resign as officer, office-bearer and member of the A.U.B.T.W., not again to become a member or take part in its activities, and not to become an office-bearer or member in any other trade union registered under the Industrial Conciliation Act.

And, who was Mr. Huyser? The paper says—

Mr. Huyser has held his present post as national organizer of the Building Worker's Union since 1948. Before this he was general secretary of the Amalgamated Bricklayers Trade Union. . . . he is director of the building industries pensions fund, and is a member of the Mining Union's Joint Committee, the Mechanics Union's Joint Committee (Mines) and the Industrial Council for the Explosive Industry.

Mr. Huyser comments upon the order that has been served upon him in this manner. He says—

Not only have I been deprived of my trade union membership, but with it the benefits to which I am entitled from the various funds to which I have contributed for 21 years. The liquidator refused to disclose documents in which he alleged that evidence against me was contained.

Of course he will never get that evidence. He is not able to get it, so that nobody but the Minister knows where he stands. We must remember that it has been a plan of the Nationalist Party organizers to seize control of the trade union movement for many years.

Dr. VAN NIEROP: And you want to keep it.

Mr. HEPPLE: They have used every possible means in their power to seize control of those unions. I do not want to go over the sorry history of all the political raids that have been made upon the three major trade unions on the Witwatersrand — the Mineworkers Union, the Building workers Union and the Garment workers Union. But we know the record of this Minister. Hardly had he taken over his office than he instituted a commission of inquiry into the Garment workers Union, not because the Garment workers Union was failing to fulfil its functions as a trade union, but because a small group had broken up one of its official meetings. Further than that, this attack upon the trade unions is exposing the trade unions to very great dangers. I have raised this matter in this House on many occasions. The Minister has dismissed my arguments as being of no importance. There was a time when I thought that perhaps we were misjudging the Nationalist Party, that perhaps we were misjudging this Government; that perhaps all the cries and the attacks that they had made against the trade union movement were merely slogans in order to win a certain amount of votes, to win a certain number of seats at the election. But now we can see the whole pattern showing itself. We did not misjudge this Government, we did not misjudge the Nationalist Party. They are ruthlessly pursuing their campaign to remove all those trade union leaders who have been a thorn in their side, and they want to remove these trade union leaders in order that their stooges will be able to fill their places.

The argument will be made from the

Government benches—it has been made before—that the Nationalist Party, the Government, does not appoint the successors of these people who are removed, that the rank and file have the right to elect them. But this campaign of terror, this intimidation and the scheming that goes on behind the scenes will ensure that the stooges of the Nationalist Party come up and take these posts. What is the outcome of this going to be? Is it going to be, as the Nationalists pretend, that the trade unions will emerge as pure and free from communism, strong to resist ruthless employers, better able to get better conditions for their members? Of course it will be nothing of the sort. It will mean that once the best negotiators of the trade unions are gone, less experienced men will take their places and these trade unions are eventually going to be completely useless to the rank and file of those unions.

We still have to judge the Nationalist Party and this Government upon its declared labour policy, and that is what I want to establish this afternoon with the hon. the Minister of Labour. I want to refer him once again to the several speeches he made in this House, and particularly to the speech which he made in January, 1943, which speech was referred to by the hon. member for Benoni (Mr. Lovell) when the House was discussing the Native Labour Bill recently. I want to know from the hon. the Minister whether his Party has officially repudiated that policy, or whether his Party stands by that policy? Because if the Nationalist Party stands by that policy then the present actions of the Government against trade union leaders are perfectly understandable. This campaign against the trade unions has gone on for a long time, but because the rank and file, through the democratic control of the trade unions, was able to resist the machinations of the organizers of the Nationalist Party, the Government is now achieving its ends by edict. Edicts in terms of the Suppression of Communism Act are being used because, under the ordinary machinery of democracy, they could not smash the trade unions. That is what is happening to-day.

Insofar as this man Piet Huyser is concerned, I would like to remind this House that he got £2,000 damages from "Die Werkers Pers".

An HON. MEMBER: Do you know him?

Mr. HEPPLE: Do I know Piet Huyser? I know this man Piet Huyser very well, and I want to say that he has done more for the workers of South Africa than any single member of the Nationalist Party. He has given his life to raise the standard and to protect the interests of the building workers of South Africa, and his record stands high. I am proud to claim Piet Huyser as a friend. I am proud to know him. The only tragedy is that there are not more Afrikaans-speaking workers who are following in his foot-steps, because it is the Afrikaans-speaking workers no less than any others who is going to suffer because of the steps that are being taken against the trade

unions to-day. The day is coming for the workers in South Africa when they will look back to this time, that they will remember it was under this present regime that the foundations of the trade union movement were destroyed. And that is a warning—perhaps not a warning, but a fact that is going to be proved in the future. Let me now quote from this case, the judgment of the hon. Mr. Justice Ramsbottom delivered on 26 June 1951. In awarding the sum of £2,000 damages to Piet Huyser because of defamation, because he was called a Communist and a lot of other names. This is what Judge Ramsbottom said

Mr. DU PISANIE: When was that?

An HON. MEMBER: You know all about it, it was your paper.

Mr. TIGHY: Du Pisanie and Dr. Hertzog!

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member for Germiston (Mr. Du Pisanie) should not pretend to be innocent, he knows the facts better than any man in this House. This is what the Judge said—

As I have mentioned above, the first defendant, the company, was formed to publish *Die Mynwerker* of which Gleisner was the editor. The Chairman of the Board of Directors was Dr. Albert Hertzog . . .

Mr. TIGHY: There you are, Hertzog and Du Pisanie.

Mr. HEPPLE: The judgment continues—

. . . a member of Parliament; no member of the board was employed in the building industry. As a result of his association with Dr. Hertzog, so Gleisner told the Court, he became convinced that the trade union movement had got into the hands of persons who were not "national minded" but whose ideas were "international" rather than "national", and that these people should be removed from the position they held and replaced by others who had a truly South African outlook. This divergence of outlook appears to have manifested itself in the view that was taken of the colour bar and of Natives in trade unions. According to Gleisner, "the national-minded" worker was opposed to Natives in the trade unions, and in favour of a colour bar, whereas those whom he wishes to displace held the opposite view. Having become thoroughly convinced of the truth of this doctrine, Gleisner was willing to fall in with the suggestion put to him by Dr. Hertzog, that the company should increase activities and publish a newspaper that would serve as the organ of those employees in the building industry who were "national minded". Beetge was introduced to him as the man who had knowledge and who would give him all the necessary information. As I have said above, the intention was that various bodies should produce their own newspapers, which should be published

by the company, but it was decided not to wait for that but to proceed at once with the production and publication of *Die Bouwerker*.

Die Bouwerker was a newspaper produced with the funds, with the money of the mineworkers, taken out of the Mineworkers Union and used to set up stooges in the building industry. The Mineworkers' Union Commission of Enquiry commented on that too. The judgment goes on—

As far as the evidence before me shows, it was to be an organ of a faction led by Beetge who candidly admitted that in his opinion it was impossible to keep politics out of trade unionism, and a few others who were a self-appointed action committee.

Self appointed!

What was the struggle about which so much has been said? The evidence does not satisfy me that there was any struggle or conflict among the members but that this faction decided to create a conflict to oust the officials of the union and take their places.

That is the historical record. That is the record of what has been going on in the trade union movement. It goes on—

The technique was simple, the executive group was labelled clique and the group was given the name "Huyser-Blake"; the *Bouwerker* then embarked upon a campaign of abuse, the target being the Huyser-Blake clique, or Huyser himself.

In other words, behind the scenes the organisers of the Nationalist Party were working in order to remove this man Huyser. They failed because the rank and file of the trade unions stood solidly behind Huyser and Blake and they failed because in the courts of the land they had no leg to stand on. So what are they doing to-day? They are using the machinery of the Suppression of Communism Act; they are short-circuiting the courts and they are able by edict to remove these very men who have been a thorn in their side. But have these men been a thorn in the side of the workers in the building trade? Have they been a thorn in the side of the workers in the trade union movement? Of course they have not. These men have been fulfilling a legitimate trade union function. They have been doing a wonderful job of work for the rank and file who put them into the positions which they hold, and what is the reward they get? They are not thrown out by the members of the trade union because they have failed in their duty. They are being thrown out by edict of the Nationalist Party caucus. That is what is happening to them. This might give immediate gratification to the Cabinet; it might give gratification to certain political opportunists in the Nationalist Party, but I want to say that the eventful outcome of this will be that the

workers of South Africa, whether they are English- or Afrikaans-speaking, are going to be in a worse position than workers in any part of the world. They will have no strong trade unions to stand up for their rights. They won't have trade unions worth twopence. They won't have any means by which they can fight back against the employer. Through all these attacks upon the trade union movement, the employers are free to continue to strengthen their position, though there are many wise employers in this country who are getting concerned about the developments in the trade union movement. In this war of revenge that the Nationalists are waging against those progressive trade unionists who have always opposed them, some of the finest trade union leaders that South Africa has ever had are disappearing from the trade union scene. I have not always agreed with all trade union leaders. There are many of them with whom I have disagreed and who have already been removed, but I say that there is no possible ground for removing these trade union leaders. If they had to be removed they should have been removed by their own rank and file. Now that the Government has introduced this political weapon in order to destroy the trade union movement, I want to ask the Minister what is his general policy; what is his future policy going to be? What is the Minister going to answer when these positions which have been vacated by force are filled by the very people who waged this undemocratic guerilla warfare against trade union leaders; is the Minister then going to tell us that that has been done by democratic means? I have said to the Minister of Labour in this House on many occasions that his duty is to protect the workers of this country, not to be the political weapon of the Nationalist Party in order to destroy trade unions. The Minister blandly replied to me year after year, "Prove to me where I am destroying the trade unions?" I say to the Minister that he has only to see what is happening when workers have to bargain with employers for new industrial council agreements. I know of cases where men who have been removed have secretly to advise their unions on technicalities and render free services to the rank and file of the trade union movement, because those who are carrying on in the interim are unable to do the job as efficiently as the men who have been removed.

Mr. DU PISANIE: And they are being paid secretly.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member says they are being paid secretly. He has a persecution complex. Nothing gives the hon. member for Germiston (Mr. Du Pisanie) greater delight than to know that he has reduced his erstwhile enemies to the gutter. It should be no gratification to him to know that these people are being persecuted, because let me say to him that he is not winning on his ability. He is winning by secret edicts. On his own ability he would not have a leg to stand on. The hon. member for Germiston is a nonentity in the

trade union movement. He has had to wait his whole life for secret edicts and the power of a Government in order to gain victories for himself. What victories, what hollow victories! If the hon. member for Germiston had been able to rise to heights in the trade union movement as a result of his own ability I would be the first to pay tribute to him. His only gratification and his only joy to-day is to see the trade unions weakened and destroyed as a result of cruel edicts. I say to the Minister of Labour that it is a shame that in no instance where the Minister of Justice consulted him on the question of the removal of trade union leaders, did he find it necessary to do anything or to take any steps. I say it is to the Minister's shame because he could have done something. In the case of Huyser I am sure that the Minister knows better than anyone else that Piet Huyser is not a communist; he is a militant trade unionist. He has the respect not only of the workers in his union but also of the employers. When Piet Huyser speaks the employers in the building industry listen to him with respect, yet the Minister did not even have a kind word to say about this man, because this man is on the Nationalist Party list. The liquidator's list seems to be the mirror of the Nationalist Party list. In this regard I want to say to the Minister of Labour too that in the coming years when he sees that the workers of South Africa are becoming more vulnerable to the attacks from employers, it won't be the Minister who will be able to save them because these things will never reach the Department of Labour. In times of slackness the employers are able to bring pressure to bear upon the workers, and these political considerations that have been used in the past will be used with greater intensity by some employers. [Time limit.]

*Mr. MENTZ: A little while ago we were told in this House, when Mr. Solly Sachs was arrested, that the Garment Workers' Union had now been broken up and that the Minister had destroyed those trade unions. To-day again we hear that because Mr. Piet Huyser was named, his union was broken up and destroyed.

*Mr. HEPPLÉ: Definitely.

*Mr. MENTZ: No, not at all. Not a single one of those trade unions will be broken up through that. No one is indispensable, and I want to go so far as to say that if that hon. member were to die to-day, even Rosettenville would be able to get another representative. But I do not want to devote much time to the members of the Labour Party. We all know where they stand. Just a few days ago that hon. member, in reply to a question by me, admitted that they do act as protectors of Communists, but South African Communists—not the kind one finds in Russia. We therefore know where they stand. I do not want to waste time on them. But what I cannot understand is that my hon. friend, the member for Florida (Mr. Tigby), the so-called shadow

Minister of Labour in the United Party, should continually run around between the Solly Sachses and the Huysers. He was a source of great embarrassment to his party by his action in connection with Solly Sachs, and now he tries to wriggle out of that matter but puts his foot into it deeper by now protecting Piet Huyser.

*Mr. TIGHY: Is he is Communist?

*Mr. MENTZ: If he were not a Communist, he would not have been named. I just want to tell the hon. member that Piet Huyser now has an opportunity, now that he has been named, to prove his guilt or innocence. I may be wrong, but I still think he will do what many others did; he will not even object to the fact that his name was placed on the list. But I want to go a little further. The hon. member really rose to challenge the Minister of Labour to state what our policy is. He said: "We as a United Party have a clear policy". I just want to pause there for a few minutes. I first want to ask the hon. member what charter he is referring to. I have before me a workers' charter issued by the leader of that party on 21 February 1951.

*Mr. DURRANT: Just read correctly; I also have it in front of me.

*Mr. MENTZ: It was issued by the leader of that party; I do not know whether he is now the ex-leader. I am referring to the hon. member for Germiston (District) (Mr. Strauss).

*Mr. DURRANT: He is still the leader.

*Mr. MENTZ: Then I have a second charter here, dated 12 May 1951, which was announced here by the hon. member for Florida, and on that occasion, when speaking about this charter, he said this—

I am speaking on behalf of my party. I am not speaking like a parrot.

Those were his words in this House. But I have a third charter issued by him on 8 June 1952. Then I have a further charter issued by the hon. member for Germiston (District) as the leader of that party on 9 September 1952, and we have now had the sixth one during this Session, announced by the hon. member for Salt River (Mr. Lawrence). But in view of the fact that he is now the person who acts here on behalf of the party opposite, I will deal with his charter. His first point is the following—

The United Party admits that capital and labour are mutually dependent.

*Mr. TIGHY: What is wrong with that?

*Mr. MENTZ: No, there is nothing wrong with it. He states further—

Capital is necessary to ensure development in the country. Labour needs capital to provide employment.

Mr. Chairman, it will not be strange to you and it will not be strange to this Committee if I say that these words have been taken word for word from the policy of the Nationalist Party and of this Government.

*Mr. TIGHY: I have never seen your policy; you have no policy.

*Mr. MENTZ: The hon. member lives in the past; he does not know what is going on. I say that it was taken word for word from the policy of the Nationalist Party. Then he says further—

The Nationalist Party has always opposed the trade unions.

That is the greatest nonsense in the world. Except for a few Leftists, the trade unions have never been better treated than they were treated by this Government and co-operation has never been better than now; that is my reply. Then I come to the second point—

The creation of consultative committees consisting of employers and employees as a link between Government and Labour

If ever a shameful act was committed by the United Party, it was to announce something like this. It has never been necessary for the Nationalist Party to have a consultative committee. We have always had the support and confidence of both employers and employees. But that party is already preparing itself to appoint such a consultative committee in case the gods ever make it possible for them to be returned to power, because they know that they have neither the confidence of the employer or of the employee. I come to the hon. member's third point: "Sufficient annual sick leave." Then he promises further—

- (b) Long leave after a certain period of service;
- (c) Subsidized vacations at the coast;
- (d) Special railway excursions for leave purposes;
- (e) Suitable week-end holiday resorts.

My reply to that is this: It is the worthless and misleading document he laid before the electorate. I want to ask him what his Party means by "sufficient annual sick leave"? I say that is misleading. What is the meaning of "sufficient"? What is the meaning of "long leave"? How long is that leave to be? Those are vague generalities; it is misleading. He refers here to long leave after a certain period of service. What is that "certain period of service"? Then he refers to subsidized vaca-

Minister of Labour

employers and the employees in the industry, the employees who belong to the various trade unions and the employers' organizations in the four provinces. Subsequently, however, I understood that the trade union itself decided not to go on with it. Now the hon. member asks why investigations cannot be instituted in regard to wages. He wants to know why no wage determination can be made. I have already given my answer during a debate in the previous session, namely, that a wage investigation would be of no use; there is no certainty that the Wage Board would recommend uniform wages. If I am to judge by the policy pursued by the Wage Board in the past, then it is highly improbable that the Wage Board would recommend uniform wages and working conditions, because in 1946 the Wage Board investigated the clothing industry of the entire Union, and their recommendations still provided for the differentiation between the Cape, Natal and the Transvaal. Therefore, there is no assurance that the Wage Board would recommend uniform wages, and there is always the possibility that the Wage Board might recommend even poorer conditions of work and wages than are provided for in the industrial agreement. In the third place, I think that when there is self-government in an industry, when an Industrial Council is in existence, when wages are arranged on a basis of collective bargaining, it is wrong for the Wage Board to be asked to institute investigations in that same industry. I think that it is wrong. That is something towards which all the workers strive, namely, to fix their wages themselves by means of collective bargaining. That is the reason why I am not prepared to instruct the Wage Board to institute an investigation.

