

point out that in the years when those interests became vested our internal industrial and commercial structure was still very unbalanced, unbalanced between the various industrial and commercial groups.

*Mr. BARLOW: What is really the point?

*Mr. G. F. H. BEKKER: The point is that you are stupid.

*Dr. J. H. STEYN: I think that the Minister can devote his attention to that; I know it does not affect him as much as the Minister of Agriculture; but as it does affect him I wish to request him to try and adjust that lack of balance. It affects him particularly as far as import permits are concerned, and he will know—his department knows it very well—that we have quite a number of retail dealers in the country who import direct; they now run the risk on account of their quotas being so small of not enjoying that privilege any longer. They will be dependent on wholesalers and subject also to the pressure that the wholesaler can exercise on them. It will entail a great deal of administrative work for the Minister; it will also entail administrative difficulties, but I think it is still worth the trouble that those difficulties should be borne for the sake of the small man.

Another small matter relates to his treaty policy, the policy of overseas treaties, and I mean now particularly and specifically the treaty we have concluded with France. Under that treaty our wine industry is prohibited from selling any wines under the designations of champagne or burgundy. Those names were originally regional names. On that account a country could perhaps claim that no other country might sell wine under the name of a certain district or region in its country. But in the meantime the position has changed and those descriptions are no longer regional names. They have become generic names. Champagne is today the description of one sort of wine just as Turkish tobacco is the name for a sort of tobacco, and burgundy is a generic name just as Virginia tobacco is today a generic name and no longer a regional designation. If we follow that policy that is laid down in the treaty we shall very shortly no longer be able to sell sherry and port because these too are the names of places. I know what the Minister's policy is and I must say that I agree with it. That ought to be our objective in South Africa, to cultivate and to market our own sorts of wine. But we must not forget the period required for that. It is a slow process. I think it may be impossible to undo what has been done, but even if it is impossible I would ask him to give his serious attention to that, if and when the contract has later to be renewed. I want

to repeat that the ideal, and I think the ideal of all wine-producing farmers in South Africa is to produce typical South African wines under their own South African names, but I want to make an earnest appeal to the Minister to give our wine-producing farmers a chance, with patience, to bridge that gap.

*Mr. HEPPLER: During the course of his speech this afternoon the hon. Minister made one remark that was astounding. He said it was impossible to get certain import figures for two periods. He should, I think, let the House have further information on that point. It is remarkable that import figures which are so essential should not be available, not only to the Government but to commercial and industrial interests. I hope the Minister will let us have some further information in this regard.

On the question of import control I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister. I hope that the pattern of control will not follow the pattern of control we had during wartime, when there were ugly rumours afloat of favouritism and abuse and unrealistic allocations. It was admitted that certain of these panels had been making unfair allocations to various sections of commerce and trade. I would like to suggest to the Minister that in order to avoid abuses of that nature, or suggestions of abuse, all the allocations should be made public so that those firms connected with the particular industry and with an interest in the matter should be acquainted with the allocation that is made to their competitors; it is important for them to know to whom the allocations have been awarded, especially in view of the right they should have of appeal. Secondly, commerce and industry generally should be made acquainted with all the allocations that are made in respect of particular classes of goods. I am saying that because I think it is important that commerce and industry should be able to air their views in regard to the allocations that are made. The Minister will admit that each man believes that the commodity he requires is the most essential commodity. We have general complaints that allocations have been given to less essential goods, charges of favouritism, and the Minister has dealt this afternoon with what he classifies as essential, less essential and non-essential goods. If that is left in the hands of individuals I think their personal opinion of what is essential, less essential and non-essential should be made known, and if the information is made public as to what goods are receiving priority it will throw a searchlight on the whole system of priorities and enable interested parties to make their representations. This will save the Government a lot of headaches.

Now I want to come to quite another question, in reference to the cost of living. I know that the Minister may not be aware

of what has been happening in the country while he has been away. But I want to assure him that according to the official figures the cost of living continues to rise. In February last when I raised the question of the cost of living, the Minister waxed sarcastic and suggested I should ask my wife, that she would be able to tell me the cost of living has not gone up. He said he did not know where I got my figures from but that he had figures from official sources which told him a somewhat different story. The different story he told me was just a question of juggling with figures. He used the same figures I had used, but he turned round and said he had pegged the cost of living. Well, since he pegged the cost of living it became somewhat crazy and slipped upwards. The index went up in March to 152, in April to 152.9, compared with January, 1948, when it was 141.8, an increase of 11.1 in a matter of fifteen or sixteen months. I do not think the Minister can juggle with those figures. He cannot now tell me that the cost of living has been pegged or gone down. The Minister must tell the House what practical steps, apart from Louwcol, he has taken to reduce the cost of living. Earlier in the year he quoted figures to show that the cost of imported goods had gone up very considerably. Nobody can argue about that. But the debate this afternoon has proved conclusively that the goods imported at higher prices have been imported at inflated overseas prices and the importers now want to recoup themselves at the expense of the consumer. They took a gamble and are not prepared to pay the price of their bet. If the Government is going to connive at this sort of thing and allow these people to get away with the swag they might as well leave out of account the cost of living. Those who gamble in commodities should be made to pay the price. Their warehouses are chockful of goods imported at inflated prices, and it is the duty of the Minister to take note of this and tell them they cannot expect the same mark-up on these goods as they did on normal imports. If the Minister will take his courage in his hands he will have the support of the majority of thinking people in this country. But he must take his courage in his hands and get away from the idea that he must be a popular boy with commerce and industry. Most responsible merchants in this country admit what I have said tonight. They admit there has been a lot of speculation and gambling in the importation of these goods. Everybody has tried to beat the gun. Nobody can blame them; it is human nature under the capitalist system of the survival of the fittest. But at the same time the Minister has a responsibility to the consumer and that responsibility is to see that the consumer does not have to pay for the gambling of the importers.

*Mr. A. STEYN: It is perfectly clear the Opposition are now seriously beginning to feel that they had a dose of castor oil on the 26th May. It is now beginning to have effect. We gained that impression listening to the main critic on the other side, the hon. member for Vasco (Mr. Mushet). He stands up here and in a stentorian voice speaks about an export drive, and he associates agricultural produce with it. Do you know what the truth really is? That party is disappointed because the Government is not exporting the people's food as they did two and three years ago. They are disappointed because the Minister of Agriculture held back 7,000,000 bags of mealies and did not export them. He could have got dollars for the maize. It was the easiest thing in the world. They wanted him to export it and then they could have gone to the people and said: The Government has exported your food. Just imagine; in a country like this where the people have not enough butter and cheese the main critic on the Opposition side asks the Government why it is not exporting dairy produce.

*Mr. MUSHET: I did not say so.

*Mr. ROBINSON: What about margarine?

*Mr. A. STEYN: No, the Opposition cannot run away from its responsibility. Agricultural products must be exported. The public should know what they have asked. There is no doubt about it. They expressed the people's food with the result that women had to stand in queues a mile long throughout the country. They cannot deny it.

Then we come to the industrial policy. What was the industrial policy of that party? Let us sum it up. They made mention here of the manufacture of agricultural machinery. A front-bencher of that party, Mr. Karl Rood, started a factory at Vereeniging to make agricultural implements. Did he have the support of the Government on his side?

*Mr. BARLOW: I have a letter here in which he says that you are stupid.

*Mr. A. STEYN: He had to go to the people to obtain money to keep that factory going. He did not get the support of that Government. You cannot tell me that. I was in it all these years and I knew what took place. No, the policy of that party on the other side has always been that we should export our raw materials to England, and then import manufactured goods and pay dearly for them. That was always their policy and they cannot run away from it.

*Mr. SUTTER: Louder.

*Mr. A. STEYN: The member can say "louder" . . .

away it seems to me that someone must have said something wrong about the backveld because in my time it was perfectly in order to speak about the backveld. I personally regard the backveld as a delightful place.

Mr. VISSER: It is used nowadays as a term of abuse.

†Mr. STUART: It ought not to be a term of abuse. It ought to be a term of affection. But cut me out of the fight; I do not want to get involved in fights. Let me remind hon. members that there is a little habit on the part of the Imperial Parliament which has grown up over many hundreds of years; it is just this, that when they reply to the Address of the King they always put the following words at the end: "and Your Majesty's Commons ask that Your Majesty will be pleased to put the most favourable interpretation upon Your Majesty's humble Commons' words and deeds." In the same spirit, I ask hon. members, if I use some phrase which may be regarded by some imaginative person as an insult against any section of the community, to place the most favourable interpretation upon my words. But, Sir, I have only ten minutes, so let me get on with my speech. I say that I believe that urbanisation is recognisable. I am perfectly certain that I can recognise it amongst the Africans in East London, a place which I know with reasonable intimacy. I am perfectly certain that it has nothing to do with landed property. You can have an urbanised person who does not own a piece of land in the urban area at all, and you can have a person who is not urbanised in spite of the fact that he inherits a piece of land there. But to say that urbanisation is incapable of definition seems to me to open the way eventually to one of the most gaping horrors facing the African community, the possibility of their removal from the urban areas, forcing them back into a form of slavery. I can see the time coming when the police will go with a dragnet to the towns and say to every African they meet: "What are you doing here; you are not permanently urbanised; you are not this and you are not that and you must get out of the urban area." There are certain Africans in town who have no other conceivable background and I do not wish to be quoted as permitting even the hon. member for Cape Eastern to say that urbanisation is not recognisable. It is no good saying that urbanised Africans must be sent "back" to the farms. Many of them left the farms so long ago that they have cut off all their roots—all their tentacles. Some, most, have never been on farms at all. It is no good saying that you do not want to detribalise the Africans. The fact remains that you have detribalised Africans today. You

might just as well say that you do not want unfarmed Afrikaners.

Mrs. BALLINGER: What do you mean by "unfarmed"?

†Mr. STUART: I mean Afrikaners who have been taken off or come off the farms, and who cannot get back. Mr. Chairman, it is rather amusing; I get a series of interruptions from people who disagree with me, and apart from wasting my time, those interruptions mean nothing. What does mean something in this country is trying to safeguard the African from the real dangers that are liable to attack him. As far as this particular Bill is concerned, I am absolutely convinced that at any rate the urbanised African—and I am sure that that term can be defined—is entitled to protection under the Bill. As far as the hon. member for Berea (Mr. Sullivan) is concerned, I can only say that I repudiate the sneers against his intelligence. As far as I can make out he has done a bit of original thinking and I cannot see why he should not get credit for it. It is natural that he should fight for the urbanised African, because that term can be defined. Mr. Chairman, there is so much that I would like to say but I cannot say it all in ten minutes. But I do say that I am afraid that non-recognition of the urbanised African, particularly by a Native representative, is going to open the way eventually to the horrors of the removal of people who are not recognised as urbanised, possibly by force, and forcing them back into a form of slavery.

Mrs. BALLINGER: It has been going on for years.

Mr. STUART: Of course, I know it has been going on for years. I could lecture for hours and hours on the subject.

An HON. MEMBER: For goodness' sake, don't.

†Mr. STUART: I know that, but let us cut out this technique of interruptions for a moment, and let me say this, that I am more afraid of the danger that lies behind this attitude that you cannot define permanent urbanisation. I say that the permanently-urbanised African should be defined and he can be defined. He may have to be defined for his own protection if the forces of removal ever climb down upon him to force him into economic slavery. [Time limit.]

†Mr. HEPPLER: I want to support the proposal of the hon. member for Cape Eastern (Mrs. Ballinger) that sub-paragraph (d) be deleted. From the discussion on this

To omit sub-paragraph (r) proposed under paragraph (d).

*Mr. VAN DEN BERG: While we are engaged on this exclusion clause, I should like to refer to the erroneous impression that exists in the minds of all the members who have spoken on the other side. I put that down to the fact that they either deliberately represent the matter in a wrongful light, or that they are doing so on account of the fact that they have not yet a proper realisation of the measure of effectiveness of such legislation. I use advisedly the expression "measure of effectiveness". Every time members of the Labour Party speak and also the member for Cape Western — in this case I mean the hon. member for Cape Eastern, and I do not apologise for having said the member for Cape Western because in this matter she talks in exactly the same way as the hon. member for Cape Western — we find that those members refer time and again to the difficulties that will arise in regard to unemployment in times of depression should this section or that be excluded. When they speak about the effect of this law in times of depression, let it sink into the minds of those members once and for all that should a depression overtake us we cannot expect that a measure such as this will cope with unemployment. There can be no help from a measure such as this to combat unemployment. It is because they are labouring under that misapprehension that they come forward with those trivial motions and suggestions. They are shifting those proposals from right to left and on both sides there is a little knot so that they will never get over their difficulties.

The hon. member for Bloemfontein (City) (Dr. C. F. Steyn), who was a Minister, is undoubtedly, amongst all the members on the other side, the one most familiar with all these aspects of the matter, and if he has seen time and again the sort of difficulties that have arisen I hope that his followers will take note of that. This measure can only provide relief to unemployed people in normal circumstances. Therefore, you will find emphasis continually laid on that in the report to the Minister. Should a period of depression come the responsibility in connection with unemployment rests on the State. In other words, the time will then have arrived to embark on relief works on a large scale; those works which cannot be started now because of the shortage of labour, both skilled and unskilled. I maintain that during a depression we have the opportunity for large construction works to be given an impetus. I repeat that I want hon. members on the other side to realise this, and when they realise it they will no longer think of this measure as one to help the unemployed out of their distress in a period of depression.

The main point on which I have risen is to ask the Minister when he replies to the motion for the deletion of paragraph (r), to inform me whether the presence of this paragraph will not possibly strike at the mineworkers in so far that there exists on the Rand, as the Minister knows, the Rand Employees' Provident Fund. I believe in certain circumstances they pay £23 a year to a worker for every year of service.

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: That is not a pension.

*Mr. VAN DEN BERG: There is also a pension attached to it when he has turned sixty. I want the Minister to give me the assurance that the mineworkers will not be affected by this. I shall be glad to have that assurance. If that is not the case, if they are really affected thereby, then for that reason only and for no other reason I hope the Minister will accept the amendment and delete the clause.

Turning to the workers who draw pension, my friends know as well as I do that normally there is no unemployment amongst people such as State employees, who have their pension scheme, the staffs of some of the large municipalities that have pension schemes, and also where other important employers have a system for the payment of pensions at a definite age.

*Mr. HEPPLÉ: So.

*Mr. DAVIDOFF: Where do you get that from?

†Mr. VAN DEN BERG: They cannot become unemployed in the normal way. I shall be glad if the hon. member would tell me how in normal circumstances they can become unemployed. The position is that those hon. members of the Labour Party have become estranged from the workers, and to the degree that they become estranged they come with proposals which are impracticable and in regard to which they will never gain the ear of the workers.

†Mr. A. H. J. EATON: I do not know whether the hon. member who has just sat down is right in his conclusions, but I think myself that we do provide an unemployment insurance fund in order to meet unemployment, and can he define what a normal period is? It is just those difficulties we experience in dealing with matters of this kind. As the Minister has rejected the amendment moved by the hon. member for Berea (Mr. Sullivan) I want to tell him he cannot wipe his hands of the responsibility of unemployment amongst those Natives who will earn less than £182. I believe he has made provision, or he thinks the fund will stand two years' payments in the case of the

passing of this Bill, in the event of an emergency arising.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: No, I did not say that.

†Mr. A. H. J. EATON: I do believe the Native does not want unemployment insurance. I can relate a personal experience to the Minister. We find great difficulty in explaining to these people why they should subscribe. In fact we find it is much easier to pay their contribution into the fund than to spend time in getting them with us. Speaking to an intelligent Native on the subject, he said: All we want is a home and food and work, all the White man's nonsense we do not want. There is a good deal of truth in that. We have arrived at our present stage after centuries of civilisation. These are things they cannot understand; to them it is the White man's nonsense. That is a point of view we have to give serious consideration to. We cannot, as a civilised people who bear responsibility towards these people as their trustees, divorce the whole idea in this relation of being without responsibility to them in the time of abnormal depression. It is possible it will come; we hope we will avoid it, but there is a possibility of depression. How can we provide for it?

I believe the employing classes of this country are not as callous as some of our friends make them out to be. Therefore we put this forward, that the employing section who will fall under (r) and who will be relieved of responsibility of membership to the fund will, I am sure, be able and ready to meet the position half-way. Our contention has been under this Act that the majority of employers in banks, insurance companies, building societies and similar institutions in this country have felt this is a burden in respect of which their employee members would never receive any benefit. For that reason they see in the original Act the imposition of subscribing under the guise of benefits to be received in the future but which will never eventuate. Therefore they have thought of it in terms of injustice by this fund, particularly towards the employees. I have not found an employee who subscribes to this fund and who works for organisations of the kind I have described, and who believes in unemployment insurance from the point of view of it being a benefit to him at some future date. On the other hand we have the employer section, and they are not callous people; I think I may say they would be willing to pay half the amount for five years on the basis that what they paid in 1948 towards the fund should be utilised when unemployment arises on a big scale. I believe the employer organisations would pay so much that it would create a very substantial fund which could be utilised in times of great stress. Those of us who remember the depression that occurred in

1930 know that amongst the Natives there was not any serious unemployment; they found ways and means of finding work, and those that became unemployed were able to be tided over very often by their own people. You know that there are kyas provided for servants in most of the homes in our towns and you would be surprised if you saw the number of brothers who find temporary shelter in these kyas.

Mrs. BALLINGER: That is illegal.

†Mr. A. H. J. EATON: Yes, but in times of stress the poor help the poor and the Natives help each other. Therefore I say if the Minister can find ways and means of inviting, or by law exacting the payment of half the amount the employers would be relieved of under paragraph (r) he would be able to have a fund which, perhaps as Minister of Public Works, he could utilise for finding employment for these people. I believe there is something in that idea, and I hope the Minister will be able to give it attention so as to create the beginning of that fund, which I am sure the employer section under (r) would be glad to subscribe to, on the basis of half the amount they paid on the 1948 basis.

†Mr. DAVIDOFF: I desire to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cape Eastern (Mrs. Ballinger) and also the amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosettenville (Mr. Hepple). In dealing with paragraph (b) we must compare that provision with the amendment moved by the hon. member for Berea (Mr. Sullivan) and with the subsequent amendment of the hon. member for Cape Eastern.

The Minister desires to exclude all Natives who are not earning £182 per annum. In his amendment the hon. member for Berea desires to exclude all Natives who are not regarded as permanently urbanised. Then there was the amendment, the best amendment, by my friend on the right who did not want to exclude any Natives. If I may in the first place deal with the amendment of the hon. member for Berea. Because of the fact, as has been stated, that there is no definition of an urbanised Native I think he should have been consequential after introducing this amendment by trying to define what is a permanently-urbanised Native. The Nationalist Party under its apartheid policy may in the very near future endeavour to introduce only migratory labour in the urban areas, and if that is so those Natives who are today classified as permanently urbanised would be in an advantageous position because, sir, if that policy were introduced by the Government in the future there would be no more permanently-urbanised Native labour and from that point of view there would be a distinct discrimination in favour of the present ones

which they are entitled to. The result is that they take up other employment and consequently they do not derive any benefit from the Act, although they are contributors. This is merely intended to assist those contributors. Only the two higher wage groups will be affected; and it is only when they are compelled through circumstances beyond their control, when the employment officer cannot offer them suitable employment in the same group and they voluntarily accept employment at a wage less than 50 per cent. of their normal earnings, that the fund will assist them for a period of 13 weeks. But even while they are in this employment every effort will be made by the employment officer to find them work in their normal employment. This is merely a temporary expedient to assist them over a difficult period. They remain contributors in their original group. They merely accept that as a temporary expedient. If they are prepared quite voluntarily to accept employment which carries a wage of less than 50 per cent. of their normal earnings, then I think it is only right they should receive some assistance out of the fund. As the Act stands, if they accept employment at a wage less than half their normal earnings they get no assistance, and my intention is to give them some assistance. I want to ask the hon. member for Cape Eastern not to press the amendment, but to give us the opportunity of allowing this arrangement to work. I can give her this assurance, that if I find there is any abuse I shall be prepared to submit an amending Bill to repeal this provision which is now proposed.

Mr. KAHN: I would like to move the deletion of paragraph (e) of Clause 9. The unemployment insurance fund is entitled under the existing Act when considering any particular contributor who has some record of having drawn on the fund to look into his record for the period of that year only. Now the Minister wants the right to consider the man's record as a contributor over a longer period.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: No, you are completely misunderstanding the Bill.

Mr. KAHN: Will the Minister explain? Even the legal draughtsmen from time to time take a tumble when their legislation comes before a court of law. I think I am correct. I move—

To omit paragraph (e).

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The amendment I am moving is in paragraph (e) of Section 9, the substitution of the word "or" for "and". Is that the paragraph to which the hon. member for Cape Western (Mr. Kahn) is referring?

Mr. KAHN: Yes.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Section 39 (4), which is being amended, reads—

Whenever in the opinion of the claims officer the number of occasions on which and the periods during which a contributor became and . . .

that "and" becomes "or"—

. . . and remained unemployed during the year preceding the date of an application for benefits is excessive . . .

The reason for the amendment is that where a contributor is constantly losing his employment, Section 39 (4) of the Act provides his benefits may be reduced. This amendment proposes to strengthen the provision by removing the limitation by which unemployment only in the preceding year may be taken into account. The substitution of "or" for "and" is intended to make it clear. This applies when you have a consistent malingering, a person who loses employment, when he is always becoming unemployed and the claims officer is convinced that he could be employed. My information is that the present position is that you very often find people deliberately losing their employment. This is not done in such a way that the claims officer can definitely prove it. In addition to that they do not want to take into account only the preceding year, but they want to take into account the record of the contributor generally, to establish whether he is the type who loses his employment through his own fault.

Mr. KAHN: Then my interpretation is correct.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Yes, I thought it was another paragraph. The employers are anxious to be protected against the malingering, the man who makes a legitimate claim on the fund from time to time, the man who nevertheless provokes his employer to dismiss him because he is a bad workman. If the malingering has become a reformed character and for a period of a year has maintained himself in a job without becoming dismissed, in other words without making an excessive claim on the fund, he is regarded as a rehabilitated character. He also has an appeal to the unemployment benefit committee.

Mr. KAHN: It is the point I made in the second reading speech. If the Minister would revert in the administration of the fund to the 1937 Act whose provisions in regard to local committees were far superior to the present one all these problems could be avoided. But in Cape Town for all the industries there is one unemployment com-

mittee, and they cannot be familiar with all the details of each industry. If the Minister would consider the decentralisation of the local committees we would have less objection to the claims officer taking a man's record for five or six years. At present, although he has the right of appeal to the committee, its members may not include anyone acquainted with his particular industry, and consequently his appeal might be treated as a formal matter. That is why I ask the Minister to be satisfied with twelve months. If he comes up a second time the Minister will have got him under the present provision. It is a salutary principle that a man's past record should not be used against him for too long a period of time. I therefore ask the Minister to remain satisfied with the existing provision. If he then finds that the claims officer's experience is that this is still being abused he can come to the House and ask for the section to be amended.

The amendments proposed by the Minister of Labour were put and agreed to and the amendments proposed by Mr. Kahn and Mrs. Ballinger were put and negatived.

Clause, as amended, put and agreed to.

On Clause 10.

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I move—

In line 37, after "performing" to insert "and the acceptance of which will not, in the opinion of the claims officer, cause the contributor concerned undue hardship".

This is an amendment to the provision in regard to "suitable work". As the provision reads now it means that in groups I, II and III, a claims officer can offer a contributor any work carrying a higher wage than the benefit to which that contributor is entitled, provided that the contributor is physically capable of performing that work. I am moving that these words be inserted that in addition to being physically capable of performing the work, the acceptance of it will not in the opinion of the claims officer cause the contributor undue hardship. That is merely a safeguard. I do not want the claims officer to confine himself strictly to the letter of the law. There may be cases of hardship. For example, you may find the case of a woman with a breast-fed baby who becomes unemployed and who may be offered work which involves sleeping away from her home, and it would be a distinct hardship to compel her to accept employment of that nature. That is why I am inserting this provision. Additional safeguards are provided, namely, that the contributor can always appeal to the Unemployment Benefit Committee, which consists of representatives of employees and employers, and from that committee there

is a further appeal to the National Insurance Board which is constituted in the same manner. So I think there are sufficient safeguards to ensure that there is no abuse of this section. There is a great deal in what the hon. member for Cape Western (Mr. Kahn) says that unemployment benefit committees should be constituted in specific industries, but I think that the way in which they are constituted at present they are representative of the different trade unions and of the different interests. After all, the representatives of the workers do not only concern themselves with the interests of the workers in their particular group, or their particular trade union; they concern themselves with the interests of the workers in general, so I feel that the safeguards which are provided are sufficient.

†Mr. HEPPLE: I think clause 10, section (2) (a) was inspired by the report of the Unemployment Insurance Commission which seemed to be chiefly concerned with the provision of plentiful farm labour, and I think this was a bone of contention right throughout the debate on the second reading of the Bill. The question of providing farm labour has been dealt with under clause 3 (b) because the Minister has inserted the provision that Native contributors must earn at least £182 per annum, which means that Natives are immediately excluded. The fear in the minds of those who felt that the Natives were drifting into the towns and that they were getting the benefit of unemployment insurance has now disappeared. But let us look at the implications of this Bill. We have excluded the lower-paid Natives and we have left under the provisions of this Bill Europeans, Coloureds and Indians, and if the provisions contained in this clause are applied, we are going to find that a European woman, for instance, can be sent into domestic service. According to the provision European men can be sent to the farms to do agricultural labour, and I think if the Minister considers the implications of this amendment . . .

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: These things will not happen. You are now quoting hypothetical cases.

†Mr. HEPPLE: These may be hypothetical cases, but the fact remains that this is very bad legislation. You cannot say that this will not happen. There are many things that have happened in the past under bad legislation in this country and why have a bad piece of legislation if it is needless? It will not be sufficient merely to rely upon those who are going to apply the terms of this Act to use their discretion. As long as they apply it to the principles which the Minister has in mind at the moment it would be in order but other people with other opinions may apply the terms of the

Act in the future and that is very bad legislation. If the claims officer feels so inclined he can send a European woman living in Cape Town to Paarl to undertake domestic service. This provision will lead to the breaking up of family life.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The claims officer can do the same thing now after thirteen weeks and it never happens.

†Mr. HEPPLE: But the Minister is now specifying something that was not provided for the previous Act. The clause provides that the contributor may be sent to undertake any work, including work in agriculture or work as a domestic servant in a private household. Here the claims officer is being given a direction. It is being intimated to him that these are two classes of work which he can choose. That provision did not appear in the previous Act. Under this clause we may find that a family is broken up. The husband may be sent to work on a farm 20, or 30 or 40 miles away from his home.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Did you listen to the amendment that I have just moved?

†Mr. HEPPLE: The Minister's amendment says that in addition to being capable of performing the work, the acceptance of it will not in the opinion of the claims officer, cause the contributor undue hardship, but what is "undue hardship"? Surely that is a matter of degree. It is a question of interpretation by the claims officer. Surely we are not going to leave it so wide that it is purely within the discretion of the claims officer. One claims officer may interpret this term in one way and another claims officer may interpret it in a different way, and in view of the vague and loose wording of portions of this clause, I want to move the following amendment—

To omit the new sub-section (2) proposed under paragraph (b) and to substitute the following new sub-section:

(2) For the purpose of this section the expression "suitable work" means work of a similar class and in the same group as the work and group wherein the contributor is ordinarily employed, but does not include any employment, the acceptance of which

(a) might prejudice the claimant in his or her future pursuit of occupation or might be injurious to his or her health or morale;

(b) would involve residence in a district in which suitable accommo-

modation is not available or is more than 20 miles distant from the usual place of residence;

(c) would provide a lower rate of wages or less favourable other conditions of employment than those normally enjoyed by the contributor or accepted by the industry;

(d) would mean that the contributor would occupy a position which had become vacant in consequence of a stoppage of work due to a trade dispute.

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The difficulty of hon. members of the Labour Party is that they do not think for themselves. They allow other people to think for them. The amendment which the hon. member has just moved did not originate from the Labour Party. They received it this morning from the Western Province Committee of the Trades and Labour Council and without examining its implications they are only too ready to move it in this House. At the present time the provision is that after 13 weeks of unemployment the claims officer can offer the contributor any type of work. Hon. members on the Labour Party benches are now proposing to delete even that. For 26 weeks the claims officer will be bound by the provisions which they now seek to insert. That is why I say that they never attempted even to examine the implications of this amendment. I am sorry, I cannot accept this amendment. I think this a very excellent and a very necessary provision, namely that in these three groups the claims officer should be allowed to offer the contributor any other work which they are physically capable of doing and which will not cause undue hardship. There are these safeguards. The cases to which the hon. member referred are entirely hypothetical cases. They can happen under the present Act after 13 weeks' unemployment. Under the Act as it stands at present, after 13 weeks the claims officer can offer the contributor any employment at any wage in any place.

Mr. HEPPLE: Why specify these two classes of employees?

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: No hardship has been suffered under the existing provisions. Hon. members on those benches cannot mention one specific instance where a contributor has been forced to accept employment of the nature that they have just mentioned.

Mr. HEPPLE: We have not had unemployment.

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: We are now extending it to the first thirteen weeks in respect of the first three groups. In regard to the interpretation of "suitable work", the interpretation has been that it also applies to agricultural work.

Mr. KAHN: It applies to Europeans as well.