The hon. member objected strenuously to the fact that leaders of trade unions who are Communists, were removed from their posts. If the hon. member for Rosettenville (Mr. Hepple) is listening, I can reply to him, too. The hon. member for Rosettenville pointed out that before the hon. the Minister of Justice removes any trade union official from his post, he first has to consult the Minister of Labour, and that in answer to a question, the Minister of Justice had said that he had indeed consulted the Minister of Labour in cases where trade union officials were removed from their posts. That is so. In each case where action was taken against a trade union official the hon. the Minister of Justice consulted me and in every case I signified my approval. Now I would just like to tell hon. members what the intention was with the inclusion of that clause in the Suppression of Communism Act. It was intended as a safety measure, seeing that I am far better acquainted than my colleague with the trade unions and the trade union leaders, so that action might not perhaps be taken against an innocent person, that it might not perhaps be thought of a trade union official who is very zealous—who is a "militant trade union leader"—that he is a Communist and that action may not be taken against such a man who is quite innocent and

does not support Communism or subscribe to it. That was the intention. I wish to give hon. members the assurance that every trade union official against whom steps were taken, was a member of the Communist Party, including Huyser.

Mr. LOVELL: What proof have you of that?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: In all seriousness I can assure hon. members that in every case I went through the files personally and convinced myself that the person was a member of the Communist Party and that irrefutable proof exists, in other words, that his name appeared on the membership register of the Communist Party.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Why do you not give them a hearing in the courts?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: In Huyser's case it was proved, and he was informed, that he was a member of the Communist Party and that his name appeared on the register of members, that he attended the meetings of the Communist Party.

Mr. LOVELL: When was that? How long ago?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: It does not matter. The fact remains that he was a member of the Communist Party, and the law provides that when a person is a member of the Communist Party he may be named and action can be taken against him.

*Mr. TIGHY: Do you deny that he helped your party in the election of 1948?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I most definitely deny it. He would never have helped the Nationalist Party. On the contrary, he has always opposed us, although that is not the reason why he was named. Huyser was a member of the Communist Party, his name appears on the register of membership, and he attended meetings of the Communist Party and he received instructions from the Communist Party. The irrefutable proofs exist, and those proofs were imparted to Huyser.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: The time is not taken into consideration?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I hope that the hon. member for Florida is satisfied. Furthermore, I would just like to say this in this connection: Five years ago, I think it was in the course of one of the first debates in this House in which I participated as Minister, on behalf of the Government I said that one of our aims was to oust the Communists from the trade unions, that we are going to eradicate the Communists from trade unionism. No matter whether he is a good or a bad trade union official, if he is Communist he must be removed. It is not only in the interests of

the country, but of the trade unions themselves too. One will have a far better trade union movement when it has been cleansed of Communism. They do a great deal for their members but their chief aim is to promote Communism.

*Mr. DAVIDOFF: How can they do that?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: It is the principle of Communism that they continually propagate among their members. The hon. member asks how they do it. Let him read the *Garment Worker* for the years before 1948 and he will see how that Satanic gospel was propagated to such an extent that the judge presiding in Sach's case said that through all the years Sachs had abused his position and had used the *Garment Worker* to spread Communism.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: How many garment workers are there?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: No secret was made of it. During the general election we repeated that we would continue to remove the Communists from the trade unions. The workers and everybody else knew it, and that hon. member also knew about it. At every meeting we said it. We said it over the radio and wrote in newspaper articles that we would do it, that the Government would continue with the policy of eradicating Communism from the trade unions. It was not unknown and it was not opposed.

*Mr. TIGHY: That is not our objection.

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Then the hon. member must not raise objections when the Communists are removed, when a man who is a member of the Communist Party is removed.

*Mr. TIGHY: I cannot accept that a decent Afrikaner is a Communist.

*Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: There are many things you cannot accept.

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Nor is it a question of whether the hon. member wishes to accept it or not. It is a question of fact. Furthermore, I can say that the membership register of the Communist Party was seized by the previous Government, by his Government when they were still in power, after the police had executed a raid.

*Mr. TIGHY: Were any membership cards found?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: That has nothing to do with it. The hon. member must accept that he was indeed a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. LOVELL: Why must we accept it?

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The Government will continue with that policy of removing Communism, whether the hon. member is satisfied or not. It is in the interests of the trade union movement and in the interests of the country.

The hon. member for Florida (Mr. Tighy) asked whether any improvements are to be made in the Workmen's Compensation Act. He said that I promised in 1948 that I would do so. Well, that promise has been kept. In 1949 there was an increase of 25 per cent in the compensation payable, and also other improvements. Subsequently there were the amending Bills which made further improvements in the Act.

The hon. member also wants to know whether we will make provision for a worker who is injured on his way to or from his work, so that he may be compensated. The law provides that while a man is under the control of his employer and he meets with an accident, that he shall be compensated, but the Act stipulates that he must meet with the accident while engaged in his work and as a result of the work he is doing. Therefore the hon. member will readily understand that it would be practically impossible to determine, or rather to introduce a clause to the effect that if a worker meets with an accident on his way to work he should receive compensation. In the first instance one must determine what the shortest route to his work is. If he first makes a detour to have his hair cut and he then meets with an accident, he is not entitled to compensation. If he decides to follow a different route it cannot be paid. These things are impossible to determine. This matter has been broached repeatedly by the trade unions, but to a great extent they realize that it is impossible to incorporate it in the Act.

The hon. member asks for full pay when a worker is injured. As far as I know there is no such clause in any country in the world. The danger is that many abuses would occur. When a man is at home and he receives his full wage there is no incentive for him to return to his work. But in any case it is a question of funds and whether the funds could afford it. The fund consists only of contributions made by the employers. The workers themselves contribute nothing towards it. The fund as such must cover all the costs and the assessments of the employers are usually calculated on the basis of what the obligations are going to be for the following year. If this were to be done it would mean that the assessments would have to be greatly increased, and we feel, that especially at the moment, such an increase in the assessment would not be fair. But I wish to assure the hon. member that when I find that the fund is in a position to carry extra expenditure I shall certainly make improvements in the benefits.

In regard to the disbursements I wish to assure him that the office does its best to expedite the disbursements as far as possible.

theme the request that had come from the hon. member for Alberton (Mr. M. Viljoen) and also the hon. member for False Bay (Mr. de Villiers) in relation to legislation to be introduced to protect the European standards of workers and their position of full employment. Now the plea that has been put forward by these two members, and which the Minister has answered in part, is to the effect that the non-Europeans are being employed by employers in preference to Europeans, and that this is causing considerable distress in the industrial areas particularly. The Minister has indicated that it may require the utilization of the Mines and Works Act, the Training of Artisans Act, the Native Building Workers' Act, the Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act—it may require all these Acts to give the necessary protection to the European workers, and that he envisaged a further Act that would make it possible for particular jobs to be classified, and thus prevent employers using non-Europeans when they should actually be using Europeans. Now, if that is the general picture, I want to ask the Minister whether he is prepared to state in clear terms the policy of the Government in relation to the whole manpower shortage question. Does it mean that the Government's policy is now one of putting South African workers first, irrespective of colour, and the determination to give every section of the community an opportunity of sharing in the industrial revolution that is taking place in the country? Is it the intention to give every section this opportunity rather than to go ahead with an immigration policy of encouraging Europeans to come to this country to fill the positions that there are in relation to our many industries and State Departments, etc.? The Minister has indicated that the position in some municipalities is difficult and that the trouble there is in relation to our transport undertakings, could be partially solved by the utilization of non-Europeans in services mainly for non-Europeans, and that he has the fullest sympathy with those trade unions concerned in their resistance to the employment of non-Europeans in the services because of the lack of legislative protection in the event of this departure from the recognized standards in this country being given effect to by the municipalities. That is the main point that the Minister has made, and it is in pursuance of that, and also in pursuance of the remarks made by the hon. member for Alberton and the hon. member for False Bay, that I ask the Minister to give a statement of policy in relation to this overall problem of the shortage of manpower in the country to-day. On the question of the Training of Artisans Act, I understand that effect is being given to the Act in certain areas, but I want the Minister to indicate whether those being trained in terms of the Act are being recruited from establishments that have semi-skilled men, and these semi-skilled men are now in the position to take an intensive training course, and thereby qualify as artisans, or is he recruiting those

who have had no training whatever, and thus strengthening the artisan position without weakening the semi-skilled artisan position? I remember that when the Bill was being debated I asked the Minister what steps he was taking to give the Railway Administration an opportunity of allowing semi-skilled men to qualify in terms of this Act. The Minister said at that time that he would take the necessary steps to see that opportunities would be given to these men. As far as I know, this has not been given effect to, and I would like the Minister in his reply to indicate exactly what category of workers will fall under this training of artisans scheme.

The other point that I want some information about is under the Vote itself. On page 165, under Head G. there is an amount of £50 for the Advisory Council of Labour. I want to know whether the Minister has re-suscitated this Advisory Council of Labour and whether the reference to £50 means that this Board or Advisory Council has been recreated, and if so, who is serving on it at present? The other point is in connection with the annual reports of the Secretary of Labour. As far as I know, the last report that was issued was in 1950 and I want the Minister to say whether it is his policy to discontinue the issue of these reports, and if not, what is causing this lengthy delay in the issue of these reports by the Secretary for Labour.

*Mr. M. J. VAN DEN BERG: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister has indicated a course to-day which in my opinion will be a solution to 90 per cent of our future problems. The course indicated by him is that in the future we should give the Minister of Labour certain powers to preserve the colour bar by means of regulations in order to protect the European workers. In view of the development which is taking place at the moment there will constantly be trouble and it will be impossible to lay down exactly by means of legislation where Natives or Coloured people or European labourers can be employed, and therefore I think this is a possible solution to many of our future problems, for then the Minister can, when there is a certain change in a particular industry, investigate the matter, and he can exercise his discretion in the interests of the country and in the interests of all the different workers by taking protective steps. I say this is a course which will ease all his future troubles more than if the colour bar is preserved by means of fixed legislation. It may perhaps be asked whether there will always be a Minister who can exercise wise discretion. That, Sir, is for the workers of South Africa to decide. They can see to it that they will always have a Minister who will exercise that wise discretion. Of course, hon. members will raise objections and say that this will mean that the workers will always have to vote for the Nationalist Party. Of course that is the position, for until such time as hon. members on the other side can frankly state that they stand for the maintenance of

the colour bar in industry, the European workers of South Africa can and will never have that confidence in them that they will produce such a Minister. Mr. Chairman, you and this House and this country will not always allow yourselves to be deceived by speeches such as we had from the hon. member for Vereeniging (Mr. S. J. M. Steyn), indicating that that side has the same colour policy as this side. It is not true. Very striking replies have been given here to-day by a few of my colleagues to the Charter policy of the hon. member for Florida (Mr. Tighy). In spite of the fact that the hon. member for Florida time and again comes forward here with that policy and makes statements in the House indicating that he and the United Party also stand for the maintenance of the colour bar in industry, the hon. member for Alberton showed us to-day that this is in direct conflict with the published policy and the guarantees which they gave to the workers at the election, such as, for instance, free association of all trade unions. What that means they still have to explain to us. But the cardinal and vital matter in which every European worker in South Africa is interested, namely, the maintenance of the colour bar, is something which those hon. members cannot officially publish in their manifesto. But apart from that clash of policy, as the hon. member for Alberton pointed out this afternoon, between the statement of policy by the hon. member for Florida and that given by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and, in any case, the published manifesto which they used during the election, there still remains another very important matter, and that is the Press statement by the Leader of the Opposition—I am now referring to the hon. member for Germiston (District) (Mr. Strauss), and not to the hon. member for Florida—namely the new labour pattern. My hon. friends there cannot deny that the new labour pattern as announced by their supreme Leader completely does away with the colour bar in industry. Of course, this is something new to the hon. member for North Rand (Mr. B. Coetzee). He was not here in those days. I do not think he will subscribe to that policy, for there are many policies which have been announced by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition but which many of them will not subscribe to. But that new labour pattern simply amounts to this, that Natives will be trained in skilled labour and will gradually climb up the ladder as their qualifications improve, and as the Natives climb up the ladder and as they reach the so-called standard of civilization, the Europeans will have to go further up the ladder, until eventually the Europeans will be at the top of the ladder and the Natives will have invaded all the broad strata of our industrial life. Then I want to ask the hon. members on the other side: What becomes of your colour bar then?

*Mr. B. COETZEE: You are already doing that now under your Government.

*Mr. M. J. VAN DEN BERG: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. There is not a single colour bar law which has gone through this House and which was not opposed by the United Party or by the old South African Party. They opposed tooth and nail all the colour bar measures introduced by the Minister of Labour. The United Party consistently opposed all those measures but then they come here again and again and tell us that they also stand for the preservation of the colour bar. But how? The Nationalist Party says: We will draw that line clearly. But they only want a conventional colour bar and that conventional colour bar will gradually change when certain influences arise such as that of the hon. member for Kimberley (City) (Mr. Oppenheimer). As one who has great influence with big employers he has laid down that the colour bar in industry will gradually have to be eliminated. And if we have only a conventional colour bar with influences which continually go against it, it stands to reason that such a conventional colour bar will gradually disappear and will eventually be eliminated; and hon. members of the United Party and of the Labour Party must understand once and for all that when we place the European and the Native on the same footing in an industry, the Native must necessarily drive all the Europeans out of that industry. Cannot they understand this or do they not care? Or do they still think that the European worker should only remain in industry temporarily? Let me say this, that the European workers have invaded industry in South Africa and they intend staying there and no Government in South Africa and no Party which is indifferent to that colour bar in industry will ever in the future be able to claim the goodwill and support of the European workers of South Africa. It is simply for the sake of self-preservation that the European workers have to take that course. It is because they had an experience in 1922 which will never be forgotten for the next 100 years. It can and will never be forgotten by the European workers because when the Chamber of Mines stated that they were no longer going to preserve the *status quo* when 5,000 European men returned from the front, the Chamber of Mines declared with one stroke of the pen that they no longer needed the services of those men and that the Natives would have to keep their jobs while those men could do what they wished. [Time limit.]

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the Minister's reply which he gave me on a matter I raised earlier to-day, and that is in connection with the role played and the Government action in regard to the trade union leaders under the Suppression of Communism Act. The Minister made his customary speech about the Government's determination to remove the Communists from the trade unions, and he made a lot of wild and reckless statements, none of which square up with the facts in regard to the trade union

movement. First of all, I want to say to this House—and I am surprised that the Minister should mislead the House on this question . . .

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must withdraw that.

Mr. HEPPLE: I withdraw it. I want to say that I am surprised that the Minister of Labour tries to make us believe that the rank and file of the trade unions in South Africa are not their own masters, that they do not make their own choice. The Minister pretends to this House that the rank and file of the trade unions in this country are being led like sheep by a handful of Communists. He says that the trade unions in South Africa stand in danger because certain officials may at some time or other in their history have been members of the Communist Party which is now illegal. I want to tell the Minister that having heard his speech this afternoon, and the speeches of one or two other members on the Government side, I am beginning to suspect that this list which is in the hands of the liquidator is made available to members on the Government side of the House, members of their caucus, because they seem to be very well informed as to who is or is not on that list. After my question to the Minister of Justice the other day, asking how the Minister of Labour had behaved in regard to this matter, I was informed that the Minister of Labour had been consulted, and the Minister of Labour told us this afternoon that he confirmed that. He had said that in none of these cases could he recommend that no action be taken. And what was his excuse for that? He said it was because these people were all Communists or ex-Communists. There were several interjections from this side of the House asking him when they were members of the Communist Party and the Minister of Labour said that that does not matter. The Minister of Labour is a master of inconsequential argument. Not once but three times has the Minister got up in this House and quoted a certain Douglas Hyde, who is a recanting English Communist, saying that if we want to know how evil the Communists are we must read Hyde. But that suits the Minister's purpose. He quotes a man like that, as an anti-Communist, but if we have any recanting Communists in this country the policy of this Government is that that is no plea; they are still Communists. Once they were Communists, they have to be purged from the trade unions. Of course the real reason is not Communism at all. The real reason has nothing to do with Communism. The real reason is that certain trade union leaders have fallen foul of the Nationalist Party and democracy has defeated the Nationalist Party because democracy in the trade unions was too powerful. They have been repudiated by the rank and file of the trade unions, so what have they done? They have now used the edict under this law in order to achieve their purpose. But I want to tell the hon. the Minister of

Labour, who is supposed to study these things very carefully, that he has not studied the case of this man Huyser very carefully, because I have been informed . . .

An HON. MEMBER: By whom?

Mr. HEPPLE: I was informed that when this man's name was put on the list he was not given an opportunity by the liquidator to answer the charges or even to see the charges against him. That is correct, is it not?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: No, it is not.

Mr. HEPPLE: The Minister says it is not correct but the right place to take it and to test it is in a court of law, but the Minister is afraid to go to the Courts. I say that the man has publicly stated and is prepared to state again to-day on a public platform that when he asked to be given an opportunity to deal with the charges against him which were laid by an informer and a supporter of the Nationalist Party, he was not given that opportunity. So now the man is put into the position that he has had action taken against him. The trade union has lost the best organizer it ever had, and a man who has done more work for the trade union movement than the whole of the Nationalist Party will ever do is lost to-day. But there is the personal side of the matter. Hon. members on the Government side of the House who are gloating at the achievement of persecuting this trade unionist forget the fact that this man has been a trade union official and a trade union member for 21 years. He has paid his contributions into the trade union and worked for the trade unions. He is asked to resign and lose all his benefits and he has lost his job and is reduced to the gutter. What a proud achievement for the Nationalist Party! I say this is an absolute disgrace. There is a bigger principle involved than this man himself. There is the principle of the attitude of this Government to the trade unions. Not once but on several occasions we have asked the Minister to tell us what the labour policy of the Nationalist Party is.

An HON. MEMBER: You know it very well.