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: It can apply to Europeans, but as I have said before, surely it is better to be employed and to earn money rather than to draw unemployment benefits. I am sorry I am unable to accept this amendment.

Mr. KAHN: That is a different argument.

Mr. MITCHELL: I think the hon. member for Rosettenville (Mr. Hepple) has clearly shown that this provision cannot apply to Natives. The Minister says that the effect of his amendment will be that if a mother with a child at her breast were offered employment where she would have to live in, it would probably constitute a hardship and therefore it would not take place in those circumstances, but supposing it did not constitute hardship in the mind of the claims officer and in the mind of any reasonable man. It might not constitute hardship in the mind of the claims officer and I am still unhappy to think that the provisions of the Bill may be used to force a mother with a child at her breast to accept domestic service, so as to avoid paying her unemployment insurance benefits. I think the Minister's own illustration is a grievous one if the Act is to be applied for purposes of that kind.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The complaint was that that occurred under the original Act. The hon. member for Durban (Umbilo) (Mrs. Benson) mentioned that.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Minister mentioned it as an example a moment ago. He said that if that employment created hardship, the woman would not be compelled to accept it. I say that it may not necessarily create hardship, and are we going to make a white woman accept employment of that nature under the conditions specified, namely where the woman has a child at her breast; are we going to compel her to take domestic service if in the opinion of the claims officer it does not constitute hardship? I hope that the Minister will explain this because it leaves me with a most unhappy feeling to think that the terms of this legislation are to be used to force women to accept employment of that nature.

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: The whole intention of this clause is to allow the claims officer to place unskilled labourers in any

type of unskilled occupation. That is the intention.

Mr. MITCHELL: But a mother is a mother whether she is unskilled or not.

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: We do not find many European women in domestic service.

An HON. MEMBER: Oh yes, we do.

†The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I was not referring to European women. I was referring to Coloured or Indian women. The whole intention of this definition of "suitable work" is that unskilled labour should be utilised in any type of unskilled work. That is the intention under the Act as it stands at present. Under the provisions of the existing Act the claims officer, after thirteen weeks, can place any contributor in any type of employment at any wage. That has been the practice in the past two years and it has never been abused. You have never had the position where claims officers after thirteen weeks have offered women contributors domestic service in a private household. These things do not happen. My information is that we have thousands of Indians in Natal whom, under the present provisions of the Act, this claims officers find it impossible to place in similar employment, but under this provision they will be able to place these Indian men immediately on sugar plantations where they are in urgent need of labour. That is the intention of the clause.

†Mr. KAHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the Minister has delved into all the repercussions of this particular clause. I would like to deal with his arguments seriatim. In the first place he says, quite correctly, that under the existing Act, after the expiry of the first thirteen weeks, during which unemployment benefits are paid, the claims officers can offer any unemployed worker any alternative employment in their discretion which they regard as suitable. That is correct, but why not leave the first thirteen weeks untouched? If the Minister does touch the first thirteen weeks it is very significant that he touches them only in regard to the lower paid workers in groups I, II and III, but the other six groups are to be left untouched for the first thirteen weeks. Why for the first time in any Unemployment Insurance Act do we find this discrimination in the treatment of the different groups with regard to the question of alternative employment? This provision is not found in any Act anywhere in the world, and the only reason why this was initially suggested, was to hit at the non-Europeans. That is why it was done. It was done to hurt the non-Europeans. The Minister must realise this. He has excluded practically

hon. member for Berea (Mr. Sullivan) and also the report of the hon. member for Johannesburg (City) (Mr. Christie), it was suggested that the consensus of evidence was in favour of retaining the principle of the Act, and that subject to certain amendments and exemptions, in order to improve the administration of the Act, provision should be made whereby registered trade unions can pay unemployment benefits to their members in terms of the Act. As I understand it, the Minister wants to centralise payments, he wants them made out of a central fund. I would remind him that the more you centralise the worse the delays and the more difficult it is to get results. I would suggest there is a good deal of substance in that point. There is a good deal of force in the contention of the hon. member for Johannesburg (City) (Mr. Christie) that the trade unions know their people best, they know where the shoe pinches, and I would urge him to accept their suggestions.

†Mr. N. G. EATON: The hon. member for South Coast (Mr. Mitchell) and the last speaker have stressed, I think very emphatically, our feelings on this side of the House in regard to contributions that were made by employees into the fund, and how they, the United Party, felt about it. I do not intend to deal with that aspect because I think the House knows the feelings of this side of the House as well as the feelings on the United Party benches. What I want to deal with in particular is Clause 10 (2) (a) and (b). Here we have discrimination of an unnecessary type in our industrial legislation. I am referring to the fact that in sub-section (2) (a) there is no period of time during which the employee who becomes unemployed can draw benefit before being canalised into other employment. There is no period of time allowed before the worker will be sent to other work, suitable or not. This is discrimination because in sub-section 10 (b) the worker is granted 13 weeks. I am not opposed to the 13 weeks. What I want to indicate here is that it is dependent on the wages earned by the employees — that is the deciding factor — whether he is going to be canalised into any type of work, or whether there will be this break of 13 weeks before this comes into operation. I would like to ask the Minister whether even at this late stage he does not consider that this type of discrimination is bad in an industrial law. I know the Minister may consider it highly essential, but I cannot for the life of me see how the Government can discriminate on a wage level. Wages have some relation to skill, but it is not the deciding factor. I am perfectly convinced that low wages do not always represent unskilled work any more than high wages always denote a skilled worker. In the groups covered by sub-section (2) (a) the claims

officer has the right to canalise these employees into any type of employment, and the Minister has made one concession in saying that there should be no undue hardships. This term can be interpreted differently by different claims officers. I feel that it is too negative a clause to assist a great deal in the objects the Minister has in mind.

That brings me to sub-section (2) (b). Under this sub-section, after 13 weeks the claims officer can send the employee to any type of work, whether there is any undue hardship or not, and you have this type of discrimination between the two classes again. I do not think the Government is serious when they indicate that undue hardship may be caused in the one case and not in the other. I wish to appeal to the Minister, is he not prepared at this late stage to give (a) the benefits that are extended to (b) and (b) the benefits that are extended to (a), so that we will not have this undue discrimination in two clauses in the same section applying to our industrial laws.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: Despite the minor amendments which the Minister has put through in the Committee Stage of this Bill it retains all its worst features, and it is quite obvious the Minister has been unmoved by the pleas made from this side of the House. I had hoped at one stage he would see his way clear to consider some of the points that have been raised by us, because as the Bill now stands we virtually accept the abolition of unemployment insurance. I think the Minister will agree with that. I want at this stage to record that this Bill, based as the Minister stated in introducing the Bill, on some of the evidence that was produced before the Unemployment Insurance Commission, has in fact ignored the viewpoint of the representatives of the employees and the employers. The Trades and Labour Council, which represents the bulk of organised workers in the country, stated in its evidence that the principle should be applied to all persons who worked for wages or salaries, and that where exclusions were to be made consideration should be given to the following classes of persons; those engaged in private households and indentured Africans who on the completion of their contracts are compelled to return to their homes. On the other hand, the Association of Chambers of Commerce of South Africa, which speaks for a vast number of employers who are affected by this legislation, recommended as follows—

As everyone benefits from the stability which unemployment insurance confers upon society, as large a section of the community as possible should contribute to the Unemployment Insurance Fund. A special investigation should be made of the provisions arising out of unemployment insurance for Natives. Subject to any in-

superable difficulties that may exist all gainfully occupied Natives should contribute to the fund.

There we have the view of employers and employees. The provisions of the Bill are contrary to the recommendations of both these groups. This fund, which will be denuded of most of its contributors, will in fact do nothing to assist the State when at a later stage, as must inevitably happen, we must provide some sort of protection for those who are unemployed. The Minister has failed to take into consideration the serious financial implications of this amending Bill. This amending Bill is in fact exempting vast sections of employers and employees from building up a fund to assist the State at a later stage in any social security measures which may be necessary. The fact that in the short period since the 1946 Act we have accumulated £21 million, which I think the Minister said might approach £28 million at the end of this year, is an illustration of the enormous amount of money that can be accumulated from contributions and which will obviate people calling on the State for assistance when they are in need. However, despite the debate that has taken place in this House, the Minister has not met any of the pleas that have been made. I am sorry that has happened. I want to warn the Minister this Bill in application is going to be practically useless. We might as well not have a measure such as this placed on the Statute Book, because the Minister has in fact eliminated most of those who should benefit by it.

First of all it has very serious omissions, the most important of which is the exclusion of all Natives earning less than £182 per annum. Then there is the second exclusion, of those who contribute to pension or provident funds, and most seasonal workers are also excluded. That has reduced the fund to a very small and select group of workers in the country.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: It will still cover almost half-a-million workers.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: Yes, but what percentage does that represent of the total number of workers in the country? This unemployment insurance fund is only going to cover a small section of workers, and this is the more serious as those most in need of unemployment insurance are excluded. That, I think, is the worst feature of the Bill.

In addition to that, two very bad principles are embodied in the Bill. In Clause 10 there is the provision for alternative work, which we have argued before. Here it is provided that suitable work means—

... in relation to a contributor who is ordinarily employed in Group 1, 2 or 3, any work including work in agriculture or work as a domestic servant in a private household . . .

Despite the minor amendment the Minister has made it still remains in effect a very bad principle. It leaves in the Bill the authority for the claims officer to direct people to two types of work in particular, domestic service and agricultural labour. Despite the Minister's assurance that such things have not happened in the past we cannot agree that this legislation will not prevent abuse in the future. The powers are too great in the hands of the claims officer.

Then we have in Clause 5 that it is left to the discretion of the Minister to nullify the whole Act. It means that the exclusions can be so wide that eventually no one will participate in the fund, because the evidence given before the Unemployment Insurance Commission showed that a vast number of people who were neither for nor against the Act definitely, wanted themselves excluded from the provisions of the Act. This means that individual employers who do not like to be bothered with this insurance will be constantly applying for exclusion under this particular clause. The Minister will be inundated with applications for exclusion and the implication is this, that as more and more of those applications are granted so the value of this fund will become less and less. Under this clause the Act itself can be invalidated. I am sorry that the Minister did not give this his very serious consideration.

Finally, I want to deal with something concerning the application of this Act in the evidence that was given.

†Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to indicate to the House that the House has already accepted the principle of the Bill by passing the second reading. After the second reading the details of the various clauses were thrashed out in Committee. I have been allowing hon. members, especially hon. members on those benches who have been in opposition to the Bill, a certain degree of latitude, but we cannot now have a full discussion as at the second reading and also cover all the details that were passed in the Committee stage.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: I accept your ruling, sir, and I have endeavoured not to repeat what has already been said in the previous debate.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: But you have done so. All the speakers have done so.

†Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: The Minister says that I have done so in all my speeches. I do not know what he means by "all my speeches". This is the first time that I am speaking on the Third Reading. All I am doing is to indicate to the House the implications of what has been done by the passing of the committee stage of this Bill. I want to interpret to this House what the repercussions are going to be. I want this to be recorded because I can see the difficulties that are going to arise from this legislation. I will endeavour to keep within your ruling, which I naturally accept, but I am now dealing with another matter which I would like the Minister to consider. The Trades and Labour Council in giving evidence before the Unemployment Insurance Commission, stated—

Many unemployed workers have become so disgusted with the whole procedure that they have decided rather to forego the benefits to which they are entitled by law than to submit to all the irritations and indignities imposed upon them. All these inconveniences about which the workers complain were unknown under the previous Act.

The Minister has provided some protection against this in Clause 13, and I do hope that in the application of this Act it will be made possible for the workers under Clause 13 to receive the payments to which they are entitled under this measure without the difficulties that they experienced in the past.

†Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that certain differences on very important details in this Bill have become clarified and crystallised during the various stages through which this Bill has passed. It seems to this side of the House that the time has arrived when these issues, the major ones, should be crystallised in the form of an amendment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: It is very late to come with an amendment. That is an after-thought.

†Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: There are a few remarks I should like to make before moving the amendment. The first is that we have greeted the Minister's action in presenting this truncated version of Unemployment Insurance with surprise. Quite frankly, we expected the Minister to take quite a different line. I must admit that we were afraid that the Minister would accept the majority report of the commission and do away with the principle of unemployment insurance entirely in the industrial legislation of our country. Now, we are very happy that the Minister seems on second thoughts to have thought better of it. Our fears were not only based on the fact that the majority

report of the commission was in favour of the abolition of the principle of unemployment insurance but also because we believed that the Minister himself thought . . .

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Are you starting again with your political propaganda, the sort of propaganda that one can expect from a political organiser?

†Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I want to ask the hon. the Minister not to make those remarks.

†Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a tribute to the Minister, and a sincere tribute. We were afraid that the Minister would do away with the principle of unemployment insurance, and that fear was based on the declared policy of the Nationalist Party.

*The MINISTER OF LABOUR: You read that in the "Suiderskem" last night.

†Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: Before the general election . . .

†Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I am afraid I cannot allow the hon. member to pursue that line of discussion. The third reading is now under discussion. That argument might have been advanced during the second reading debate but it cannot be advanced now.

†Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: As you wish, sir. But now that the Bill is in its final stage, I would like to tell the Minister how grateful we are that he has taken up the attitude that he has taken up in this Bill. We are not completely satisfied. There are many provisions of this Bill that we fought to have amended during the various stages of the Bill. We were afraid that the Minister might abolish the principle of unemployment insurance but his wiser counsel has prevailed; he has broken away from some of the major follies contained in the programme of principles of his own party, and he has given us something here which has at least a semblance of the policy of the party on this side of the House. We feel that when this Bill has been in operation for some time the Minister will come back to this House with an improved Bill, making further concessions to the point of view of this side of the House and even of the cross benches. We have seen again and again that although the present Government make attempts to put some of the extravagant aspects of their policy into force, hard experience and cruel facts force them to realise that they are wrong and that we are right. We have had that experience, a very dramatic experience, only in the last few months on the question of Native school-feeding.

†Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. I am not prepared to allow the hon. member to continue in that strain. The question of Native school-feeding has nothing to do with the third reading of this Bill and I must warn the hon. member that if he continues in that strain I shall be obliged to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. TROLLIP: On a point of order, with all due respect, I submit that the hon. member is quite entitled to review the provisions of this Bill in the third reading debate, and when he uses another example as analogy, surely he is entitled to do so.

†Mr. SPEAKER: I think I shall be the judge of that, and I have ruled that I will not allow the hon. member to discuss the question of Native school-feeding.

Mr. TROLLIP: But, Mr. Speaker . . .

HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

†Mr. SPEAKER: I am not prepared to have my ruling discussed. The hon. member was discussing Native school-feeding and I have informed the hon. member that I shall not allow that question to be discussed in order to make comparisons at the third reading.

Mr. TROLLIP: I am sure the hon. member for Alberton (Mr. S. J. M. Steyn) will observe that ruling. . . .

†Mr. SPEAKER: Then I do not know why the hon. member is questioning my ruling.

Mr. TROLLIP: I am not questioning your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but if the hon. member discusses a question which may be analogous, I do not think the Speaker has the right to say that he will ask the hon. member to resume his seat.

HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

†Mr. SPEAKER: That is for me to judge, and I shall decide when it is necessary to call upon any member to resume his seat.

Mr. TROLLIP: May I with all due respect put this point of view to you, that under the rule which entitles the Speaker to call upon a member to resume his seat, it is for a specific reason and that is if the hon. member repeats the same arguments. If there is repetition the Speaker is entitled to ask the hon. member to resume his seat, but not for any general reason, and I would like to call your attention to the provisions of that rule which I think must be strictly interpreted.

†Mr. SPEAKER: I shall decide when I consider that the debate is being conducted in a way in which it should not be conducted. When I consider that the hon. member is introducing irrelevant matters into the debate, I shall call upon him to sit down. Having explained to the hon. member for Alberton what he may discuss and what he may not discuss, the hon. member may now proceed.

†Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: I shall now read to the House the amendment which I intend to move. The amendment reads—

To omit all the words after "That" and to substitute "this House refuses to pass the third reading of the Bill unless the Minister undertakes to pass additional legislation during this Session to provide for—

- (1) The payment of unemployment benefits to all employees who are entitled to benefits under the present Act who lose their employment owing to sickness; and
- (2) The repayment of contributions made under the 1946 Act to those Europeans who are now excluded from the operation of the present Act or who are to be excluded by future administrative action by the Minister."

Mr. Speaker, if one looks at that amendment against the background of the discussions that we have already had, one notices that there is a rather important omission and that is that there is no reference here to one point which was raised here by this side of the House, that the test for the exclusion of Natives from the operation of this form of insurance should not be a wage test but rather an urbanisation test. Sir, we considered including that point and we deliberately decided to omit it for this reason: We believe that the two points we have raised here are of vital importance, and in view of the declared policy of the Minister and of his party, we have some hope that he will accept this amendment. But we know that if we introduced any matter referring to the non-Europeans we had no hope of his accepting it, and we also know that in the course of time events will compel the Minister to modify his attitude towards the inclusion of Natives in this Bill. I think we should warn the Minister again that he may have to pay a very heavy price for the lesson that he is bound to learn as the result of the exclusion of Natives from the operation of the Unemployment Insurance Act. We all know that in the cities of South Africa, we have a growing number of Natives who are urbanised . . .

*An HON. MEMBER: Another negro-philist.

In concluding I want to say this: If the idea of this Bill is to keep as many people as possible from coming to South Africa then its provisions will succeed in doing that. If we pass this Bill it will mean that tens of thousands of people who might have emigrated to South Africa will never come here; I might say hundreds of thousands. It will also mean that many thousands of people in South Africa, rather than accept a second-class citizenship, will leave our shores. In other words, the passing of this Bill, although some of my friends opposite have tried to argue to the contrary, will not mean the strengthening of the people of South Africa. I pass this note of warning to the Government benches; if this Bill is passed it will mean weakening the position of our white population in our country. It will tremendously detract from the citizenship we now possess. This Citizenship Bill will be looked upon as the legislation of people who want this big country all to themselves. We hear of people making a corner in food, of people making a corner in this commodity and making a corner in that commodity. This Bill wants to make a corner of South Africa for a privileged few people. That is what it means. You are trying to make a corner of this land for a privileged few people. That kind of thing in the end never works. I tell you this land of ours is too great, this inheritance of ours is too rich and too promising to be left in the hands of a few people. This Government, I say again, and they know it, only represents a section of the people, and this legislation as it is being passed today exactly suits that section of the people. For the other sections of the people it is something less valuable, something not so good, something inferior. They have all the first-class tickets, and all the other people have the second and third class tickets. I say this is a most serious matter. As a matter of fact, the more I study this Bill the more I am alarmed at its provisions. The Minister brought it in with all his suavity and look at his smile this morning, a smile if I may describe it in terms of the Bill, a smile of Machiavelli.

An HON. MEMBER: It is worse.

†Mr. MUSHET: It is the smile of Machiavelli and the next thing we will discover is a diabolical plot. [Laughter.] I leave the House and the country to decide whether this is a Parliamentary Bill in the true sense of the word or whether it is merely a diabolical plot against the majority of people in this country.

†Mr. HEPPLE: A Bill of this nature requires as far as possible a dispassionate approach and not the emotion that has been engendered not only in the House but outside as well. There can be no doubt that the whole of South Africa, whether the English-speaking people or the Afrikaans-

speaking people, has been looking forward to our taking a further step towards our nationhood when we can proudly say we are South African citizens. For that reason there are many aspects of this Bill that are welcome to everyone. I do not think there can be very much quarrel with the new principle that there is no particular discrimination towards British subjects. But what can be objected to at the outset is the suddenness with which this change is proposed to be made. During the past decade we have had in the world to our grievous cost a nationalism that has led to war and has led to strife, and the progress of this country towards nationalism may closely follow the pattern we have seen followed in other countries. Very few of us would like to see a situation like that arise. There is a danger which the Government should have foreseen; and that is in view of their accession to power only twelve months ago and because of the acute feeling that had existed in this country on the question of nationality, this Bill could well have waited a little longer, because they are now faced with the charge that they are attempting to steamroller this Bill through the House. We of the Labour Party, while we readily support a Bill establishing the citizenship of all South Africans feel, in view of the long Order Paper we have before us, that this Bill could well have waited a little longer. Not only because of this Bill itself but because we know several important measures on the Order Paper are going to be neglected on account of the introduction of this Bill.

I say this because we have twenty-nine items on the Order Paper. Some of the measures figuring on that list are very important measures. We on the Labour benches believe that the Rents Bill is one of the most important Bills that has ever come before the House. It is a very important measure indeed. If the House is going to devote the best part of this week to the South African Citizenship Bill I know that many members on both sides of the House will be anxious to get away and we will have to rush through the balance of the legislation this Session, and we will not do justice to it.

Mr. MITCHELL: Will we not?

†Mr. HEPPLE: I would not like to argue. I would like to know whether you will.

Mr. MITCHELL: No.

†Mr. HEPPLE: Particularly the Rents Bill is a most important Bill.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

†Mr. HEPPLE: It requires a lot of discussion, and if the House is going to dissipate its energies on this emotional Bill

that we have before us, I am positive that other important measures are not going to receive the earnest attention they deserve. We on the Labour Party benches have had bitter experience of emotional questions having cut right across the real needs of the people of South Africa. We have for years and years had emotional struggles on flags and similar issues and we have neglected the very people who depend on bread-and-butter politics for their existence. These bread-and-butter politics are going to take second place to this extreme desire on the part of the Government to put through this legislation that we have before the House. I would like to assure the Minister that if this Bill had not been put before the House as it has been done, he would have received a considerable measure of support from us on the Labour benches. But now we suspect the motive behind the introduction of this Bill. It has been said by speakers in this House, it has been said in the Press outside, that the intention of the Government is to prevent something like 30,000 recent British immigrants to this country from exercising the vote within a period of two years of their arrival.

Mr. S. E. WARREN: Do you believe that?

Mr. DU TOIT: We know it is so.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: I would not like to believe it. But when this Bill is rushed through the House in this manner, one can be excused for suspecting there are ulterior motives. The Minister knows quite well this Bill could have been brought forward next session, but the Minister fears that will be too late, that too many of the immigrants would qualify for the vote. I have no special brief for British immigrants. South Africa needs all the immigrants from Europe it can get. Nor should there be any discrimination between those that come from Great Britain and those that come from other parts of the world. I agree with the Minister when he says we come from the stock of more than one nation and that all immigrants to this country should be placed on an equal footing. But we are creating a suspicion not only in the minds of those immigrants but even in the minds of other English-speaking South Africans, to say nothing of a number of Afrikaans-speaking South Africans, when this Bill is being pushed through so earnestly this Session instead of being held over till next session. If the Minister is sincere in his attempt to establish South African citizenship, surely another six months will not make all that difference, except, as I have said before, that it may make a difference in regard to voting rights. I do hope that the Minister and members of his party will realise that this is only a temporary expedient, because the

pushing through of the Bill at this stage is certainly going to cause further racial feeling in this country, which is quite unnecessary. We have in this country English-speaking South Africans in the third, fourth and fifth generation. They have no greater sentiment towards Great Britain than the hon. Minister himself. Those people are only too anxious to see South Africa grow into a great nation, they are only too anxious to be called South Africans and not Union nationals. They have no particular desire to place British nationals on a different basis to others. What they do want to see is that this Government, that we in this country, get away from what we have had for so many years, the bitterness of 1900 and the bitterness of 1939. We cannot do these things if the Government is going to insist on rushing this Bill through this particular session. It is a most unnecessary step on the part of the Government.

My attitude towards the Government on the question of the Citizenship Bill, whether introduced now or at any other stage, is that we are a little worried about their attitude towards nationalism. My attitude on nationalism is not quite the same as that of some of the members opposite. Because I remember there were some members on the Government benches, fortunately not all of them, who showed a great leaning towards the nationalism of Nazi Germany; and I have no admiration for that type of nationalism. I would rue the day that type of nationalism came to South Africa, and that is where I cross swords with some of the members opposite.

Mr. S. E. WARREN: What about Communism?

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: I believe on the question of nationalism, that that nationalism should be of a nature that embraces internationalism, the love of our fellow-beings in other countries and the desire to co-operate. I would not like to see my children proud of their South African nationalism and intolerant of the nationalism of other countries. That is where the proud nationalism of Nazi Germany failed. These are questions which come to one's mind when we see the urgent desire to put this urgent legislation through this Session. I believe that if the United Party had been returned to power they would have introduced a Bill very similar to this one. Whether they would have discriminated . . .

Mr. RUSSELL: What would your Labour Party have done if they had come into power?

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: I say that the United Party might well have introduced a Bill of this nature. Whether they would have gone to the lengths the Minister has in making

discriminations and whether they would have broken faith with these immigrants who have come in, I doubt. Nevertheless they would have introduced a citizenship Bill; and the point I am making is that the United Party would have introduced a Citizenship Bill, though it might not have gone as far, perhaps, as the Minister's Bill has gone.

I believe, too, that a Citizenship Bill on the right lines could go a long way—this Bill goes a little distance towards it—in removing one of the main planks of Nationalist Party propaganda in this country, and that is accusing the majority of English-speaking citizens in South Africa of having a dual loyalty. We hear it particularly from the platteland that English-speaking citizens have a dual loyalty. That is quite untrue, and hon. members know it. The majority of English-speaking South Africans have no other loyalty than their loyalty to South Africa. One or two jingoes may have a different point of view. The Minister laughs . . .

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Why do you say the majority?

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: I am speaking for most of the people I know, they have only a single loyalty.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: You admit a large number have not.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: There is only a very small number that I know. The largest number exists in the mind of the Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: We say that all Afrikaans-speaking people have only one loyalty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: At the beginning of my speech I mentioned the emotion in a Bill of this nature. The Minister of Justice apparently is filled with that emotion and it will die with him and it will prevent him thinking reasonably.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Have you no emotion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: It is not clear that from whatever part of the world the immigrant comes, his sentiments are naturally at first with the people he has just left, until he breaks that down. This does not only apply to British subjects but to people from all parts of the world. Really, to make an accusation of that nature is childish. What this country needs more than anything else is for politicians to concentrate their efforts

more on the bread-and-butter politics of the common people. The people of this country are constantly being misled, and their minds are frequently diverted from the essential issues that face them by sentimental and emotional issues. If more attention could be paid to the economic issues, to the economic problems that face the people of this country and less propaganda made on issues such as this, we could perhaps attach a little more sincerity to the sentiments of those who profess that they are working in the interests of South Africa. Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to those objections to the Bill we have certain other objections and they are in the Bill itself; one particular objection being that the powers to be left in the hands of the Minister are far too great, far too wide and can lead to a considerable amount of abuse. The delegation of powers into the hands of the Minister can lead to a considerable amount of injustice, not intended injustice, but it gives the Minister powers far beyond those necessary to be conferred upon a Minister in the application of a Bill of this nature. To quote one or two instances. In Clause 8 (1) (g), the Minister may, upon application in the prescribed form, grant a certificate of registration as a South African citizen to any person who is a citizen of any Commonwealth country or of Eire, provided he satisfies the Minister of so and so, and then (g): He has an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship. Now, although it is quite obvious from a further reading of the Bill that the Minister wants to provide machinery in order to give an indication of this to those who apply for registration for citizenship, I doubt whether any two Ministers holding that portfolio will give the same interpretation of an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship.

Mr. S. E. WARREN: How can they be South African citizens if they do not know?

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: To the hon. member for Swellendam (Mr. S. E. Warren) who keeps on interjecting, the responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship will be most obscure. It would require a ready tongue, if not a witty one. It has a political implication. The Nationalist Party Government with a Nationalist Party Minister would have a completely different idea of what an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship are as compared with a Minister of the United Party and certainly a Minister of the Labour Party.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Read 8 (1) (d).

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: "He is of good character." The Minister say its applies to (d), but I think whatever one's political affiliations are, one generally has an idea of what good character is. Good character surely refers to a man's social attitude on the question of the observance of the laws of the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Would you and I agree?

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: I do not see why not. I might disagree with a man's political views but I would not deny that he may be a man of good character. Surely, under sub-section (g) my idea of what an adequate knowledge of responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship are, might be different from every other member of this House. I might set a very much higher standard than any other member, and on the other hand, I might set a lower standard. On this particular question I want to remind the Minister that our educational facilities in this country in regard to civics are far below what they should be. The majority of children emerging from our schools have a very poor knowledge of civics and a very poor knowledge of their responsibilities as citizens. One has only to conduct an election campaign to see how little people know about the responsibilities of citizenship. This clause (g) if applied to the whole of the population of South Africa would show that very few are qualified if the standard is set high enough.

An HON. MEMBER: It should be applied to members of Parliament.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member says we should apply it to members of Parliament, but I think we should apply it to the people outside; it would be too easy to apply it to members of Parliament. On this question too, although he provides something for it in this Bill, the Minister knows and must admit that civic teaching in this country does not qualify a South African born citizen under this heading, and it is a most important feature. It is a question of degree.

I now want to refer to Clause 8 (9) which says—

The grant of a certificate of registration shall be in the absolute discretion of the Minister and he may without assigning any reason, grant or refuse a certificate as he thinks most conducive to the public good, and no appeal shall lie from his decision.