Mr. HEPPLE: I want to quote the Minister of Labour. I did so once before and quoted from one of the speeches he made in 1943 in this House, and the Minister interjected and said that he said that in the foolish days of his youth, or words to that effect, as though he had changed his mind. But in the course of the debate on the Native Labour Settlement of Disputes Bill the other night the hon. member for Benoni (Mr. Lovell) quoted that speech emphasizing what the Minister had said on 19 January 1943. Amongst other things, he said—

The principal function of present-day trade unions will disappear. Those organizations will not be so much entrusted with the function of obtaining better wages and working conditions by means of collective bargaining with the employers but they will be mainly entrusted with the task of regulating matters between employers and the employees

But I am not concerned. I do not want to argue. I want to know from the Minister whether he still stands by that policy. Is that his intention? Is that the role he wants the trade unions to play? He has not answered that. I now challenge the Nationalist Party to tell the country whether they stand by this policy, the emasculation of the trade unions to make the trade unions the petty tools of the employers. The hon. member for Krugersdorp (Mr. M. J. van den Berg) laughs.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If hon. members must talk and do not want to listen to the debate, they should go and talk outside.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member for Krugersdorp. I think, is the great embarrassment to the Minister of Labour. I have never seen the Minister of Labour so ashamed as when the hon. member for Krugersdorp talks about labour matters. I have every sympathy with the Minister. We suffered the hon. member for Krugersdorp for many years, but we always said that fortunately one cannot get measles twice. I want to make a final appeal to the Minister of Labour. I want to say to him that on his Vote on this occasion I have a lot of other matters that I wanted to raise but I would be failing in my duty if I neglected to deal with this serious and important matter. I think the most serious attack which has been made upon the trade unions is this constant removal of trade union officials, men with fine records who have done much for the workers. I want to remind the Government that they should remember what went on in 1922. That was described all over the world as a Red revolt. [Time limit.]

*Dr. HERTZOG: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Rosettenville (Mr. Hepple) has now told us that the trade unions are the symbol of democracy and among other things he mentioned the name of a certain Mr. Huyser about whose naming as a Communist he is very much concerned. He called him the best organizer the trade unions ever had. He should have said he was the best organizer that the Labour Party ever had. Then he would have been right. But just allow me to tell you about the methods of this best organizer, about what he did in his trade union. He became a member of this trade union not very long ago. Before that he was secretary of the Bricklayers' Union. Now he is with the Building Workers. Hardly had this Mr. Huyser become national organizer of the Building Workers when he immediately took steps to

ensure that only Communists could be elected as officials in that trade union and this was his method. Huyser introduced the system—and it was taken up into their constitution—whereby no one became eligible for an official position in that trade union until he had answered a list of questions which he, Huyser, and his friend had drawn up and unless his answers were what he, Huyser, regarded as correct. Now I want to ask this. When a Communist has such powers in his hands does not this lend itself to the greatest abuse? And Huyser did abuse it like that. On many occasions there were men who sought election as office-bearers in that trade union, men who were not Communists.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: He received indemnification for those things.

*Dr. HERTZOG: That list of questions was given to those men and if they did not answer like Communists they were not allowed to become office-bearers. That is the type of democracy they want. I say that we should be grateful to the Government for having intervened in time to put a stop to those practices in the trade unions.

This afternoon the Labour Party was very excited at the beginning of their discussion of workers' affairs in this House and I can understand very well why they were so excited. I can understand very well why they should feel nervous there where they are sitting, for it is curious to note what is really happening to that Party in South Africa. Let me remind you of the facts. There was a time when they really represented organized labour in South Africa. To-day that is no longer the case. There was a time, in 1920, when they had 21 members in this House. At that time they showed promise of gradually becoming a great Party and a great power in this country. But because of their policy they already began to deteriorate in 1924. Then there were only 18 of them. In 1943 they were only nine and in 1948 they were only six, while to-day there are only five, who are only sitting there on sufferance, as the tail of the dog. They are clinging there like five nits clinging to the tail of the United Party dog. You cannot cling to a dog so for many years without taking on the colour of that dog and that is what is happening to them. They are gradually becoming the colour of that Party by whose grace they continue to exist. Let us look at the other side of the matter. It grieves us and perhaps we should not judge too harshly, but it grieves us to see how they are shrinking to nothing while opposite them sits a Party which is gradually taking over all the people they have lost. But that is not surprising. We have seen a tremendous increase of strength on this side of the House. In 1943 there were only 43 members here. To-day we have 94.

*Maj. VAN DER BYL: What has that to do with the Vote?

The Minister of Labour (of the then United Party) desires Mr. Walker to interview the commission. The Minister has also asked that any decisions which the commission might have arrived at that day, be not announced—

The decisions to hold elections were not to be announced—

Mr. Walker arrived at 2.15 p.m. . . .

*Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: [Inaudible.]

*Dr. HERTZOG: The hon. member over there received £3,000 to put those things through—

Mr. Walker said he would suggest for consideration by the commission that no further meetings be held at Benoni and Krugersdorp.

They then decided—

That the union be advised that the commission cannot hold any elections.

That was the role that was played also by that vociferous member in connection with this matter. We had this state of affairs in the country that a Government broke a promise which it had made to a big trade union with a membership of thousands. This was not merely an undertaking; it was a written undertaking and, moreover, it was an undertaking which was embodied in the war clauses and thus became part of the laws of this country. Those people who had undertaken an obligation which was incorporated in the laws of the land and who had given this undertaking to the workers proceeded in a shameless, surreptitious way to withdraw that promise with the result that that promise which had been made to the mineworkers could never be carried out. To this day the election that they were promised has never been held.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I can quite appreciate why the hon. member for Ermelo (Dr. Hertzog) gets so very excited over these matters. I can quite understand that. Unfortunately, he has to sit there and see the back of the head of the hon. member for Krugersdorp (Mr. van den Berg)—and the hon. member for Krugersdorp was the right-hand man of the then Minister of Labour, Mr. Walter Madeley, when the actions were taken that the member for Ermelo complains about.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Yes, that is right, he is the culprit. [Interjections.]

Maj. VAN DER BYL: Come over here and get a front view!

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I want to say that when I hear hon. members of this House talking about

Labour matters as if they were authorities on them, I realize that they don't know the truth and that I have to tell them the truth. The truth is this, that the hon. member for Krugersdorp was the expert in the Labour Party on the affairs of the Mineworkers' Union . . .

An HON. MEMBER: Thereby hangs a tale.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: . . . and he quarrelled with me and other members of the Labour Party because we disagreed with the very thing that the hon. member for Ermelo is complaining about to-day. I say this: If the hon. member for Ermelo wants to have the hon. member for Krugersdorp on the carpet, then I am willing to join with him. I think that this is a caucus matter for the Nationalist Party, and not a matter for this Committee.

As far as the hon. member for Ermelo is concerned, he has attacked and sneered and jeered at the Labour Party. I want to tell the hon. member that the stock reply to the Labour Party is to call us all sorts of names and to sneer and jeer at us. But that is not the answer to the points that we raise in this House. We have heard this sort of thing over and over again; it has become a parrot cry in this House. We never get the replies to the arguments we put up; we never get a sensible reply. We get the silly parrot cry of sneers and jeers at the Labour Party. I want to tell hon. gentlemen that we can take it. We don't mind. We are so used to it that it makes no difference to us. But it will not stop us from putting up cases to the Ministers. Members on the Government side of the House may not fight for the workers of South Africa, but we will do it. We will prick their consciences. [Laughter.] They can laugh; let them laugh. I want to tell hon. members this: I happen to have grown up in the industrial struggles of the Witwatersrand. I haven't any cockeyed ideas about it. I want to say that the same method of fighting was used against my father and my brothers, calling them "agitators". That was the word they used in those days. The "1922 Red Revolt", as they called it. They called them "bolshies". Good South Africans they were, too. It is not good these members sitting here quoting the 1922 strike to this House as if they were all in the front line! That is what I want to say to them.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: What about saying something about my Vote?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I want to say that I am surprised that the hon. member for Ermelo, in view of the judgment, a portion of which I quoted this afternoon, when £2,000 damages were awarded against him in the Court, should repeat the same charge and use the same phrases in this House that he used then. I am surprised that he seeks the protection of this House to avoid the judgment of the Court.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must revert to the Vote.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I want to say that this is very much the Vote . . .

Mr. SERFONTEIN: Don't get excited.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: This is very much the Vote. I hope that we will see a change of heart on the part of hon. members on the Government side of the House. To come to this House and say that they got a mandate from the electorate, that these issues have the backing of the workers, is not the answer. The answer is that the workers have not yet had the opportunity of examining these things and understanding them. Lets be frank about it. I am just as anxious as every other member of this House to see that we protect the standards of all workers in this country, but we won't protect them if these things are going to be made political issues. That is the great danger that is facing the workers of South Africa to-day, because this Government treats everything on a political basis. It might win them votes, but votes themselves are not enough. It might get them seats in Parliament, but it will only lead to disaster for the people of South Africa. And that is what is going to be the end of all this. Perhaps it will come sooner than we think.

There are one or two other matters which I want to take up with the hon. the Minister. I raised one of these matters this afternoon, and that was the question of wage incentives, and I want to say that I am very disappointed at the reply I got from the hon. the Minister. The point I raised with the Minister was simply this, that if it is right for him to advocate and to have given a lot of his time over several years to see that wage incentive schemes are introduced in South Africa, then it is right that he should take the next step and see that the application of those incentive schemes is studied and taken advantage of. My question to the hon. the Minister this afternoon was this: having provided for these wage incentive schemes in Industrial Council and other agreements, what steps is he taking in order to study them?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Study what?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: What steps is the Minister taking to find out which is the best of several systems in industry? What steps is he taking in order to see that only the best schemes are used? The Minister gave me no reply to this question. He said that he had not got the powers; he has not got the machinery in order to make a study of these things. He made the generous offer that if I come to his office he will give me the names of factories where such schemes are working, and I will see that they are working very well. But I want a scientific approach to this. I myself know of factories where they are working. I have had discussions with a lot of workers who are working under these wage incentive schemes; but I am concerned with the overall economy of the country, and if the Government thinks it is in the interest of the country to apply these

wage incentive schemes in order to increase production, then, surely, the consequential step is to have some machinery for the examination of these schemes? I know that in some industries they have got two or three incentive schemes in different factories, and I have heard workers in different factories arguing about it. They say, "My scheme works like this, yours works like that", and they try to decide between themselves which is better or which is worse. Those are only the workers in the factories, but what about the employers and the Government? Has the Government compared the schemes? Has the Government considered which is the better of the schemes? Then the next step is to consider the application of these schemes to different industries. Merely to include provision for the scheme in Industrial Council agreements is not enough, because by merely putting it in the Industrial Council agreement it leaves it wide and it leaves it optional. No machinery is applied or is even attempted to be applied to examine these things in their practical working. I hope that the hon. the Minister will not leave the matter there and consider that that is the answer. I hope that he will take this matter up with the Cabinet and see whether they cannot bring some realism into this question of wage incentive schemes. It is no use making airy speeches before Chambers of Commerce, before gatherings of employers, gatherings of employees, and saying that the trouble with South Africa is that our productivity is too low. Its no good just saying that we have got to increase the productivity of this country. We have got to deal with the question in a scientific manner. We have to have a study of the various schemes. If the Minister himself has not got the power to do this, then I hope that he will take the matter up with the Cabinet and see that the machinery is set up so that we can examine these schemes and take advantage of them where they are in the interests of the country.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The hon. member for Rosettnville (Mr. Hepple) has again referred to the operation of the incentive bonus schemes. I would suggest to the hon. member that he give this matter more consideration before he raises it in the House. The hon. member must realize that it is an entirely voluntary matter. No compulsion is exercised by the Minister or by the Government on any employer or on any trade union to accept an incentive scheme. An incentive scheme can never be made a success if compulsion is exercised. It is absolutely essential that there be the fullest co-operation between management and labour in order to make it a success. That is why it must be entirely voluntary. I have advocated the introduction of incentive schemes to increase productivity, but I have never intended to exercise any form of compulsion. The hon. member must also realize that there is no uniform scheme that can be applicable to all the various industries. Every factory must, of necessity, have its own peculiar type of scheme. It is a question of time

and motion study. It must be worked out on a scientific basis; it must be submitted to the employees and the matter must be fully discussed with them before it is applied. There is no uniform scheme, and there are hundreds of factories which could all apply different schemes. Is it the suggestion of the hon. member that the Government or the Minister should formulate schemes which will be suitable for every individual factory when we have hundreds of factories in South Africa? It would be ridiculous even to make such an attempt.

Mr. HEPPLE: You have not understood my argument.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: We have organizations which are making a point of studying incentive schemes, formulating these schemes, and giving employers and employees all the necessary advice. The Industrial Development Foundation for instance. Not only are they dealing with the institution of incentive schemes, but also training in industry. We have numerous consultants to-day who are employed by employers to evolve a scheme which can apply. This is not a matter for the Government. All that we do is to prevent any legal prohibition against the introduction of a scheme in any industry.

Mr. HEPPLE: How do you know they are any good?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: We know they are good. I have seen them in operation and I know the experience that they have had with them in Britain. The Government of Great Britain does not know what the schemes are or how they are operating, but on the whole they have operated very successfully in almost 90 per cent of the industries in Great Britain. Productivity has increased considerably.

Mr. HEPPLE: But they do study them.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The Government of Great Britain does not study them. The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. It is entirely a voluntary matter for employers and workers in every establishment as to whether a scheme should be introduced or not. It is voluntary and it is based on co-operation between employer and employee. That is what is happening in South Africa. We have information that has been given voluntarily in regard to a number of industries where the schemes are in operation, and we have found that in many industries where the schemes are being operated productivity has increased up to as much as 55 per cent; and that the earnings of the workers have increased by from 25 to 30 per cent. In one particular factory that I visited the productivity of some workers had increased up to 80 per cent.

Mr. HEPPLE: Where was that?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I will give the hon. member the information privately. I do not want to give it across the floor of the House. There is one clothing factory in Johannesburg where the productivity of some of the workers—their output has been stepped up to such an extent that the productivity has been increased by almost 70 per cent. It has been accepted by nearly every country in the world that it is a benefit, that it does increase the productivity, so surely South Africa will not be an exception? We in South Africa are starting very late, we should have started many years ago and our productivity would have been very much higher to-day.

The hon. member for Boksburg (Mr. H. J. Williams) wanted to know, in regard to the Apprenticeship Act, whether night schools have now been substituted by one day per week. Technical classes for one day per week have been prescribed for quite a number of industries, and we are gradually extending that system. The hon. member then wanted to know whether a provision of the Act is being applied, namely, that an apprentice in his penultimate year can undergo a test and if he is successful in the test, receive journeyman's status. We have arranged with the Department of Education to do the trade testing now, and that will be coming into operation very shortly.

Mr. H. J. WILLIAMS: It has not yet been applied; it has not yet gone through?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: No. Prior to the passing of this Act, contracts were entered into for a five-year period, and in those contracts no provision was made for a test at the end of the penultimate year. Consequently, this could only be applicable to apprentices who became indentured after the passing of the Act. We have now made the necessary arrangements for the trade testing, and directly the apprentices reach the penultimate year of their apprenticeship they will be entitled to undergo the test. If they are successful in the test they will receive journeyman's status.

Mr. H. J. WILLIAMS: Can the hon. Minister devise some means whereby apprentices will be advised that that is the position?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: They know about it, it is now in their contracts, and it is also prescribed in the conditions of apprenticeship for the different industries.

The hon. member wanted to know about the Training of Artisans' Act. We trained approximately 90 men during 1952. We gave them intensive training at Kimberley, and they have now been apprenticed to employers. In terms of the Act, after being a year with an employer they are entitled to undergo a test, and if they succeed in that test they then receive journeyman's status. During this year we are also opening two new training centres, one at Olifantsfontein and one at Westlake. We are also making provision for the training in certain of the engineering trades; for instance, fitters and turners and welders in addition to

builders. We have also issued about 278 proficiency certificates in terms of the Act to persons who have received training, but not in terms of the Apprenticeship Act.

I am also concerned about the shortage of apprentices in the building trade. The young men of to-day do not like the building trade and that is one of the reasons why we started this training scheme for training building workers; to make up for the shortage of apprentices. I don't think the situation will be improved by increasing wages. We have to keep the balance between the wages of apprentices and journeymen. There must be some incentive. I might say that the wages of apprentices have been increased, and I think that the maximum wage for a fourth-year apprentice is now 60 per cent of a journeyman's wage. I think that that is fairly high. But the hon. member must realize that these apprentices are more or less in the same position as students at the universities; but whereas the student has to pay for his training, the apprentice is paid to undergo his training. He is actually a student and he only becomes a productive factor, as the hon. member should know, in about his third year. But he is paid for undergoing that training and that is why the wages cannot be increased to any appreciable extent.

*The hon. member for Roodepoort (Mr. M. C. Botha) has touched upon a very important matter and that is in connection with the provision of employment to blind persons. The Blind Persons Act is administered by the Department of Social Welfare and the sheltered places of employment also fall under that department. All that my department does is to endeavour to place blind persons in employment as far as possible. I admit that we find it very difficult. Employers are undoubtedly prejudiced against blind persons. We do succeed, however, in placing quite a number as switch-board operators. I agree with the hon. member that something must be done in this connection, not so much in the form of a separate department where, under the guidance of a blind person, the employment of blind persons can be dealt with, but to offer more training facilities to blind persons for specified work. Of course, this involves considerable financial implications and I cannot give a reply in that connection at this stage. We experience this difficulty not only with blind persons but with all semi-fits. There is provision in this Vote for subsidies to municipalities and other bodies employing semi-fit persons. But there are many whom we cannot place in employment I have considered whether it will not be desirable in the future perhaps to pass legislation similar to the legislation in England, that is to say, to force employers to employ a certain number of semi-fits. This is an Act which has been in operation in England for a number of years and they have had considerable success with it there. I have repeatedly appealed to employers to employ these people, because they are still productive; they are still able to produce good work provided they obtain suitable employment. It is not only these people

but particularly the older people too. If the employers do not heed this appeal I shall have to consider the question very seriously of introducing the necessary legislation to place an obligation on employers to employ a certain number of these people.