Here again we have the qualification of what is conducive to the public good. In many cases public good may be determined by a man's political outlook. As a matter of fact in introducing this Bill, the Minister made special reference to criminals and communists and he rightly said, that it might not be conducive to the public good to grant

a certificate of registration to a criminal. I think nobody would disagree with that but when he says that it would not be conducive to the public good to grant a certificate of registration to a communist, then he gets on to the political field. However much we may disagree with communists and their outlook, surely we are not going, because of their political affiliations, to deprive them of their right of citizenship because we disagree with their political affiliations. I say this very purposely and definitely. I say it because we on the Labour Benches are being accused of being communists or having communistic inclinations or outlook. The next step from refusing registration to a member of the Communist Party will be refusing it to a member of the Labour Party; and the next step from refusing it to a member of the Labour Party will be to refuse it to a member of the United Party. [Laughter.] It is easy to laugh, but that is logic. And it may well lead to excluding it from everybody so that we shall have a one party State. That is the logical step, and while we may disagree with the political views of communists or anyone else, why should we preclude them from the right of citizenship? Our laws are good enough and strong enough to deal with those who violate the laws. I want to take this point further, this question of public good. One must define what public good is and I hope the Minister will, in reply to this debate, explain to us what his interpretation of "public good" is.

Next I come to Clause 10 (1) (h), where the Minister deals with the question of naturalisation of citizens and there they must also have adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship. In Clause 10 (13) it says—

The grant of a certificate of naturalisation shall, subject to the provisions of sub-section (12), be in the absolute discretion of the Minister and he may, without assigning any reason, grant or refuse a certificate as he thinks most conducive to the public good, and no appeal shall lie from his decision.

In Clause 19 (3) (a) it is stated—

Subject to the provisions of this section, the Minister may by order deprive any South African citizen by registration or naturalisation of his South African citizenship if he is satisfied that such citizen—

(a) if outside the Union, has shown himself by act or speech to be disloyal or disaffected towards His Majesty.

There exists in my mind anyway, a certain amount of doubt as to the definition of what disloyalty to His Majesty by speech may be. Does it mean that he makes treasonable statements if he says: "Down with the King," or something like that, or

does it mean if he says anything by speech that is disloyal to the Government of South Africa? I find that the interpretation of this particular clause is obscure and I would like the hon. Minister to define it, if he will, in his reply because quite a lot of ideas come into my mind. We have had, since the present Government came into power, the charge made against certain South Africans who have gone abroad, that they have besmirched the name of South Africa, and those citizens have replied that they were not referring to South Africa but to the Nationalist Party. It would be interesting to know whether this clause here would apply to a citizen's criticism of the Government in power. The Minister on reflection must realise that Governments come and Governments go and that this clause may be applied to him and his colleagues one day. I know very well it can be applied at all times to members of my Party; but if the Minister will give us some explanation of his interpretation of this particular clause, it will assist us to see what he has aimed at here. Despite Sub-sections (5) and (6), the Minister still retains the absolute power of depriving citizens by registration or naturalisation from citizenship, in Clause 19 (4) it is provided—

Before making an order under this section or under Section 20, the Minister may, if he thinks fit, refer the matter to an enquiry as hereinafter provided and so forth. He may refer the matter to an enquiry which is provided under Sub-sections (5) and (6) which say—

Any person in respect of whom an order is proposed to be made shall, if he is in the Union, be entitled to appear personally or by counsel or attorney on his behalf, or if he is outside the Union, by counsel or attorney on his behalf . . .

and so forth, and (6)—

an enquiry under Sub-section (4) shall be held by a committee of not more than three persons, including the Chairman, constituted for the purpose by the Minister, presided over by a person, appointed by the Minister, who is or has been a Judge of the Supreme Court of South Africa or of the High Court of South-West Africa, and shall be conducted in such manner as the Minister may direct; provided that any such enquiry may, if the Minister thinks fit, be held by any Provincial Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa or by the High Court of South-West Africa.

But it is almost invalidated by Sub-clause (4) which says—

The Minister may, if he thinks fit . . .

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR:
Read to the end of Sub-clause (4).

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: —

The Minister may, if he thinks fit, refer the matter to an enquiry as hereinafter provided, and if the order is proposed to be made on any of the grounds specified in Sub-section (2) or paragraph (a) or (c) of Sub-section (3), the Minister shall give the person in respect of whom the order is proposed to be made, notice in writing addressed to his last known place of residence, informing him of the grounds on which the order is proposed to be made and giving him an opportunity of claiming that the matter be referred to an enquiry, and if the person concerned so claims within a period of six months of the date of the notice, the Minister shall refer the matter to an enquiry as hereinafter provided.

Mr. S. J. M. STEYN: Why not the Court?

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: My point is that it is completely at the discretion of the Minister. I have discussed it with my legal colleague, and he supports my view. I will ask him to deal with it when he speaks, because I do not want to get involved in a legal argument because I am bound to lose. My reading of this clause that the Minister may, if he thinks fit, refer the matter to an enquiry, is a complete answer. He may. And if he may not, he does not. I will leave it there. I have put the matter before the House and I hope that some of the legal members will deal with the particular clause because it seems obscure to me.

Under Clause 36—

Whenever the question arises under this Act as to whether or not a person was ordinarily resident in the Union, the question may be determined by the Minister and his decision thereon shall be final.

Here is another question where the Minister has wide powers in coming to a decision. I think a matter like this should not be left in the hands of the Minister. It has too wide implications.

And then I want to deal with Clause 37 which reads—

The Minister may establish such facilities as to him may appear necessary or desirable to enable applicants for certificates of naturalisation under this Act, to receive instruction in the responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship.

I referred to this aspect earlier and I think it is very commendable that such a thing

should be included. The Minister in introducing the Bill, mentioned the policy followed in the United States of America, but I hope that the Minister will not in this country attach the same demonstration and bally-hoo that is attached to this type of thing in America. While we want to give applicants for citizenship some kind of guidance and instruction as to their responsibility we must as far as possible not lead away from a reasonable and sound approach to the problems of this country, because the value of immigrants to this country is that they bring new ideas, and they bring refreshing ideas that will assist us to get out of the rut, the stereotyped approach to our own problems, and if we are going to endeavour, under this particular clause to inculcate into these people an acceptance of the popular point of view in South Africa, it will be a very retrogressive step and will not be in the interests of the country as a whole. In welcoming immigrants to this country, we must also welcome new ideas and welcome them with open arms. Finally I want to say to the Minister that in view of the fact that there are a considerable number of objections to the various clauses of the Bill, and particularly in view of the status of immigrants who have not fulfilled the requirements of Clause 8 (1) (c) dealing with the abolition of the automatic citizenship as applied to British subjects, I hope he will reconsider the whole question of this Bill. It is a very delicate subject that he is dealing with. It deals particularly with the relationship between the English- and Afrikaans-speaking sections of this community. I am sure that it is not the intention of the Minister himself or of the Government to give offence to any section. After listening to his introductory speech I am quite convinced of that. I am quite convinced of his sincerity to introduce a sane measure, a measure that will be generally acceptable to all parts of this House, and I would make this appeal to him, in view of these aspects, and particularly in view of the emotional aspect and the sentimental aspect, to consider this matter a little further before pushing this Bill through the House. I repeat that I do not believe that there is any need to rush it through this Session. The question has been raised of the voting rights of immigrants who have entered the country in the last two years, but this is a matter of minor importance—it should be of minor importance, and for the reasons I have stated, we of the Labour Party will support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Germiston (District) (Mr. J. G. N. Strauss) and that is that this matter be referred to a Select Committee.

†*Dr. VAN RHYN: It is quite clear to me from the speeches which have been delivered in this debate up to the present that the opposition to this Bill on the other side of the House is based largely on ignorance, fear

and suspicion. These people are afraid; they are suspicious, and after sleeping over the matter over the week-end I believe that they would rid their minds of a good deal of this suspicion, but it seems to me that they and especially members of the Labour Party have not yet reached this stage. Everyone seems to be agreed that a Bill of this kind is necessary; that we are entitled to South African citizenship. But our experience in connection with this Bill is exactly the same as our experience in connection with all our problems. Our friends on the other side are also in favour of apartheid, but as soon as we try to introduce a Bill, as soon as we try to take the necessary steps, they are up in arms. Our friends on the other side are also against mixed marriages, but as soon as a Bill is introduced, as soon as we try to adopt measures to prevent it, they are up in arms. Our friends opposite went so far as to vote on quite a number of occasions against the Unemployment Insurance Bill which was introduced by the Minister of Labour, and one need only look at what happened at the third reading. It seems to me that if we on this side of the House are to satisfy members on the other side then we must do nothing at all; we must not undertake anything which is of some value to South Africa; we must not take any action in connection with questions of major principle. I say that for the greater part the opposition to this Bill is prompted by fear on the other side of the House. I need only quote what was said towards the end of his speech by a sober individual like the hon. member for Vasco (Mr. Musket), a former Minister. He is afraid of a "diabolical plot". He is even afraid of a sort of rebellion, a diabolical plot. I do not know what he is afraid of but he is afraid of something. The hon. member for Natal South Coast (Mr. Mitchell) is also afraid. He says that when he started reading this Bill he was afraid of a Republic; he was afraid that this Bill would be the first step towards the establishment of a republic, and before he had gone much further he made the discovery that we were a kingdom. He started with a republic and ended with a kingdom. And after telling us how proud he was of the fact that he would also become a South African subject, a South African citizen, the member for South Coast and other members of the Opposition went on to say to our English-speaking friends: "It will no longer be indicated on your passport that you are a British subject; it will only be indicated that you are a South African citizen." Let me just say in all courtesy that on this side of the House we Afrikaners want unblemished title deeds. We no longer want an endorsement in red ink on our certificate of citizenship which suggests that there is still a sort of servitude of British nationality attached to our status. If that view is still held on the other side of the House, it

done so. I was once inclined to be sceptical on the subject, but on personal investigation I have come to the conclusion that there is every justification for investigating this aspect of the mining industry. It is strange but none the less true that lately the death rate among miners suffering from heart trouble has been extremely high, and it is increasing. That is something that concerns the Minister of Finance almost directly, because he has a lot to do with the gold mines. Not only am I raising the subject from the point of view of the miner but I am raising it also from the point of view of the industry. It is strange that you find a number of young men dying from heart trouble on the mines. I have come to the conclusion there must be some reason connected with the work which is the cause of this heart trouble. It may be necessary, I feel, to declare heart trouble an industrial disease in respect of the mining industry of South Africa.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. TIGHY: I sincerely hope that the Minister of Mines will not omit to honour the promise he has made to the hon. member for Krugersdorp. I also hope that hon. members opposite realise that when a miner dies from heart trouble he gets no compensation, nor does his wife and family get any. All they get is the savings from the Mutual Aid Fund. They do not get compensation from the mine. This the Part Appropriation Bill, and I do not want to occupy the time of the House unnecessarily, but I do feel that I should be permitted to raise this matter because . . . [Time limit.]

†Mr. UECKERMANN: I shall be very brief. First of all, I would like to endorse what the hon. member for Johannesburg (West) (Mr. Tighy) has said. I would in addition like to give my very fullest support to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Springs (Mr. Sutter). I hope the Minister of Labour will not mind retaining his seat for one moment because there is a point I would like to address to him.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: If you come to it at once.

†Mr. UECKERMANN: Thank you. I am very grateful. Before I proceed I think it would be advisable to repeat some of the important factors of the Silicosis Act of 1946. The 1946 Act provides for widows pensions on the basis of £6 10s. for widows and half that amount for each child. That basis is in line with the pensions under the Workmen's Compensation Act which was in operation at the time. During this Session the Workmen's Compensation Act was amended and the pensions in respect of widows were raised to £10 and the

children's pensions were raised in proportion. The Silicosis Act of 1946 was based on the Workmen's Compensation Act and it follows therefore that some amendment must be made to the Silicosis Act.

Now, sir, I have a further point, and before I proceed, I would like to thank the hon. the Minister of Labour for retaining his seat, because I want to deal with a very important question, namely unemployment. The hon. the Minister stated in this House recently that he would do everything he possibly could to watch the situation and I have not the slightest doubt whatever that he will do so, but there are other important factors which I would like to bring to his notice and here is a very important one indeed. It is my submission that the official unemployment figures do not reflect the true unemployment position in this country.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Registration is compulsory by both employer and employee.

†Mr. UECKERMANN: If I may just proceed I would like the hon. the Minister to appreciate this point. The average man who becomes unemployed does not register at a labour exchange. I am talking of the man who might be hit in business, hit by import control, a man with a little bit of capital who lives on his own resources in the hope of finding a job for himself. It is that class of man whom I feel we should watch. I feel we are losing very valuable manpower because these men are out of employment for eight, nine, twelve months and even longer. I do not question the official figures, but I wish to indicate that this class of man does not register because he feels he can make the grade on his own account. I would like to make one suggestion to the hon. Minister. During the war the South African Air Force conducted tests in order to ascertain the qualifications of a man and so fit him for a position in which he is best suited; these aptitude tests were designed to place a man in the right position and I wonder whether the hon. Minister will in the future give consideration to a scheme of that description.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I have it for juveniles.

†Mr. UECKERMANN: I would like to see you extend it to adults too in due course. If you will give consideration to that, sir, I shall be very glad. After all it does put the right man in the right place. Studying a man and finding out what he is capable of doing and then putting him in the right position. I would even suggest that the hon. Minister, knowing how conscientious he is, and I do pay that tribute honestly and sincerely, that you would conduct some

sort of departmental enquiry to see how such a scheme might be put into operation. There is no reflection at all, sir, on the officials of the Labour Department. I think they are doing a very fine job. During the war years they placed many ex-volunteers in employment, and I am grateful to them. But it might be possible within the scope of the present machinery to extend it and bring into operation some such plan as was conducted in the Air Force. I shall be very grateful to have the Minister's views on that subject because I regard the unemployment position as a pretty serious one especially in relation to that class of man who does not take advantage of the Labour Exchange, the class of man we are losing. We are losing manpower. I shall be glad to have the Minister's reaction.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately none of the Ministers are in the House with whom I wanted to raise certain questions. I wanted to address my remarks to the Minister of Mines, the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Justice.

An HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Mines has already replied to the debate.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: Unfortunately he replied very early in the debate before many of us had a chance to take part. I want to deal with the question of the amendment by the Labour Party and that is the nationalisation of the Free State gold mines. This is part of the policy of my party and I think events such as are taking place in this country in connection with the gold mining industry confirm that our attitude to the gold mining industry is the correct one. We have recently seen that there are certain members on the Government benches who incline to our view and feel that the gold mining industry should not be left in the hands of individuals who believe in exploiting the mineral wealth of South Africa. As the whole economy of the country is bound up with the gold mining industry, we are in fact staking the future of the country on what can be called nothing less than gamblers. There is a mistaken conception that the affairs of the gold mining industry and the gold mining companies themselves are completely divorced from the activities of the stock exchange. Anyone who has any practical knowledge of what goes on in the mining industry, knows that the companies and the Stock Exchange are very closely related. The recent amazing discoveries in the area referred to as "Erfdeel", which caused an amazing rise in the price of gold shares; then the subsequent report that at "Dankbaarheid" there had been an even greater discovery, and the aftermath of both these reports that the ore was not as rich, or the subsequent ore that was taken was not as rich as expected, illustrate my point. Now what happened at that time?

Free State Gold Areas shares rose from 13s. 6d. to 56s. They jumped around for a few days and now with the latest reports coming through, they have dropped right back to 19s. 6d. We have had for two weeks wild gambling on the Stock Exchange and while this country is facing a considerable amount of economic difficulty, and while the hon. the Minister of Finance is making endeavours to meet these difficulties, in raising an overseas loan, in raising the price of gold and finding a free market for part of our gold output, we are finding the manipulators and the gamblers in this country who deal mainly with gold mining shares were able to make considerable sums of money in between the margin of 13s. 6d. on the 3rd of June and the sky-rocketing price of 56s. on the 6th June for the Free State Gold Areas shares. A considerable number of transactions took place and a considerable number of people must have made a considerable amount of money at the expense of others. That does not only apply to the Free State gold mining shares. While this sort of thing is allowed to continue and while the Government accepts this as being part and parcel of our economic system, we must not then raise our eyebrows or object to the fact that those who dig the gold out of the ground, those who work to get the gold out of the ground are going to stake their claim at a very high level. There are probably no workers in this country who have been worse dealt with than the miners, and while they are working for £30 or £35 a month which at the present high cost of living is probably worth half that, they see the considerable amount of speculation taking place, as part and parcel of our economic system, and nothing can be done about it. The Government accepts it and gets a certain amount of taxation in the share transactions and are in other words turning a blind eye to what is happening.

Certain questions were asked in this House recently as to the reports that have been made about discoveries in the Free State, and it was said that investigations would be made. We have not yet heard if such investigations have reached a conclusion. I submit to the hon. the Minister of Finance that his Cabinet should give earnest consideration to what is taking place on the Stock Exchange and also what is the responsibility of the gold mining companies in relation to this vast speculation that has taken place. The hon. the Minister of Finance must accept the fact that this speculation would not have taken place if the gold mining companies themselves, the responsible people, had not issued the statements they had made. The report of this astounding discovery at "Erfdeel" was quickly circulated round the Stock Exchange and gambling started. Surely there must be some machinery for checking this sort of report and now while there has been a considerable amount

of money made by speculators on a rising market further money was made by those who were able to sell short on a falling market and we have the further position now that there are rumours circulating in the Stock Exchange today as to the future of the Free State goldfields which are going to create further uncertainty. Happenings such as have taken place recently on Stock Exchanges will be of no assistance to the Minister of Finance in his negotiations overseas. I think the pleas that have been made from the Government benches that there are certain individuals who go overseas to besmirch the name of South Africa and are therefore creating further difficulty, are completely wrong. The difficulties that are created overseas, the lack of confidence in our stability, are caused by such things as we see on the stock exchange here. I hope the Minister will take due note of that.

I wanted to deal with another aspect of this, and that is the report of the Social and Economic Planning Council which made a complete investigation into the economic aspects of the gold mining industry. This is a very valuable document. It is impossible for me to deal with it in the very short time at my disposal, but I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member for Ermelo (Dr. Hertzog) who is as interested in this aspect as I am and ask him to read the comment on the working costs of the Witwatersrand gold mines and he will see there that of the cost per ton milled, 23s. 10d., 10s. 10d. goes in wages and salaries, of which 6s. 7d. is for European wages, and the comment is this—

In the early days the industry had to pay relatively high wages to the skilled type miners on account of their scarcity. Now, however, other industries are outbidding the mines for skilled labour. For this reason there seems little possibility of reducing working costs by cutting European wage rates even if such a cut were otherwise desirable or practicable.

I think that is something which could be brought to the attention, not only of the hon. member for Ermelo, but I think to the members of the Mine Workers' Union.

And then in relation to the nationalisation of the gold mining industry in the Free State, the comment here of the Social and Economic Planning Council is worthy of note here. It says—

The Council favour the extension to new mines of every possible assistance in order to enable them to reach economic production. For example, new mines should be treated sympathetically as regards income tax allowances for capital expenditure. The Council also considers that one of the questions raised by the Industrial and Agricultural Requirements Commission, namely, whether the State should partici-

pate and assist in the exploration of new producing areas should be investigated as soon as possible.

This links up with the policy of the Nationalist Party which says there should be tripartite ownership of the gold mining industry: there should be the State, there should be the owners or shareholders, and thirdly, the workers in the gold mining industry. This policy of tripartite ownership of the mines approaches very closely to the idea of a corporate State, because if it is further analysed, it will be realised that it narrows down the ownership of the mines as far as workers are concerned, to an absolute minimum because I doubt whether many miners will be able to avail themselves of that ownership. The only solution is that which has been suggested from this side of the House, namely, nationalisation. I repeat again I am sorry the hon. the Minister of Mines is not in the House to take a note of that.

I want to go on to another point which concerns the Minister of Justice but unfortunately he is not here. I want to deal with his reply to the hon. member for Cape Western (Mr. Kahn) on the question of banning the hon. member's meetings. I am glad to see the hon. the Minister of Justice has just come in. I was beginning to deal with the hon. Minister's reply to the member for Cape Western, in which he states that he was glad to have banned the meetings of the hon. member, particularly after hearing his speech in this House in the course of which he said that it is the type of speech he makes to the audiences he addresses. Unfortunately, I cannot quite follow the hon. Minister's logic. He made a very good political speech, expounding the policy of his Party, but not what may be termed a Ministerial explanation of his reasons for exercising his powers the way he did. As I see the matter, if the hon. member for Cape Western is addressing meetings and inciting violence or creating hostile feelings between any two sections of the community, surely the logical result of that is that there must have been disturbances at some of the meetings. Then there must have been a warning. The member for Cape Western must have failed to take notice of such warning, and then the Minister had to act. As far as I can see, none of those steps have been followed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: [Inaudible.]

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: Yes, I know the law does not require it, but as the Minister knows, I particularly raised the question of delegation of powers because I believe that powers in the hands of Ministers are liable to be interpreted differently by different Ministers. I think the hon. Minister will accept that and what happens is this, that there

is a tendency to apply one's powers according to one's political outlook rather than along the lines of justice. I do not say that the Minister of Justice is not trying to be fair, but I am trying to draw a parallel. The hon. member for Cape Western addressed those meetings and if disturbances took place or if there were indications that the relations between the different sections of the community were worsened, the hon. member should have been warned and if he had failed to take notice of that warning, then the Minister would have been entitled to take the steps which he is entitled to do under the Act. The Minister did not explain that and I think if we are going to maintain an even balance of justice in this country, however much we may disagree with the views of certain people in this country, we should follow progressive steps in applying the law to these people. That is all I have to say on that point.

Now I want to deal with a matter affecting the Minister of the Interior and that is the question of the recent withdrawal of passports from certain individuals who were going overseas.

I want to deal with the question of the withdrawal of passports that were issued to certain South African citizens who wanted to proceed overseas. I refer particularly to certain trade union officials who wished to proceed overseas to attend a trade union conference. On the eve of their departure their passports were withdrawn by the Minister of the Interior and I would like the Minister to tell us why he has withdrawn those passports and why he has refused to allow these people to proceed overseas on perfectly legitimate business. I have a copy of the "Cape Argus" in front of me which gives a report of the proceedings in court. The report says—

Mr. Justice Roper gave judgment today in the Supreme Court on the application by the Minister of the Interior (Dr. Dönges) for confirmation of a rule nisi calling upon Mr. E. S. Sachs, General Secretary of the Garment Workers' Union, to show why he should not be ordered to produce his passport to the Principal Immigration Officer, Johannesburg, for cancellation within 24 hours after the service of the order of the court. The judge confirmed the rule.

But in confirming the rule the judge made some very important remarks in connection with this case. Inter alia, he stated—

This is an unfortunate case for Mr. Sachs. He has made out a very strong case on the desirability of his attendance at the conference in Lyons in the interests of his union.

Furthermore, if certain allegations made by him are true, they indicate an old-

standing vendetta between the political party, of which the Minister is one of the leaders and himself.

Mr. Sachs also shows that considerable hardship has been imposed on himself personally in having his trip overseas virtually prohibited when he had gone to the trouble and expense of making all his arrangements and what is equally or more serious, the Minister's decision interferes with his liberty, because it is virtually impossible to travel abroad without a passport under present conditions.

I have no doubt that he feels, and that many members of his trade union feel, that he has been very ill-used, and that the reasons are of a party-political nature and connected with the vendetta I have referred to.

That is a very serious statement for Mr. Justice Roper to make and it implies what has been said in this House on many occasions, that when powers are delegated to a Minister the application of those powers are so wide that there is no appeal against the Minister's action, and in this case the judge himself has commented upon it. In coming to his decision he is reported to have said—

How can I find that this is the case on these papers in the face of the Minister's statement that he acted in good faith, a statement on oath, and that he acted in the public interest?

In other words, Mr. Justice Roper said that all he could do was to see that the powers of the Minister were upheld. It did not come within his powers to upset the law; he could only see that the law was applied and in these circumstances he granted the Minister's application. I hope that the Minister of the Interior will make a statement to this House and explain his reasons in as much detail as possible for following this policy with regard to passports, because his action in this case is creating a lot of fear and uncertainty, especially in the trade union movement. They feel that the Government is interfering with the freedom of movement particularly of members of the trade union. They feel that now that this Government has come into power they are taking this opportunity of settling old scores with the trade unions, particularly with Left Wing trade unionists and furthermore, they believe that this Government is treating certain trade unionists in this country in a very high-handed manner. I hope, therefore, that the Minister will give us some explanation of his policy, and furthermore, tell us whether it is his intention to apply the same harsh policy in the future to trade unionists who intend to travel overseas on the legitimate business of their trade unions.

21ST JUNE, 1949

8690

to come in from all over the world. It is these that efforts have been made to restrict immigration of late, but we must remember that America does not need more immigrants today. It is a country of over 130 million inhabitants. There has been much reference to Canada. It has a population of 10 million.

Mr. LAWRENCE: They are still encouraging immigrants into Canada, they are flying them.

Mr. CULL: Australia is also building up her population. I think this Government is making a fatal mistake in pushing through this Bill with its restrictive clauses. Our Prime Minister went over to England and created a marvellous impression throughout the world and we thought that South Africa was going to be a Utopia. We appreciate what he has done, the wonderful service he has rendered South Africa. Unfortunately that service is being nullified by this Bill.

An HON. MEMBER: You did not say that about the Prime Minister during the by-election.

†Mr. CULL: No, because you did not bring in the Citizenship Bill then. If you had done so I would probably have had a majority of over 4,000. Today owing to the actions of this Government there is a sense of insecurity and anxiety, particularly among the settlers who have just come to this country, and I am going to appeal to the Minister of the Interior to reconsider the restrictions he seeks to impose.

Mr. LAWRENCE: You will need a Moses to strike that rock.

†Mr. CULL: It is all very well to say that the Government is not bound by the undertakings of the previous Government. It is a matter of honour and moral obligation to these people; and if the Minister can rise above politics and show his great-heartedness notwithstanding the uncomplimentary remarks and epithets that have been hurled across the floor of the House he will be doing a service to the country.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: In this Clause 8 (1) it is stated that the Minister may grant a certificate of registration as a South African citizen under several conditions, one being that the citizen of a Commonwealth country shall satisfy the Minister that—

He has an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship.

That point has been dealt with by other members, and I wish to ask the Minister if

he would not reconsider this clause. He has mentioned it is in the Australian Act. That in itself does not prove its suitability. It will lend itself to various interpretations differing with the political outlook of the Government in power and the responsible Minister. I cannot understand how it is going to be interpreted or applied. Does the Minister believe he can set hard and fast rules as to the course that will be followed in educating these people into an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship? Those who apply for naturalisation have to undergo some form of test, but when it comes to citizens by registration it is imposing a hardship on those qualified to be South African citizens, except that they have not been born here and are not South African citizens by descent. That is imposing a hardship on the same basis as is imposed on citizens who qualify for naturalisation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: It will not be imposed on anybody who is qualified when this Act comes into operation.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: I think the Minister will agree there will be many who will apply in future.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Yes.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: They are probably not aliens, they are members of the Commonwealth.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: They have not been in this country.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: They have been in countries following a similar democratic system of government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Yes, in spite of that Australia has this legislation.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: They must be wrong in Australia.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: There is a Labour Government in Australia today.

†Mr. HEPPLÉ: Yes, but I have seen the Minister of Labour disagree with some of his own colleagues. I want to get on to sub-section (9), which states that the grant of a certificate of registration shall be in the absolute discretion of the Minister and that he may refuse to grant a certificate as he thinks most conducive to the public good, and no appeal shall lie from his decision. The Minister has replied to criticisms that have been made on this particular clause and he knows very well my view on this matter. I believe that the powers being

placed in the hands of the Minister are not conducive to the public good; too much power in the hands of Ministers is more likely to lead to abuse than the public good. It is not a question of the integrity of the Minister personally, but the question of placing power in the hands of one individual whereby that individual can decide whether a person will be granted registration as a citizen and further whether that person will be entitled to democratic rights in this country. It even puts in the hand of the Minister the right of granting the franchise. That, I think, is most dangerous.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR:
That is the existing position.

†Mr. HEPPLE: And that is wrong, too.

Dr. VAN NIEROP: You want everything changed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: You have raised no objection to it.

Dr. VAN NIEROP: Why not change your party?

†Mr. HEPPLE: We have had very recent experience when the judiciary commented on the power placed in the hands of the Minister and a judge has stated in a recent case that his hands are tied and he can only see that the Minister gets the rights he is entitled to under the law. But at the same time he felt the citizen was not getting a square deal. I would like an amendment to the effect that the Minister may refuse a certificate if he is not satisfied that the averments contained in the application are true in any material respect, and in that event he shall notify the applicant who shall be entitled to require that the application be referred to an enquiry as provided for in Section 19, the provision of which section relating to an enquiry shall apply mutatis mutandis. I have taken that from an omnibus clause submitted by the hon. member for Germiston (District) (Mr. J. G. N. Strauss) and which has not been moved in this House, but I think a clause of this nature would be much more suitable than the present one.

Mr. WARING: The member for Aliwal (Capt. G. H. F. Strydom) referred to a speech he made in 1941.

†Mr. CHAIRMAN: But that is not in order here.

Mr. WARING: I have not said very much to give a line on the point, but I would point out to the hon. member that he did not tell the House about the trouble he had in his caucus at that time as a result of his speech.

†Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order! We are on Clause 8, we are not dealing with the caucus.