Mr. LAWRENCE: You should read what Henry Ford says about that.

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I have read it but our employers do not believe it. That is the difficulty; they are prejudiced.

The hon. member for Umlazi (Mr. Eaton) raised the question of our immigration policy. Our immigration policy has been announced time and time again over the past five years. We would welcome suitable and selected immigrants. We give them every facility to come to South Africa. What we do not want is that the labour market should be flooded; that there should be a surplus of labour in any particular occupation or any particular trade. We have offered employers every facility and encouragement if they wish to bring skilled men from oversea, but they have not availed themselves of that offer. We do not believe in State-aided immigration and the United Party has never told us yet in regard to their immigration policy whether they envisage State-aided immigration or not.

Mr. LAWRENCE: But we carried it out for two years; you know that.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: No, that was not State-aided immigration. That was merely assistance to the immigrants.

Maj. VAN DER BYL: Why did you stop it?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The conditions are quite different from what they were in those days.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Because you killed it; you missed the bus.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I can give the hon. member this assurance; I was overseas two years ago and apart from unskilled workers, what facility they wish to give skilled men, whatever assistance they wish to give them apart from paying their passages and supporting them here until they have been placed in employment, they simply won't get those men.

Mr. LAWRENCE: You missed your chance.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: That is why that immigration policy was nothing but a bluff because they won't get the people.

Maj. VAN DER BYL: We got 48,000.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: They won't get those people unless they are prepared to

tive is to employ non-Europeans to make up the leeway as far as European labour is concerned?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is happening to-day.

Mr. EATON: I want to know if that is now the accepted policy of the Government, and if it is the accepted policy of the Government, is that why all this legislation is necessary to protect the Europeans standards? In other words, the issue is this, that whether we like it or not, the non-Europeans have to do the work that has been done in the past by Europeans, and the Government has accepted that as the alternative to immigration. That is the issue that I want the Minister to deal with, and he has gone back and said that the immigration policy of the Government is so and so. I want the fact established quite clearly that the Government, because of the rapid industrial development in this country, has now decided that non-Europeans in this country should be given the opportunity of doing work which in former years was done by Europeans. It is not a new policy. It is a policy that has been carried out by the Railways for years and years. But if this is not the policy of the Government, are we to continue paying enormous sums in overtime payments to Europeans because we cannot get Europeans to do the work and to fill the existing vacancies? Is that the policy of the Government? I think it is time the Minister made a clear statement on this issue: whether the utilization of non-European labour because of the shortage of European labour is now the policy of the Government, and they are bringing in legislation to protect the Europeans and making quite sure that the Europeans will always be fully employed, and that Natives, Indians and Coloureds will be utilized when they cannot get Europeans. If that is the policy that the Government is putting forward, I want the Minister to say that that is definitely so, and not to tell me that they have an immigration policy and that that is the beginning and the end of it all. I want the Minister to say clearly exactly what the future policy is in relation to the manpower shortage in the Union to-day.

***Mr. M. J. VAN DEN BERG:** When we discuss labour matters here, I think it is necessary to be clear and calm, unlike the hon. the Leader of the Labour Party, who does not know the history of this country over the past 10 years. He has completely lost touch with labour conditions in this country. I cannot say that he is off his head but he has lost his head. He does not even know that when that great strike took place, which has been under discussion here this evening, it was the hon. member for Westdene (Mr. Mentz) and myself who stood up on that side of the House and criticized the then Minister of Labour, Dr. Colin Steyn. Now the hon. member jumps up and says that at that time I was responsible for it. But I was the man who, together with

the hon. member for Westdene, fought in this House for days. The hon. member is too inexperienced and too young in this House to be a leader of a party, because any person who commits such blunders is certainly not qualified to lead a party in this House. The hon. member is annoyed with me. He has his knife in for me this evening. I am friendly towards him but he has his knife in for me this evening. If I had been guilty I would not have minded, but the whole of South Africa knows that it was the hon. member for Westdene and I who at that time tried to clear up the whole mess. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that on one occasion I read out a statement here in connection with corruption, but the hon. member does not even know what happened in this House. He does not even know the most important labour events of recent times and then he wants to make the world believe that he represents the workers. He wants to make the world believe that that great fight in 1922 was described as the work of a number of Bolsheviks. He is so unacquainted with the history of South Africa that he does not know that the strike of 1922 was in connection with the agreement which existed between the Chamber of Mines and 5,000 European mineworkers who went to the front. Whilst these Europeans were at the front the Mineworkers' Union agreed that Natives be appointed temporarily in their places. When those men returned from the front the Chamber of Mines said to the mineworkers that they could go to Jericho. That was the reason, and the hon. member does not know it, and then he is supposed to be a leader of a party. That was the cause of that bloodshed. In those days we had a Labour Party that was in touch with the European workers, not a party like the Party which sits on those benches to-day. Look how they criticized the Minister of Labour here this evening. They started by referring to a man whose actions they wanted to defend. The Minister said to them: "Come and see for yourself and I will give you all this information confidentially." Now the hon. member for Umlazi (Mr. Eaton) wants a statement of policy from the Minister and when one demands a statement of policy from a Minister one must put one's own policy against it. I recall the days when I was in that Party, when Mr. Walter Madeley and I came along year after year and stated what our policy was. But those hon. members are afraid to put their policy in writing because they are afraid that the country will discover to-morrow or the following day that they are going in the opposite direction.

***Maj. VAN DER BYL:** What has become of your policy?

Mr. EATON: We are now discussing the Labour Vote, not the Labour Party Vote.

***Mr. M. J. VAN DEN BERG:** The hon. member created the impression that I was under discussion here because he made an

attack upon me. It was the Leader of the Labour Party who brought this matter to the fore, not I. You know, Mr. Chairman, that it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize. But my hon. friends over there do not do that. They always complain that we are attacking them when we reply to them. I say that the most significant statement which the Minister has made on his Vote is that in the future in connection with the maintenance of the colour bar between European workers and Native workers and Coloured workers certain powers will have to be given to the Minister so that he can act by way of regulation after having investigated the matter. That is one of the best announcements that the Minister has ever made, and if hon. members over there were worthy of the term "Labourites", it was their duty to welcome and to encourage the policy announced by the Minister. But what do they do? They are continually making criticism which is calculated to aggravate the difficult position which already exists in connection with the maintenance of the colour bar between these three different groups in South Africa. My hon. friends must remember that the European workers are compelled to fight for self-preservation and they have only one guarantee in South Africa that they will be protected and that a colour bar will be maintained in the industrial sphere and that is the guarantee of the Nationalist Party and the Nationalist Party Government. But what guarantee is offered by any of my hon. friends over there? This is a most important issue in regard to which the European workers in South Africa are perturbed to-day. I ask my hon. friends, since this is the crux of policy matters, what they offer in this connection? Can they get up and say: "Here is a method which can be adopted to protect the European worker against the Native and even against the Coloured"? In the Cape Peninsula we have this phenomenon that the whole of the Coloured population has been ousted from the labour market by Natives who flooded the market under the United Party regime. They wiped the Coloureds off the labour market in one fell swoop and that is because there were no protective measures. Unless those measures are adopted this penetration which took place in the Peninsula on such a large scale will continue and spread over the whole of South Africa and that must inevitably lead to difficulties. That is why we give this guarantee to the European workers that as long as we are in power they will not be faced with the situation which obtained under the regime of the United Party. There will be no strikes such as the big strike on the Witwatersrand and there will not be this process of penetration that we had in the Peninsula. Unless steps are taken along those lines, we cannot expect the European workers or even the Coloured workers of South Africa to have any confidence in them.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: It is very difficult to debate anything with the hon. member for Krugers-

dorp (Mr. M. J. van den Berg) because he always evades the issues before the House, sets up a new issue of his own, presents the case, breaks it down and then throws up his arms in triumph. I just do not know what to say to him. I would like to jog the hon. member's memory for a moment. His repetition of the causes of the 1922 strike won't fill any stomach to-day, but he is quite right as to the initial cause of it. What I said here to-day was that eventually that was described as a Red revolt.

Mr. M. J. VAN DEN BERG: By the Chamber of Mines.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Of course by the Chamber of Mines, just in the same way as the Nationalist Party describes everybody as Communists to-day. My argument is that the enemies of the workers described it as Bolshevism, just as the Chamber of Mines and their satellites called the strikers Bolsheviks. It is the old argument when they want to oppress the workers. I want to endeavour for the third time, very briefly, to make the Minister understand what I was talking about when I dealt with the wage incentive scheme. [Interjections.] If hon. members are going to keep on a running commentary no wonder the Minister cannot understand it. However, I have plenty of time. I want to say to the Minister that I was not arguing the merits or demerits of wage incentive schemes. What I was saying to the Minister was that if in one industry there were three or four or several wage incentive schemes operating in different factories, surely it should be the responsibility of someone in South Africa to have a look at those schemes and to decide which of those schemes is better than all the rest.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: You have to be an expert to decide what the scheme is like.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: But the Minister was an expert when he went round South Africa and spoke about these wage incentive schemes.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I spoke about the general principle.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Well, having been so wedded to the general principle and so in love with the general principle, should the Minister not have gone further and having persuaded a considerable number of workers of this country to accept that principle, should the Minister not try now to get the best out of it? But having ridden that horse to exhaustion, he is now turning to something else. That is my complaint. Surely it should be the responsibility of some department or some person to take this thing to its logical conclusion. I leave it at that, but I hope that the Minister will take note of it.

Now I want to deal with one other aspect with which I did not deal earlier, and that is the question of wage incentive schemes in cases

where there is no Industrial Council agreement but where there are merely wage determinations. What steps is the Minister taking to protect those workers against exploitation? There is no provision for it at the present time. Take the case of one factory that I know of. The workers are given a target and if they exceed that target they get a blue flag. The workers are being misled and workers are being bluffed with these wage incentive schemes. They are being promised pie in the sky. I think the Minister should consider the question of these wage determinations.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: In those cases a complaint should be submitted to my Department and I shall have it investigated.

Mr. HEPPLE: Is it not the Minister's duty to take the initiative?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: We have not the staff to inspect thousands of factories in South Africa every day.

Mr. HEPPLE: Should the Minister not ask the Wage Boards to see that in these determinations provision is made that where these schemes are applicable, certain minimum requirements should be complied with. It would not be difficult for the Minister to do that. He could make it an instruction to the Wage Board, and I am putting that suggestion to him in the hope that he will do something about it.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I will give it consideration.

Mr. HEPPLE: I want to leave this matter now with the Minister by saying to him that it is traditional in South Africa for Cabinet Ministers to pass the buck; I hope the Minister of Labour is not going to follow that course.

Mrs. BALLINGER: There are just two things I want to say to the hon. the Minister before this Vote passes. One is a very simple question. I want to ask him why on his estimates, in addition to this problematical £50 he has here, he has £3,500 here for trade-testing fees in relation to the Native Building Workers Act while the Native Affairs Vote makes provision for £5,000 partly for the same thing; I think it is also called trade testing and training for Native building workers. I have no doubt that it is due to some curious complicated accounting but I hope the Minister will give us some explanation of this peculiar overlap. There is another thing of more general importance that I want to say to the Minister. It comes out of the course of this debate. I have been very seriously concerned about the requests that are being made to the hon. the Minister to apply the Mines and Works Act to the field of secondary industry which, of course, it is within his power to do by proclamation. I took very careful stock of his own reply, which was that he was impressed with the anxiety of the European workers and the feeling of insecurity on their

part as against the Native workers. I want to ask him, in view of the terms of the last departmental report and his statement last year on the employment position, in which he underlined the fact that unemployment was the very merest fraction of the labour field, whether he is anticipating an economic contraction. On what grounds are the European workers anxious about the future, when in fact we have as full employment as anybody could possibly hope for in any country. He himself has said that we have .1 per cent of unemployment, and the only people who are really a problem at all are the semi-fits and the unfits for whom he has done a considerable amount in the way of subsidization of public bodies that undertake to employ them. I want to ask him what is his reason for this anxiety among the European workers. On what grounds are the European workers feeling insecure? Or is it simply a political illusion that they are feeling insecure? But, Sir, the speech of the hon. member for Umlazi (Mr. Eaton) put a new complexion on it. His argument suggests that what the hon. the Minister is facing is a change in the racial composition of the industrial field as a result of the progressive shortage of European workers and that it is the intention, therefore, to establish a pattern that will reduce the point of contact between Europeans and Africans, particularly those which might give rise to the suggestion that the Nationalist Party are encouraging social contact. The hon. the Minister replied to the hon. member for Umlazi by interjection that he would explain his plan in this regard when he brought in legislation. What I want to say to the hon. the Minister is this: For goodness sake don't bring in legislation until he has given us all a chance of discussing this matter in some sort of open and mutually confident way. There is no doubt about it that circumstances are developing in this countryside which will induce new industrial patterns. We have a shortage of European manpower; we have a very considerable amount of African labour which ought to be much more productive than it is. My own feeling is that, in spite of all the policies of political parties, industry is accommodating itself to the available labour supplies, and the suggestion now is that the Government is for social and other reasons going to change that pattern. I beg the hon. the Minister—who, on the whole, I must say, takes the labour view of the situation and not primarily the political view, except when the pressure from his party is too strong—not to frame legislation and then present us with a *fait accompli*. There are psychological factors in that situation which it is quite impossible to deal with. I trust, therefore, that the hon. the Minister will not do this, that he will in fact put the whole of the industrial situation before the House for full discussion and consideration before any attempt is made to bring in legislation which will establish a fixed pattern so that it becomes practically impossible to go back. I trust that we will get a guarantee from the hon. the Minister in that regard.

Mr. GAY: I wonder if the hon. the Minister would clear up what appears to be a little bit of misunderstanding, which I have no doubt he quite unwittingly created when he was dealing a few moments ago with the question of his visit overseas and the importation of skilled labour into the Union as a result of that visit. A few minutes ago the Minister mentioned that his visit overseas was for the purpose of attending the I.L.O. Conference and other conferences, but that it had no connection with a search for immigrants at the time. I know that the Minister has had a fairly heavy programme to deal with lately, but I would draw his attention to his comments to the House just before he left on that visit, when he certainly gave the impression that one of the objects of his visit overseas was to find skilled labour for this country. When he spoke of his visit overseas on 22 May 1951, very shortly before he left on that visit, after referring to his attendance at the conferences which were the main object of the visit, he said—

At the same time I will discuss matters of mutual interests with governments of several other countries. Included in these matters will be immigration, of course. Other matters will also be discussed. I am visiting Italy as a guest of the Italian Government. I have received an invitation and I have accepted it. In Italy I not only want to see the method of training of their artisans, but I am also very interested in their building methods.

Then the hon. Minister went on to describe certain difficulties in our building industry in South Africa, which are irrelevant to this particular point at the moment, and at a later stage in the same speech he said—

Then I am visiting West Germany to discuss matters of mutual interest with the German Government. I also want to satisfy myself in regard to the degree of skill their artisans attain. The same thing applies to Holland, and of course to Britain, where I will remain probably for a few weeks. I shall also have discussions on these lines with the British Government.

The whole tenor of that debate was dealing with the obtaining of suitable immigrants overseas to boost up the shortage in the State departments of the country at the time. Whether it was unintentional or not, I think the House was certainly left under the impression—I certainly was—that the hon. the Minister during that visit was going to do what he could to see that we got a flow of the right sort of immigrants from these countries which he was visiting. That is in complete contradiction with the Minister's statement a few moments ago, and there seems to be some misunderstanding, which is not usual with this Minister, and I though that he might just clarify the position.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I said that I did not go to recruit immigrants. That was my statement a few minutes ago: I did not go to recruit immigrants. I had discussions with the different governments. I found that the governments were not at all anxious to allow their skilled workers to emigrate. I investigated also matters appertaining to the skill of the craftsmen in those countries, but I did not go to recruit immigrants. I did go to find out whether those governments were agreeable to allowing their skilled men to emigrate, and I investigated the degree of skill that has been obtained by the artisans. But there were other matters that I discussed with those governments. I made a study of their industrial legislation, amongst other things. So there is nothing contradictory in what I said then and my statement just now.

The hon. member for Cape Eastern (Mrs. Ballinger) wants to know about this amount of £3,500 for "Trade Testing Fees". Well, a final decision had not been taken yet which department will undertake the trade testing—Native Affairs or Labour. That is why an amount appears on both these Votes.

Mrs. BALLINGER: So that one can hand back the money.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: In any case the money that is not utilized is paid back to the Treasury. In regard to the other matter the hon. member raised, I can assure her that there will be the fullest discussion before legislation is introduced.

Vote put and agreed to.

On Vote No. 35.—"Public Works", £6,223,000.

Mr. GAY: There are one or two questions in regard to which perhaps the Minister could give us a little bit more information on this particular Vote. Under Head E we find a substantial increase in the amount debited against us this year under the heading of "Native Pass Fees and Payments under the Native Service Levy Act". The amount budgeted for shows an increase of something in the region of £11,000 to £12,000. I take it that the increase is largely as a result of the Native service levy falling due this year, but as the Minister responsible for this increase in expenditure, I want to ask him if he is satisfied that he is getting a return for the money we are called upon to spend, a return in the form of Native housing as a result of that levy. Is it merely an amount paid into a fund, or is it being converted into bricks and mortar?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Nothing has been done yet. The Act has only recently been promulgated. We are going to pay in terms of the Act.