Mr. WARING: The hon. member for Pretoria (District) (Mr. Oost) referred to a leading article that appeared in the "Star" to which reference was made to a broader approach to the problems of South Africa. It is significant that the hon. member in extolling that leading article and quoting it to the House did not read from "Die Burger" or "Die Transvaler" but from the "Star". He read an article from the English Press which has been criticised on the Government benches for "opsweeping" of the country on this articular issue. It is amazing that in his reference to this particular clause, on the question of the extension of the two-year period to a period of five years, he goes back to an article from the "Star". Let us get away from the smokescreen that has been put up by that side of the House in an attempt to cover up their acts of injustice and their grave mistakes in connection with this Bill, the most grave mistake of all being that a clause like this was not thrashed out in a Select Committee, and reasoned out point for point and put before this House as an agreed measure. That is the complete answer to the hon. member for Pretoria (District). He says that he wants to warn the country against stirring up feelings. The reason why there is any feeling at all is because clauses of this type have been thrust upon the House in this way and there has been no opportunity of consultation. That is the answer to the hon. member and it becomes obvious as we go from clause to clause. I want to put this to the hon. the Minister. He has quoted from the Canadian and Australian legislation. I want to ask him this: Does he think for a moment that Canada and Australia would ever have accepted a five-year period for the franchise? Would they have accepted that basis for one minute, and would they have accepted the partly agreed measure which was piloted through their Houses? The Minister will know from the discussions that took place in those Parliaments that the period of two years for the franchise was a sine qua non of that legislation. Admittedly they accepted the period of five years in the case of citizenship rights, but over and above that they accepted the broader concept of Commonwealth citizenship. To withhold the franchise for five years from people who come from Commonwealth countries, is iniquitous. The Minister, in his second reading speech, talked about South Africa being sixth in the race for nationality stakes. I say that nowhere in any Commonwealth country has this precedent been accepted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR:
What about Ceylon?

I cannot accept. I regard it that there are certain matters in which no Government should itself be entitled to take sides; it should be left entirely to the trade to sort out without any Government interference and without any Government attempt to create divisions. Once you start that sort of business you are looking for trouble, and once you start that you are creating monopolies. We have seen it in the Marketing Act. Complaints have come from this side of the House in regard to the wheat monopoly in South Africa, and these have been legitimate complaints. They do not go out to be competitive, they came out only when power was given for the Wheat Board to restrict licences. They only came through legislative power being granted to the Department. They do not come through the legitimate working of trade but they came out of the interference by the Government who considered they could improve matters with the result that they made a ghastly mess of things. In the end they have created worse monopolies than ever existed. I would say that ninety-nine times out of a hundred no benefit is derived by the public; their interference only upsets the economic trend and raises prices primarily to the consumer. All you create is another marginal force right against the whole economic scheme. You create a middleman, and the middleman becomes the Government. Greater profits are made by the people in the business and they come out of the mouths of the consumer or the hands of the taxpayer. It is time that Governments realised that there is a certain sphere of economics they know nothing about, and in the end action based on their ignorance will lead to complete disorder in a system of proper marketing.

I am not so happy about the powers in this Act that are being handed to the Minister. I do not like Clause 6, which almost contains a blackmail clause.

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: Were you in Parliament in 1944?

Mr. WARING: Yes.

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: It is a pity you did not think of it then.

Mr. WARING: Did Parliament in 1944 decide to advertise people's names?

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: I will reply to that.

Mr. WARING: Let me read this wonderful Clause 6—

... The Minister may request any person or combination of persons engaged in any practice or applying any method or concerned in any scheme or arrangement

dealt with in such report, which in the opinion of the Minister is detrimental to the public interest, to discontinue such practice, method, scheme or arrangement, and if such person or combination of persons fails to comply forthwith with such request, the Minister may publish in such form and manner as he thinks fit, any fact concerning such practice, method, scheme or arrangement and the name of any person implicated therein, whether such fact or name was conveyed to him by the Board or was ascertained by him in any other manner.

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: Why not read further?

Mr. WARING: That is all.

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: I have an amendment to move there.

Mr. WARING: You tell me to read further, and then you tell me your amendment is omitted.

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: It is only facts communicated by the board.

Mr. WARING: May I ask the Minister whether this was in the Act in 1944 he refers to?

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: I will tell you later on.

Mr. WARING: I should like to know now. I wonder whether he is going to follow the example set by the Minister of the Interior and give us any precedent in the Commonwealth. I am convinced that no member of the Commonwealth would be so foolish as to attempt to put a Bill like this on the Statute Book. I think this clause is a blackmail clause, and it is only an attempt to enable the Minister of the Board of Trade or the Department if they are not satisfied that a particular industry has come up to scratch according to their lights to try to ruin it by publicity and to try to ruin the people's reputation. This threat will be held over their heads in connection with the Minister's instructions. I have been in the House since 1944 and here the Minister makes statements about economics on lines that I do not think are healthy. He has referred to a basis of apportioning licences, not on the basis of actual ability but on a system of racial grouping. He considers that is the way commerce and industry should be conducted. I do not care whether it is the United Party Government or the Labour Party Government or this Government, I do not hold for any Government being allowed to apportion licences or apportion businesses in groups. In the interests of our country we have to get away from this sort of thing. Nobody wants

monopolies or cartels; but no one can tell me that they operate in business at present. The Minister has at various times indicated that the way he wishes to control business against monopolies is entirely against the public good. There may be price arrangements, but you have price arrangements in the Marketing Act for ordinary marketing. You have them in the Government, in enterprises such as the D.D.T. factory, Iscor and others. And all this about what a man should do and should not do is so much nonsense, and it is about time the Minister and his Department realised there is a limit to their interference with the ordinary business of the country. Their knowledge is exceptionally limited, their ability even more limited. The whole basis of efficiency does not come from Government action; the whole basis of the economic efficiency of a country rests on what various units in it are building up on sound economic practices and not on legislation of this sort.

*Mr. SONNENBERG: At the outset I want to say that I am not wholly opposed to all the principles of this Bill, but I would like to ask the Minister whether trade has been consulted, the Chambers of Commerce and so on. The Minister has promised time after time that he would not do anything without consulting the various interests affected. If this Bill will result in a stop being put to monopolies which exist in this country I say that I am in favour of the stopping of these monopolies. But the Minister has omitted to tell us where these monopolies exist. Are there any monopolies?

What I really fear is that the whole tendency of the Bill will be to increase the cost of living instead of tending to reduce it. What will happen is that stodge companies will be established for the distribution of food and other commodities. Let me tell the Minister this, that the Bill is wrong; if it is the intention to reduce the cost of living then the thing is wrong. He lays down in this Bill that it is unlawful to induce anyone to charge any specified minimum or maximum price. Let me remind the Minister that the prices of several commodities are controlled today, minimum and maximum prices are fixed — the very thing he is legislating against in this Bill — and if it were not for these controlled prices the goods would actually be distributed much cheaper than they are today and the consumer would benefit. But when a trader sells a loaf of bread at a farthing below the minimum price he is prosecuted. This has actually happened; there have been many prosecutions in connection with certain commodities governed by a fixed price. I include bread and various food products where minimum prices are fixed and where the goods could be sold very much cheaper but for the fixing of a minimum price. Before the war

the profit margins for certain commodities were much less than the traders are bound to take under the present controlled minimum price. I admit that there is a good deal in the Bill that may be approved. But what is the reason for bringing in this legislation into the House at this late stage in the Session? It contains some very important matters. There is no reason why the Minister should not hold it over because under the war measures you have the protection that you are now seeking. You have it under the war measures. You could act under some of the existing war measures. They have not all been cancelled so I will appeal to the Minister to hold this Bill over until next Session. Let us take our time. There is no reason why this Bill should not be referred to a Select Committee early next Session. Let us then consider this matter from all its aspects. I do not know whether the Minister discussed this Bill with the Chambers of Commerce and the Chambers of Industries, but it would be advisable to do so unless the Minister has some very good reason why he wants it to be pushed through this Session. If this Bill is merely intended to deal with the petrol position, then I do not think it will serve its purpose because there you are up against the difficulty of getting petrol pumps. If it is intended to cover other commodities, let us have a comprehensive measure. The previous speaker pointed out that under the Fisheries Bill, which is on the Order Paper, you are creating a greater monopoly than you have at the present time . . .

THE MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS:
Do not discuss the Fisheries Bill now.

*Mr. SONNENBERG: No, I am merely repeating what the last speaker pointed out that under the Fisheries Bill you are creating a monopoly, the very thing that you are trying to prevent under this Bill. This is a matter which is of great importance to the whole country, and I ask the Minister to consider the question of holding this Bill over until next Session. Let him discuss it in the meantime with the trade. I shall be glad if the Minister will tell us in his reply to the debate what the urgency is for introducing this Bill at this late stage of the Session. I must confess that I cannot see any great urgency.

*Mr. HEPPLER: My objection to this Bill is that it does not go far enough. There are certain minor points with regard to powers which are conferred upon the Minister in this Bill, with which we are not in agreement. I do not want to deal with those now. What I want to deal with is the scope of the Bill. From the introductory speech of the Minister it appears that he is only concerned with one or two commodities, and I think it is deplorable that

the Minister has not considered the most important items of all, and those are agricultural products. I think the greatest abuse that exists today with regard to prices and conditional selling is in relation to agricultural products, and dairy products particularly. We found, particularly during the years of shortages in this country, that those who were fortunate enough to be the handlers of foodstuffs were able to use commodities that were in short supply in order to blackmail other dealers or the public at large, by insisting that they also buy other goods which were in plentiful supply.

Clause 2 of this Bill provides—

The Governor-General may, on the recommendation of the Board of Trade and Industries, established under Section 2 of the Board of Trade and Industries Act, 1944 . . . apply all or any of the provisions of this Act to and in respect of any article . . .

I think the Minister should have included the National Marketing Council as well instead of confining the provision to recommendations from the Board of Trade and Industries. I say that because there are a considerable number of commodities which are used by traders in order to serve their own purpose in disposing of other products. Under the control of the National Marketing Council and its subsidiary boards, for example, we have deciduous and citrus fruit. When there is a shortage of oranges and only a small number of pockets of oranges come on to the market, the traders who handle oranges will tell their customers that they cannot have oranges unless they also take certain other commodities. If they are not prepared to do so, they cannot get oranges, unless they are fortunate enough to be in the good books of another dealer. When you come to deciduous fruit you find that in Johannesburg certain dealers take up all the boxes of grapes that come on to the market and the ordinary housewife finds it impossible to get grapes. Although the prices of these commodities are fixed, you cannot buy them. They find their way into channels that suit the purposes of the people who handle these commodities. The hon. member for Orange Grove (Mr. Waring) has dealt with the position that exists in connection with wheat. In the dairy industry, for instance, we have a limitation of licences in respect of those people who handle dairy products such as butter and cheese. It is difficult enough to get butter and cheese, but you find that there are certain monopolies which have sole distributive rights in respect of butter and cheese in the main urban areas. Those people are also manufacturers and distributors of bacon, sausages and polonies. They go to the dealer and say: "I am sorry you cannot get butter and cheese unless you also take bacon,

sausages and polonies". That is what is taking place. This Bill does not deal with the real problem that we have before us. With regard to the last illustration I have given, I have received complaints myself from numerous restaurants and shopkeepers who say that they are not allowed to buy their supplies where they want to buy them; that if they want to buy cheese or butter from certain distributors they must agree to buy sausages as well. In that way it hits back at the consumer. I say that the Minister has completely missed the purpose of the Bill by omitting agricultural products, particularly those that come under the control of the various marketing boards. I hope that he will consider the advisability of inserting in Clause 2 of this Bill, after the words "Board of Trade and Industries Act" the words "National Marketing Council" in order to ensure that agricultural products, particularly dairy products, will be included in the scope of this Bill. Unless the Minister deals with those commodities which are most essential to the consumer he will be rendering the consumer no service at all. If he confines himself to those few major items that he mentioned such as petrol, he will only deal with the few disgruntled people who feel that they have a grievance because they cannot get petrol pumps. I want to see that the housewives of this country are able to buy their requirements from the shops that they want to deal with and that they are not held up to ransom.

†Lt.-Col. OOSTHUIZEN: I think that every reasonable member in this House will agree with me when I say that there sits the modern Nero fiddling while Rome is burning. The hon. the Minister of Finance has told us clearly of the serious economic position in which this country finds itself, and yet we find the Minister of Economic Affairs introducing this very drastic Bill in the very last stages of the Session. This can only cause unrest amongst the commercial community. I do not think that the Minister wishes to cause any unrest in the commercial community. Surely he has enough sense to realise that if ever there has been a time when we should create confidence in commerce and industry so as to increase our production which is so very necessary, and not to interfere with the legitimate channels of trade, now is the time to do so, instead of which we have this very drastic Bill before the House, a Bill that may have a most profound effect upon the commercial life of this country. Surely I put the Minister above the intention of merely wanting to secure a "kill" this Session, although it is very late in the Session.

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: Don't be petty; get on with the job; you are wasting time with nonsense of that description.

†Lt-Col. OOSTHUIZEN: I think it would be much better to leave this Bill at the present moment, or at least to refer it to a Select Committee before it is forced through the House at this stage of the Session. It is true that a number of the provisions of the Bill have been sugar-coated so that the Minister can only act on the recommendation of the Board of Trade, but that is not sufficient. The Minister himself has told us that this will only be an interim measure and that he really only had in mind certain articles. I think he mentioned petrol and tobacco. If that is so, and if he has no mental reservations, why apply this Bill to every commodity in the country and so cause consternation, and consternation has been caused in commerce and industry in that part of the country from which I come. Why do that? Why not limit the provisions of this Bill to those commodities in regard to which the Minister has had complaints and in regard to which he thinks it is very necessary to have certain further powers. Parliament has been very jealous in the past of delegating its powers in this wholesale manner. There is no Statute on our Statute Book in which any Minister has been given such wide powers as to declare—even with the recommendation of the Board of Trade—that certain commodities shall be controlled commodities, after which they will be very largely in the hands of the Board of Trade and of the Minister. I refer particularly to the Act of 1931, the Unlawful Determination of Prices Act which the Minister seeks to repeal in this very measure. The scope of that measure was limited by Parliament to petrol only, but this further power was given that the Governor-General could extend it also to only four other articles, i.e., bread, meat, fish and coal, but beyond that it could only be extended to any further article upon a resolution of both Houses of Parliament. That shows how very carefully Parliament guarded its prerogative by refusing to delegate these wide powers even to the Board of Trade or to any Minister. Why should we depart from that principle now, and at this very time when we have this economic position in South Africa? No, sir, I say that to delegate powers even to the Board of Trade is simply tantamount to giving away the prerogative of Parliament which should not be allowed. I think we would be unworthy custodians of our prerogative in this House if we simply continued to delegate our powers to boards of this kind and to Ministers, and I do hope that hon. members opposite will also very seriously consider that aspect of the matter.

I have already said that this very drastic Bill will have a very profound effect upon industry, and that industry is truly perturbed and so is commerce. They are truly perturbed at the moment, at a time when their minds should be at rest so that they can continue unhindered with their methods

of distribution as they have done in the past, and so that commerce can act freely throughout the country and industry will be encouraged to increase its production, without the fear that these powers may be exercised under this Bill hanging over its head all the time, and well may commerce and industry be perturbed about this Bill when you look at its provisions. Let me turn for a moment to Clause 3 of the Bill which says—

Any person engaged in the trade or occupation of selling a controlled article for re-sale shall be guilty of an offence if, by any means whatsoever, exercised directly or indirectly, he compels or induces or endeavours to compel or induce any person—

- (a) to charge any specified price or specified minimum or maximum price for such controlled article sold by him; or
- (b) to refrain from purchasing a controlled article from any source or seller, or from selling or dealing in a controlled article; or
- (c) to limit the quantity of any controlled article which he shall sell.

The whole of commerce in this country and our industries have been built up on a system of price fixation and price control as far as their own commodities are concerned, and I say that in every instance it has been for the benefit of the public. If you do not control the minimum price and you are compelled to sell to everybody, we have seen in the past what happens. The result has been over-trading. It led to the cutting of prices so that many decent people were driven out of business and unemployment resulted.

The Minister has mentioned tobacco. If he will throw his mind back he will remember that not so long ago—I think it was in 1933—the distribution of cigarettes and tobacco was simply in a chaotic state until associations were formed throughout the country to control the distribution. Up to that time the sale of cigarettes very largely went to an undesirable type of shopkeeper and a great many of the distributors were Indian shopkeepers who cut the prices to a great extent and went so far as to make gifts to customers simply with the object of attracting people to their shops. It got into such a chaotic state that no one could make a living out of that particular trade alone, if he was only a tobacconist or a seller of cigarettes. Then these associations came into being. Price control was introduced and membership was strictly controlled, so that today there is sound control of the distribution of the commodity to which the Minister has referred, and I think he would be very unwise indeed to disturb that particular method of control. That argument applies

ful life. He was a member of the medical profession and as such he contributed his part to the alleviation of suffering in a practical way. But apart from that he continued to take a great interest in the scientific side of his profession, more especially the research side of medical science. He was a lecturer at the University of the Witwatersrand, and so great was his interest in the scientific side of medicine that he wrote several books in that connection and contributed very valuable papers to medical journals. When he came to Parliament he showed himself to be one who took his duties very seriously. He studied very thoroughly all aspects of the problems which came before Parliament, and that was reflected in the speeches which he made in this House. Besides being a student of every problem which came before Parliament he possessed also a very remarkable gift of expression. He was only 44 years of age when he died. He was a member of this House only for a short time. The future still lay before him and there was a great promise for him in that future. His death is a great loss especially to his party in this House, and the sincere sympathy of every one of us goes out to his party in the loss of one of their most prominent members. His death is a loss to this House and a loss to the country at large. I move.

†Mr. J. G. N. STRAUSS: I second the Prime Minister's motion, sir. This Parliament, as the Prime Minister has indicated, has been subject to a very high rate of mortality. As he pointed out, this is the seventh loss that his quite young Parliament has suffered so far. The late hon. member, as we have heard, was a specialist particularly in the medical field and made it his particular concern to specialise in social medicine. He was a very highly qualified specialist. He was a Rhodes scholar and one of the few Rhodes scholars who came to the House, but although he was a specialist in the medical field he was also a man of very great versatility. He was not a narrow specialist confining himself only to his one particular field; he had a very great and a very deep sympathy and took a very keen interest in a large number of questions outside his particular field. He was interested in economics and banking and finance and all those subjects, particularly in economics, the field where the underprivileged were affected. What struck me about the late Dr. Osborn was his very great sincerity. He was a deeply sincere man, and what struck one was that in the debates which took place in this House, although he spoke with very deep conviction and very deep sincerity, one never saw any sign of animosity in him. Even in debate when interjections took place, as we know they take place, he was able to reply to these

interjections very effectively, but without introducing any personalities, without any animosity. It was always a case of the soft answer turning away wrath. But none the less, it was a very effective answer that he was able to give. He was an outstanding member of Parliament although, as the Prime Minister indicated, he was a member of this House for only a short period, less than two years. He was an ornament to this House, as he was an ornament to his profession. He always gave evidence of his culture, of the fact that he was well informed. He was a forceful and yet a dignified speaker, and I think, above all, he was a fearless advocate of the cause for which he stood. He was courageous and fearless, and a gallant gentleman, and that, sir, was exemplified quite recently when he came here from his sick bed to take part in a division on a measure about which he evidently felt very deeply. He came here with his doctor in attendance at a time when one might say that he was already dying. That shows, sir, his great courage, his fearlessness and what a gallant man he was. His place will be difficult to fill in this Parliament, or for that matter, in any other Parliament. We shall miss him very sadly. We mourn his passing very deeply. I second.

†Mr. HEPPLER: Mr. Speaker, I speak with great feeling today because not only was Dr. Osborn all that the hon. the Prime Minister has said and all that the Acting Leader of the Opposition has said, but more than that he was a great friend to all of us on these benches, and all his party comrades. While one might disagree with Dr. Osborn, one could never doubt his sincerity, and one could never doubt his desire to help his fellow men. He always used to say: "The trouble is that we divide the world into heroes and villains, but after all, are we not all flesh and blood; are we not all frail human beings?" On that basis he judged everyone wherever he came across them. As a party comrade I knew him to be a man who was a tireless worker, a man who never spared himself. Even in his weakest physical moments he would drive himself on and for years it has been the spirit that has carried him on. Within his frail physical structure a weak heart was beating, but a rich heart of gold. After some of the more strenuous debates in this House he has taken his opponents into the tearoom and had a cup of coffee with them, not because he wanted to make up for the antagonism in the House, but because he felt that their opinions were just as valuable to him as his opinions were to them. During his short Parliamentary career he has contributed a great deal to the deliberations in this House. Inside the Labour Party he also played a very important part, in recent years particularly, because he only took an active part in politics in the last five years. I remember

when he first joined the Labour Party he said: "I am no politician; I am no dogmatic socialist, but I cannot allow things to go on as they are. Surely there is something I can do". That seemed to be his whole attitude. When he came to problems affecting any political matter he would say: "Please leave me out of any fighting of a political nature; I am trying to do something to make this a better world than I found it". And it was on those lines he approached every problem. I do remember when I have worked very late into the night with Dr. Osborn working out, it may have been an economic problem, or getting his advice on nutritional problems, with him trying to fit his ideas to a practical approach to commerce—which he detested—I found him unflagging and untiring. When I would remark: "You are overtaxing yourself"; he would say: "No, we will go on, this is more important than we are". He placed himself second to all the problems he endeavoured to deal with. I think hon. members in this House have found him to be a man of that calibre. I am sure the country will miss him. We on these Labour benches certainly will miss him. He will be hard to replace and he will remain in our memories for many years to come as having been a vital personality and a very courageous man.

†Mrs. BALLINGER: I think this is a very distressing occasion for all of us; but it is a particularly distressing occasion for those of us who sit in this corner of the House. For myself I find it difficult to express adequately the sense of loss I suffered when I heard the news of Dr. Osborn's death. Most of us have known him for years. All of us knew that the services he was giving to the House of late were services given at the cost of the few days he had to live. I was told at the time he stood for Parliament, what was confirmed this morning, that he was warned if he came to this House he would only have a very short time to live. He decided he would rather live a short time in the service of his country than protect his own life. We are all agreed on the services he has given to the House. Apart altogether from his services on behalf of all those who are unfortunate, we must all appreciate the magnificent way in which he has maintained the tradition of the seat he has held. The passing of Mr. Walter Madeley was an event that stirred us deeply. We had always been enlivened by his contributions to the debates in this House, and when Dr. Osborn came in his place we realised that we had got a colleague who was not only a man of sound political principles but one whose attitude to life, like that of his predecessor, was free, and gay, and full of joy. I think the Acting Leader of the Opposition has applied the right word to him. Gallant has been the service he has given, gallant he has been all his life. Deeply we regret his passing and we will hold him in precious memory.

*Mr. OOST: I want to add to the words of deeply felt respect which have been expressed by the Hon. the Prime Minister and various other members, and say that all of us without exception deeply regret the passing away of our hon. colleague. He was a very talented man, and not only as a scientist; we also got to know and appreciate him as a business man and politician. We were proud of this son of the Transvaal who was called away so early in his middle age. We will cherish his memory.

Motion agreed to unanimously, all the members standing.

MOTOR-CARRIER TRANSPORTATION AMENDMENT BILL.

First Order read: Report stage, Motor-Carrier Transportation Amendment Bill.

Amendments considered.

In Clause 1,

The MINISTER OF TRANSPORT: I wish to move the amendment standing in my name to Clause 1 as follows—

In paragraph (b), to omit the proposed sub-section (5) and to substitute the following new sub-section:

(5) No person shall, except in conjunction with and for the purpose of motor transportation lawfully carried on by him, or in pursuance of written authority in the form and manner prescribed by regulation, from the appropriate local board—

(a) in writing or by notice in any newspaper or other publication make known that he is willing to undertake the conveyance of persons or goods by means of a motor vehicle, or desires to be conveyed to any place by means of a motor vehicle or desires any good to be so conveyed; or

(b) by any means whatsoever make known that any other person is willing to undertake the conveyance of persons or goods by means of a motor vehicle, or desires to be conveyed to any place by means of a motor vehicle, or desires any goods to be so conveyed.

and to omit all the words after "(5)" in line 44 down to and including "known" in line 47.

Mr. POTGIETER: I second.

sonal liberty of the citizen is a condition which I feel we ought not to tolerate for one moment. This House has, in fact, reacted violently to this sort of thing in other cases. I need only recall the fight which the Opposition put up in this House earlier in the Session, which eminently did credit to our democratic traditions, when it persuaded the Minister to withdraw a similar provision in regard to the Aliens Act. It is a type of revision which we have progressively attacked wherever we have found it in legislation in recent years and the incidence of which we have gradually reduced in our Statute Book. To extend it now is to go back on the progress we have been making in that regard and to go back on that progress in a field where the effects must be greater than if we were applying this restriction to ourselves. It is an additional burden upon the people who already feel that the laws of the country weigh far too heavily on them. And we who represent the Africans in this House must speak with particular feeling on this subject. We see constantly the effects of this type of legislation on the people we represent. We are only too well aware of the dangers of this type of legislation, of the effect it has on the temper of the people, and the increasing tendency it has to throw our African people up against the European people. To place the Asiatics or those who may be listed as Asiatics in the same category and under constant irritation, is tending to make the bond tighter and tighter between these groups of the population. For those reasons I shall be glad if the Minister will agree to the deletion of this clause and thus to leave the law as it was. I cannot believe that its deletion will in any way hamper the administration of this Act, and I hope that in the circumstances the Minister will agree to its deletion.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: I am afraid I cannot accept that amendment. I wish to point out that in the first place, when this 1926 legislation was before the House, these words were not in the Bill. They were added on a subsequent occasion, and the whole idea is to search premises where nobody should be sleeping, in order to prove that those premises are occupied illegally. These people should not be sleeping there at all, so if they do sleep there, they cannot quarrel when inspectors come along at night to find out whether anyone is occupying the premises illegally. The Asiatics are not entitled to occupy these business premises.

Mr. KAHN: Supposing there is no Asiatic there; it may be a European; why should he be disturbed at night? The inspector may be on a fool's errand.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: It is impossible to administer the Act unless we have this provision, because you can never

prove that certain premises are in fact occupied by Asiatics, for the simple reason that if the premises are visited during the day, you will not find proof that they are occupying the premises, but if you go at night you will find proof, and that is the only time to go. In order to carry out the provisions of the Act it is absolutely necessary to have these words, otherwise the whole object of that provision will be nullified.

†Mr. HEPPLER: I think the hon. the Minister has missed the whole point of the objection to this clause. It is this: that generally the inspector will act on some report made to him, and you may conceivably have this position that a person with a grievance against his neighbour will lodge a complaint against his neighbour that Asiatics are sleeping on the premises next door, and those people may then be disturbed by a malicious report made to an inspector. You will not then achieve the purpose which the Minister has in mind. Furthermore, I doubt whether there are many cases of the type that this clause intends to cover. The Minister's advisers, who suggested the inclusion of this clause, probably acted on the assumption that one can only find out whether people are sleeping on the premises if one goes there at night, but we are going to find under this clause that inspectors will only act on the reports that are submitted to them, very often malicious reports, and when they go on these false errands, they are more likely to disturb law-abiding citizens than to get those persons who are actually breaking the law.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as printed, put and agreed to.

The remaining clauses and the title of the Bill having been agreed to.

House Resumed:

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

Amendments considered.

Amendments in Clauses 11 and 12 put and agreed to, and the Bill, as amended, adopted.

Bill read a third time.

SEA FISHERIES AMENDMENT BILL.

Fourth Order read: second reading, Sea Fisheries Amendment Bill.

†The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Paragraph (b) is the provision which would give the inspectors the power to enter premises by night as well as by day, which is the present limited right that is enjoyed by the Minister's Department under the Act. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of the Interior, when replying to the second-reading debate, said that he himself was not enamoured of the extension of the right of inspection from the day time to the night. But he put forward, not with very much vigour, the argument that officers of his Department informed him that in many cases when they went out to inspect premises there was no one to be found there, and therefore they wish to go by night. It is not a question of when the Act is being contravened, because occupation is continuous, even if a person is present in occupation for a portion of the day, for a portion of the morning or a portion of the night, it is in certain circumstances a breach of the Act, but that applies to a whole host of other laws. It applies to a whole host of other criminal activities. Nevertheless, in respect of most other crimes the power to enter by night is not given. Why then must the Asiatic people suffer this very special discrimination and be subjected to a violation of their privacy by night, so that they may be raided at any particular time by an inspector who can force an entry into the premises which they are occupying? I would like to say this that these powers will not only be used against Asiatics, they will also be used against Europeans and Coloureds who may have been reported wrongly or maliciously by somebody to the Department as being Indians and their premises will also be subjected to search. It is not done in the case of the others. I can tell the Minister, from personal experience, that these nocturnal visits can be very unpleasant. They take place not only under the Asiatic Land Tenure Act, but they also appear to take place under the Riotous Assemblies Act, and no one relishes the idea of having his sleep disturbed and being subjected to the shock of finding some stranger under cover of authority entering upon his premises for any purpose whatsoever. When similar activities such as raids and inspections take place in regard to African people it has always been a source of very great unpleasantness and resentment indeed. The Minister of Justice who is temporarily in charge of this Bill should know that under the guise of various laws affecting Africans, searches and raids are frequently made at night. There are many communities who do not indulge in the same form of night attire that some Europeans do, and they have been subjected to the indignities of inspectors or police coming into their premises and very roughly and rudely pulling off their bedclothes and exposing both men and women, married or cohabiting, who are in bed. Therefore, it is an undesirable

practice that the right to search should take place at night. It is something which the African people deeply resent, and I am certain Indian people will feel sore about having their premises raided and searched at night. I would like to remind the Opposition that when we had a discussion in this House under the Aliens Amendment Act, the Opposition were the people who prevailed upon the Minister to withdraw a proposal giving the officials the power to search premises by night for suspected prohibited immigrants. Such powers in all laws are very strictly limited, and for the same reason these powers should not be given to inspectors under the Asiatic Land Tenure Act. There can only be very few instances where it is absolutely impossible to establish the nationality of the occupier of a building, because he is absent by day; in most of such cases it would not be the whole house that is occupied. It would only be a room in a tenement which is occupied and then there are neighbours in the tenement who could establish who the occupier of that particular room is. There is no need whatever for a clause of this kind. If there is a whole house which is under suspicion of being occupied by an Asiatic, then surely there must be a wife, there must be children in the household who could be seen during the daytime, and so from a practical point of view there is no need for this clause.