Mr. GAY: But very substantial amounts have already been accumulated by local

served the interests of the country better if the country and the House had been informed in advance of the contents of an important Bill such as this apparently is. I want to say that in the absence of such publication, I would press on the Government the necessity for a long interval between the introduction to-day and the second reading stage, so that the Opposition would have an opportunity of studying the provisions of the Bill and doing its proper duty to the country and so that the country would also have an opportunity of appreciating the full significance and contents of the Bill.

Mr. HEPPLE: Because South Africa knows perfectly well the intention of the Bill which the Minister of Justice is asking leave to introduce in this House, we of the Labour Party are going to oppose this motion. The sorry history of the attempts to remove the Coloured voters from the common roll . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss that.

Mr. HEPPLE: We are going to oppose this measure because the hon. the Prime Minister at the Joint Sitting on Wednesday informed the country that his Government was now going to take the next step, which he promised us would be constitutional, in order to achieve that purpose—the purpose of removing the Coloured people from the common roll. In view of the fact that we have had that advance notice of this Bill and the purpose of this Bill, we of the Labour Party are not even interested in its contents, because its purpose is one which we of the Opposition have steadfastly opposed for the last few years. By opposing this application for leave to introduce we wish at the very outset to register our strongest protest at the attitude of the Government in persisting with a matter that is causing a great deal of . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is irrelevant now.

Mr. HEPPLE: The country in having to discuss the proposed measure by the Minister of Justice is no doubt going to be involved in a great deal of expense and unrest. Mr. Speaker, with these few words I will leave it there, but I want to inform the House that we of the Labour Party oppose this motion and we will divide the House on it.

Mr. STUART: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the limitations imposed on anybody speaking at this particular stage of any Bill, but I feel a certain difficulty in regard to which I would like to ask your advice and in regard to which I feel I need elucidation. This is quite obviously a Bill in some way affecting the Appellate Division. I haven't seen the Bill, nobody has seen the Bill, except presumably the person about to introduce it—that I am entitled to assume. Now actually

we have one difficulty about approaching anything to do with the Appellate Division and that is a ruling given by you, Sir, in this House, some week or two ago on the question of the extent to which any doings, actions or inactions of the Appellate Division Judges, past, present or future, could be attacked at all, and if this Bill is coming up in order to open some angle at present to me as the speaker, unknown, though suspected, and we have to deal with that position in the near future, then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether in fact we would be bound by such ruling, or whether circumstances . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! These remarks have nothing to do with the stage before the House now. The hon. member cannot continue in that strain.

Mr. STUART: Then I will forget about that, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry if I don't get any help.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot say that. He must abide by the rules of the House and observe the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. STUART: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The other point that was put by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is one which I put a little more strongly, if I can do do it, to the hon. the Minister introducing this Bill, and that is this: We have just had a statement made by the hon. the Prime Minister indicating the amount of work to be done in this House in the immediate future prior to our stopping our activities, and of course this Bill falls in as one of those . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is irrelevant now.

Mr. STUART: Perhaps I may be allowed a minute to indicate what I meant by that; then the irrelevancy may not be immediately apparent. The point I was going to put is this that the request that we should be given information about this Bill in advance as was made by the Leader of the Opposition, seems to be so essentially reasonable that I do press upon the hon. the Minister the necessity or advisability of saying something at this stage. He has merely moved, he has made no further statement at all. It is impossible for us, as I well know, to raise any discussion on the first reading of the Bill—at least I imagine that to be the case, because I understand on authority that only at the time when leave is being sought, can one speak at all. I am in the same position as the Labour Party and as the United Party. Like the United Party I have suspicions as to what this Bill may be, and like the Labour Party I say that if my suspicion is correct and it is a certain type of Bill, then I am bitterly opposed to it and, subject always to the Rules of the House and your discipline, Mr. Speaker, I propose to do

everything that I humanly can to oppose the Bill, if it turns out that my suspicions are justified. That is the point I wish to put. That being the case would it not be very wise if the Minister of Justice pointed out to us that those suspicions are not justified? It may be a triviality. I do not know in the sense that knowledge is absolute. If I have suspicions born out of previous experience of this type of legislation, then the Minister himself can wipe away those suspicions so simply and so easily. He can take all my troubles away from me and leave me with a clear mind in order to approach whatever the Bill may be without these fears. Surely the hon. the Minister could give us that little assistance and surely he could tell us: "No this has nothing whatever to do with wild remarks uttered by other Ministers during a previous sitting of the Higher Court of Parliament; this has got nothing whatever to do with that; it has got no relation at all". In that way he would assist us materially and I do hope that he will do that, and that he will take it seriously and that he will realize that if he has a Bill that he wants to get through, much the best way is to take us into his confidence and tell us what it is all about.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: This motion is one asking for leave to introduce a Bill "to amend the law relating to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa". As has been said, we do not know what that Bill is. We all have a genuine fear that it is going to interfere and meddle with the rights of our Judiciary and with our courts. Now I do not want to go any further into that, but I should like, Mr. Speaker, to have your guidance by putting a question to the hon. the Minister. I do not know whether I would be out of order, but before putting that question, I must refer to the fact that last year there was a Bill introduced into this House which was also intended to interfere with the rights of our Appellate Division. That Bill was introduced by the Minister of the Interior. This Bill is now being introduced by the hon. the Minister of Justice. The question I want to put is this: Does that denote that there are differences in the Cabinet?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is irrelevant.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: I am asking . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: No, the hon. member is irrelevant.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. the Minister of Justice asks this House—

For leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa.

He moved that motion quite bluntly and without giving any reasons whatsoever for asking

this House to assent to the motion. Now I know that in the ordinary course of our Parliamentary procedure that is the custom; that, at this particular stage of the introduction of a Bill, the Minister responsible does no more than to rise in the House and to move for leave to introduce. But the present occasion, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has very rightly pointed out, is a peculiar, an extraordinary occasion. It is common knowledge amongst members on both sides of the House that the Bill, which the hon. the Minister is asking this House to be allowed to introduce, is part and parcel of the Government's scheme to further their end in respect of which they were defeated on two occasions . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss that. That is altogether irrelevant at this stage.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Sir, I submit with respect that I am entitled to ask the hon. gentleman why he asks us to give him leave to introduce this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: That the hon. member may ask, but he cannot argue that now.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I want to ask him why does he ask this House to give him leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to the Appellate Division? Why is it necessary at this time of the day that the law relating to the Appellate Division should be altered? When the hon. the Minister got to his feet this afternoon, I was racking my mind to think of some reason that might actuate the hon. the Minister. I was trying to think of some motive that might be actuating the Minister of Justice which might have influenced the Cabinet in coming to the decision that it is necessary, in the interests of the proper administration of law, to amend the law relating to the Appellate Division. But when I thought, Sir, I could see no reason. I have cast over in my mind the various Statutes relating to the Appellate Division. I know the recent legislation that was introduced. I think in 1949, by which the Appellate Division of the Union of South Africa was given jurisdiction to hear criminal appeals on questions of fact and not merely on question of law reserved on legal points; and I have been trying to think in the short time while the hon. the Minister was on his feet of what could possibly be actuating the hon. the Minister, what has influenced the Government in taking this line, because I have always understood from the hon. the Minister of Justice that in his view the members of our Appellate Division are the finest in the world. I remember . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot argue that way at this stage. The hon. member knows full well that he cannot argue that at this stage.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Sir, I am not arguing . . .

would make it even worse? The second method mentioned by the hon. member is the fiscal method to combat the cost of living. This means that by means of taxation you attempt to overcome inflation, and now that the hon. the Minister of Finance is proposing a few additional taxes, just a few additional taxes asking about £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 more from the people, there are complaints by hon. members on the other side about these additional taxes which are supposed to be so oppressive.

*Mr. DURRANT: Look again at your figures.

*Dr. DIEDERICHS: I will be prepared, although it is unnecessary, to look once again at the figures if the hon. member will look at them for the first time. Hon. members of the Opposition must once and for all say what they want. Do they want a deflationary policy here in South Africa to lower the cost of living, or do they want to continue with their propaganda against the Minister because he is pursuing a deflationary policy?

The hon. member for Houghton told us that another method would be to increase productivity in the country. That is quite correct. We accept that. We must increase productivity in the country. We on this side of the House have also always said so. But let us go back a little to see what proposals they make to promote productivity. Was it not the members on the other side who closed the vocational schools and the agricultural schools during the war, the schools which have to enlighten and educate the people so that higher productivity can be achieved? Was it not those people who, in a period of a few years when 31,000 young boys made application to become apprentices, accepted only 12,000 and rejected 19,000? Those people could have been trained under the Apprenticeship Act and could have contributed to greater productivity in the country. And then they speak about increasing productivity! Was it not the present Government which amended and improved the Apprenticeship Act and adapted it to the requirements of modern times? Was it not this Government which passed an Act in connection with artisans so that even artisans of an advanced age were assisted to become more productive? Was it not this Government which introduced the idea of incentive pay to increase productivity still further? What positive support did we receive from that side of the House in all those matters? I maintain that hon. members on the other side, during all the five years in which I have been in this House, have not brought forward one single positive idea for the advancement of the economy of South Africa, except one—their one solution of our economic question lies in immigration from outside and integration from below. That is their solution of our problem; to bring in the Black people more and more into our economic life, to integrate them more and more into our economic system, and if that is not sufficient, then we must bring in as

many people as possible from abroad. They have no faith in the Europeans of South Africa; they want to bring in the Black man of South Africa and they want to import Europeans from overseas to solve their problems.

I come to my last point. The hon. member Vereeniging, who is not in his seat, interrupted me a few times and asked: "What do you say about a depression?" Let me say that I spoke in this direction and I do not retract one word I said, but let me once again make clear what I did say and what I did not say. I did not say that South Africa was on the brink of a depression. I have never said that in South Africa a depression is just around the corner, that there will be a depression in the near future. What I did say was this, that economic history shows that there are periods of prosperity and periods of recession. During the past 100 or 200 years that has happened regularly. I said that wars and armaments could ward off a depression, that droughts and other adverse circumstances may extend a depression, but there is a cycle, a regularity in the economic life right throughout the world, and according to that cycle we can expect a depression to occur once more in the world. I did not say that South Africa was going to experience a depression in the near future. I also did not say that, economically, South Africa was in such a position that it was heading for a depression. Never. I believe that if there is one country in the world to-day which is stable enough to resist a depression, then it is South Africa under the wise policy of this Government, and if a depression should come, it will not originate here but it will come from overseas. I stated clearly here that it was like a disease which knows no borders, something which oversteps the international limits, and should a depression come it will come from outside and our economic structure, our economic framework, is in a better position than that of any other country to resist a depression, thanks to the policy of this Government. I want to point out that the reason for that is that this Government did not fall for all the plans of that side of the House, all the plans for immigration and integration and inflation and what not. This Government is following a policy of consolidation, the policy of consolidation as set out by Dr. de Kock of the Reserve Bank and as accepted by the Minister of Economic Affairs. It is that policy of consolidation which is going to protect South Africa if there should be a depression. Here I can mention the fight of the present Government against inflation which has prevented inflation from reaching the peak here which it has reached in other countries and because inflation in South Africa has never reached the heights which it has reached in other countries, South Africa will never fall to the depths to which other countries may fall in a period of depression. I also want to mention the policy of the Government in respect of the Unemployment Insurance Fund which the other side of the House already wants to pay out. The policy of the Government in

Depression -
Nazi attitude to workers.
Reference in T. U.

Hepple
Appropriation Bill - 2nd Reading

respect of its Unemployment Insurance Fund is a wise policy because it is there building up a fund which in times of depression can be used to stabilize and to increase the purchasing power of the people. In the second place I want to point out that it is the policy of the Government in respect of public works not to scatter new public works all over the country as that side of the House has often advocated, but to ration them so that in a time of recession or depression, we can continue with public works in order to create purchasing power in the country. And I particularly want to mention the policy of the Government with respect to the gold-mining industry. This Government has always done all it can to stabilize the gold-mining industry and to maintain it, knowing that in time of depression the gold-mining industry and gold are the strongest bulwarks against a depression and a stabilizing factor in a period of depression. For that we have never received any thanks from that side of the House. We never hear a word of gratitude from that side of the House to the hon. the Minister of Finance for not taxing the gold mines as he might have done. We hear no thanks from that side of the House for the courageous efforts of the Minister of Finance to obtain an increase in the price of gold in terms of the dollar. Therein lies a part of his policy for the strengthening of the economic position of South Africa in times of depression as well.

I want to conclude with this thought: Members on the other side simply refuse to realize in how difficult a position South Africa finds herself in regard to gold, and that we cannot be compared to other countries, as the hon. the Minister of Finance has already said, because the price of our most important export product has remained constant for nearly 20 years in terms of the dollar. If the price of our gold had risen along with the prices of other commodities which have risen two and a quarter times during the last 15 or 20 years, or if the gold price had only doubled, then we would have had no problems in South Africa—then we would have had no problems as regards the balance of payments; our revenue from gold would have been twice as high and we would have had no investment problems because everybody would have wanted to invest in gold; the State would then have received more revenue from them and we would have had greater prosperity. No, we are surprised that, despite the fact that South Africa's most important product has remained constant in price while everything else in the world has risen two and a quarter times, South Africa's economy is still as sound as it is to-day, despite that handicap. That is only due to the conservative and far-sighted policy of the present Government.

The hon. member for Vereeniging did not enter the debate to deal with these economic questions in an uneconomically objective manner; he merely took part in the debate in order to make propaganda, to exploit the difficulties of the country—because there are difficulties—to exploit the problems facing the Govern-

ment—because there are problems—not in an attempt to help to find a solution but to make political capital from them. In this respect, we reject those attacks by him, because if they wanted to be constructive in their attacks, they would have come forward with a positive policy, but we are entitled to say that the United Party has absolutely no economic and financial policy. All the hon. member for Vereeniging can bring forward is a piece of political propaganda.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: It is always interesting to listen to the hon. member for Randfontein, because he is the economic expert of the Nationalist Party and he is always able to give the House a mass of figures to prove whatever case he is asked to prove. The hon. member for Randfontein (Dr. Diederichs) unfortunately has ruined his reputation this Session, because he has been guilty of acrobatics as far as his economic theories are concerned. The hon. member for Randfontein got up in this House, earlier on in this Session, and quite rightly, I think, he asked the Government what they were going to do, what steps they were going to take in order to meet a depression that was upon South Africa. The day after the hon. member for Randfontein spoke the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs was delegated to rise in this House to repudiate him. I think it is necessary for us to quote the actual words of the hon. member for Randfontein, because he now says that he did not say that there was a depression coming, that he did not say that there was a depression coming to-morrow or the day after to-morrow, or when it would come—what he was talking about was something quite different, he says. But this is what the hon. member said—

I would like to direct a few words to the hon. the Minister in the form of a question in regard to this "phantom", viz. a coming depression. If hon. members were to ask me what I know about a coming depression, I would tell them that I know nothing about it. I do not know when it will come; I do not know in what form it will come, and I do not know how seriously it will affect us and how long it will last, but I do know one thing, viz. that this depression will come.

Further on he continued and repeated the same thing—

One thing is sure, and I think we can accept the fact that there will be a depression.

Mr. SCHOLTZ: When?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I quite appreciate the difficulty hon. members are in, the same difficulty the hon. Minister of Economic Affairs was in. The hon. member for Randfontein threw the fat into the fire, and I can well understand why he threw the fat into the fire, because as

an economist he realizes that this Government is leading South Africa to ruin and his economic instincts directed him to tell the truth. He had to throw his politics to the winds and speak as an economist and he had to state the facts. I appreciate the position he was in.

Mr. SCHOLTZ: What did he say?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: If the hon. member for Namaqualand wants me to continue to read, I will read a bit more of what he said—

The question I want to ask the hon. the Minister is whether he or the Government have given any attention to the possibility of an approaching depression and the measures we ought to take at this stage, the plans we should make now for the steps which we will have to take to counteract the bad effects of a depression.

I want to say to the hon. member for Randfontein that he could not have done a greater disservice to this country or to the Minister of Finance if he was preaching a depression. In saying what he did say, he was telling the rest of the world, where we are trying to seek money, that in South Africa there is a depression round the corner. It may be that in a highly industrialized country, or greatly developed country like America or Great Britain that they are worried about the economic results that might flow from the cessation of hostilities in Korea, but South Africa is in a different position. In fact, under the present circumstances, South Africa should be a good place for investment. But the hon. member says that if the other countries have that fear, South Africa, although a young developing country, has that fear to a greater degree. I deal with this question merely to rebut the arguments of the hon. member for Randfontein, who now tries to pretend to the House that he was in fact misunderstood. I do not think he was misunderstood at all. I leave that matter there. It is open to hon. members on the Government side to take part in the debate instead of just making interjections. What concerns me is that in a debate of this nature it is quite impossible to get members on the Government side of the House, or Ministers, to deal realistically with the problems of the mass of the people of this country. The discussion of the cost-of-living in this House has become a yearly joke.

Dr. DIEDERICHS: It is a joke.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member says it is a joke. I know that that is the attitude of the Government side.

Dr. DIEDERICHS: The joke is on your side.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The cost-of-living may be a joke for Nationalist politicians, but it is no

joke for the mass of the people of this country. The people of this country are suffering and have been suffering for years under the crushing burden of ever-rising prices and pegged wages and cost-of-living allowances. The cost-of-living allowances in this country have always lagged far behind the increase in prices of commodities, and every member of this House knows that. It is an absolute fact. But in addition to that—and it is a point that I have made in this House before—the wage and salary earners in this country have not had an opportunity to overtake rising prices with increased wages or salaries, before they hear talk of a depression. Now they have a new problem. So far they have been getting into debt, while struggling against this rising cost of living. Now they are faced with talk of unemployment. I want to tell the hon. members on the Government side, in case they do not understand it, that this is not an economic theory to the man in the street, but a harsh reality. A depression means unemployment, it means being out of work, being unable to find the wherewithal for the family to procure the necessities of life. It is not an economic theory to the man in the street. That is the approach I would like hon. members on the Government side to have to this serious problem, because this talk of a depression is not a piece of political propaganda, but a grave threat to the living standard of the people of this country, and I say I am frightened if there is to be a depression, very frightened.