There is another point which I would like to make which I repeat once more and that is the general power which the Minister or anyone else has to allege in criminal or civil proceedings that a person is Asiatic, and by the magic of that allegation every person becomes an Asiatic unless he can submit proof to the contrary in a court of law. [Time limit.]

†Mrs. BALLINGER: I hope sincerely that the hon. the MINISTER is both empowered to accept this amendment and that he will accept it. Of course, we are in a very difficult position these days when we are forced to deal with Bills introduced by one Minister, by the kind offices of another, who is usually not in a position to offer any accommodation; but since this practice is extending with this Government I should imagine that some arrangement has been made behind the scenes so that the Minister in charge may use his own judgment, and it is in the hope that that is so and that this Minister will use benign judgment in this regard that I am making my appeal to him. I feel that the amendment to the Act which the Minister of the Interior has proposed in this clause is one which no right-minded person can accept. There is already a grave interference with the accepted rights of citizens in a democratic State under the whole of this law; but that the administration of the law should allow this day-to-day interference with the per-

1950

CONTENTS

(continued)

1950

1950 CONTENTS

DAIRY IND. CONTROL (AMDT.) (2R)	7951, 7976
GOVT. VILLAGES (2R)	4060 [missing]
GROUP AREAS (2 R.)	7502
KLIPFONTEIN ORGANIC PROD. CORP. (2R)	5607
" " " " (CTEE)	6660, 6709,
" " " " "	6788.
PART APPROPRIATION (2R)	1004
POPULATION REGISTRATION (2R)	3128
" " (CTEE)	5724, 5864,
" " "	6001, 6068.
RENTS (RESUMPTION)	776, 1747
SUPPRESSION OF COMMUNISM (2R)	9143
" " " (CTEE)	9329, 9361,
" " " "	9390, 9474,
" " " (3R.)	9539 (Missing)
TIME FOR SUPP. OF COM. (MOTION)	8860
MORNING SITTINGS (MOTION)	8653
FREEDOM OF THE PRESS (MOTION)	2322
NO CONFIDENCE (MOTION)	59

MORE~

1950 CONTENTS

(continued)

SUPPLY (MAIN ESTIMATES) (MOTION) ..	3247
VOTE 16 (NATIVE AFFAIRS)	4743
VOTE 22 (JUSTICE)	5071
VOTE 26 (POLICE)	5197
VOTE 39 (INTERIOR)	5266 [Passports]
VOTE 31 (AGRICULTURE)	6150 (Missing)
VOTE 35 (COM. & IND.)	6851
VOTE 45 (LABOUR)	7252, 7296
VOTE 39 (SOCIAL WELFARE)	701
SUPPLY (ADDITIONAL)	497

[PRIME MINISTER - D.F. MALAN]

That is what he tells the Communists. He goes further and says that the workers, the people who are unemployed, are making demands—

They are making demands; their demands must be sound.

Is that "thinking nationally and speaking nationally?" Can one imagine a responsible politician in South Africa, knowing what the composition of the population of South Africa is, making such a statement to people whom he himself described in the past as people with an underhand and devilish creed, that is to say, Communism? Can we in South Africa, a country which is ripe for Communism, imagine the Leader of the Opposition inciting those people — because it is nothing else but incitement when he tells them that the demands they are making must be sound demands which must be met.

But he goes still further. Not only does he seek by implication, to spur on the Communists to come forward with impossible demands, or for that matter with any sort of demand just to create trouble for the present Government, but goes still further. He also tries to incite the industrialists against the Government. He says—

It seems that industries are going to be slack.

He would also like to make use of the industrialists. He goes further—

People will become unemployed; cost of living will rise . . .

An HON. MEMBER: [Inaudible.]

Mr. OLIVIER: What he did not say was that the shares of the United Party had tumbled badly. But it was not only limited to the Leader of the Opposition. For one of his age, he took a very active part in the propaganda, but the propaganda was carried more especially by his lieutenants, particularly by the one who sits next to him, the crown prince. On the 27th August the hon. member for Germiston (District) (Mr. G. N. Strauss) said in Pretoria — the hon. member for Hospital (Mr. Barlow) does not like him but has to put up with him—

The Government allowed the gold reserve to dwindle and the national debt to increase.

He can well realise that the hon. member, when he was a member of the Government of the country, was in such troubled waters that he was definitely not able to pay attention to other aspects of government,

otherwise he would not have talked such nonsense. He went on to say—

The beautiful, rich legacy that was left by the United Party is ruined. The Minister of Finance is going all over the world to beg for a loan.

No, it is the members on the other side who are begging for votes to put them back in power. That is the only begging that we know of. Now what are the facts? Why did the hon. member not acquaint himself with the facts before he talked about these matters? Does he know what the gold reserve was during the last nine or ten months of the United Party's regime? Does he know that at the beginning of that period the gold reserve was approximately £260,000,000? And what was the gold reserve when they had to stand down? Then it was no longer such a large sum. No, it had already dwindled to approximately £90,000,000. Then the time had arrived; no, it was overdue, because as long ago as the previous March the Governor of the Reserve Bank had warned those on that side, that if they continued at the same tempo at which they were proceeding, South Africa would go bankrupt. They did not heed that warning, because an election was at hand and they did not have the courage to do it. That is why it was the duty of this side of the House, when we came into power, to do those things that our party has done and which the party on the other side did not have the courage to do.

The hon. member for Claremont (Mr. Waterson) and some of the other members on the other side who predicted that this Session we would have a deficit of between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000, are very sorry now that they are going to be disappointed. The Minister of Finance has already given an indication that those forecasts on their part, and also the forecasts of the "Cape Argus" that there would be such a huge deficit, represented nothing but wishful thinking. That is the propaganda; that is the language which the members on the other side used during the past year. That is the method they are using in an effort to keep on beating the war drums and to dig up the past and to revert to those things on which the nation has already given a verdict. But we will now deal with a few facts to show what the true position is.

What is the truth? We would like to answer them again out of the mouths of their own people, out of the mouth of the Chairman of the Federated Chambers of Industry who at their congress in Bloemfontein last year used words to which they did not pay serious attention at that time, but which we hope the United Party will take to heart today. Mr. Fleming said there—

It is high time the political parties and their servile instruments and henchmen

take stock and account to their consciences for the consequences of their words.

[Time limit.]

Mr. HEPPLÉ: There is no doubt that the popularity of this Government since it came into power has waned considerably, especially over the past twelve months, and during that period we have had to suffer nothing but apologies and explanations for the various difficulties with which they have been confronted. A state of confusion exists in this country which I think correctly reflects the state of confusion which exists in the mind of the Government itself. The proposer of this motion has rightly pointed out that the country is kept in a state of suspense regarding proposed legislation dealing with Coloured voters and with the removal of the Native Representatives from this House. The Government has threatened this country with legislation of this nature and yet it has done nothing to clarify the position, particularly in regard to the apartheid aspect of their policy. No legislation has been brought before this House to provide those positive aspects of their apartheid policy and at the same time the non-European people of this country are kept in a state of uncertainty and fear. I think that the hon. Prime Minister will be the first to admit that if we are going to develop this country and make it a country worth living in, if the Europeans on the southern tip of the African continent are going to give leadership and have supremacy, they can only attain that if they are clear-headed, clear-thinking and fair to the masses of the people. In his New Year message the Prime Minister said—

The tide has turned in our favour and further ahead the return of normal conditions and greater prosperity is already coming into view — a well-being in which all sections and interests will have a fair share.

I do not know how the Government proposes to provide that fair share for all sections of the community. I do not know whether they have considered the many aspects of fair-sharing in a nation such as ours. Some people would like a fairer share of the spiritual things. A few would like a fairer share of the material things of life. Nevertheless, the vast masses are not getting even a small share of the benefits that should accrue to them and it is on this aspect I had hoped to see brought before the House this Session some form of legislation to give the people of this country what they have expected and what they were promised by the present Government.

I will endeavour to point out several aspects of the failure of this Government

to provide those things which they promised. At the present moment we are faced with growing unemployment. While it is not on a vast scale it is steadily growing. The workers in many industries are asking what is going to happen to them tomorrow. The cost of living keeps on going up. There is talk of retrenchment, and in face of this economic insecurity the Government offers us nothing much more than a population register. During the last session of Parliament we had certain legislation dealing with industrial matters. We had legislation, for instance, dealing with unemployment insurance benefits which were taken away from large numbers of workers in this country; and under that legislation we could foresee that many more workers were going to be deprived of these benefits. During the recess our fears came true. We have seen the Minister under the powers given him under the amended Act grant exemptions almost every week, and so the small benefits that had been gained by workers in this country a few years ago are being dissipated and taken away. More insecurity and uncertainty is being created in the minds of the people of this country when they see that not only is this Government antagonising the non-European section of the population but at the same time they are doing things and uttering threats that are disturbing the European people in South Africa. The attitude of the hon. Minister of Labour towards the trade union movement has encouraged the opponents of the working class movement in this country, has encouraged those who want to keep the workers down, and the result is that we have two organisations gathering around those trade unions. If there is any member of the Nationalist Party who understands anything about trade unionism and working class organisations he will be aware that the effect of such action will be not only to destroy the trade unions and the working class movement, but it will have serious repercussions on production and stability in the industries of the country. While other countries in the world are developing better relations between employers and employees, in this country we are following the pattern which is leading to division and strife and antagonisms between employers and employees, and I can see no possibility of alleviating those difficulties unless and until this Government comes to its senses.

We recently had a statement made by the Minister of Education at Brandfort when he said—

As far as I am concerned, the conscience clause in the Education Act might well be scrapped.

This uncalled-for statement by the Minister of Education was a remarkable one. It immediately was pointed out by the many

religious sects that exist in this country that this indicated that one particular religious denomination would be accorded priority over all the others. Is that the way to build up unity of the European sections of the population? Our Education Act provides that—

No specific sectarian doctrine or dogma which is peculiar to any religious denomination or sect shall be taught.

Yet one of the Ministers of this Government makes a statement which can only be calculated to cause offence and awaken fear in the minds of those who do not subscribe to one particular creed.

Then we have the Minister of Labour. One of the first steps he took on assuming office was to institute an enquiry into the Garment Workers' Union, and enquiry that was instigated because of a few hooligans who broke up a properly organised meeting of that trade union. The Minister could not set about that investigation quickly enough, but when unemployment arose in that industry due, it is said, to import control—when unemployment reached the figure of over 5,000 the Minister had nothing to say. Subsequently the Minister promised that work would be found for those employees in that industry who were thrown out of employment. I do not know if the Minister realises the implications of this promise. Does he expect a garment worker to take up manual labour or domestic work? Was he serious when he said that he could provide alternative employment for 5,000 South African girls who were trained in the garment-making industry? Is that consistent with his emphasis on providing incentives to workers in order to make them produce more? When workers are trained in one specific industry and the Minister then says that he is going to transfer them to other industries, how does that square with his statement in regard to increasing production and his complaint that workers are not producing enough? This is a further indication that the Government does not understand the economic set-up in this or any other country. They have not the realisation that their social policy is breaking down the economics of this country. They do not realise that if you want a planned society, if you want to organise things in a proper manner, you have to see to it that you have a sound and clear policy so that the people, and in particular the workers, understand where they are going and what their future will be. This is the Government that has promised the workers, particularly on the Witwatersrand, during the general election campaign, that the next government would see that the workers got a square deal. The first part of the square deal is unemployment. The second part of the square deal is the rising cost of

living; and in regard to the rising cost of living I would like to quote to this House what the Minister of Economic Affairs replied . . .

*The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: On a point of order, there is a motion on the Order Paper, in the name of the Leader of the Labour Party (Mr. Christie), in connection with a number of matters including the question of the cost of living. This will be discussed next week, and I should like to know from you, Mr. Speaker, as there is already a motion on the Order Paper in this connection, whether that matter can be discussed now. Otherwise it would mean that there would be two debates on the same subject. I would like to know where I have to answer. If I have to answer this debate, then I shall not reply to the debate on the motion of the hon. member for Johannesburg (City). If we want a full discussion on this matter, which I should very much like to have, let us rather have it on the motion of the hon. member for Johannesburg (City). I understand, however, that there is also a rule in connection with this matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister has drawn my attention to the fact that there are certain motions on the Order Paper which will relate to these specific questions about cost of living and he has asked whether it is in order for the hon. member to speak now on those questions. My ruling is that the hon. member should avoid doing so. The ordinary rule of relevancy should be observed as far as possible. He will have the opportunity to discuss these matters when the motions come before this House.

Mr. TIGHY: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I humbly point out that it has been the invariable practice for Mr. Speaker to allow us a very considerable amount of latitude in a debate on a motion of no-confidence. May I, therefore, appeal to you on behalf of members to do your best to allow us a certain amount of latitude in this respect?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will allow a certain latitude, but the rule should be observed as far as possible.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Mr. Speaker, in view of your ruling, I do not propose to go into details in regard to the cost of living, and I will not avail myself of this opportunity to throw back at the Minister what he said last year; I shall have an opportunity at a later date. I merely want to touch on the broad aspects of the subject and to point out that the real wages of the workers of this country have in fact gone down because the cost of living keeps on going up, and the people of the country are

finding it more and more difficult, if not impossible, to make ends meet. Reference to the number of debtors appearing before our courts, and a statement issued by the Chambers of Commerce, indicate the largely increased amount of credit that is being extended in the retail trade. We have also personal knowledge of what is happening in respect of our own incomes; that is proof enough that we are heading for economic disaster unless concrete steps are taken either to increase wages or to reduce the cost of living, and in this respect the Government has done nothing. It is for that reason more than any other that the people of the country are losing their confidence in the Government. Every day we find more and more people bordering upon poverty not because they are unemployed but because their real wages are as a rule about one-third of what they were in 1938. Cost-of-living allowances are completely inadequate to meet the increased charges that people have to pay today. It is a well-known fact that practically every merchant or industrialist that makes an approach to the Minister is granted an increase in commodity prices, and it is also a well-known fact that today the rich are getting richer. That is no idle statement. We have not got away from the era of post-war profiteering. Large incomes are becoming very much larger, and at the same time the workers are earning very much less.

I referred earlier to the state of uncertainty which exists, especially among the non-European population of this country, the uncertainty among the Coloured people as to what is to be their fate in so far as their rights under the Electoral Act are concerned. The hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Finance blandly issued a statement to the country that they cannot agree upon this policy, and therefore it is going to be shelved until after the end of 1950. There is disagreement and uncertainty in the Government ranks on this proposed legislation, this legislation which was so strongly demanded and desired according to the propaganda of the Nationalist Party. Surely that was a strong enough incentive for the Government to deal with it, or have we a Government of expediency which is going to juggle with the destiny of this country to serve their own political ends? That is the issue we have before us. Over the New Year when the hon. the Prime Minister was sending his New Year message to the nation and holding out the prospect of a bright future for us all, the non-Europeans were meeting at Bloemfontein and Dr. Moroka, the President of the African National Congress, said—

There can be no shadow of doubt even to the most sceptical European, that there is a rising and irresistible upsurge of African nationalism.

We Europeans have found it necessary to oppose Nationalism or so-called Nationalism amongst Europeans, because Nationalism and the Nationalist Party signify some policies that are repugnant to us, but now we have something even more dangerous. We have rising here a black Nationalism, a black Nationalism that is being fostered by a spirit of hate and oppression. We have a Government which threatens to do all sorts of things but does nothing except to leave the country in a state of suspense and fear. If it brought forward some practical and realistic policy, particularly on the positive aspect of apartheid, we certainly would not have a threat such as this, and I would like to know from the Government whether they realise the implications of a growing black nationalism in this country? Do they think we can defeat black nationalism on the African Continent with guns? Do they think that we can do it with an atomic bomb? The Colonial Territories that are governed by other Governments are following a policy of development, a policy of education, and while it is only at the beginning really, this black nationalism will develop so rapidly that it will swamp us completely in the south, and this Government should do everything in its power to see that we as Europeans are safe on this Continent. I have heard hon. members on the Government side of the House attack the Opposition because it has no positive policy, but we have seen no signs of a positive policy from the Government benches. We have heard nothing but threats, suggestions and promises. We have seen a few signs of their policy of maintaining White supremacy in South Africa, in the form of boards on railway carriages, separate entrances at stations and in the post offices. Is that the way to rule the country? Is that the way to rule South Africa?

An HON. MEMBER: What is the policy of your Party?

Mr. HEPPLE: A positive policy from a Government which is responsible for the growth and development of this country should surely not give merely sign-boards on railway carriages and separate entrances for Europeans and non-Europeans . . .

Mr. MENTZ: Are you against it?

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member asks whether I am against it. Let me ask him whether he is for or against whatever he is quarrelling about? We have not yet had a clear explanation from hon. members on the Government benches as to what they propose to do in this regard. I would like hon. members on the Government side of the House to explain to us what their attitude is towards this new decision that has been taken by the hon. the Prime Minister

and the hon. the Minister of Finance regarding the suspension or the postponement of the policy of apartheid.

Mr. MITCHELL: They do not know. They have not been told yet.

Mr. HEPPLE: I think it is in the national interests that we should be told, during the present Session of Parliament, what is going to happen. So far we have not heard a single word.

Mr. A. STEYN: Are you disappointed?

Mr. HEPPLE: I am extremely disappointed.

Mr. A. STEYN: I thought so.

Mr. HEPPLE: This shadow is hanging not only over the heads of the non-European people, it is hanging over the heads of Government members, and this Government is taking no positive steps at all in order to reassure the people.

I would like to deal now with another aspect of the confusion that exists in the minds of hon. members on the Government benches, particularly in the minds of some of the Ministers. In September of 1948 when this country had been eating brown bread for a long time, the Minister of Agriculture stood up in this House and he waved a loaf of white bread and said to the House, "This is what the country is going to get; we promised the people white bread and they are going to get it. You can imagine how nutritious and good this white bread will be." Well, the country got white bread and then for whatever the reasons may be, be it devaluation or dollar exchange, the price of bread had to go up and the Government very ingeniously dealt with it on the basis of the delivery charges on bread. I do not know whether the Government sees how this question of the delivery of bread operates in the cities, but the whole thing has become an absolute farce. At the same time the Minister, when putting up the price of bread, because put up the price of bread he did, made this remarkable statement . . .

An HON. MEMBER: Did he not also put up the weight?

Mr. HEPPLE: No, he only put up the price; he had put up the weight before. He made this remarkable statement; he appealed to the people to eat more brown bread. He was browned-off with white bread. He said—

Nutritional experts are alarmed at the extent to which the consumption of white bread has increased at the expense of brown bread.

Here is a clear illustration of the confusion that exists in the minds of this Government. First of all they give you white bread and boast that this is the finest and the most nutritious bread that can be given to the country and afterwards they say that the nutrition experts are alarmed, that this bread is bad for you, that it is gnawing at your vitals and destroying you, that you must not eat white bread.

An HON. MEMBER: What did you want to eat?

Mr. HEPPLE: I know what I want to eat, but I do not think the Government knows what it wants to eat or what it wants to do. I will eat any bread that I can get, but unfortunately, judging by the way the Government is acting, I suppose we will get back to the old standard loaf, or a lot of people will go without bread altogether.

An HON. MEMBER: What is the price of coffee?

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member wants to know what the price of coffee is. I do not know. The hon. member can afford to be facetious about it because he has probably never gone without bread. Perhaps he thinks it is a joke to say one moment that white bread is nutritious and then to say the next moment that it is bad for you. I quote that merely to show the confusion in the minds of the Government. They do not know whether white bread is good or whether brown bread is good; they do not know whether apartheid is good or whether it is bad; they do not know whether 1950 is the right year to introduce legislation, or whether 1951 is the right year. In other words, this Government has not only lost the confidence of the country, it has lost consciousness. It has lost the ability to think things out clearly and the ability to do things. For these reasons, I say that we on this side of the House support the motion.

*Mr. LIEBENBERG: The purpose of the motion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition was, according to his introductory words, to have a general discussion on the Government's policy. But almost immediately the hon. Leader made one of, I think, the most irresponsible speeches that has ever been made in this House. I want to accuse the Leader of the Opposition that he as Leader of the Opposition, ever since this Government came into power and particularly during the past year, has shown the greatest lack of responsibility, and especially in his present speech. He has shown greater lack of responsibility in his speech than a statesman of his calibre has ever shown—irresponsible in the first instance towards the world outside. My view is that a Leader

of the Opposition has the same obligations towards his country as the Prime Minister who is in power, in maintaining and defending the honour of his country against the outside world.

*Mr. ROBINSON: As in the war.

*Mr. LIEBENBERG: Yes, as in the war. The most irresponsible things were said by the Leader of the Opposition during the past year and since this Government came into power, and I repeat that it shows that that sense of irresponsibility is not part and parcel of his make-up. Who landed this country in a state of dissension? Was it this Government, this side of the House, or was it that side? Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition not continually made use of one section of the population to violate the wishes of the other section of the population? I say that we in South Africa have had a very well-behaved population in that they did not act more forcefully during the years of persecution and provocation that we experienced in this country. I shall come back to this particular point. A Leader of the Opposition and an Opposition in a Parliament of a democratic State like ours is in duty bound to uphold the honour of the country against the outside world, just as the Government is in duty bound to do it. I want to ask the Leader of the Opposition whether he did it. In every possible way and on every possible occasion he gave the outside world to understand that violence was practised in South Africa, that certain sections would be exterminated, that people would be robbed of the money that they had sent here, and that the present Government would commit every conceivable form of outrage. Was this responsible conduct on his part? The Leader of the Opposition rejoiced in the fact that the Treasury, which he had left empty, had created difficulties for the present Government. Our national debt at the outbreak of war, as has already been shown, was £273,000,000. This has increased to more than £600,000,000. The Leader of the Opposition now says that he never borrowed money. Where does this debt come from then?

*Mr. SUTTER: He borrowed it in this country.

*Mr. LIEBENBERG: Yes, and the result is that all our local capital is locked up in those loans and our own country has not sufficient funds for our own people to develop our industries and other industries as they ought to be developed. For that reason it has become necessary for the present Minister of Finance to look for capital overseas. Otherwise it would not have been necessary for us to do so. That £300,000,000 would have been more than sufficient to provide for all our industries and commitments—that £300,000,000 of the

country's money which the Leader of the Opposition borrowed and froze in Government loans and which is not available for our national development. Let hon. members on the other side deny this. And all this debt was incurred in connection with matters outside the interests of this nation. The hon. Leader of the Opposition and his party are very fond of enquiring into a man's war record and whether he was anti- or pro-war. They tell us that they are the people who fought for democracy, but they do not want to afford another man the opportunity of expressing his own opinion in this country. That is the false democracy they fought for. They talk about Hitler and Fascism. There was never more Fascism under Hitler than there was during the time South Africa was at war. Fascism is an ugly word. I still want to add this. The commission of enquiry that is now being appointed and against which the Opposition is reacting so violently, is really the result of those Fascistic measures which the former Government applied to the nation and is designed to bring those Fascistic measures to light and to redress the injustice. Will the hon. Leader of the Opposition deny that the hon. member for Standerton (Mr. W. C. du Plessis) was one of his victims? That is how the nation reacted at the last election because those Fascistic methods had been applied to it during the war and had made such an inroad into our national way of life. My friends on the other side believed that they would rule the country for ever. They did not take into account the fact that our people have a very strong sense of justice. Many people who formerly supported the party on the other side, have helped to put this Government into power in order to have a more just Government. I say that the time has arrived for the Opposition to regain a sense of responsibility, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, as he is regarded as a world figure. We are told that when he speaks the outside world listens. He himself has said that he is so strong that he need only send a telegram and then enough money will come to this country. He also says that this Government has had to send a Minister to go and beg for money. Where was his sense of responsibility when he said that? Would he rather see his nation destroyed; and why had he not sent a telegram if, as he says, he need only send a telegram to put matters straight?

It reminds me of a meeting which the Leader of the Opposition addressed at Odendaalsrus, where he violently attacked the Government on account of serious neglect of the mines. There was an old man present, an English-speaking supporter of the Leader of the Opposition, and this was what he said: "I have always had the greatest admiration for Field-Marshal Smuts, but tonight he spoke as an ordinary politician

second time that this happened. The first time it happened the Minister of Finance was saved by my Leader, who helped to bring South Africa out of the mess that side got it into.

An HON. MEMBER: What about Mr. Hofmeyr's attitude?

Mr. POCKOCK: We all had our differences. At every crisis my Leader has come forward to help you. The Minister knows that if any crisis develops he will also get the help of this side of the House in carrying out a sound financial policy.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: When the hon. Minister of Finance introduced his motion he referred to the war-time mentality of wastefulness. I think what the country is more concerned about is the war-time mentality of high prices and big profits. While it may be true, as has been pointed out, that to some extent the Additional Estimates are due to devaluation I presume the Minister also realises that people generally in the country are getting precious little benefit from devaluation in other ways. We have made the point before, that unless some practical and concrete steps are taken to stop the rise in commodity prices the demand for higher wages and increased cost-of-living allowances will continue. Unfortunately the civil servants have had their cost-of-living allowances frozen for twelve months, when the cost-of-living index can be reviewed. In the meantime employees of the Government are going to suffer more and more hardships, because I can see no indication from the Government of their taking any practical steps to hold the rise in prices, let alone reduce the cost of living. Devaluation apparently is having harsher effects on our economy than was at first envisaged, and these effects are going to be felt by the man in the street. These Additional Estimates have got to be defrayed and they will be paid for at the expense of the wage and salary earner. But in other directions they will also have to pay in the shape of higher prices for their everyday needs. In this regard the Minister stated in his constituency that people no longer save; that they are drawing more money out of their savings accounts than in the past. The answer to that must be obvious to the Minister; people are now finding it necessary to live on their savings, to use them to supplement their ordinary incomes; and the position is far more serious than members of this House appear to realise. We shall have an opportunity later of dealing with this question more fully, but at the same time I hope that the hon. the Minister is bearing in mind the serious problem of the rising cost of living and that we shall see some concrete measures to reduce the cost of living when he introduces the Mair Estimates. After all, the effects not only of

devaluation but of the rising cost of living, are reflected in the subsidies under the Agricultural Vote. If the people are able through their ordinary incomes to pay fair prices for the commodities affected by these subsidies, the need for the subsidies will disappear, and that applies to the social services. The worse the condition of the people in this country the greater the need for social services, and while the hon. the Minister is following a policy of contracting State expenditure, the position is that as fast as he contracts that expenditure, so will the need for it expand. The hon. the Minister insists that the only way in which he can balance his Budget is by means of contracting expenditure, yet he must realise that at the same time a reduction in State expenditure is going to spread to private spending and so we will have unemployment, we will have a drive for lower wages with the inevitable repercussions upon the economy of the country as a whole.

The hon. member for Pretoria (Sunnyside) (Mr. Pocock) has referred to what he calls the subsidisation of members of Parliament who stay at the camp known as Sassar in Wingfield. Perhaps the hon. member is one of those fortunate individuals who has such a large income that he need not stay at a converted military camp, and I want to say to the hon. member that a camp such as we have at Wingfield is not only needed for the handful of members of this House who make use of it, but for civil servants who are uprooted from their homes in Pretoria and who are brought down here year after year, and who have to pay extremely high prices for boarding in second-rate hotels.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Wingfield remedied a scandalous position.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Of course, it did. I think this was one of the finest steps ever taken by any Government. It was long overdue, and, in any case, I would point out to the hon. member that the Vote of the Department of the Interior carried this amount in other respects in previous years, and this is no subsidisation of either members of Parliament or of civil servants. I think the House will eventually have to consider the question of erecting something permanent to accommodate civil servants and members of the two Houses when Parliament is in session in Cape Town.

An HON. MEMBER: What about the time that it is in session in Pretoria?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: If we are going to continue with the luxury of two capitals we must be prepared to carry the financial burden that is entailed by two capitals, and the hon. member had many opportunities of remedying this position in the past when he was a member of a Government party. I

think any criticism of this camp at Wingfield is most uncalled for.