Dr. J. O. H. DU PLESSIS: Why then talk about it?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member asks why I talk about it. Why should I, like hon. members on the Government side, whistle to keep up my courage and say that it is not there? I say that the hon. member for Randfontein was right in so far as he appealed to the Government to throw all its political propaganda to the winds and to come down to the reality of the problem.

Dr. DIEDERICHS: When did I do that?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member did that, and I am with him there, I support him wholeheartedly. I say that any government worth its salt would devote its time to preparing to save the people from the impact of a recession or a depression, and I say that he made a very realistic appeal to the Government, but unfortunately politics proved stronger than economics, and therefore the Government is going to do nothing in that regard. I want to say, however, that we cannot close our eyes to the frightening figures of the price spiral in South Africa. The figures have been quoted in this House before. We have been promised that shortly we were going to turn the corner and that this year's Budget was going to be the first step towards dealing with the question of inflation, turning back the spiral and so making the £ buy more. But what in fact has

happened? Only this morning we got the latest cost-of-living figures, the retail price index for August, and it has reached the highest point in the history of this country. The retail price index for the nine main centres of this country in August 1953 reached 195.8 in comparison with 146.7 in May 1948. This increase of nearly 40 per cent, in the retail price index means a bitter struggle in regard to the family budget. Year after year we rise in this House to make appeals to the Government, but we are accused of making political propaganda and we are told that we are lucky that we do not live in Rhodesia, or Timbuctoo, or the South Sea Islands, where the position is much worse. But we are South Africans and we live here and we are concerned with the cost-of-living in South Africa.

Mr. BARLOW: They have never been so rich as they are to-day.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member for Hospital (Mr. Barlow) says that we have never been so rich as we are to-day. I hope the hon. member for Hospital is not talking about the man in the street.

Mr. BARLOW: I am employer of men and I know.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: We know the hon. member's attitude to these things. He lives in the realm of luxury, and I do not want to argue with the hon. member for Hospital. Because he lives in a land of milk and honey, he thinks everybody else does. Let him go to his constituency and see how people in his own constituency live.

Mr. BARLOW: What about your own constituency?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: In my constituency, too. I was saying that the retail price index has gone up to 195.8 in August, but that is not the end of it. We have before us the gloomy prospect of the effect of the increase in the price of petrol and the increase in railway rates, as a result of which prices will rise still further and the retail index will rise still higher. The struggle for existence for the wage and salary earners is going to get worse and worse.

Mr. DU PISANIE: Have the wages not gone up?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member for Germiston says "And if wages go up?" I suppose the object of the member's question is to say that if wages go up, the spiral will continue to rise and prices will increase. That is an old technique used to refuse workers an increase in wages and cost-of-living allowances. It is the easiest excuse. But it is not only wages and salaries that force up prices. There are a considerable number of other items. I have just mentioned two, the petrol price and the railway rates. Then there is such a thing

as rents. I do not know whether the hon. member for Germiston thinks that it is right the amount of rent working people have to pay to-day. And there are a considerable number of other things which all contribute to the high cost-of-living. Now the Minister of Finance has made it quite clear that there is going to be no further increase in the cost-of-living allowances for anybody in this country whether they are in the Government service or outside. There is going to be no commensurate increase in cost-of-living allowances to offset these increased prices, and so the working man has to carry the burden of this inflation, nobody else. In addition to that, wages are not going to be increased, but taxes have gone up, taxes for the lower income groups have gone up. And so it is the old sorry story, the poor have got to pay the piper. The hon. member for Randfontein has quite correctly pointed out in this House before that it is no use arguing the question of the cost-of-living with the Minister of Economic Affairs, because only 30 per cent of the items that are contained in the retail price index come under his purview. Food comes under the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture says that there is nothing he can do about it; the prices of food have to go up, otherwise farming would be uneconomic in this country. The Minister of Transport says: How can I make the Railways pay if I do not get higher rates for the Railways and higher fares? So it goes on and so it comes back to the wage and salary earners in this country, and the more we argue in this House and the more we appeal to the Government for a different approach to this problem, the less response we get.

I want to relate this to another problem and that is the problem of the workers themselves. While they have been beaten as far as their economic status is concerned, parallel with that we have an attack by the Government on the trade union movement. In other words, this Government is going to make sure that the workers of this country will not be able to resist; they are going to be oppressed and ground down without being able to resist, without being able to hit back. That is the plan. That is what is going to happen. By removing their leaders, by emasculating the trade unions of this country, this Government is making sure that in times of an economic crisis, the workers of this country will have to eat humble pie, will have to accept the worsening economic conditions and like it, and they will not be able to retaliate. In other words, they are to become paupers and to be afraid to speak up for themselves. That is the pattern that is being built by this Government.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Ceres (Mr. P. J. H. Luttig) is not in the House, because I would like to remind the hon. member in the presence of the rest of the House of what he said—just as an illustration. Other members hold the same view, but he had the arrogance to speak out in this House, and

showed their attitude to the workers of this country. He said, speaking in this House on 30 July of this year—

One thing is certain and that is that our labourers, particularly our non-Europeans, will have to realize that they will have to do more work for the wages they receive. There is a tendency towards high wages to-day while the work done is as little as possible.

An HON. MEMBER: What is wrong with that?

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member asks "What is wrong with that?" The hon. member for Ceres continued—

There is a tendency towards high wages to-day while the work done is as little as possible. Take the building industry, for instance. Whereas a bricklayer laid an average of 1,500 bricks per day before 1949, they only laid 300 to 400 a day a few years ago. You need five men to do the same amount of work as one bricklayer did before 1939.

Mr. FRONEMAN: Quite true.

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member says "Quite true". He is a lawyer, you see. To finish the quotation of the hon. member for Ceres—

I think that we as members of Parliament should raise our voices against this tendency of constantly demanding higher wages and constantly doing less work for those wages.

Just imagine an hon. member of this House making such a statement that workers are constantly doing less work and demanding more wages! If there is anybody who is guilty of doing less work for higher wages, it is some members of Parliament.

Mr. VON MOLTKE: Including yourself?

Mr. HEPPLE: No, not including myself. I want to say to the hon. member for Ceres when he talks about 1,500 bricks a day, that I would like to see him lay 1,500 bricks a day or the hon. member for Karas (Mr. Von Moltke). I would like to see him merely throw 1,500 bricks a day from one side to the other, each brick weighing 9 lbs. I challenge any one of those members on the Government side to do a day's manual work. I will start a roster of members for that purpose. I want to see them do it. You see, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of members opposite is that of theorists. They cannot do a practical job. Let them work outside in all kinds of weather to earn a living and see what happens.

Mr. A. STEYN: And what do you know about manual work?

Mr. HEPPLE: Men in their twenties and even men in their late sixties have to do work outside. When members sneer like the hon. member for Ceres (Mr. P. J. H. Luttig) sneers at the road-workers who stand and lean on their shovels, I would like to see him to that sort of work, him and his friends, and see how long they will last. This constant sneering at the workers is becoming a disgrace. The hon. members on the Government side go to these same workers and plead for their vote and pretend they are their friends and they are quick enough to take their votes. Hon. members on the Government side of the House might be in a state of temporary exultation because they think they are sitting pretty, but I want to tell them that they are sitting pretty for a very short time. [Interjection.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

An HON. MEMBER: You are sitting here by the grace of the United Party.

Mr. HEPPLE: While they have that attitude, this contempt for the workers of South Africa, they reveal it in their attempt to destroy the resistance of the trade union movement. I have raised this question here before and I make no apology for raising it again, because I got no satisfactory reply last time. Unfortunately, none of the Ministers concerned is in the House. They very seldom are. But I raised this question before, hoping that I would get some sort of satisfaction.

An HON. MEMBER: What a hope!

Mr. HEPPLE: When the Minister of Justice replied to me on one occasion he made a statement, and I thought I had not heard him correctly, so I took the trouble to read the printed report of his speech and I see he said the following in connection with the removal of trade union officials from their posts—

It is not our policy to interfere with the activities of the trade unions.

An HON. MEMBER: That is correct.

Mr. HEPPLE: I want hon. members to listen quietly to this because it is important—

Hon. members know that trade unions are now excluded from the provisions of the law

But they are not excluded from the provisions of the law. Where does the Minister get that? It is not true. Trade unions are not excluded from the provisions of the law.

Mr. MENTZ: Trade unions as such are not excluded from the provisions of the law.

Mr. HEPPLE: That is just juggling with words—

Trade unions are not excluded from the provisions of the Suppression of Communism Act.

I have put questions to the Minister on this point and I have had various replies because the Government acts with such zeal in this regard that their figures change every day and almost every hour. On 18 September I asked the Minister of Justice whether he would tell me how many trade union officials had been discharged or ordered to resign from their organization, and he replied that in terms of Section 5 it was 17, and in terms of Section 9 it was 16, making a total of 33.

An HON. MEMBER: Is that the trade union as such.

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member asks whether that is the trade union as such. That is a peculiar question to ask. This law does not deal with trade unions; it deals with individuals, and when you are attacking the officials of a trade union you are attacking the trade union.

HON. MEMBERS: No, nonsense.

Mr. HEPPLE: Of course you do. I am not interested in these assurances we get from members on the Government side of the House. I am interested in another aspect of the matter, and it is this. I doubt very seriously whether the Government is really concerned with dealing with Communism as such, or whether it is concerned with dealing with Communism in the trade union movement. I make the statement here that this Government is only concerned with removing the militant trade unionists who will resist their plans. That is the first step in a greater plan, a plan to have a new labour pattern in this country. I can see it. It is becoming clearer by the day. In order to carry out this plan, it was essential that they should have a black list which could not be tested in a court of law, and that is the basis on which they operate.

I now want to give another side of the picture which seems to be unknown to members of this House. I think it is essential that it should go on record. Various co-ordinating bodies of the trade unions in South Africa, not only the Left wing bodies but also the Right wing bodies, met in Johannesburg in June 1952 to discuss this question, and arising out of those discussions they elected a delegation to wait upon the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Labour. That delegation eventually met the Prime Minister and the other two Ministers in Pretoria, and they stated their attitude towards this Act. They were told that the Government was determined to deal with Communism and Communists as such in the trade unions of this country, and the delegation was asked to submit to the Government alternative proposals that would lead to the dealing with Communism as such. The delegation went back to their conference and

reported this, and they submitted a memorandum to the Government containing alternative proposals, but until this day they have not heard a word about it from the Government. Unfortunately the three Ministers concerned are not in the House now. I want to ask the Government: Why this blanket of silence? Why this iron curtain? I read into it something very sinister indeed, because if the motives of the Government had been genuine they would have been only too ready to reply and to meet these trade unions and to give them an answer. But no, they are not concerned about that. They want to pretend—and there I agree with the hon. member for Vereeniging (Mr. S. J. M. Steyn)—not only here in South Africa but to the world, that the Government is waging a holy war against Communism. They are doing this as a propaganda effort in order to divert attention away from their own actions.

HON. MEMBERS: Nonsense!

Mr. HEPPLE: I agree with the hon. member for Vereeniging when he says that this is just a façade behind which they want to hide. Because the world is ranged against the possibility of Communist aggression they want to use this to hide their own actions. That is what they are doing. But I want to tell this Government that they are deceiving no one. I have said to the Minister of Labour on several occasions, and I say it in this House again, that the trade union movement in the rest of the world is very disturbed as to what is happening in this country. The method of defining who is a Communist and who is not a Communist in the South African trade union movement is not only a matter of concern in South Africa, but also in other parts of the world.

Mr. VON MOLTKE: Is that what you tell them?

Mr. HEPPLE: I want to say . . .

Mr. VON MOLTKE: May I ask you a question? Are you in favour of retaining Communists in trade unions in South Africa?

Mr. HEPPLE: I am in favour of letting the trade unions elect and reject their own officials and I say that no outside body has the right to interfere with that. If the trade unions feel inclined to elect a Communist as an official it is their own business and no business of the Government and no business of mine.

Mr. DU PISANIE: You do not realize your responsibilities.

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member says I do not realize my responsibilities. I am not a Fascist. I do not believe in despotism in dealing with people with whom I disagree.

An HON. MEMBER: Are you a Communist?

Mr. EATON: You do not have to be a Communist to be named in this country.

Mr. VON MOLTKE: You have to be a Communist to be named.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will hon. members please allow the hon. member for Rosettenville to make his speech.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Thank you, Sir. The trade unions must have the right to elect or reject their own officials, and I say that any government, here or in any other part of the world, which takes away that right, is guilty of gross interference and lays itself open to the charge of being undemocratic and despotic. I will reply to the hon. member for Karas (Mr. von Moltke) in this way. If he would make a study of trade unionism and Communism and Socialism . . .

Mr. VON MOLTKE: Which I have done.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: If he would do that he would know that the question of political affiliations does not go as deep as he seems to believe.

Mr. VON MOLTKE: It is because I have made that study that I say you are talking nonsense.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Look at the position in Britain. There are trade unions in Great Britain who have as their elected officials leading Communists, but these trade unions, by a popular vote, have a levy to be affiliated with the British Labour Party which is anti-Communist.

Mr. VON MOLTKE: But which is Socialist.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: After electing a Communist official, they democratically strike a levy to affiliate themselves with the British Labour Party. I make no apology for raising this matter in the House this afternoon, because I am trying to throw some light on a dark subject, because there seems to be a tremendous amount of confusion and misunderstanding in regard to this particular matter. I want the hon. members on the Government side of the House to be warned that what they are doing to-day is not going to harm me. It is not going to harm individuals in this country, but it will harm the mass of the working people of South Africa who will be unable to fight for their existence because their trade unions will be of no use to them in time of need, because the trade union leaders in whom they had trust have been removed. Consequently they can have an economic policy applied to them in this country which will result in nothing but poverty and degradation for them. I appeal to the members opposite to forget their political propaganda.

*Mr. GREYLING: May I ask a question? What will the hon. member say if a trade union in this country affiliates itself with the

Nationalist Party? Will he be in favour of it or not?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Certainly. I say that if a trade union in this country affiliates itself with the Nationalist Party, they have every right to do so, and I say that if they want to have a levy to affiliate themselves with my party or with the United Party, they have every right to do so. I hope the hon. member will support me in that view. The trade unions, if they democratically affiliate to political parties, will be on the right road, because economics is politics, and unless the workers in this country have a bigger say in this House they will have very little hope of a better existence.

*Mr. MENTZ: Mr. Speaker, I think that as from to-day there ought to be no doubt in the mind of anyone as to where the Labour Party stands. The hon. Leader of the Labour Party was very clear to-day. The hon. member for Karas (Mr. von Moltke) put a question to him, which he replied to very willingly, whether he was willing that Communists should be leaders of trade unions in South Africa. His reply was that trade unions should be left free to choose their own leaders.

*Mr. LOVELL: Hear, hear!

*Mr. MENTZ: In other words, they should have the right to elect even the greatest Communist in South Africa.

*Mr. LOVELL: Yes.

*Mr. MENTZ: That is what the Leader of the Labour Party says and it is also what the hon. member for Benoni says now. That is their policy. Then they must not take it amiss if I say to-day for the umpteenth time in this House that those members of the Labour Party are the protectors of Communists.

Mr. LOVELL: You are talking nonsense.

*Mr. MENTZ: The hon. member has just said so.

Mr. LOVELL: We are protecting the trade unions.

*Mr. MENTZ: We are now quite convinced as to what their standpoint is. The hon. member was asked whether he would be in favour of trade unions being affiliated with political parties and he said yes, under certain circumstances, certainly; but then they are the people who attack this Government all the time and say that we interest ourselves in the trade unions. I do not want to go further in regard to this matter of Communism, except to say this. Those hon. members must realize that that Act is on the Statute Book to-day. When they openly say that they protect Communists in the trade unions, they must not take it amiss when this Government says that it is prepared to remove every single Communist official from the trade unions. We will not argue the matter further.

I want to deal with another point. I came to the conclusion this afternoon that what that hon. member knows about labour is dangerous both to himself and to his party. We have to be realistic in regard to the workers. I represent workers and until recently my whole constituency was composed of workers. But I am not afraid to say that if we want to reduce the cost of living, our workers have to produce more. But what does the hon. member want? He tells this side of the House: I do not believe that a single one of you know what it is to perform physical labour.

*An HON. MEMBER: And we are all farmers!

*Mr. MENTZ: I wonder whether that hon. member has done manual labour for one minute during his whole life. I do not think so.

*An HON. MEMBER: I should like to have him on my farm for a week.

*Mr. MENTZ: I am not afraid to say it. But I want to go a little further. The hon. member was so concerned about the rise in the cost of living.

*Mr. LOVELL: Which does not worry you.

*Mr. MENTZ: I just want to tell the hon. member for Benoni (Mr. Lovell), with your permission, Mr. Speaker, that if he would just fall 3,000 feet in his own opinion he would perhaps be himself. Now the hon. member for Rosettenville (Mr. Hepple), I say, is one of those who is very concerned about the rise in the cost of living. I now want to ask him how he will bring about a reduction in the cost of living. I now want to ask him how he will bring about a reduction in the cost of living in regard to the building worker. There are only two possible methods, and I have repeatedly said so in my constituency. If one takes the building worker he referred to to-day, one can reduce the cost of living in two ways. The one is by reducing wages. Does my hon. friend want that? I do not want it. If he wants to reduce the cost of living only one alternative remains, namely, higher productivity. I recently held a meeting in my constituency and questions were put to me. I asked the person who cross-examined me: What were your wages as a bricklayer in 1936? His reply was that it was £6 10s. 0d. a week. I then asked him how many bricks he laid and he said 1,500. The hon. member for Rosettenville does not know how many bricks a man can lay. I then asked this man what his salary was to-day, and his reply was £16 0s. 0d. a week. I asked him how many bricks he now laid and he said he was not allowed to lay more than 600 bricks a day. I now say that if we want to be honest towards ourselves and towards the workers, how can one expect to reduce the cost of living without higher productivity? We have to produce more and the workers of South Africa will appreciate it if the latter is

explained to them. For that reason, I agree with the hon. member for Mayfair. We have to have higher productivity if we want to reduce the cost of living. The hon. member for Rosettenville, who is so concerned about the cost of living, and also the hon. member for Vereeniging (Mr. S. J. M. Steyn), and all the other hon. members who spoke here, to all of them I want to say that this matter of the rise in the cost of living has now been discussed *ad nauseum*. Ever since we came into power it has formed part of every motion of no confidence. That also happened in 1951. Their own newspapers spoke about all the opportunities they missed as a result of their course of action. The *Natal Mercury* referred to the motion of no confidence in 1951 and said the following about it—

The United Party missed a great opportunity. World conditions are in such a state that it was up to them to try—possibly the opportunity was forlorn, but it was still worth trying—to get this country down to something approaching commonsense. Instead, they chose to concentrate the debates on such things as the cost of living. If they had stopped for a moment to examine the causes of the rise in the cost of living they would have had to admit that no individual Government can honestly be accused of being responsible for the rise in the cost of living. It does not matter what Mr. Eric Louw said in 1947, 1948, 1950 or 1952. Had the United Party won the 1948 General Election, conditions so far as the cost of living is concerned would have been very much as they are to-day. It is just as well to be reasonably honest about these things.

I do not think it is necessary to reply to this further. That was the truth at the time and it is still true.

I want to deal with the hon. member for Verneeniging, who acted here to-day as the chief speaker of the United Party. He made the statement that the whole country is in a state of unrest. There is unrest throughout the country. Where is this terrible unrest in South Africa which we do not know about?

*An HON. MEMBER: It is in the United Party.

*Mr. MENTZ: Yes, there is unrest, but it is only in the United Party. In the speech of the hon. member he actually had the temerity to say: We on this side of the House ask that the Government should make way so that the United Party can govern the country. I say that is ridiculous. There are certain requirements for any political party before it can govern the country, and the chief requirement is that the people want a unified party, which stands together especially in regard to the great problems of the country, and which has a sound policy. Mr. Speaker, have those people opposite a policy?

kom, en dat hy sowel vóór as ná die afkondiging van die wet „doen en late bepleit, verdedig en aangemoedig het wat daarop bereken was om die verwesening van die oogmerke van die Kommuniste soos in art. 1 van die wet omskryf, te bevorder”.

The article goes on to say this—

Dit is 'n totaal ander storie as verlede jaar.

And later on—

Waarom is eersgenoemde (mnr. Kahn) se reg op 'n setel in die Volksraad verdedig, maar laasgenoemde s'n nie? Watter heilige beginsels het in 1952 gegeld wat nou kragteloos geword het? Die antwoord is dat die ommeswaai met beginsels min te make het, maar wel baie met stemme.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! What has that to do with the point raised by the hon. member?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am not raising this as a matter of privilege, Sir.

Mr. SERFONTEIN: The point is “I want to defend myself”.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am not raising it as a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member can raise that now. He can do so at the earliest possible opportunity, but not now.

Mr. LAWRENCE: No, Sir, I am not raising it as a point of privilege. I want to have this on record, because I want to bring this specially to your notice, not in any bellicose spirit, Sir. It may well be that what was said in that leading article might be actionable. But I am not concerned with that. I am much more concerned with the rights of members of Parliament, and while I am perfectly prepared to agree and accept valid criticism of the actions of any member of this Parliament by the public Press or any public body in regard to matters of policy, it seems to me that there is a distinction between what we may be doing now in this House, which may be subject to public criticism, and what a Select Committee may do when it has to make a finding of facts. You see, Mr. Speaker, the inference from that leading article is that Mr. Waterson and Mr. Mitchell and I, instead of doing our duty as we should have done and apply our mind impartially, honestly and fairly to the evidence before the Select Committee and making a finding upon the evidence on that basis, instead of doing that, we for some base purpose, for the purpose of votes, gave a finding on the facts which was not necessarily in accordance with the facts. It is a very serious allegation. If that allegation were made about judges or magistrates in courts of law or chairmen of committees it would be a very serious thing

indeed, and all I am concerned about to-night is this. I raise this matter purposely as a matter of principle. I raise it on behalf of members on both sides of the House. I say that I think that that criticism was not correct and I do hope that the responsible Press will realize the distinction between the activities of members of Parliament when they sit in a semi-judicial capacity to make decisions on questions of fact, and when they sit as members of Parliament to make decisions on policy. What we may do to-night may be a subject of criticism. The only way to criticize the findings of the committee on questions of fact would be to come out honestly and say that we were dishonest. Obviously, if any public body or the Press considers that a member of Parliament is dishonest in coming to a conclusion on a question of fact, they may say so in the public interest. I am sorry that the hon. gentlemen are not taking notice of this, because it is a very serious matter indeed. I am raising it in order to show my *bona fides*. I have not rushed to take legal advice or to raise points of order or points of privilege. I have waited until this occasion to raise it on this particular issue in a spirit of trying to defend the inherent rights of members of Parliament. I regard it as totally wrong to impugn the motives of members of Parliament when it comes to a question of fact. People can impugn our motives as much as they like about political matters, but when we sit in a semi-judicial capacity it seems to me that it is not upholding the dignity and the standards of public life in South Africa when members of Parliament are subjected to criticism of that sort.

For the reasons I gave earlier, I regret that this side of the House is not able to vote for the amendment.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I rise because I want to place on record my attitude towards this motion before the House. As in the case of the previous representative of the constituency of Cape Western, we of the Labour Party strongly oppose the proposal for the removal of that hon. member from this House. My colleague, the hon. member for Benoni (Mr. Lovell), has stated very clearly and unambiguously what our standpoint is. He has stated a point of view which I regret is not held by more members of this House. Apparently in these troubled political times in South Africa fewer and fewer people are prepared to stand firmly by the basic principles of our democratic society.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Those arguments are irrelevant. The hon. member now has to discuss the matter before the House.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I am applying myself to the addendum moved by the hon. member for Cape Eastern (Mrs. Ballinger), in which she makes an appeal to the Minister of Justice that no action be taken in this case. I will deal later with the report itself, but my preliminary remarks are concerned with the

motion by the hon. member for Cape Eastern, which I support. This is our last opportunity to plead with the Government to deal with this matter in a rational and reasonable manner. If we do not speak now, we will not have any further chance. To-night we are signing the Parliamentary death warrant of the hon. member for Cape Western (Mr. Bunting) and I would not like to remember that I sat quiet in this House without making an appeal in the matter. The hon. member for Salt River (Mr. Lawrence) has tried to elucidate the attitude of the United Party, and it would appear to me that these hon. gentlemen have concerned themselves strictly with the legal aspect of this matter and said that as the law provides in the manner it does, they had no alternative but to come to the decision contained in this report. I do not want to repeat the points made by the hon. member for Benoni, but one thing about this report concerns me gravely, and that is that in Par. 6 of this report it says that the committee finds—

That before and after the promulgation of the said Act, he advocated, defended and encouraged acts or omissions which were calculated to further the achievement of the objects of Communism as defined in Section 1 of the said Act.

Now this is a very grave allegation to make against an hon. member of this House, because if in fact this finding is correct then the hon. member for Cape Western is liable to be sent to gaol for ten years. The provisions of the Suppression of Communism Act in Section 11 that if after the passing of that Act any person advocates, defends or encourages acts which are calculated to further the objects of Communism as defined in terms of Section 1 of the Act, he is guilty and liable to heavy penalties. I presume that the hon. gentlemen on the Select Committee considered the implications of taking this decision. I have not heard in the debates this afternoon any direct evidence in support of this finding. I have heard a lot of argument and debate about Communism, about certain individuals who are, or once were, Communists, but I heard—and I listened very carefully—no evidence to support this argument that the hon. member was so guilty. Mr. Speaker, while the hon. members of the United Party felt concerned in the Select Committee to support all these findings of the Select Committee, I presume that in some form or other they will join with us and register an appeal to the Government to take no further action in this matter. I was very sorry to hear the hon. member for Salt River saying to-night that he could not support the motion of the hon. member for Cape Eastern. I can only say that I am absolutely surprised at that, because no matter what legal arguments led these members of the Select Committee to arrive at their findings, I cannot conceive what moral argument they can use to support the expulsion of a member from this House, because of his political views.

There are two points upon which I want to support the motion of the hon. member for Cape Eastern. The first is that as I said when the previous representative for Cape Western was in the same position, I cannot support the removal from this House of a member by a vote of members of this House, a member who has been properly and democratically elected by the voters of his constituency. I said at that time that if we support that proposition, then every member of this House is vulnerable, because on the same basis and upon the same interpretation any one of us can at a future date be removed from this House because our views are unpopular. On that principle alone, I am opposed to it, and I plead with the Government that they should not take action on the report of this Select Committee.

There is another danger, Mr. Speaker, and that is that if this Parliament, in a democracy, is going to use totalitarian and despotic methods to fight what it calls despotism, it is exposing itself to becoming itself a totalitarian state. In so far as the representation of the constituency of Cape Western in this House is concerned, I think this House should take cognizance of the views of that electorate, and I wish to quote here from the report of the Select Committee, para. 575. The hon. member for Cape Western was asked—

You stood for Parliament and on 10 November 1952 you were duly declared elected a member of the House of Assembly for the Electoral Division of Cape Western Circle?

His answer was yes, and then he was asked—

Am I correct in saying that you received 4,123 votes?

He replied that that was so, and then he was asked—

And that Mr. C. C. Johnson received 387 votes, and that Mr. H. M. Joynt received 58 votes . . . and Mr. A. G. Long 495 votes?

And his reply to those questions was "Yes". Now those figures show that the hon. member for Cape Western was elected to this House by an overwhelming majority. The hon. gentlemen here asked me to read the subsequent questions, and I will read them. The next questions put to him were these—

In that election you issued a manifesto?—Yes.

That manifesto is before this Committee?—Yes.

You were a member of the Communist Party until its dissolution?—Yes.

I presume why the hon. gentlemen wanted to hear that portion of the questioning was to say: There you are; this man was a Communist before he was elected. But surely they are putting the cart before the horse. The argument has been raised here before, and

think there is a lot of truth in it, that the previous representative of the Cape Western Circle, Mr. Kahn, apparently had the confidence of these voters and when his nominee or somebody who supported his views stood for election again, he was elected by an overwhelming majority. That means that the action that may be taken by the Minister of Justice on the acceptance by this House of this report can result in this electorate feeling that it is no longer any use sending representatives to this House because their representatives are immediately thrown out. Our difficulty in debating this matter rationally is the phobia that exists in the minds of hon. members opposite on the question of Communism. If they had any intelligent understanding of Communism, they would realize that this is the very last way in which they should oppose it. The reading of this Select Committee report also reveals to me that the members of this Select Committee were most of the time in a maze as to what they were seeking, in a maze as to how to arrive at the conclusions they have now presented to the House. In the short time available to us, having to study this report, I myself got many headaches because I found a lot of the questioning inconsequential and a lot of it leading up blind alleys and in many parts—I think I am speaking for most members of this House—I could not make head or tail of it. Nevertheless, we are presented with the report of the Select Committee and we have their findings. There is a very important aspect upon which I dwelt very briefly just now and which I now want to elaborate upon in my appeal to the Government to listen to the proposals of the hon. member for Cape Eastern. I have said that the hon. member for Cape Western was elected to this House by an overwhelming majority. But we need not consider that only in relation to his own constituency. We must consider it in relation to the overall representation of all sections of the South African community in this House. We have to bear in mind the impact our actions will have upon the voteless people of South Africa. We have to bear in mind that in this House we have 150 members representing Union constituencies of Europeans, the total population of Europeans in the Union being 2,600,000. But 8,500,000 Natives in this country have three representatives in this House, only those in the Cape Western and Cape Eastern and Transkei areas having representatives here. If we want to talk in terms of giving the non-Europeans opportunities in this country, we cannot do it by throwing the representatives of the Natives out of the House. I repeat again that the Natives in South Africa who have three representatives in this House are going to judge their future hope by the actions that we now take. We have thrown out one man whom they elected to this House and we are now in the process of throwing out another. In the course of doing that we are exposing white civilization in South Africa to great dangers. Hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House who set themselves up as the so-called protectors of white civilization in this country

are in effect setting themselves up as the destroyers of white civilization.

Mr. A. STEYN: Then tell us why they keep on electing Communists.

Mr. HEPPLER: I have a number of matters to deal with. I presume that the hon. gentlemen who have such feelings on the matter will themselves rise and take part in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member may continue.

Mr. HEPPLER: I want to elaborate on one of the dangers I pointed out earlier on, that arise out of the report of the Select Committee in so far as the interpretation is concerned under the definition of "Communist". The hon. member for Benoni has dealt with the matter, but in wading through the report of the Select Committee I was very interested to read paragraph 1350. The hon. member for Karas (Mr. von Moltke) was cross-examining the accused and he was endeavouring, as far as I can understand from his cross-examination, to ascertain the similarity between the political views of the hon. member for Cape Western with those of the newly established Liberal Party of South Africa. In the course of this examination, the hon. member for Karas, in paragraph 1350, asks—

Is there anything in that programme published by the Liberal Party of South Africa which does not conform with the programme of the Party as envisaged in this paragraph 121 of the Report of your Central Committee?

Now, hon. members on the Government side of the House have quoted this paragraph 121 repeatedly to-day. It reads as follows—

The National organizations, to be effective, must be transformed into a revolutionary party of workers, peasants, intellectuals and petty bourgeoisie, linked together in a firm organization, subject to a strict discipline, and guided by a definite programme of struggle against all forms of racial discrimination in alliance with the class-conscious European workers and intellectuals. Such a party would be distinguished from the Communist Party in that its objective is national liberation, that is, the abolition of race discrimination, but it would co-operate closely with the Communist Party. In this party the class-conscious workers and peasants of the national group concerned would constitute the main leadership. It would be their task to develop an adequate organization apparatus, to conduct mass struggles against race discrimination, to combat Chauvinism and racialism in the national movement, to develop class consciousness in the people, and to forge unity in action between the oppressed peoples and between them and the European working class.

The hon. member for Karas began, in the course of this cross-examination, to draw a parallel between this Communist Party organization and the Liberal Party. He pursued his cross-examination in this way—

From its publications in the Press, I gather that the Liberal Party is against all racial discrimination?—No.

They want equality of votes, irrespective of race, colour or creed?—I am sorry, but that is not my understanding of the programme of the Liberal Party.

The Labour Party is different. In its programme published in January of this year, it says that all male Natives of an educational standard of Std. 6 should receive the vote. The Liberal Party wants to raise the educational standard for whites and non-whites alike, but the same standards should apply to both—that is to say, no discrimination. Can you point to anything in the Liberal Party as we know it to-day which does not conform to the Party envisaged in this Report of the Central Committee three years ago?

Here we see the development that is taking place. This report of the Select Committee shows what is in the minds of some members of the Select Committee, and therefore in the minds of members of this House. The pattern is developing of making the definition of Communism in the Act and Communism in general apply to other political parties in this country. I say that this is one of the dangers of which we warned the country at the time. The hon. member for Benoni has endeavoured tonight to draw a distinction between what happened in the rebellion in 1914 . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I told the hon. member at the time that that was irrelevant and I hope the hon. member will not be irrelevant again. That is going too far.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I will not be irrelevant. I will leave that point and return to the motion of the hon. member for Cape Eastern. After this debate is over we will have no further opportunity of dealing with the question before the House. After the House has accepted this Report, it will then go to the Government and be left in the hands of the Minister of Justice to take what further action he may consider expedient. I have a very good idea of what that action will be, but I think as many members as possible of this House should join with us in pleading with the Government, while accepting this report, to take no further action against the hon. member for Cape Western. Time will clearly show that it will make no difference to the political outlook of either European or non-European in South Africa, whether the hon. member for Cape Western or any of his successors are on these benches. The development of political thought in this country, as in any other country of the world, is a development in the minds of people. It is not something which can be regulated by

law, and so if the Government sees this matter in a reasonable and rational light it will realize that the best course to adopt is to allow that hon. member to remain in this House.

Mr. EATON: I do not wish to tire the House with a long speech. I want to say that much of the ground I would have traversed has already been traversed by the hon. member for Cape Eastern (Mrs. Ballinger), and the amendment which she moved is one which I support. The remarks that have been made in support of that amendment I fully agree with. The seconder of that amendment, the hon. member for Transkei (Mr. Stuart), went on to indicate in so many words something which this Report we are now discussing gave information about, and that is on page 84, paragraph 575. The hon. member for Cape Western was being asked certain questions, and this is one of them—

You stood for Parliament and on 10 November 1952 . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That was read out just a few minutes ago.