Now I want to deal with an item under Vote 7, "Provincial Administrations". I would like to ask the Minister to inform this House whether he has issued instructions to the provincial authorities to curtail their expenditure, and whether he has indicated to them in what regard he wants them to curtail expenditure, because in Vote 7 we have an additional amount of over £1,500,000 which has to be paid in the form of subsidies. Only a small portion of this refers to the period 1948-'49. Under the Financial Relations Act of 1945 control of the spending of the provinces is limited. Although a contribution by Parliament is provided for, I notice that the Transvaal, for instance, has to be paid £1,200,000, which is a substantial increase over the original request of £8,150,000. In the previous year, 1948/49, their total vote was £7,465,000, and in this regard I would like the hon. the Minister to inform the House whether he has had discussions with the provinces and whether he has come to any arrangement with them as to the curtailment of their expenditure, and in what respect this curtailment will take place. I for one am very concerned that there should be any curtailment of provincial services in any respect whatever. I am very nervous of policies of economy because policies of economy never affect those who can afford to provide themselves with all the good things of life. Such policies are paid for by the poorer people of this country and by them alone.

Then there is another item under Vote 44. While it is a very small item I think there is a principle at stake here. I refer to this amount of £1,000 paid in respect of a lawsuit in which the editors of "Manpower" were involved. It would appear to me that the editors of "Manpower" took an excursion into the realms of controversial medical practice and got themselves involved so deeply that the country now has to bear the burden. I would like to ask the hon. the Minister to inform the House whether the editors of "Manpower" and of other Government publications are indemnified against anything they may say or write, because if there is an indemnity, I think steps should be taken to see that they do not embark upon these excursions into controversial matters that will involve the State in expense. In this particular case we are fortunate in getting away with a mere £1,000 but who knows how much we may have to pay in the future?

Mr. Speaker, I also want to deal with a statement which, I think, has a bearing on the budgeting of the hon. the Minister. I notice that when he was touring his constituency, he is reported in "The Star" of the 12th January of this year, to have said—

and I presume the report is an accurate one—

When he spoke at Dewetsdorp yesterday, Mr. Havenga said that gold mining and farming had to be protected against injury by new secondary industries. Before new industries were started it was essential to study labour and raw material requirements.

I do not know whether that is a statement of the policy of this Government, whether this Government is going to tie itself principally to the economy of gold mining and farming—back to forty years ago—or whether it is serious and intends to follow a policy that is so often laid down by the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs and that is to attract capital to this country and to encourage new industries in this country and to develop our economy. This statement is very much in conflict with what other Ministers are saying with regard to the economic development of this country, and I hope that the Minister has not been correctly reported, because if that is his policy it will be a sorry day for South Africa.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to the hon. the Minister to consider seriously this very vexed problem of the rising cost of living, and that he will make some provision in his main estimates to alleviate the sufferings of the majority of the people of this country.

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: The hon. member for Sunnyside (Mr. Pocock) had a somewhat difficult task to perform this afternoon. His only criticism was that they have left us a legacy and that that legacy has now been entirely squandered. May I remind the hon. member of three budget speeches? The first is that of the late Mr. Hofmeyr for the year 1946-'47.

*Mr. BARLOW: He has been dead three years.

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: Yes, but we must remind the Committee what happened. In 1946-'47 Mr. Hofmeyr gave us an exposition on the financial state of the country and he indicated to what extent the country was in funds, chiefly because there were no opportunities to import. The present Minister of Finance has emphasised the same point. But in the following year a change came, a great change. There were opportunities to import; money flowed out and our reserves declined more and more. When you study the Budget speech for the year 1947-'48 you will find the details set out there. But the hon. member and other members on the other side of the House do not know what the actual position was when the last Minister of Finance on the other side was to have held the Budget

Speech, which he did not hold. Does the hon. member for Sunnyside forget that the hon. member for Turffontein (Mr. Sturrock), then Minister of Finance, did not take the country into his confidence in March, 1948, before we went to the polls? And that is why we did not know the extent of the flow of capital out of the country. In that year orders were placed for goods overseas to the value of £476,000,000. The hon. member did not mention that the Chairman of the Reserve Bank had repeatedly warned the previous Government that there was a colossal reduction of reserves resulting from imports.

*Mr. WARING: What has that to do with the Additional Estimates?

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: I mention this because the hon. member said that we have squandered our fine legacy. I am pointing out that we were left in the dark on these matters. We now come to the budget speech of the previous year. Our Minister of Finance informed us in connection with the loan estimates that the various departments had asked for the sum of £103,945,000 for necessary services.

*Mr. POCOCK: For which year?

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: That was last year. But the present Government reduced that sum to £75,000,000. They did not agree to everything for which the Departments asked. On all those amounts that were voted, totalling £75,000,000, the Minister is now asking for an additional £2,000,000. But there has also been a tremendous saving on the various Votes. The hon. member on the other side says that we have been very extravagant. In his last budget Mr. Hofmeyr said that £47,000,000 was needed for the loan estimates. Last year we were obliged to ask for £75,000,000. Why? It was because we had to make provision for services which the country did not get during the war. We have to make up the back-log, and much of the money that we have to spend now is the result of orders placed during the regime of the Party on the other side. For example, there is the sum of £30,000,000 for the Railways.

*Mr. BARLOW: We are not against it.

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: Why then does the hon. member accuse us of extravagance? We are making up the back-log; we are providing services which, as the Minister has explained, will involve a sum of some £50,000,000. On the whole Budget the Minister now asks for an increase of some £5,000,000 and each and every item can be justified before this House. And that is why I say that the hon. member for Sunnyside had a very difficult task.

His one point of criticism was in connection with the appointment of commissions. He feels that a saving can be effected there. Well, these commissions have already brought to light a great deal that was wrong. Are we to allow these things to be covered up in our country? When commissions bring to light matters which are amiss then they benefit the country.

*Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: They must eliminate corruption.

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: A further objection which he raised was in connection with the appointment of Press attachés. Every day we are told by members opposite that we are the people who want to isolate South Africa. But when we send people overseas to supply information there about affairs in South Africa then we are accused of extravagance. No, ever since Dr. N. J. van der Merwe delivered that speech of his, the world has changed. It has now become essential for us, especially as the result of present circumstances, to send our representatives overseas.

Another point of criticism was in connection with the increased amount for white bread. I shall leave it to the hon. member for Germiston (District) (Mr. Strauss) and to the Minister of Agriculture to discuss that. But I am convinced that if hon. members will only listen to the housewives of this country, they will not complain about white bread.

*Mr. WARING: What do you know about the housewives of this country?

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: I have many constituents who are married. Another point of criticism was in regard to Wingfield. I feel that the hon. member over there (Mr. Hepple) has given a satisfactory reply on this point. The greatest increase of expenditure in these Estimates is the result of devaluation for the simple reason that we have had to pay more. The Minister has referred to imports for the Post Office and there the increase is the result of devaluation. That applies also to the cost of living allowance of officials who must be paid overseas.

I think the hon. member for Sunnyside has put up a very poor case. The present Minister of Finance is known to be anything but an extravagant Minister; he is known for placing the country on a sound financial footing and we are all happy about it, but it would seem that members on the other side regret that the country is being placed on such a sound financial basis.

Mr. KENTRIDGE: The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee has been meanderingly traversing the speech made by the hon. member for Sunnyside (Mr. Pocock).

But the main point he made in defence of the hon. Minister of Finance was that he had had requests from various Government Departments for sums of money by way of loans for public expenditure and that he had been able to reduce these departmental requests to £76 million. And he puts that to the credit of the Minister of Finance. The hon. member must know, as chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, that whenever a Government Department asks for money they mention a larger sum than they expect to get from the Minister. That applies not only to Government Departments but to other public bodies and to municipalities. I may say that when I was chairman of the Finance Committee of the Johannesburg City Council we had tremendously heavy expenditure and tremendous development, and we experienced the same state of affairs. Each Department put up a request for more money than it expected to get. The amounts asked for were in due course cut down; but because of that it would not have been right to suggest that the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Council — or in this case the Minister of Finance — could rightly claim credit for having embarked on a policy of economy.

The point made by the hon. member for Sunnyside has not been answered by the hon. member for Gordonia (Mr. J. H. Conradie). The point that was made is that it is wrong for the Minister to attach responsibility to the late Government for this heavy expenditure. The Minister's attitude amounts to telling the country that any difficulty he and the Government are faced with is due entirely to the policy of the previous Government. The Minister has suggested by way of interjection that he meant the people. But I think that as a very fair man he must realise that the statement that he made about squandermania and the war mentality of the public necessarily conveyed the impression that that was a mentality that had been created by the previous Government and that therefore he was blaming the previous Government for it. Instead of going into the generalities of the matter let me remind the House of two facts. I take the ordinary expenditure for this year, including the £5 million-odd for additional expenditure, it amounts to £146,084,089. It is worth while recalling to the House and the country that during the war, during what the Minister describes as a period of extravagance and squandermania and which created the mentality which the Minister declares still thrives, the amount of expenditure, if we take for instance the particular year 1944-'45, was £133 million compared with the Minister's £146 million today. So that in reality squandermania if not being engineered is at least not being discouraged by the present Minister. Actually at that time we spent in one year £13 million less

though we were in the midst of war and there were various other activities that had to be carried on.

I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that once the war was over the previous Government and previous Minister of Finance set out definitely to reduce expenditure and to get away from a war mentality to a peace mentality. In 1947 during the regime of the last Government the actual estimate, including additional estimates for that year, had been cut down to £119,688,000. So that really previous Minister of Finance settled down to reduce expenditure to a minimum and that, even though their expenditure during the war years was less than the Minister's expenditure today, including additional estimates. While in 1947-'48 under the last Government the expenditure was only £119,000,000, today the Minister of Finance, the great economist, the man who has been lecturing the country on squandering money, the man who has been lecturing everybody not to spend money finds that he has to please his supporters, and he comes along with a budget this year of £146 million. Under those circumstances how can he honestly accuse us of being responsible for extravagance? The same thing applies to loan expenditure. My hon. friend was talking about the "wonders" of the Minister of Finance because he had reduced the amount of loan to £76 million. What do we find in connection with that? Without going into the generalities voiced by the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and taking the official figures, we find that while this year the loan expenditure amounts to £76 million, in 1943-'44, at a time when we were spending £50 million on defence, the loan expenditure totalled £64 million; and in 1944-'45 while we were still engaged in the war and still spending at the rate of £50 million per annum on defence, the loan expenditure for that particular year was £65 million.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE: I thought the main criticism against this Government was that it had stopped all development because it had no money.

Mr. KENTRIDGE: The main criticism of the Government is that in justifying the expenditure for which they are responsible they claim that there has been development in many directions. But when the United Party Government, having committed themselves to smaller expenditure, it then becomes a case of Government squandermania. Our main criticism now is that this Government is spending to a greater extent than we were but they are showing no return for it. They are showing no additional benefits to the people by virtue of the additional expenditure. I venture to say that a great deal of that

Wingfield, to the provision of housing facilities there, because in view of the fact that the housing position in Cape Town is unsatisfactory. All we object to is that a special allowance should be given to a very small number of people benefiting thereby.

The MINISTER OF HEALTH: May I make a short statement in regard to the question raised by the hon. member for Sunnyside (Mr. Pocock)? He is aware and the House is aware and the country is aware of the difficulties experienced by officials who come from Pretoria for the Session and how they had to put up with inconveniences in the past. Then his Government and later on this Government considered means to meet their requirements and both came to the conclusion that Wingfield would be the best site to make provision for them. This is not the first amount which is being voted for the purpose. Previous amounts appeared under another head, I think under the Vote for Public Works or some other Department. This is a smaller amount this year and is due to a deficiency on services rendered by the Railway Department. The fees paid by people residing there, civil servants and members of Parliament, and I believe also a number of Senators, the fees charged have been considered by the Railway Department and approved by the Treasury.

Mr. POCOCK: Is this an amount for transport?

The MINISTER OF HEALTH: That is included in the total fee, £1 per month for transport, I think. The position briefly is then that this is a shortage in respect of the previous year which has to be made good.

Mr. HEPPLER: I am glad that the hon. member for Sunnyside (Mr. Pocock) had second thoughts on this matter.

Mr. POCOCK: You were under a misapprehension.

Mr. HEPPLER: I was not under any misapprehension, but am glad that the hon. member now admits that it was necessary to make provisions at Wingfield. But the point he apparently missed is this, and it is an important point, that the existing site was not selected and is not the most ideal place, I can assure you. These are converted military hutments spread over a very wide area, which makes the administration of this camp more costly than if it were more concentrated. It is off the beaten track and a special bus service has to be provided, and I submit that the people living there do not want a subsidy, and as a matter of fact are not receiving a subsidy. The rates they are paying there are comparable with the ordinary hotel

charges in Cape Town. As the Minister of Finance rightly said, it was to rectify a scandalous position that provision was made at Wingfield. If there is going to be need for a further amount on this vote in the future, then the whole question of Wingfield arises and can be reconsidered. But if hon. members want to know what is going on, I would advise them to go there and have a look and to attempt to get accommodation there. Then they will back the scheme with everything they know. I think this very small amount which is being asked for is reasonable, as Wingfield is of great value to civil servants and members of Parliament who come to Cape Town for the Session..

Vote put and agreed to.

On Vote No. 40—"Interior", £37,000.

Mr. BARLOW: I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior a question.

Mr. TIGHY: He is not here.

Mr. BARLOW: Where is the Minister of the Interior. I am asking the hon. the Prime Minister: Where is his Minister of the Interior? I would like to know.

Mr. S. E. WARREN: You know where he is.

Mr. BARLOW: If I am not allowed to know where the Minister of the Interior is I will have to divide the House.

Dr. VAN NIEROP: You know that he is at the conference.

Mr. BARLOW: What conference? Who is replying to my question? This amount of £31,500 has that anything to do with the question of the appointment of Press attachés or information offices?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE: £13,000 is required for the remuneration of the attachés and £18,500 is in connection with the rise of the cost-of-living allowance.

Mr. BARLOW: I would like to know a little more about these Press attachés, by whom they were appointed. In reply to a question, I find that the answer discloses that all the men who were appointed were men working on Afrikaans newspapers and supporters of the Nationalist Party.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BARLOW: It is all very well for hon. members on the other side to say "Hear, hear". This is rank racialism.

An HON. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. BARLOW: I want to ask the hon. the Minister why all the persons who were appointed as Press attachés were working on Afrikaans newspapers, supporting the Nationalist Party. That is my question. I know something about newspapermen in this country. You cannot tell me that the men appointed were the best men out of some 300 and more who applied for these posts, this looks like jobs for pals. And are any of these Press attachés related to Dr. Otto du Plessis? I want the hon. the Minister of Finance to tell us, I am going to read the names of these gentlemen: L. W. Binge, M.A., of "Die Burger"; rather a good name—Binge. Then M. A. Grobler, B.A., "Die Volksblad"; A. C. Jerling, B.A., "Die Volksblad". Then B. J. Nel, "Die Volkstem". He is an exception.

An HON. MEMBER: What has that to do with the increase?

Mr. BARLOW: So I can continue.

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: On a point of order, Is the hon. member in order to discuss the personnel of these Press attachés?

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is entitled to discuss the increase and if the appointment of the personnel is the reason for the increase, he is in order.

Mr. BARLOW: I ask you to think for a moment. Can you believe that the man who in this Parliament is in charge of Finance, as far as this House is concerned, who is chairman of the Select Committee of Public Accounts, can ask such a question?

Then there is Mr. B. Badenhorst, "Die Volksblad", and Miss Joan Human of "Die Transvaler". I say this: How many languages can these people speak? You are sending a man to the Argentine who can speak Afrikaans and English. Where did you pick these people up? Did you consult the Society of Journalists? Did you consult the editors of newspapers? Or was it Dr. du Plessis who just selected them? These people are going overseas to protect South Africa, to protect the interests of South Africa. When you send people overseas in this particular job, they will have to meet members of Parliament, they will have to frequent with journalists of name in various places and you should send the best men you could find, not the smallest men just because they belong to your Party or were junior reporters on small papers. We do not stand high as far as our information officer is concerned. We know that Dr. du Plessis wrote an article after the fall of France, where he indulged in very strange language. That has not been forgotten. Did he appoint these Press attachés? He seems to be the responsible man.

The CHAIRMAN: The Government appointed them. He is not under discussion.

Mr. BARLOW: Has the Government appointed them? What is his job?

The CHAIRMAN: He is not under discussion here.

HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. BARLOW: The Chairman says that he is not under discussion and I take his word. What are you shouting about? I am asking the hon. the Minister how these people were appointed. Will the Minister of Finance tell me? The Minister of the Interior is not present, and a few days ago the Minister of Agriculture was not present, when his Vote was under discussion. The Minister of Finance is gradually becoming a Mussolini with 12 portfolios. We know what happened to Mussolini.

*Mr. SERFONTEIN: On a point of order, I want to ask whether the hon. member is in order to discuss the question of portfolios of Ministers under this vote.

Mr. BARLOW: How are these Press attachés appointed?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has already put that question.

Mr. BARLOW: We get the cry back all over the country by hon. members on the other side that things overseas are bad and that we have made them bad. Now you are sending a lot of young people overseas who know only Afrikaans and English, have very little experience, and most of them are second- and fourth-rate reporters. I want to ask the hon. Prime Minister how that has come about. He is an old newspaperman. We know how he sat in "Die Wagtoring", all alone in the cold of the night. How were they appointed? I am speaking on behalf of the Society of Journalists. There would not have been the least objection if good men had been sent, like Dr. Geyer from "Die Burger", or the hon. member for Bethlehem (Dr. van Rhyn), that type of man.

Mr. SERFONTEIN: Or Mr. Barlow?

Mr. BARLOW: The only point is that Mr. Barlow would not go; but to appoint a number of cub-reporters with no knowledge of the world or of the newspaper world, or who do not know how to handle these matters, and to dump them in the capitals of the world—well, I ask you what these people will say about them. I know as a newspaperman. They will say: "Who is that fellow? Looks like a sugar-cane farmer from Natal". They will ask where he comes from, who he is, and they will do a lot of harm to South

Mr. Hepple

It was referred to a Select Committee on the 5th of May last year and the Select Committee was appointed on the 10th of May, with the request to present their report to the House not later than the 21st of May. Immediately when the Committee got together, it was realised that it was facing a gigantic task, with which it would be impossible to cope in the short time at its disposal. On the 16th of May leave was granted by this House to the Select Committee to sit during the sitting hours of this House, on the 18th of May it was granted an extension of time to the 30th of May; on the 24th of May there was a further application for an extension of time to the 3rd of June and on the 1st of June a further extension of time was granted to the 10th of June. We in this House had only seen the Bill as amended by the Select Committee a few days before the prorogation of Parliament. The Report of the Select Committee, was only submitted a few days before Parliament prorogued. But the point at issue is: Did the Select Committee fulfil its function as a Select Committee? I say it did not and I would like to quote a definition of the functions and duties of Select Committees as given by Mr. Speaker Krige on the 14th of June, 1923, when he said—

Redlich (vol. II) describes the function of such Committees as being a special part of the mechanism of the House which is set in motion for the study of a subject and the devising of plans for its treatment. They are constituted for the consideration of a proposal for legislation or for the consideration of an administrative measure which needs to be discussed, or for the purpose of ascertaining the condition of national administration, or again for instituting an enquiry into the procedure of the House itself. The task of a Select Committee is accordingly investigation. Such committees are indirect aids to legislation, inasmuch as they arrange the material upon which legislative decisions are eventually based, and they help to focus the ideas of the House upon matters of principle or to work out the technical details of some legislative course of action, the principle of which has been accepted. Being first and foremost committees of investigation, they have regularly been entrusted with the right to require the attendance of witnesses and to examine documents, papers and records relevant to the matters referred to them, and with the right of insisting upon the production of any such papers by witnesses. In a word, they are appointed for the purpose of considering the merits of some question referred to them, of taking evidence on the subject, of making recommendations to the House on the strength of such evidence, and of tendering any further advice which they may deem desirable.

The Select Committee, as I remarked, worked against time and found it impossible to comply with this definition of its functions. In the first place, on the evidence of the hon. member for Roodepoort who was a member for the Select Committee, no evidence was heard from tenants of dwellings.

Mr. MENTZ: That is not correct. We had evidence.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member for Roodepoort stated that no evidence was heard from tenants of dwellings and that it was proposed in Select Committee that the Chairman of the Cape Peninsula Rent Board should be heard on behalf of tenants, that he should give evidence on behalf of tenants but that this proposal was turned down.

Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: Since when is he a representative of tenants?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I do not take sides on behalf of the Chairman of the Rent Board, but I simply state that it was proposed that he should give evidence before the Select Committee and that the proposal was turned down.

Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: We had our memorandum before us.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Let us examine what evidence was submitted to the Select Committee. About a dozen witnesses appeared before them—

Mr. Abrahamson, United Building Society; Mr. Barnack, Cape Peninsula Property Owners; Mr. Brink, South African Institute of Valuers; Mr. Geldenhuys, Cape Peninsula Property Owners; Mr. Hurd, Estate Agents; Mr. Johns, Transvaal Property Owners' Association; Mr. Judin, Tenants' Protection Association.

He was the only one to appear on behalf of tenants, but tenants of business premises only, the vested class. Then there was Mr. Kahn, who apparently had hypnotic powers and appeared on behalf of the Transvaal Property Owners' Association, then—

Mr. Kusche, Secretary of Social Welfare, who gave evidence from the administrative point of view, and furthermore—

Mr. Pratt, Transvaal Property Owners' Association; Mr. Silberman, Transvaal Property Owners' Association; Mr. van den Bergh, Cape Peninsula Property Owners' and Mr. van Zyl Ham, chairman of the Rent Control Board.

It therefore appears that the Select Committee took evidence on the landlords' side only. I cannot see from the report of the Select Committee that any attempt was made

to hear evidence from tenants or the representatives of tenants. It was on the basis of the evidence submitted to the Select Committee by the landlords, without any rebutting evidence of tenants that the recommendations of the Select Committee have been brought forward. When the original Bill was introduced by the Minister of Social Welfare he also issued an explanatory memorandum which stated—

The objects of the Bill are—

- (1) to consolidate certain provisions for the protection of tenants and the control of rents of dwellings and business premises;
- (2) to incorporate certain provisions of the emergency regulations which became necessary under war-time and post-war conditions;
- (3) to apply certain provisions which at present are applicable to dwellings only, to business premises as well. These additions will be pointed out under the various sections;
- (4) to remedy certain defects which the administration of the Act has brought to light. Several of the defects have meanwhile been remedied by means of emergency regulations.

The Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, departs radically from the objects of the original Bill. What in fact the Select Committee has done is to so distort the original Bill that the objects which the hon. Minister had in mind have been destroyed. What the Select Committee in fact has done is to seize the opportunity to get at the Bill and to change it into a landlords' charter. From the reading of the evidence which was submitted by the landlords and the representatives of the landlords, we see that they themselves did not demand as much as has been given to them by the Select Committee. They asked for an inch, and have been given a yard and I am not surprised that the landlords themselves were astounded because they realised that they have not got any hope of getting the rents which they could get if the Bill as recommended by the Select Committee were to become law. Hon. members on this side of the House and that side of the House have jeered when it was said that the rents might go up as much as 30 or 40 per cent. But their jeers mean nothing because those are facts. Rents will go up by at least 30 per cent. The Secretary for Social Welfare in his evidence before the Select Committee dealt fully with this point. He stated—

Why does an owner want to have his building free from control? Because he wants a higher rate of interest than 6 per

cent. and 8 per cent. If there are to be more buildings for which rentals are to be fixed higher than 6 per cent. and 8 per cent. the rents will be higher and how will that then affect this 62 per cent. of our applicants for accommodation who are applying for accommodation with rentals of £12 and less. These people are the people who even today are finding it difficult to pay controlled rents. The Department of Social Welfare, which has had experience in these matters, feels that if a person pays 20 per cent. of his salary towards rentals he is paying as much as he ought to pay. If he pays more than that he has to go short in other important directions in the conduct of his household.

I think that is the crux of the argument in connection with the Rent Bill. The Select Committee in its failure to take evidence on both sides, in its failure to take cognisance of tenants throughout the country and in its recommendations in regard to alterations in the Bill, have so distorted the Bill that it has no relation to the original Bill which was introduced in this House. The hon. Minister himself when the Select Committee made an application to this House in its fourth special report — they made application requesting leave to consider the advisability of extending the scope of the Bill (Clause 34) to include dwellings and business premises after the date of the promulgation of the Rents Act 1949 — the Minister found it necessary to intervene at that stage and he made the following statement—

This morning the chairman of the Select Committee informed me of his intention to raise this matter here this afternoon for the approval of the House. I have had no opportunity to study the trend of the extension as indicated in the report, and while I do not want to oppose the request of the Select Committee at this stage, I feel that if I remain silent now, it may be assumed that I approve of the principle, and that hon. members who remain silent also approve of the principle. I just wish to say now that my silence must not be interpreted as approval of the principle. On an earlier occasion I said that the House would be free to vote on the particular aspects that will be raised, and I want to keep my word. I feel, however, that at this stage I must indicate that while I have noted the proposal, it does not follow that I agree with the principle.

That is the position of most hon. members in this House. We were faced with a request from the Select Committee and the House was anxious that a report from the Select Committee should come forward then and that the Select Committee should submit its recommendations in the form of an

amended Bill to be dealt with before the end of last Session, but it is obvious from what I said earlier that the Select Committee was working against time and found it impossible to complete its task. Everything was done in a hurried manner and its duties as a Select Committee were neglected.

Mr. MENTZ: Were you a member?

Mr. HEPPLE: It abstained — I do not know whether it was done wilfully or whether it was carelessness — from taking evidence from tenants or representatives of tenants and therefore it did not function in the true manner in which a Select Committee should function. It failed lamentably in that direction and submitted a Bill to this House which really should have been scrapped. That Bill was not scrapped and I am surprised that the hon. the Minister has asked leave to reintroduce the Bill in the stage where it was left off. Unfortunately we are now having what virtually amounts to a Second Reading debate. This could have been avoided if the hon. Minister had found it possible to introduce a new Bill. Furthermore, if this House had referred the report of the Select Committee back to the Select Committee it would have done the right thing. I have quoted from a ruling which has been given previously by Mr. Speaker, Krige in regard to Select Committees, and I want to read another passage from that ruling—

That the House or its presiding officer has the right to refer reports back to a Select Committee in cases where it is found that sufficient consideration has not been given to a subject referred to it is undoubted.

That is what should have happened here. That is not only my opinion, but that is also clear from the work of the Select Committee and the evidence they have had before them and it is also clear from the reckless recommendations they submitted to this House.

*Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: On behalf of the members of the Select Committee, and that also includes the hon. member for Edenvale (Mr. Davidoff), I want to object most strongly to the utterances of the hon. member who has just sat down. The members who served on the Select Committee and the other hon. members who know how hard we worked there will reproach the hon. member for making the insinuation here that we did not do thorough work in the Select Committee.

Mr. HEPPLE: That is nonsense.

*Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: He made the accusation that the Select Committee had not done its work properly, and the insinua-

tion is that the report should be referred back to the Select Committee for consideration. I think it is beneath that hon. member's dignity to say such a thing. I am really surprised that such a thing comes from him.

Allow me to say this, that the Labour Party were opposed to this Bill from the very start when this Bill was introduced in the House last year, and they now want to clutch at these little straws to see whether they cannot make political propaganda. Well, hon. members of the Labour Party are perhaps laughing about this, but I am convinced that this kind of soap-box speech we are getting from the Labour Party will have no effect in the country. The public will take no notice of it. Last year when this Bill was before the House, I asked those members whether they were prepared to invest—and those are wealthy people over there who pretend to be poor—their money in buildings, in fixed property for the purposes of letting. Two of them said "no" and the other remained absolutely silent. The reason is, of course, because it is a bad investment. They can do better with their money than to put it into houses for letting purposes. That is exactly the reason why there are insufficient houses in the country. The reason is simply that people do not want to invest their money in fixed property because it is not profitable to let houses. The second reason is that if a man invests his money in houses and he thinks he is getting a reasonable return on his money, then the Rent Board comes along and it sucks a valuation out of its thumb which is no valuation at all, and the rent is linked to that, with the result that the person suffers financial loss and finally gets rid of the house.

Members over there must not forget that the industry of houses for renting purposes in South Africa is much larger than the gold-mining industry. There are a few people who possess large buildings, but those buildings constitute a small part of the rented premises in this country. It is the poorer people, it is the bricklayers, working men in general and the miners, persons who do the sort of work to which no pension is attached, who wish to buy one, two or three houses while they can still work, who pay for those houses with the rent so that when they retire they will have some sort of pension in the form of rent which they have built up in that way.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: That is not 10 per cent. of house owners.

*Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: That statement the hon. member has also sucked out of his thumb, just like the statement that if this Bill becomes law, it will increase house rents by 30 per cent. to 40 per cent.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: That is so.

*Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: Let the hon. member mention one case which will substantiate that figure. He makes these assertions, but he produces no evidence to bear them out. Let me tell him on the other hand that I know of an instance in Pretoria where the Rent Board came along and fixed the rent on the basis of a valuation of £71,000 for the building. The rent was then fixed on the basis of 8 per cent. on the improvements and 6 per cent. on the ground. The same place was sold for £55,000, for much less than the valuation fixed by the Rent Board.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: Who is the owner of it?

*Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: The new owner is perhaps the hon. member who is interjecting. I do not know who the owner is; I only know what the property was sold for. That rent now has to be brought down to the new basis of £55,000, if this Bill is adopted, on the basis of 7 per cent. and 5 per cent. It will mean a decrease of more than 30 per cent. in the rent. But what we hope to achieve by this Bill is to do away with the enormous inequality in rents and that enormous inequality exists in this country today.