Mr. EATON: That is as far as I will go in quoting this report. The hon. member for Transkei said that in his opinion the hon. member for Cape Western received those votes because of the good work that had been done by the former member for Cape Western (Mr. Kahn), that Mr. Kahn had shown great sympathy with and consideration for members of the African people. Now, that is my real difficulty. I have discussed this problem with the African people and I have discovered that because the hon. member for Cape Western and his predecessor have shown kindness and consideration towards the Africans, the Africans are now confusing Communism with Christianity, and in doing that it is not because of Mr. Kahn's beliefs but because he was actually doing the things that the Christians in this country have preached to the Native. In other words, we have this position to-night that we who profess to be Christians—and I am glad the hon. the Minister of Lands is in the House, because of a statement he made just the other day—that in the light of what we preach we are in the difficulty of being accused of acting in an un-Christian way towards a member of this House. It is a startling thought that we should be prepared to throw a man out who in the eyes of the Africans is doing the very things which we tell them are the characteristics of Christians. The problem I see is that we Europeans in this country have either to stop preaching Christianity to the Africans, or we have to start putting into practice what we preach. That is the problem I see, and that is why I would be far happier in seeing the Africans next year at the elections throwing Mr. Bunting out and putting someone else in, rather than for us to do it and give rise to the problem I have mentioned, the problem and the confusion that is in the minds of the African people to-day.

in South Africa. For the first time in the history of the Union it is summoning a second Joint Sitting of both Houses of Parliament in the same session.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That point is not under discussion.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The point under discussion is this: We are asked to adjourn in order to make room for that Joint Sitting, and the point which I think is pertinent at the present time is this that the Government should take not merely Parliament but the country into its confidence. This House is in Session and we are entitled to know what the Government intends to do. I am not saying that by way of criticism of what the Government may or may not do, but I am criticising this Iron Curtain which the Government is drawing over its intentions at the present time. This Government has suddenly changed its proposals. It has sat late into the night in its discussions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That is irrelevant.

Mr. LAWRENCE: It may not be relevant so far as this debate is concerned, but the public outside regard it as having some relevance . . .

The MINISTER OF LANDS: Go and address the public outside then.

Mr. LAWRENCE: . . . because they know that the Government is coming forward with a new measure and the public outside are entitled to know what this Government proposes to put before the Joint Sitting. Before the Joint Sitting of 1936 we had six years of debates in a Joint Select Committee. Before the introduction of the Separate Representation of Voters Bill in 1951 the Bill was published six months beforehand, but now apparently a Bill is to be introduced . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Those remarks can be made when the Bill is introduced, not now.

The MINISTER OF TRANSPORT: It has nothing to do with the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has nothing to do with the adjournment.

Mr. LAWRENCE: With the greatest respect, Sir, I may have other things to say when the Bill is introduced, but what I want to know is what Bill is going to be introduced? The country is entitled to know this. Is it the intention of this Government to withdraw the Appellate Division Bill which is before the House? That is one point and we are entitled to know that. That Bill is still on the Order Paper. We should be going on now to Order No. 2 of the day, the second reading of the Appellate Division Bill. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce that Bill before a Joint Sitting of both Houses of Parliament or is it the intention of Parliament

to withdraw that Bill, because, if so, then the Government should let the country know. There should be no hole-in-the-corner business about this; there should be no secrecy about this. This is not a matter for secrecy; it is a matter of the greatest importance. The country will be profoundly relieved if they know that the Government is going to withdraw this Bill and that it is not going to go on with this monstrous Bill which was on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must be relevant.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I want some information, Sir.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: I will give you the information.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is one thing I want to know. Then I want to know, if the Government does not propose to proceed with the second reading of the Appellate Division Bill before the Joint Sitting of Both Houses of Parliament, what Bill the Government proposes to introduce at a Joint Sitting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: If you will give me an opportunity I will tell you.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Will my hon. friend first give me an opportunity of putting my questions; they are simple questions—very simple questions. I want to know what Bill is going to be introduced because the Minister had made reference to a Select Committee. Evidently it is going to be a Bill which is going to be introduced at a Joint Sitting and that Bill is going to be sent to a Select Committee.

The MINISTER OF TRANSPORT: Sherlock Holmes.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I want to know (a) what is the subject matter of the Bill which the Government proposes to introduce at this late stage of the Session after their midnight vigil, and (b) I want to know whether that Bill is going to be sent to a Select Committee and, if so, is it going to be sent to a Select Committee before or after the second reading. Those are questions to which the country wants replies. Those are answers which the country is entitled to have at the present time.

Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: In any case, you won't be on the Select Committee.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. and excitable member for Krugersdorp (Mr. M. J. van den Berg) says that I will not be on the Committee.

Mr. M. J. VAN DEN BERG: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That raises the very important question as to how this Committee is going to be appointed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot go into that.

Mr. LAWRENCE: You see, Sir, that kind of suggestion makes it so necessary to get clarity on this point, because if it is suggested that I cannot sit on a Committee of this House, then I want to know why. It is a very serious allegation. I hope that the hon. the Minister of Finance will now take us into his confidence. He apparently could not do so yesterday, and we realize now why he could not do it yesterday, because apparently the Government still have to get the approval of certain of their members. But now the Minister has no longer that yoke round him . . .

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: You speak very feelingly on that matter.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I hope that either the Minister of Finance, or perhaps the Minister of Lands will give us the necessary information this afternoon. I would be more interested if the Minister of Lands got up this afternoon to tell us what he decided yesterday.

The MINISTER OF LANDS: I saw the sparkle in your eye the whole afternoon.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Well, I must say that there is no longer a sparkle in the Minister of Lands' eye. A sad and a wiser man he rose . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not relevant now.

Mr. LAWRENCE: It is not necessary for me to go on, because I put my questions quite clearly to the hon. the Minister and I hope that he will now give us a reply.

Mr. HEPPLE: I want to congratulate the hon. member for Salt River (Mr. Lawrence) for the manner in which he has broadened this enlightened discussion and I hope that he will be responded to in a manner which will give us more information that we possess at the present time. We object to these tricks being played on the House day after day. We in this corner of the House have constantly had the charge made against us that we waste the time of the House when we endeavour to deal with the Bills that come before us in an objective manner and to analyse them very thoroughly. With respect, I would like to mention the Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Bill that came before this House, when we were accused of holding up the business of the House and were told that it was impossible for the Government to complete the business of this Session and that there was still such a lot to do. Now all parties have prepared themselves to deal with Item No. 2 on the Agenda "second reading, Appellate Division Bill".

An HON. MEMBER: Do you want it?

Mr. HEPPLE: Of course we want to tell the country what we think of this kind of measure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must be relevant.

Mr. HEPPLE: I am endeavouring to discuss the motion for the adjournment of the House Mr. Speaker. A couple of weeks ago the hon. the Prime Minister gave this House a list of the measures that had to go through during the current Session, and this item, the Appellate Division Bill, was the most important one remaining for the attention of this House. Now without any notice, suddenly, we are faced by a motion by the Leader of the House that the Government has decided that all business is over. He gives us no reason why the Appellate Division Bill has been dropped, if it has been dropped. Yesterday, the hon. the Minister of Finance rose in reply to a question by the Leader of the United Party and then the debate was closed, and we were not in a position to say something more about that important matter. The hon. member for Salt River has quite rightly pointed out that the whole country is anxious to know what we are doing in Parliament. They want to know why these sudden changes of plans are sprung upon us. Something extraordinary is happening in this Parliament and the country is entitled to know if the Government has decided to experiment with a new kind of tactic in order to see whether they can achieve nefarious purposes which they have in mind. This attitude towards the affairs of State is remarkable and I am surprised that the people outside tolerate it. [Laughter.] Of course it is a matter for joking for the hon. members on the Government side. Everything that comes before this House is a matter for joking for hon. members on the other side of the House. That is their usual attitude.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: You are competing now with the hon. member for Salt River.

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member for Salt River apparently caused some discomfiture on the ministerial benches and I, like the hon. member for Salt River, am concerned about these long caucus meetings and adjournments and Cabinet meetings, without the country being told what the crisis is in the Cabinet. I am speaking for hundreds of thousands of people outside when I ask what is going on. Surely this Government has a sense of responsibility? They should not be afraid to tell the people of this country what this measure is going to be that will be sent to a Select Committee.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Tell us what is happening in your party?

Mr. HEPPLE: In reply to the hon. the Minister I say that that is apparently behind these tactics. The Government, instead of dealing with the affairs of the State, is hoping to seize a political opportunity in order to test out a theory . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: It has a lot to do with the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not under discussion now. The hon. member must be relevant.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I say that the people are anxious to know why this House adjourned suddenly yesterday, and why it is adjourning suddenly again to-day. Why can we not go on with this matter of the Appellate Division Bill? That is a simple question. I continue in this strain, because yesterday I missed that opportunity, because I thought that the hon. the Leader of the House was getting up in reply to a question, but then the debate was closed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I join with the hon. member for Salt River in asking the Government to make some statement before the House is adjourned.

Mrs. BALLINGER: I have quite a simple protest to make. I want to protest that the hon. Leader of the House puts forward this sort of motion without giving us an explanation when he introduces the motion. He did it yesterday and he has done it again to-day. Yesterday he told the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that he would tell him something if he would sit down. The Leader of the Opposition sat down, and he assumed apparently that after the reply by the hon. the Minister of Finance, there would be an opportunity for discussion. Now the Leader of the House has again indicated that he is prepared to reply to the questions that has been put to him by this side of the House, but we now know, from what happened yesterday, that when he replies, the issue is closed and that there is no further opportunity to discuss the matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Are you reflecting on the Chair now?

Mrs. BALLINGER: No, far from it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Then you are criticizing my conduct?

Mrs. BALLINGER: Yes . . .

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: In what way?

Mrs. BALLINGER: I think the position is very simple. When the hon. the Minister proposes a motion of this kind, he knows that the House wants some information, and I feel he owes it to the House to give that explanation at a point when we are still in a position to discuss it. I am not accusing the hon. the Minister or Mr. Speaker, in regard to the closing of the debate yesterday . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot refer to that.

Mrs. BALLINGER: I am simply saying that to-day we are in the position that whilst the hon. the Minister is prepared to give an explanation, we will not be able to discuss that explanation. I also desire to say that I am disappointed that when the hon. the Minister summoned the Whips to discuss the position with him to-day, he summoned some of the Whips and not all of them. I had assumed that when a matter of importance in regard to the business of the House was under discussion, we would also be consulted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: I must say that I am amazed at the attitude of the hon. member who has just sat down. What is her grievance about the incident of yesterday afternoon? I am not responsible for the position which arose. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition made some remarks and asked me about the position. I got up and replied. The Speaker said that thereafter, according to the rules of the House, the debate was closed. She is either reflecting on the Chair . . .

Mrs. BALLINGER: I am not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Well, what was wrong in my conduct? The hon. member knows that it is customary in this House that as far as a motion for the adjournment is concerned, that is moved without any discussion. If the business on the Order Paper is of such a nature that it is convenient for the House to adjourn, such a motion is moved.

Mr. RUSSELL: It is not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Well, here again, I have gone out of my way, when I moved this motion to give the House more information than has ever been given in regard to such a motion. I commenced by saying that as a result of the message that was read this morning from the Governor-General providing for a Joint Sitting, in view of the fact that that sitting will take place on Thursday and in view of the state of the Order Paper it is convenient to adjourn now. I have also indicated the programme, and it must be very clear that this particular measure referred to by the hon. member for Salt River will not form part of the further legislative measures that will be considered by the House. Apparently both the hon. member for Salt River and the hon. member for Rosettnville (Mr. Hepple) are very disappointed that that particular Bill is not being proceeded with.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I said that we were profoundly grateful that it was not being proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Why this particular interest then, when it appears from what I said that the Bill, as will happen in the case of several other matters on the Order Paper, will not come up for further discussion?

Now as the point mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I am anxious to give as much information as possible about the proposal. I think it might be possible, in view of all the circumstances and the request of the Leader of the Opposition, to give that Bill to the Press to-night to be published to-morrow. I am considering that at the moment. Then the House will at least have an opportunity of knowing what the contents of the Bill are. I understand that there is no objection from a procedural point of view to this happening.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why not give it to us now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Why is the hon. member so anxious to anticipate the whole matter? The hon. member knows full well that ordinarily a Bill only becomes available to members after leave has been given to introduce.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why not give us the contents now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: I am prepared to give it to the Press, if it is at all possible.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why not to Parliament?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: That is ridiculous. I am trying to be helpful and if the hon. member takes up this position, I shall follow the ordinary course.

Motion put and agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.47 p.m. until Thursday, at four o'clock p.m.

THURSDAY, 1 OCTOBER 1953

Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.5 p.m.

NATIVE LABOUR (SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER communicated a message from the Honourable the Senate transmitting the Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Bill passed by the House of Assembly and in which the Hon. the Senate has made an amendment, and desiring the concurrence of the House of Assembly in such amendment.

Amendment considered.

Amendment in Clause 7 put,

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Hon. members will recollect that in Clause 7 provision is made for the establishment of works committees. There is also a provision that the

employer shall notify the inspector if the employees desire to form a works committee. A proviso has been added stipulating that if the employer does not notify the inspector he will commit an offence.

Mr. LAWRENCE: There is another clause dealing with punishment at a later stage?

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Yes.

Amendment put and agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The MINISTER OF FINANCE, I move, as an unopposed motion—

That the House suspend business until 4.30 p.m.: Provided that Mr. Speaker may, if he thinks fit, accelerate or postpone the time for the resumption of business by causing the division bells to be rung.

Mr. J. E. POTGIETER: I second.

Agreed to.

Business suspended at 4.15 p.m. and resumed at 4.35 p.m.

RESERVATION OF SEPARATE AMENITIES BILL

Mr. SPEAKER communicated a message from the Hon. the Senate transmitting the Reservation of Separate Amenities Bill passed by the House of Assembly and in which the Hon. the Senate has made an amendment, and desiring the concurrence of the House of Assembly in such amendment.

Amendment considered.

New Clause 4 put,

*Mr. LAWRENCE: This is an important amendment and I hope an explanation of it will be given.

*The MINISTER OF FINANCE: This amendment is in connection with certain provisions which have been made with regard to foreign representatives. The Department of the Interior has taken certain steps, and the effect of this amendment is that foreign representatives will not fall under these provisions.

*Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: Does it apply to foreign representatives only?

*The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Yes.

New clause put and agreed to.

BIOGRAPHY

" A brilliant parliamentarian, Mr Hepple is admired by both sides of the House for the battle he wages on behalf of South Africa's workers - White and Black."
Rand Daily Mail 15/3/1958

Born in Johannesburg, South Africa, August 28, 1904. Grew up amidst rapid industrialization of the city, experiencing its harsh impact upon a typical white working-class family.

Father was an active member of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, being blacklisted and victimized by the employers for his part in the 1913 and 1914 strikes and arrested in the bloody strike of 1922 in which Alex Hepple himself took part. Both parents were Rand Pioneers and foundation members of the South African Labour Party. Mother born Pietermaritzburg, Natal, 1872. Maternal grandparents arrived in South Africa 1849. Father came from England when gold was discovered on Witwatersrand.

Married in 1931 to Josephine (Girly) Zwarenstein. Their only son, Bob Alexander, born 1934. She is closely associated with all his work. Her father emigrated from Holland in time to fight for the Boers in the Boer War, and her mother was born in the Orange Free State Republic.

Alex Hepple, a lifelong member of the South African Labour Party and office bearer from 1935 onwards, began work as a messenger boy at £4-0-0 per month - eventually became a company secretary and factory manager. These positions he gave up when he was elected to Parliament in 1948. Member of Transvaal Provincial Council 1943-1948; Member of South African Parliament 1948-1958 when Labour Party was eliminated from Parliament

Parliamentary Leader from 1953 onwards. Served on numerous bodies fighting for human rights.

Has made a special study of labour laws and trade unionism, and is a strong opponent of those who seek to interfere in the affairs of

the trade unions, or curb their democratic rights. Well known for his labours on behalf of non-white workers and the repeal of discriminatory laws.

Chairman of the South African Treason Trial Defence Fund, 1956- 1961 (Dissolution) ;
Chairman of the South African Defence and Aid Fund 1960 - 1964 ;
Editor of Forward (Johannesburg) 1962 - 1964 ;
Director and Editor of International Defence and Aid Information Service (London) 1967-1972 ;
Assisted several trade unions in various capacities.

Publications :-

South Africa: A Political and Economic History (282 pp.) Pall Mall Press, London, 1966
Verwoerd (253 pp.) Penguin Books, London. (Pelican Series - Political Leaders of the Twentieth Century) 1967

Pamphlets :-

Trade Unions in Travail (94pp.) Unity Publications, Johannesburg, 1954. (Story of Broederbond - Nationalist plan to control South African Trade Unions.)

The African Worker in South Africa (36pp) The Africa Bureau, London, 1955. (A study of Trade Unionism.)

A Trade Unions Guide for South African Workers (40pp.) S.A. Congress of Trade Unions, Johannesburg, 1957.

Poverty Wages (16pp.) Wages Committee, Johannesburg, 1959. (An examination of wage policy in relation to South Africa's lowest paid workers.)

Censorship and Press Control in South Africa
(78 pp.) published by the author, Johannesburg
1960.

Pamphlets specially written for the International
Defence and Aid Information Service :-

Transit Camps in South Africa (13pp.) 1967.
(Deals with the beginnings of "resettlement
of Africans from "White" areas.)

The Embargo on Arms for South Africa (9pp)
1968

Workers under Apartheid (83pp.) 1969,
2nd. ed. 1971. (88pp.) French translation -
les travailleurs livrés à l'apartheid -
(89pp.) 1973.

"Resettlement" - The New Violence to Africans
(47pp.) 1969, French translation - Camps
de réinstallation -(64pp.) 1970

Arms and Apartheid (18pp.) 1970

Apartheid Quiz (93pp.) 1972

The Press under Apartheid

Articles on political issues, industrial laws
and trade unionism contributed to various
periodicals, magazines and newspapers.

Collection Number: A3393

Collection Name: Bob Hepple Papers

PUBLISHER:

Publisher: **Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand**

Location: **Johannesburg**

©2015

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document forms part of a collection held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.