As regards the inspectors, this is a matter which, to my mind, may be dealt with quite satisfactorily and comprehensively in the Committee Stage. I just want to say this here, that I think the time has arrived that we should cease to impose a sort of inquisition upon our nation and to have a lot of inspectors for each Act. I wonder how many Acts there are, each with its own little police force. Let us take this unofficial police force and incorporate it with the police of the Minister of Justice. This sort of thing where there is a sort of police force for every Act must cease.

*The MINISTER OF FINANCE: Hear, hear.

*Mr. VAN DEN HEEVER: I hope hon. members of the Labour Party will now give us a chance to carry on with the Committee Stage of the Bill. All the arguments they have raised, they will raise again in the Committee Stage, and then we will be able to thrash the matter out properly.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am in this difficulty in regard to this matter that the motion asks us whether the House will agree to allow the debate to be proceeded with from the point reached last session. That is the question before the House. What do we achieve if we say no?

Mr. DAVIDOFF: A new Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL: What guarantee is there that we will have a new Bill? The hon.

Minister can introduce the same Bill; we will go through all the stages step by step, and we will reach the same position with identically the same Bill. Last session the hon. Minister was pressed to let this Bill go to a Select Committee, and I am very sorry that certain hon. members have found it necessary to animadvert on the services which the members of the Select Committee rendered to this House. I was not a member of that Select Committee; but surely the members who served on that Select Committee are entitled to have their work accepted at its face value. We must accept that hon. members who did the work on the Select Committee did it to the best of their ability and tried to weigh up the pros and cons, in order to give a fair judgment when they reached their decisions.

As I say, we may well spend a tremendous amount of time with a new Bill and finish up where we are today. I see nothing which can be gained by turning down this proposition made by the hon. Minister. We may not agree with the provisions of the Bill. That is not the question at the moment. There will be opportunities to deal with the provisions of the Bill. There are one or two provisions which I do not like, and most likely there are some which the Minister himself does not like. But we do not overcome the noxious clauses of the Bill — noxious as far as we are concerned — by saying to the hon. Minister that he cannot go on with the Bill from the stage reached last Session, and that he has to start de novo. In that way we will waste a lot of time and it would not get us much further. We all agree that a Rent Bill should be placed on the Statute book this Session, that there should be a fresh Act to protect the position, whatever our views are on the actual contents of the Bill. Now we have reached this point that there will be an opportunity in the Committee Stage for hon. members to voice their views on the provisions of the Bill, and there is nothing to guarantee that what the hon. member wishes will happen, namely that the Minister will introduce a new Bill if we do not accept this motion. What would be the position of the Minister if, after we asked him to send the Bill to a Select Committee, we say that we wish to scrap all the work of the Select Committee and introduce a new Bill without reference to the work of the Select Committee?

At 10.25 p.m., the business under consideration was interrupted by the Deputy Speaker in accordance with the Sessional Order adopted on the 1st February, 1950, and the debate was adjourned; to be resumed on 8th February.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House at 10.26 p.m.

hawked about, because those who imported the goods in order to hold them for higher prices have now been "caught". He had to pay the bill, and now he has to sell. We also know of certain types of clothing that are being offered to merchants. They are begging the merchants to take those articles. I refer particularly to certain materials for men's clothing of which there appears to be a sufficiency of supplies in the country. As far as materials for women's clothing are concerned a shortage is developing.

What we intend doing in this connection is to decontrol piece goods for clothing purposes. Again I am speaking about goods from the sterling areas; they will be decontrolled altogether as far as piece goods are concerned, but subject to a ceiling price.

Mr. WATERSON: All materials for clothing, or only certain piece goods?

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: Materials for the clothing industry, or for making clothes in homes, but subject to a ceiling price. One of the reasons why we got into trouble in South Africa and were obliged to impose import control was because of the high-priced goods which were imported, in other words, luxury goods. I envisage a time when it will again be possible to import those goods, but that time has not yet come. South Africa cannot afford to import these highly priced goods and, therefore, when we decontrol it will be subject to ceiling price. Importers will not be allowed to import piece goods which exceed a certain price. By that I do not mean that it will necessarily be a low ceiling. It will be possible to import good cotton, woollen and other materials to make articles of quality, but the women who wish to wear highly priced fashion goods will still have to be patient for some time.

In conjunction with the decontrol applied to clothing materials we will also decontrol sewing cotton and needles, and also domestic sewing machines. The purpose is to make it possible for women to buy material and to make their own clothes, as so many of them do.

There is something else in connection with which we have had many complaints, namely paper patterns. A mere man does not appreciate the importance of these paper patterns which unfortunately come mostly from the United States of America. But even though it will mean the spending of a certain amount of dollar exchange, I am prepared also to decontrol paper patterns. What we have in mind is to clothe the people, and therefore we are giving these relaxations.

But that does not apply only to consumer goods. It is my intention also to decontrol piece goods required by clothing factories. I have already said that the clothing

factories have not had much reason to complain, although some of them did complain. In some cases one can only describe their complaints by the American expression, viz, that they were "bellyaching". My information is that the position in the clothing industry was not as bad as to warrant those complaints. Be that as it may, the decontrol of piece goods will also apply to the clothing industry.

The decontrol of piece goods will, I think, have a salutary effect in regard to something which I mentioned in a recent speech, and for which I was much criticised, namely that there are in the clothing industry a fairly large number of smaller and inefficient factories which sprang up like mushrooms during and after the war, and which were able to maintain themselves only because of war conditions, and latterly behind the import control wall. With a free supply of materials, we will very soon find out which units in the industry are efficient and which are not. Decontrol will also have the effect of releasing piece goods now being held with the hope of a rise in prices. Such goods will come into freer supply. A lot of stocks will be brought out of hiding, and the position will be much easier.

These are the concessions which we envisage. I am referring only to imports from the sterling areas. I think this will bring about very considerable relief. I have already said that the list of inessentiality can be carried too far. There are types of goods which are not really essential, but certain stores are dependent on those goods. They do not sell much else, and if import control is carried too far, those stores will find themselves out of stocks, and unemployment and other difficulties will follow. We are watching the position very carefully, and in consultation with the Chambers of Commerce, we will try to give such relief as is possible.

There is also the type of merchant who was not in business in 1947.

Mr. WARING: The returned soldier.

The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: Yes, he is one of them. These are cases where the basis for an import permit is relatively small, because these people only started in business in 1947. The time has come when I think special consideration should be given to these new businesses which came into being in recent years, and who suffered considerably as a result of import control. Members of the Chamber of Commerce will also know that I have been concerned about some wholesale businesses. Then there are also the merchants in the country towns that have suffered. Commercial travellers sell their available supplies at places near Cape Town. They may go as far as Worcester, but many do not go further

afield. These country stores will also have to receive special consideration. I may be challenged on this point, and be accused of discrimination. I am quite prepared to take that responsibility. Up to the present I have carried out import control without favour or prejudice, and I shall continue on those lines.

There remains the so-called prohibited list. Commerce does not like that. But my intention is to maintain it, and perhaps even to extend it. It is only by maintaining the prohibited list—goods which can be imported only with a special permit—that we are able to prevent the importation of unnecessary goods. We are going to maintain that policy. It is only because we have maintained that policy that we have been able to grant the recent measure of relief to commerce.

Mr. Speaker, may I take advantage of this opportunity to express to Commerce—in spite of their being the naughty boys who "beat the ban"—may I express to the Chambers of Commerce and to the Afrikaanse Handelsinstituut my appreciation of the manner in which they co-operated with me and my Department during the very difficult times through which we have passed. I have had regular consultations with those gentlemen. There is a Liaison Committee on which there are representatives of the Chambers of Commerce, and of the Afrikaanse Handelsinstituut, and those discussions have been very fruitful. They have sometimes given me good advice, and on the other occasions they have given me advice which I did not accept. But, generally speaking our co-operation has been very fruitful, and I know that the Chamber of Commerce has been appreciative of the work done by the Department, the Director of Imports, and myself, to make the operation of import control as easy as possible. The same applies to the Federated Chambers of Industry. When I referred to complaints received from secondary industry, I was not referring to the Federated Chambers of Industries. I was referring to individual industrialists who, as soon as they felt the pinch, immediately rushed to the newspapers with their complaints. I have not had much of that from commerce.

My policy will be to continue with the gradual relaxation of import control. There can be no question of lifting import control in the near future. After what we have experienced South Africa has, I hope, learned its lesson. I hope it will be realised that it is necessary to go slow, and that relaxation of control should be done carefully and cautiously. Our policy is one of caution, and I hope we will continue to enjoy the co-operation we have received from commerce and industry.

There were those importers who tried to beat the ban. Others have since realised

that they were saved by import control. I know of such cases. Let me express the hope that they have profited by their experience. I also express the hope that the public of South Africa will realise that we have been living beyond our means and that it was necessary for us to apply corrective measures. Last year in this House I described these measures as "spare diet and castor oil". That expression was used as a peg on which to hang a great deal of banter and criticism. I think I can say that the spare diet was necessary and was all to the good. As regards my reference to castor oil, well, although it has certain effects which are not so pleasant, on the whole it has worked out very well. [Laughter.] That was an unconscious pun.

South Africa is well on its way to economic recovery, but there must be a period of convalescence. We cannot expect the patient to get up and walk too far. We will continue with the policy we are following, and I hope that when I appear before this House next session it will be possible to announce that import control has been relaxed to such an extent that it has become only an unhappy memory.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The House is very pleased to see this mood of conciliation on the part of the Minister of Economic Affairs. This mood may arise from the great and grave number of difficulties he has faced in spite of his assurance that things are getting better and better. I do not want to go into the difficulties of import control. We do, however, know that it has taken the machinery of import control an overlong time to understand the ways of commerce and industry. However that may be, what I am more concerned about, and I think what the country at large is concerned about, is the absence of any plan from this Government to develop the industries of the country. Before this Government came into power we were told, not once but dozens of times, that we would have plans for development something like the period of industrial development which the country had after the First Great War, but that this plan would be greater than anything we had ever seen in the country. As far as I can measure the situation this Government is merely maintaining the status quo of the profit system, the status quo of confusion and complete absence of planning. I see no sign anywhere that the hon. the Minister of Finance is getting any assistance to solve the economic difficulties of this country by embarking upon some type of planned development of industry in this country. The hon. member for Kensington (Mr. Moore), in the course of his speech, said that I misunderstood the hon. the Minister of Finance when he said in a speech in his constituency that our economy was based on gold mining and farming and that we must be careful that new secondary

industries did not absorb the capital and labour that were available and take them away from the gold mining industry and farming. Well, that is a very contentious subject. It has many aspects, but nevertheless, it is clear to anyone in this country that there exists a considerable amount of confusion on the side of the Government as to what the future economic development of South Africa should be. We hear a great deal about wage incentives, but we see no production plan. We see no plans for increasing production and reducing prices. The hon. member for Kensington dealt with this matter today on a high financial level, and I think it is fitting that this House should also consider the matter from the level of the man in the street who has to live on petty cash, who sees none of the big money, although that big money may be the structure on which our economy rests. This confusion, Mr. Speaker, is shown first of all in a statement which the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs repeated here this afternoon and that is in connection with mushroom concerns. Times out of number members of the Government, Cabinet Ministers in this House and at public meetings, have boasted about the inflow of capital to this country, about the development of new industries and the wonderful opportunities that await us. At this time last year it was the hon. the Minister of Finance himself who said—

There is, however, another aspect of our development about which the public generally are only dimly aware. It is the great interest being taken by industrialists from a large number of countries in the industrial development of the Union.

He discussed this and then concluded—

The opportunities to which I refer aim at enduring benefits and provide a long-term basis for the economy of the Union. I want to state, since it is not generally known, that for many months I and my colleagues directly concerned with problems connected with new industries and our departmental officials have seen a succession of business men from abroad, all interested in establishing new factories in the Union. That interest has gone further than a mere cursory exploratory visit. In some instances developments are already in progress.

We know that that is so. He went on to say—

In others, negotiations are well advanced, in yet other matters are only at a preliminary stage. In all, however, the realness of the interest is very evident, and the magnitude of the prospective developments is very large. I do not think I am exaggerating if I say that the develop-

ments now proceeding in the Union are larger than any similar period of the development of South Africa.

The logical step after that is to expect that all industries are going to be welcomed and that criticisms are not going to be put forward by Ministers too hurriedly. Not only did the hon. the Minister of Finance point out to these industrialists who are so interested in South Africa that there is a danger that they won't be able to compete with the gold mining industry and the farming industry in getting labour, but the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs, too, said that a lot of these are mushroom concerns, that these concerns are inefficient, that they are badly run and that they have no right to exist. He repeated the statement in the House this afternoon when he said that in the coming months we shall see which of these firms will survive and which will go under. He who belongs to a party which is neither capitalist nor Communist, who is now preaching a policy of *laissez faire*, a policy of the survival of the fittest, he who speaks for a Government that believes in interference by the State, he tells these people whom he has been welcoming into the country and whom he told the House this afternoon are inefficient, that they face the prospect of going under. I wonder if the Minister of Economic Affairs who, unfortunately, is never in the House when I speak, understands the implications of the policy that he is following. Surely he must understand the repercussions, not only of his statements, but of many of his policies. I want to quote another statement made by him in which he said—

I am afraid that in many cases high production costs result from other causes—from too high capital cost, from faulty planning, from poor budgetary control and inefficient costing methods.

That statement suggests that it could not have been made by a man who has any understanding of industry in this country or the basis of its operation. As a young country we have small industrial units, and we have big industrial units. While the large, rich and fortunate concerns can afford to carry large costing staffs, it is safe to say that at least 90 per cent. of the factories in this country could not afford to carry expensive costing staffs. While it would be most desirable they cannot do it and yet the Minister lightly refers to it. What he is in fact saying is this: "You are too small; you cannot afford to have a luxurious costing system and a costing staff; it is time you went out of business". On another occasion when he was speaking to the Northern Transvaal Chamber of Industries he said, in dealing with the question of labour—

afield. These country stores will also have to receive special consideration. I may be challenged on this point, and be accused of discrimination. I am quite prepared to take that responsibility. Up to the present I have carried out import control without favour or prejudice, and I shall continue on those lines.

There remains the so-called prohibited list. Commerce does not like that. But my intention is to maintain it, and perhaps even to extend it. It is only by maintaining the prohibited list—goods which can be imported only with a special permit—that we are able to prevent the importation of unnecessary goods. We are going to maintain that policy. It is only because we have maintained that policy that we have been able to grant the recent measure of relief to commerce.

Mr. Speaker, may I take advantage of this opportunity to express to Commerce—in spite of their being the naughty boys who “beat the ban”—may I express to the Chambers of Commerce and to the Afrikaanse Handelsinstituut my appreciation of the manner in which they co-operated with me and my Department during the very difficult times through which we have passed. I have had regular consultations with those gentlemen. There is a Liaison Committee on which there are representatives of the Chambers of Commerce, and of the Afrikaanse Handelsinstituut, and those discussions have been very fruitful. They have sometimes given me good advice, and on the other occasions they have given me advice which I did not accept. But, generally speaking our co-operation has been very fruitful, and I know that the Chamber of Commerce has been appreciative of the work done by the Department, the Director of Imports, and myself, to make the operation of import control as easy as possible. The same applies to the Federated Chambers of Industry. When I referred to complaints received from secondary industry, I was not referring to the Federated Chambers of Industries. I was referring to individual industrialists who, as soon as they felt the pinch, immediately rushed to the newspapers with their complaints. I have not had much of that from commerce.

My policy will be to continue with the gradual relaxation of import control. There can be no question of lifting import control in the near future. After what we have experienced South Africa has, I hope, learned its lesson. I hope it will be realised that it is necessary to go slow, and that relaxation of control should be done carefully and cautiously. Our policy is one of caution, and I hope we will continue to enjoy the co-operation we have received from commerce and industry.

There were those importers who tried to beat the ban. Others have since realised

that they were saved by import control. I know of such cases. Let me express the hope that they have profited by their experience. I also express the hope that the public of South Africa will realise that we have been living beyond our means and that it was necessary for us to apply corrective measures. Last year in this House I described these measures as “spare diet and castor oil”. That expression was used as a peg on which to hang a great deal of banter and criticism. I think I can say that the spare diet was necessary and was all to the good. As regards my reference to castor oil, well, although it has certain effects which are not so pleasant, on the whole it has worked out very well. [Laughter.] That was an unconscious pun.

South Africa is well on its way to economic recovery, but there must be a period of convalescence. We cannot expect the patient to get up and walk too far! We will continue with the policy we are following, and I hope that when I appear before this House next session it will be possible to announce that import control has been relaxed to such an extent that it has become only an unhappy memory.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The House is very pleased to see this mood of conciliation on the part of the Minister of Economic Affairs. This mood may arise from the great and grave number of difficulties he has faced in spite of his assurance that things are getting better and better. I do not want to go into the difficulties of import control. We do, however, know that it has taken the machinery of import control an overlong time to understand the ways of commerce and industry. However that may be, what I am more concerned about, and I think what the country at large is concerned about, is the absence of any plan from this Government to develop the industries of the country. Before this Government came into power we were told, not once but dozens of times, that we would have plans for development something like the period of industrial development which the country had after the First Great War, but that this plan would be greater than anything we had ever seen in the country. As far as I can measure the situation this Government is merely maintaining the status quo of the profit system, the status quo of confusion and complete absence of planning. I see no sign anywhere that the hon. the Minister of Finance is getting any assistance to solve the economic difficulties of this country by embarking upon some type of planned development of industry in this country. The hon. member for Kensington (Mr. Moore), in the course of his speech, said that I misunderstood the hon. the Minister of Finance when he said in a speech in his constituency that our economy was based on gold mining and farming and that we must be careful that new secondary

industries did not absorb the capital and labour that were available and take them away from the gold mining industry and farming. Well, that is a very contentious subject. It has many aspects, but nevertheless, it is clear to anyone in this country that there exists a considerable amount of confusion on the side of the Government as to what the future economic development of South Africa should be. We hear a great deal about wage incentives, but we see no production plan. We see no plans for increasing production and reducing prices. The hon. member for Kensington dealt with this matter today on a high financial level, and I think it is fitting that this House should also consider the matter from the level of the man in the street who has to live on petty cash, who sees none of the big money, although that big money may be the structure on which our economy rests. This confusion, Mr. Speaker, is shown first of all in a statement which the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs repeated here this afternoon and that is in connection with mushroom concerns. Times out of number members of the Government, Cabinet Ministers in this House and at public meetings, have boasted about the inflow of capital to this country, about the development of new industries and the wonderful opportunities that await us. At this time last year it was the hon. the Minister of Finance himself who said—

There is, however, another aspect of our development about which the public generally are only dimly aware. It is the great interest being taken by industrialists from a large number of countries in the industrial development of the Union.

He discussed this and then concluded—

The opportunities to which I refer aim at enduring benefits and provide a long-term basis for the economy of the Union. I want to state, since it is not generally known, that for many months I and my colleagues directly concerned with problems connected with new industries and our departmental officials have seen a succession of business men from abroad, all interested in establishing new factories in the Union. That interest has gone further than a mere cursory exploratory visit. In some instances developments are already in progress.

We know that that is so. He went on to say—

In others, negotiations are well advanced, in yet other matters are only at a preliminary stage. In all, however, the realness of the interest is very evident, and the magnitude of the prospective developments is very large. I do not think I am exaggerating if I say that the develop-

ments now proceeding in the Union are larger than any similar period of the development of South Africa.

The logical step after that is to expect that all industries are going to be welcomed and that criticisms are not going to be put forward by Ministers too hurriedly. Not only did the hon. the Minister of Finance point out to these industrialists who are so interested in South Africa that there is a danger that they won't be able to compete with the gold mining industry and the farming industry in getting labour, but the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs, too, said that a lot of these are mushroom concerns, that these concerns are inefficient, that they are badly run and that they have no right to exist. He repeated the statement in the House this afternoon when he said that in the coming months we shall see which of these firms will survive and which will go under. He who belongs to a party which is neither capitalist nor Communist, who is now preaching a policy of *laissez faire*, a policy of the survival of the fittest, he who speaks for a Government that believes in interference by the State, he tells these people whom he has been welcoming into the country and whom he told the House this afternoon are inefficient, that they face the prospect of going under. I wonder if the Minister of Economic Affairs who, unfortunately, is never in the House when I speak, understands the implications of the policy that he is following. Surely he must understand the repercussions, not only of his statements, but of many of his policies. I want to quote another statement made by him in which he said—

I am afraid that in many cases high production costs result from other causes—from too high capital cost, from faulty planning, from poor budgetary control and inefficient costing methods.

That statement suggests that it could not have been made by a man who has any understanding of industry in this country or the basis of its operation. As a young country we have small industrial units, and we have big industrial units. While the large, rich and fortunate concerns can afford to carry large costing staffs, it is safe to say that at least 90 per cent. of the factories in this country could not afford to carry expensive costing staffs. While it would be most desirable they cannot do it and yet the Minister lightly refers to it. What he is in fact saying is this: "You are too small; you cannot afford to have a luxurious costing system and a costing staff; it is time you went out of business". On another occasion when he was speaking to the Northern Transvaal Chamber of Industries he said, in dealing with the question of labour—

But I wish to draw attention to a tendency in certain industries to replace European labour by non-European labour. Let me say immediately that I do not wish to deprive the non-European of his rightful place in our industrial life, but care should be taken that a gradual replacement of European by non-European labour does not take place.

We on these benches are particularly concerned about the substitution of cheap non-European labour for skilled European labour. But this is not consistent with the facts. If the Minister would refer to the statistics of labour employed in this country he would find that that is not the case. It is something that he been resisted so far, but the important point is that we have to build up our industries in this country and we have the alternative of bringing in immigrants from overseas or training our own labour, whether it be European or non-European. What is the Government's plan in that direction? We have heard nothing of it at all, so this talk about industrial development in South Africa, and the large flow of money to develop our industries and building a bright future for South Africa, is nothing but talk. These are mere words. There is absolutely no meaning in them because no concrete steps are being taken to implement what is being said by Ministers in the Cabinet. But I know and I suppose any other member in this House knows that these new industries have come to South Africa, first of all, as has been said by the hon. member for Kensington (Mr. Moore) because they are afraid of Socialism in Great Britain. They want to come here and establish an alternative place where they can exist under the profit system, and secondly, they hope to exploit the cheap black labour we have in this country. What is the Government's policy in that connection? What does the Government propose to do as far as that is concerned? That, I think, is the crux of the whole economic situation in this country. What are the plans of this Government in order to make full use of the capital which flows in from overseas? What are their plans to give the people of this country the fullness of any industrial development that may take place, and what are the plans of this Government to guide and direct that development? We see none of it.

Capt. G. H. F. STRYDOM: Then you must be blind.

Mr. HEPPLE: Now, I would like to deal with the question of devaluation. I hope that the hon. the Minister of Finance will forgive me if I quote what he said when he introduced the Part Appropriation last year. He said—

Many people imagine that when a State encounters financial difficulties it should pursue the course of monkeying about with its currency. Devaluation has, therefore, been advocated as a way out. I must start by remarking that those who now advocate devaluation do not seem to have kept abreast of international currency developments.

He then dealt with these international currency developments and went on to say—

The advocates of devaluation want us to sell our exports more cheaply in order to pretend that we are better off. At a time when we are at last coming to grips with our inflation they want us to inject another dose of inflation into our economic veins. This does not solve problems, it only postpones them.

No, Mr. Speaker, we shall have to solve this problem the hard and honest way, not the easy and specious way which is only a palliative.

We know, sir, that the hon. the Minister of Finance himself, was not responsible for the fact that South Africa devalued her currency. We know that his hands were tied and I think it helped to show this country that we are only pawns in the game of international high finance, that we have to follow those who control the currency of the world. Our hands were tied and that is why it is so ludicrous when Ministers of this country put out their tongues to UNO and pull faces at great countries of the world.

Mr. G. F. H. BEKKER: Like Russia.

Mr. HEPPLE: We know our place and we have to accept it. When we come to the effects of devaluation, I was pleased to see that the spokesman of high finance, the hon. member for Kensington, at least, put in a word for those who are getting their pensions in devalued currency. I am sorry he did not pursue the question and deal with those who have to pay the cost of devaluation. The hon. member for Kensington, of course, omitted to tell this House . . . [Quorum.]

Mr. LUDICK: Why interrupt your own member?

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. member for Kensington omitted to tell this House that what he called the life blood of this country, the Stock Exchange . . .

Mr. MOORE: I did not say that.

Mr. HEPPLE: Excuse me, you referred to it as the life blood of this country where the money flows. However, possibly I misunderstood the hon. member, but I will quote to

the House the statement that was made by Mr. Lamb, president of the Johannesburg Stock Exchange—

Referring to the beneficial effect upon the gold mining industry of devaluation, Mr. Lamb said that between September 19th and September 30th an appreciation of over £100,000,000 in the aggregate market value of gold mining shares was recorded.

A sum of £100,000,000 or perhaps more was gained in the space of a week when this country devalued. Who made that money? It was not the common man. The common man made nothing, but I hope that the Minister of Finance, in contemplating his Budget this year, will take that into consideration, and I hope he will bring before this House plans in order to recoup some of this £100,000,000 or more from those who made it so quickly and easily through devaluation, and that he will pass it on to the ordinary wage- and salary-earner who is suffering so much today as the result of devaluation and high prices. I suggest that the hon. the Minister, as has been suggested from these benches before, should consider some form of food subsidy, the money for which can be raised from a source such as this in order to see that the poor people of this country get some of the benefits of devaluation and not only its disadvantages. This is a most important matter and I hope the hon. the Minister will devise some means whereby he can obtain some of the benefits of devaluation for the poorer sections of this country.

I want to raise also the question of savings because I think this is another point which should be borne in mind by the hon. the Minister. This is something to which we have also referred before, namely, the fact that people are today living on their savings. We have the fact that there has been a drop of over £4,000,000 in Union Loan Certificates in the last twelve months; there has been an enormous drop in Government savings bank deposits. Not only have all amounts that are usually invested in small quantities by the ordinary worker come to a stop, but those amounts are being drawn upon and people are being compelled more and more to use their hard-won savings in order to exist today. These are some of the things I would like the Minister to consider in order that there may be some alleviation of the lot of the poorer people when he draws up his Budget.

*Capt. G. H. F. STRYDOM: We have now heard from the other side of the House that the Government thus far has accomplished nothing. The charge against the Government is that everything they have done so far has been against the interests of South Africa. It will carry us no further

to argue the toss over that. We expect the Opposition to criticise, but we expect constructive criticism, and yet hon. members on the other side have not come forward with a single proposal, all we hear is their monotonous old story. We took over from the previous Government shortly after the war. We all know that this World War was a great catastrophe for civilisation. Throughout the war years we could not import the materials required by the various Departments of State. Consequently large orders were placed overseas immediately hostilities ceased in order to provide for the needs of the country. The first action which the Minister of Finance had to take when this Government came into power was to find the money for those orders. We know the record of the hon. the Minister in the past. He first had to put our own house in order. He immediately investigated the state of affairs and found that our expenditure exceeded our income. We all know that one cannot continue with a policy like that and that it leads to bankruptcy. The first action he took was to limit our imports and to apply import control. Orders had been placed overseas to a value of over four hundred million pounds. Those orders could not be executed because the goods were unprocurable during the war. After the war those goods began to flow into the country and the Minister had to find the necessary funds to pay for them.

We have just listened to a speech by a member of the Labour Party, a party which merely apes the Opposition and is nothing but a voting appendage for the Opposition. They have no policy, they have no authority. Their only function seems to be to say yea and amen to everything the Opposition says. They follow the Opposition blindly. As I said, these large orders had been placed and those commitments had to be met and the Minister had to make provision. The orders had been placed by the previous Government; we had to find the money. We, as a young country, must expect that developments will take place here and it was essential to place orders overseas on a large scale, but we could not find adequate funds to pay for the imported goods which were needed to promote the interests of the country. That is where the difficulty arose. I consider that if we regard the position honestly today, we must admit that which ever Government had been in power today it would have been obliged to do precisely what this Government has done. This Government has only one object in view and that is to promote the interests of South Africa. That the Government has done ever since it came into power. During the time this Government has been in power, there have been no strikes; we have had no labour troubles. There was the riot in Durban, it is true, but what happened?

It was settled immediately. The Government took effective steps to put a stop to it. Many of the members who represent Natal constituencies told me that the Government should not have intervened and should have allowed the people concerned to kill each other. This Government has brought peace to the country, and what is more, we live at peace with our neighbours and with the world, except of course the Communists. How can you have peace with an aimless policy? The party on the other side never had any policy; they are still without one. Then you have the Labour Party. They follow the United Party blindly, of course, and furthermore there are the three Native Representatives.

*An HON. MEMBER: It is exactly the same as when you follow the Minister of Finance.

*Capt. G. H. F. STRYDOM: Mr. Speaker, I know the Natives, and I tell you that those Native Representatives in that corner over there do not know the first thing about Natives. There is the hon. member for Cape Eastern (Mrs. Ballinger) for example; she knows nothing about Natives. They have suddenly discovered a new terminology; they call the Natives "Africans" now. The hon. member for Cape Eastern never comes in contact with the Natives. She goes to Cape Town and Johannesburg and speaks there in large halls and is continually inciting them.

*An HON. MEMBER: And to India.

*Capt. G. H. F. STRYDOM: Yes, to India—in the slums there.

Mrs. BALLINGER: I must ask you not to repeat that ridiculous tale.

*Capt. G. H. F. STRYDOM: That is what the papers say.

Mrs. BALLINGER: It is not true.

*Capt. G. H. F. STRYDOM: And what did one of her political associates, the former Senator Basner, do? He sat at UNO and besmirched this country, but not one of them has contradicted him in the interests of South Africa. All they do is to fan the fire constantly. I know that none of them is responsible for the fires started on the mountainside here and one is grateful for that, but one can draw a comparison between these mountain fires here and the fires which they start. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the Minister of Economic Affairs and the Minister of Finance. I shall tell you why. I consider that they are not doing what they ought to be doing for the right people. Consider agriculture today. The farming industry has just emerged from a

terrible drought. Practically nothing was done for the farmer. The farmer must provide food for the country. If you eliminate farming, we shall all starve. The world is clamouring for increased production of foodstuffs today. I notice that one of the clever people like my hon. friend over there, the hon. member for Kensington (Mr. Moore) stated the other day that even in a favourable year the world could not provide sufficient food for its population, much less could South Africa. With all the criticism expressed on the other side, with its jumble of parties and policies and the fusion of those elements sitting over there, you will never hear anything favourable to farming. We know that the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs is doing his best. He wants to solve our petrol troubles in a peaceful manner. He does not want to impose compulsory saving. The stand which he takes is that he tells the public: Follow me and I shall lead you and if you co-operate we shall solve the problem, I, too, feel that more petrol could be saved. What happens? Last week three inspectors arrived at the wool-washing plant at Wolseley, each in his own car. They arrived there on a Friday afternoon when the employees had to be paid. I know of other instances where inspectors travel by train and forward their cars by road. We must put a stop to this wastefulness. We must ask the Minister to act in this matter; there is something wrong somewhere, and when there is, it must be remedied.

*The MINISTER OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS: We are taking action against them.

*Capt. G. H. F. STRYDOM: I now come to the hon. member for Green Point (Maj. van der Byl) who now represents a constituency in Cape Town where there is less trouble than in his previous constituency. I believe that the seas over there are rather stormy; here at the foot of the mountain it is calm. The hon. member wants to know why the Government is giving the people white bread? The hon. member always used to be a defender of white bread. They tell me that all the women voted for him because he promised them white bread if his party came into power. Now he comes along as a front bencher and attacks the Government, because the Government gave the public white bread. No, Mr. Speaker, let us be consistent, for Heaven's sake; surely we must follow a policy; don't let us all be talking at sixes and sevens, one this way and the other that.

I now turn to the hon. member for Natal (South Coast) (Mr. Mitchell). When he speaks in Natal, he speaks in an altogether different language from that which he uses in the Transvaal. Everywhere my hon. friends on the other side first take a look round to see who are present and then decide

having to offer no apologies, and we offer no apologies to oppose the attempt being made to adjourn this debate. Apparently, although the hon. member for Graaff-Reinet (Mr. G. P. Steyn) gave no specific reasons why he moved the motion for the adjournment of the debate . . .

Mr. LUDICK: He did.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: . . . let us say . . .

An HON MEMBER: You do not understand Afrikaans.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: Well, let us say that the reason he gave was so puerile and futile that it almost falls within the scope of Rule 36, sub-section (2), which reads—

If Mr. Speaker or the Chairman shall be of opinion that any such motion is an abuse of the Rules, he may decline to propose a question thereon.

I would not go so far as to say that this motion is an abuse of the Rules. What I do say to the hon. the Prime Minister is that because of the fact that the Government side was afraid to take the responsibility for the Bill in the original stages and now realise what a blunder they made, they want to go into caucus and try to rectify the position. But that is no genuine or legitimate reason why this debate should be adjourned. The matter under discussion — the Rents Bill — is the most important social and economic issue that has been raised before this Parliament, and the Government is again funkling the issue, and . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member is now going beyond the actual motion before the House. The motion is whether this debate should be adjourned or not, and he cannot discuss the merits of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Labour Party took up a very firm attitude throughout, and it maintains that attitude, and for the reasons that have been given right throughout on every question that has arisen we say, and we repeat, that this motion, the motion for the adjournment of the House, should not at this stage of the debate be accepted.

Mr. LUDICK: Repeat it again.

Mr. DAVIDOFF: No matter how often I repeat it, it will never sink into the minds of some of the hon. members on that side of the House. No good reasons have been advanced for the adjournment of the debate, and for the reasons that I have stated I trust that the House will not accept it.

Mr. BARLOW: Mr. Speaker, the United Party has placed its position quite fairly

and squarely before the House and the country. The hon. member for Bloemfontein (City) (Dr. C. F. Steyn) said we are not going to do so-and-so and so-and-so. Why does not the Government on the other hand do the same? Why do not they put their position before the country? Why do not they put their position before the House? Instead of that the Chairman of the late Select Committee, whose recommendations have been cast aside by his party's chief organiser, the hon. member for George (Mr. Botha), gets up and complains that politics are now being dragged into the matter.

Mr. BOTHA: It was never a party matter.

Mr. BARLOW: Why does not the hon. the Prime Minister get up and say, I will now answer the ex-Minister and put our position before the House and the country. They know full well that the Rents Bill, as far as they are concerned, is being met by a divided party.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I regret I must again draw attention to the fact that all that the House can discuss now is whether this debate should be adjourned or not. Hon. member cannot discuss the merits of the Bill.

Mr. BARLOW: That is my point. If you will allow me just to carry on you will see that I am exactly in agreement with you. My point is this, and they know it full well, that they have a divided party now and they want to take refuge in putting aside the Bill and waiting until they can set up a Commission or something on it. That is the point I want to make, and it is fair to the country. Surely the gentlemen on the other side of the House should have made up their minds by now. They should have had a caucus on this. We know that they have had caucus meetings. We know that they have disagreed with their caucus. Ever since they came into power in 1948 the party has not been more divided than it is today. And therefore we on this side of the House say that men who have principles should know exactly how they stand when we have those principles discussed on the Floor of the House. We are against this question being postponed; we want the country to know how they stand. The whole country is crying out today, What is happening to the Rents Bill? That is why I am putting this forward now. Why does not the hon. the Prime Minister get up and say in answer to the ex-Minister of Labour: "This is our position. You do not want to deal with us under certain conditions, this is what we are going to do." He cannot do it. He cannot do it because he has got a divided party behind him. Have you ever seen a more miserable-looking party? There is not a jolly farmer on the other side who can agree with the peri-urban

representative. We find that the hon. member for Germiston (Mr. Du Pisanie) is in an awful hole. He does not want it. He wants the Bill changed, whereas the hon. member for Graaff-Reinet wants a capitalists' charter, a landlords' charter.

That is why we say they are trifling with the country and they are trifling with the House. This is the most important matter that has come before Parliament so far. The people want the cost of living brought down. My friend says that we will not do anything which is going to raise the cost of living. Our friends on the other side are afraid to meet the challenge. Therefore they say: "Let us stop it; let us run, let us run away from it as hard as we can; let us adjourn the debate." Fancy a big party like that adjourning the debate. Fancy a party that talked about how it was going to save everybody in 1948, adjourning a debate. We never adjourned a debate in our time. The Rt. Hon. the then Prime Minister would get up in the House and say, "This is our policy, and we stand or we fall by our policy." But these gentlemen opposite neither stand nor do they fall; they creep. Half of them have run out of the House to hold a caucus outside. There is a caucus being held now between the leader of the Nationalist Party in the Transvaal and the leader of the Nationalist Party in the Cape, while the other leader, the leader of both the parties, sits with his hand on his head and is wondering what is happening next. Look at them. Look what they look like. I say that they are trifling with the people. We cannot stand for that. We will have to fight the motion for the adjournment of the debate. We will have to fight it to the bitter end. We are not going to allow the people of this country to be trifled with. I say, as much as we feel for the unhappy divided people on the other side, we are going to stick to our principles and see that the people of this country are properly treated.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Mr. Speaker, if anything reveals the uncertainty and confusion that exists in the minds of the members of both the large parties in this House on the question of the Rents Bill it is the motion for the adjournment of the debate. One would have thought that after the discussions that have taken place on this very important matter members of this House would have made up their minds as to what they actually wanted. This afternoon the hon. member for Bloemfontein (City) (Dr. C. F. Steyn) introduced an amendment from his party in which he disclosed the new attitude of the United Party to this Bill, which in some respects is very welcome. But that attitude is not very helpful at this particular stage. The motion for the adjournment of the debate, moved from the Government benches, is making the matter additionally difficult for us on these benches

because we know that we will have to put up a further struggle to get members of this House to appreciate the merits of our case.

An HON. MEMBER: What case?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: An adjournment of the debate at this stage will mean, I hope, if it succeeds, that the hon. the Minister will introduce a new measure and that it will be a measure that will be acceptable to the tenants particularly, if not to the landlords.

I presume then that the hon. member for Graaff-Reinet (Mr. G. P. Steyn), who moved the motion for the adjournment of the debate, had in his mind the idea that his party would be able to emulate the example of the United Party and devise some ways and means of clearing their conscience with the public on this matter. I think the question of rents is of such great importance that the members of both the big parties should have reached this standpoint much earlier, and not have waited until the whole country is crying out against the proposals that have come before this House from the Select Committee.

I would appeal to the hon. member who has moved the motion for the adjournment of the debate to allow the debate to continue in order that we may see much clearer than we have seen up to now, what is the attitude of those members who wanted to participate in this debate, and who will be precluded from participating in the debate this afternoon if the motion for the adjournment is carried.

There is a further point why we on these benches oppose the adjournment of the debate. There are other vital matters on the Order Paper, matters which hon. members did not anticipate would come up for discussion in this House today. If this debate is adjourned now the House will get on to a very important matter, and the matter I am referring to is that which is being handled by the hon. the Minister of Labour. If it is going to be squeezed by tactical moves into the discussions today I doubt whether it will receive the attention that it merits.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Bloemfontein (City) (Dr. C. F. Steyn) moved his amendment to the motion before the House he put this debate on an entirely different level. For those of us who were members of the Select Committee an obligation now exists that we might have the opportunity which will be denied us if the motion for the adjournment of the debate is carried, of explaining our attitude taken on the Select Committee, which dealt with this matter from a non-party angle. I, for example, claim that I have the privilege and the right and should not be prevented from doing

We can imagine that the news items coming from correspondents working for the Argus group appear in thousands of overseas newspapers, thousands of newspapers abroad where the reputation of South Africa is perhaps very often besmirched, thousands of overseas newspapers in which insinuations and accusations are continually repeated, as was done fifty years ago. But the Argus group constitutes a greater danger to us. This group is a danger to us because today to a greater extent it does not only control its own news, but the news which appears in nearly every other newspaper, and the news which appears overseas. Sapa is the organisation which supplies us with our overseas news and Sapa-Reuter is today controlled by the Argus group, together with its Siamese twin, the Bailey group of newspapers. Today those two groups of mine magnates practically control every item of news which comes from overseas to South Africa. The Argus group — and through this group the mining groups — is today in a position to decide which item of news can be given to any particular paper in South Africa, which items of news the citizens of South Africa may read. The supply of news is controlled so strictly that with the exception of sports news, which is occasionally broadcast to South Africa direct, all news items are first sent to London, where it is carefully vetted. Lindsay Smith, in his book "Behind the Press in South Africa," says—

Almost all the news that trickles through into South Africa of events outside the continent passes through London, where it is either suitably vetted for the South African public or is allowed to filter through untouched and innocuous.

This monopolistic institution in the newspaper world constitutes a further danger to us. The influence which the mining capitalists exercise over the Native population of South Africa is more dangerous. The more the State endeavours at the expense of the nation to teach the Natives outside to read, the more the mining interests use that knowledge which the Natives acquire to influence the minds of the Natives and probably to enslave them in the same way as they have spiritually enslaved a large section of the European population of South Africa. By the formation of the company "Bantu Press" they have established newspapers everywhere or have taken over small Native newspapers and today the Bantu Press receives large yearly subsidies from the mining interests. Today the Argus group has a growing grip on the spirit of the Native. The Bantu Press, which today is practically under the control of the Argus group, has no less than 16 publications in different Native languages and they pride themselves on the fact that they have no

less than 250,000 subscribers. Throughout South Africa, in every Native community, their influence is already apparent, and not only here in the Union but also in Rhodesia, in the Protectorates, Basutoland, Swaziland and Bechuanaland. Everywhere the European controllers of the Argus group are getting a hold on the Native populations. When we see riots and assaults everywhere today; when we see that a new spirit is taking root amongst the Natives, I do not think we can absolve those newspapers from all blame. The Argus newspapers are partly responsible for the conditions we have today in Native circles. Recently, before the Native riots on the Rand, one of the Native leaders in Sophiatown uttered the following words: He said that the hostile attitude of the Bantu people was to a great extent due to the fact that the English Press in South Africa and the Communists terrorise the Bantu by means of statements about the brutality of apartheid and of the Broederbond. Those newspapers in the hands of the Argus Group are today a danger to the relationship between White and Black. Fifty years ago the mine magnates gained control of the Argus Group of newspapers. Fifty years ago they turned a large portion of the English newspapers from a free Press into a servile Press. They then used that Press to hypnotise the English-speaking section of South Africa and to paralyse the European population and to keep them paralysed. They had one object in mind, namely, to extend their power and to carry on their deeds, unhampered.

In every conflict in which our country has been involved, in every election in which the leaders of the nation have been elected, that Press has followed the sinister ways of capitalism, very often with catastrophic results to the country. I repeat that that large number of newspapers, more than half of the important English language newspapers which are today controlled by the mine magnates, constitutes a threat to our future and a threat at the present moment. No country dare tolerate a state of affairs where big capitalistic interests obtain a stranglehold not only on the economy of the country, but where in addition they obtain a stranglehold on the spirit of the nation. The welfare of a nation can only be ensured by a free Press and not by a servile Press. In my humble opinion, therefore, the time is overdue, not only for a thorough investigation into this matter, but for drastic action.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I have listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. member for Ermelo (Dr. Hertzog). He has quoted at great length from a book in which the author has shown the role played by the Press in South Africa to advance the imperialistic policy of divide and rule. With righteous indignation the hon. member has

shown that the Press played a very sorry part in furthering that policy and it is quite apparent to me that the hon. member has studied that book well and has learned from it, because he today is following the same path in his journalistic activities — the policy of divide and rule. As a director of a large capitalistic combine, the Afrikaners, which is expanding its activities every day, he is now straddling the divide between the capitalists and the workers and is today engaged in the activities of the editor, manager and controller of a new Press, "Die Werkerspers," and in that he is following a policy of divide and rule. The policy of this "Werkerspers" is to divide the workers along racial lines. His appeal is made in the organs which are issued under the "Werkerspers", viz., "Die Mynwerkersnuus", "Die Klerewerker" and "Die Bouwerker", and there are going to be several other issues under this Press, of which he is the manager or director and in which he plays a leading role. The object of this Press is to further the interests not of the workers of this country, but presumably of the capitalists which he also represents as a director in another organisation. Now, Mr. Speaker, any investigation into the freedom of the Press in this country must of necessity be an investigation into freedom itself and not so much an investigation into the Press. I have noticed in the course of the debate in this House that it is the interpretation of the meaning of the word "freedom" that worries most people here. Depending upon one's political outlook, depending upon one's understanding of the word "democracy" and depending upon one's appreciation of the workings of a democratic society, so will the interpretation of the freedom of the Press vary from person to person. Who is going to be the final arbiter as to what is freedom and what is licence? There have been suggestions that we should have a commission and that suggestion has been challenged on this side of the House on the ground that many commissions we have seen in this country have been whitewashing commissions, commissions that have presented findings suitable to those who were anxious to have such commissions. If we are going to have a Commission to investigate the matters included in the motion, perhaps that commission may be loaded with people who are sympathetic to a monopolistic Press; it may be overloaded with people who are sympathetic towards those who want to break down the freedom of the Press, and whilst a commission must be composed of all shades of opinion, how can we know in advance that such a commission will be in a position to satisfy all of us in its interpretation as to what is freedom and what is licence? The mover of this motion has included in the motion the following words—

Whereas this House is of opinion that a free Press is essential to a free democratic country . . .

Those are fine words, Mr. Speaker—

. . . and whereas it is convinced that a self-disciplined freedom ultimately constitutes the best safeguard for the maintenance of the freedom of the Press and all activities and tendencies to undermine or abuse such freedom, which exist, or are taking root in this country, should therefore be combated . . .

Those are words that could have a very wide interpretation. Take the word "self-discipline". We see in the world today a tendency more and more for fewer and fewer people to discipline the majority. We see a desire on the part of too many people to want to discipline other people to their way of thinking, and while we would all like to see an orderly society, the question of what is to be a well-disciplined Press, can be left to conjecture. It is not a simple matter to put down in a law. Legislation cannot determine what is self-discipline. As far as the public generally are concerned discipline in a State means obeying the laws of the State, but when those laws exceed the bounds of justice, when those laws exceed the ideas of freedom and democracy of the people as a whole, then people revolt against those laws. We have in this Motion the words—

All activities and tendencies to undermine or abuse such freedom which exist, or are taking root in this country, should therefore be combated.

The mover of the Motion endeavoured to explain to this House what those evils are. Many of us have occasion to complain at the attitude of the Press; we object to the manner in which the Press conducts its activities, but at the same time there are few of us who would dare to suggest legislation in order to circumscribe the activities of the Press. I have no hesitation in saying that I think that some of the leading newspapers in this country leave a lot to be desired. I think, for instance, that the "Sunday Times", which is issued as a weekend paper in Johannesburg, has deteriorated year by year, and today is not worth the paper it is written on. I say that definitely, and honest men in this country and those who are bound to read it as the only English newspaper appearing on Sundays on the Witwatersrand, will agree that it is a newspaper that carries nothing but sensational stuff. Its illustrations are usually those of semi-nude women; its illustrations are those of bathing beauties. Those who are responsible for the production of the newspaper appeal to the emotions and the sensational side of life. But it is not the only newspaper that does that. There are other newspapers which do the same sort of thing.

An HON. MEMBER: Be careful.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: The hon. member need not tell me to be careful. He knows just as well as I do that we have in this country newspapers which do not carry news and which do not carry magazine matter of information but carry other matters. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? It is because the Press of this country under our capitalist system must look to circulation, must look to building up circulation and must look to pleasing its advertisers. That is no exaggeration. If I were a newspaper owner and my newspaper had a poor circulation and my competitors had a big circulation and were getting all the advertisements, it is only natural that I would want to know why. I would want that circulation built up and I would probably find, as newspapers all over the world have found, that they need a little bit more sensation; they need a few more "scare" stories, and a few more lurid reports of court proceedings in order to attract a greater reading public. The old role of the editor and his staff in the newspaper world has completely changed. In the early days of the Press the literature of a country could be found in the columns of the newspapers. Reasoned thought, reasoned argument, could be found there, but now such things are relegated to back pages of the daily Press in order to make place for things that are considered to be more in the interests of building up circulation and creating popularity for the paper itself. On the question of dealing with and regulating the activities of the Press in this country, we have to be very careful. We have to watch out that in our attempts to see that we have a clean and decent Press in this country, we do not prevent freedom of speech and freedom of opinion. I recently came across a report on the new constitution, for instance, of the Argentine, which provides for the freedom of the Press. It says that all the inhabitants of the republic enjoy certain rights, among which are to publish their ideas through the Press without prior censorship. It was not 24 hours afterwards when I read in the local Press that a democratic organ, "La Prensa", had been closed down by the State. That was the activity of a Government that subscribed to the principle of the freedom of the Press, and yet was able to close down the Press. We do not want to see that here, nor do we want to encourage the idea that we are prepared to give any Government the right to close down any Press. However much we may dislike the opinion expressed in newspapers, the last thing we want to support or encourage is interference with the Press itself. The hon. member for Hospital (Mr. Barlow) hit the nail on the head when he said in this House this afternoon that what should be investigated is the growing Press monopoly in South Africa. I think that is the most important matter. As far as we on these

benches are concerned, we have not that half a million pounds which is necessary in order to build up our own Press. We have not even half a thousand pounds in order to start a Press, but we do know that the hon. member for Hospital was not far wrong when he said that the Press monopoly in this country is so strong, that only unlimited funds would make it possible for a new Press to appear in this country with any hope of success whatever. That is the position. Is that a healthy state of affairs? Is that conducive to having a free Press? Is that conducive to having a Press that can explore all avenues of thought and express all points of view? No, Sir, far from it.

We have, too, in this country something that is associated with the publication of news, something that is associated with the dissemination of news. I refer to the monopoly of the Central News Agency. The Central News Agency in this country, with its association with the major newspapers, its interlocking directorships and its unique position of holding the field in advance of all other competitors, can now determine whether or not any magazine or newspaper can be distributed successfully in this country.

I would like to quote in this connection the words of an ex-newspaperman, Mr. Lindsay Smith, who has been quoted in this House before. On the question of the Central News Agency he says—

Whether the newspapers are for English or Afrikaans readers they have one thing in common. Nearly every one of the dailies (and a great bulk of the weeklies) is published by the Central News Agency, which enjoys a virtual monopoly of the newspaper publishing business. The exception in the case of the dailies is "Die Transvaler", a Nationalist organ that conducts its own publishing arrangements.

The Central News Agency has an issued capital of £103,930 of a nominal capital of £120,000 in £1 shares. It has given a progressively increasing return to shareholders, and the balance sheet for the year ended 30th June, 1944, showed a net profit for the year of £117,088 0s. 10d., with a general reserve of £1,000,000.

Dr. FRIEDMAN: That has all been said before.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: This may have been said before, but it is worth repeating. He goes on to say—

Much of this highly satisfactory state of affairs has been brought about by the publishing of newspapers in conjunction with a chain of bookshops and stores throughout the country. Any venture into the newspaper business must, of necessity,

under the existing conditions, consider whether the Central News Agency, Ltd. is prepared to handle the publication. Should the Central News Agency decide to do so the venture is assured of sale by newsboys in the streets in the principal towns, and of sale at the thousand and one bookstalls controlled by the agency. The alternatives are either oblivion or the inauguration of a rival publishing agency.

Mr. RUSSELL: Does every newspaper use that service?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: No, not every newspaper uses that service, but the Central News Agency has a monopoly in that regard, and if a newspaper does not want to use that service, it will have to provide hundreds of thousands of pounds to build up a rival organisation to distribute its papers. That is one of the additional financial burdens that faces anyone who wants to start a Press in this country, and that means that we are going to attract other great Press monopolies to this country because they are the only ones that have a hope of competing with the existing entrenched interests in South Africa today. Quite a number of hon. members in this House have referred to the Press gallery which reports the proceedings in this House to the best of their ability. Everyone has joined in paying compliments to the Press representatives in the gallery who are trying to do a difficult job under difficult conditions. It has been said that the members of this House complain unnecessarily at not being mentioned in the Press when they speak in this House. Members on both sides of the House have often said to me that their own Press, the Press that speaks for the two major political parties in this House, are often, by design or accident, reporting poor speeches in extensio and give no publicity to well-reasoned speeches. An hon. member on the Government side of the House said to me only last week that when his constituents read that Mr. So-and-So also spoke in the House, they wonder what he said and that is the extent of the publicity he gets, whereas if somebody gets up and makes a sensational speech in this House by making wild and extravagant charges, by talking nonsense, provided it is nonsensical enough, he can get the headlines and even get his picture into the paper. It is also known that the House assembles at 2.15, and when we get to 3.30 it is tea-time, and the House empties and the Press gallery empties and the unfortunate speaker who comes on the floor in this House at any time after 3.30 is lucky if he gets two words of reporting in the Press. We must understand what this means. It is not a question of personal conceit, of the man thinking that he spoke sense and that therefore it should be fully reported. It is a question

of each individual in this House, having been returned to this House by 10,000 or more voters, and those voters are wondering what their representatives are doing in this House. While we realise that it is not possible for the Press to give a detailed report of every speech made in this House, it is essential for us to recognise that the role of the Press in reporting Parliament, by force of circumstances, is such that it cannot give a true and fair report of every speech made in this House. But members are judged on the reports they get in the Press, and that is an important thing for us to remember, when we deal with the question of conducting an investigation into the activities of the Press in this country.

I now want to deal with the South African Press Association. As the hon. member for Hillbrow (Dr. Friedman) has remarked, a lot of these things have been said before. I do not want to delay the House. I believe the hon. member also wants to speak. I do not want to deal with the set-up of Sapa. I do not want to deal with its activities. I just want to deal with the association between Sapa and the South African Broadcasting Corporation. Under the arrangements between Sapa and the South African Broadcasting Corporation, we get our news over the air, copyright by Sapa, and the result generally is this, that what you read in the newspapers in the morning you hear over the wireless on the 1.15 news. That is the position today. In other words, all that our Broadcasting Corporation is able to do is to relay news that we have already read in the newspapers. The function of a radio in the lives of people in modern society is to give them news quickly, to give them news that they are anxiously waiting for, sooner than they can by waiting for the daily Press. Under that arrangement with Sapa, in order not to take away any of the advantages of the daily Press, the South African Broadcasting Corporation must play second fiddle, and therefore we get second-hand news, usually very late.

An HON. MEMBER: Some people do not read the papers.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: For those who do not read the papers it is a very useful service, but the majority of people read the newspapers and they also want to get some news over the wireless, in addition to that, and in this connection, I would also like to quote to the House the experience of a certain radio broadcaster in the Cape, that is to say, Mr. Leo Marquard, ex-chief of the Army Education Services. He was broadcasting over the Cape Town transmission in 1948 and he was to speak on the independence of the Press. I would like to quote to the House what he was going to say over the radio in that talk. He was going to say this—

The main accusation (against the Press) is — and must remain until it is cleared up — that a section of the English Press is dominated by a monopoly powerful enough to prevent effective competition and that news and views are subject to the control of large financial interests. This does not apply to the Afrikaans Press which is largely political . . .

Why does the public feel so strongly about the Press? Why should a group of financiers not combine to publish newspapers to promote their interests? Why should they not use all the legalised tricks of monopoly to make large profits?

The answer lies in the history and tradition of the Press, which has sedulously taught us that a free Press is part of the very fabric of democracy. The Press has a glorious part in the struggle against repression and dictatorship. . . . It is no wonder that we want to assure ourselves that the Press is still the champion of popular rights and freedom.

Then he goes on to deal with the matter a bit further and he ends on this note—

The fundamental point is that Parliamentary democracy grew up to regard the Press as the public Press. If circumstances have changed a section of it from a public to a private Press, then Parliamentary democracy is bound to reconsider the position.

That must involve finding out whether or not the Press is independent. If it is, well and good, if it is not, then it is surely not only possible, but also urgently necessary, for Parliamentary democracy to take steps to restore the Press to its public and independent position.

That broadcast was banned by the Directors of the Broadcasting Corporation. They refused to allow Mr. Marquard to make that speech over the broadcasting network. They refused because they said that if they did so, they would have to allow the rival interests to state their side of the case, and they did not want to enter into the field of controversy.

Mr. RUSSELL: Then say the B.B.C. is a monopoly.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I do not want to argue with the hon. member about monopolies. He knows more about Press monopolies than I do. But in the meantime we can see the encroachment of the powerful force of Sapa and its associated Press, even into our broadcasting service, and that is something, too, that needs to be looked into.

Now, I want to deal with the attitude of the Society of Journalists. The Society of Journalists have always associated them-

selves with a free and democratic Press and also with the right at any time to conduct an investigation into the Press, which they would welcome. When the hon. member for Hillbrow introduced his motion in this House in 1948 the "Rand Daily Mail" issued two editorials which spoke in quite a sneering tone about the address of the hon. member for Hillbrow, and the South African Society of Journalists thought that it would be in the interests of all concerned — in the interests of a free Press — to reply. Here we have a very clear example of what the freedom of the Press can mean when we have a set-up such as we have today. The set-up that we have today means that the Press has the power to include or exclude any item of news or any point of view to which they object. When the S.A. Society of Journalists disagreed with the attitude of the editor of the "Rand Daily Mail", they wrote him a letter, dated the 26th February, 1948, in which they set out their views on this particular matter. That letter was never published. It never found space in the columns of the "Rand Daily Mail", so the South African Society of Journalists sent it to another newspaper with a very small circulation, the "Forward", and the "Forward" published it. I would just like to quote a short extract from the "Forward's" comment—

In urging an inquiry into the S.A. Press, Dr. Bernard Friedman, acted at the instigation of the S.A. Society of Journalists. This fact was set out in a letter written by the Society's General Secretary to the "Rand Daily Mail". That paper had commented adversely on Dr. Friedman's motion, and his speech in support of it, but omitted to publish the letter from the Journalists' society in which definite exception was taken to certain points made in its comment. Since any comment made by the Journalists' Society on the subject of Dr. Friedman's motion is of outstanding public interest "Forward" hastens to repair the "Rand Daily Mail's" omission by publishing the letter.

And it published the letter, and as far as I am aware that was the only place in which this letter was ever published. That is what I mean when I say that the Press is able to publish only the news that it thinks fit to print. The Press has the arbitrary power to exclude news, or to exclude the opinions of other people, if it so desires. I want to read to the House what the journalists said in that letter. It is rather a long letter. A great deal of it deals with the hon. member for Hillbrow (Dr. Friedman) and his association with the Press, and also his attitude in this matter. The relevant portion of the letter reads as follows—

The motion requesting the House of Assembly to appoint a select committee to examine the financial and technical control of the South African Press is still under the consideration of Parliament. The "Rand Daily Mail", however, has deemed fit to express itself on the subject in two leading articles of the 6th and 26th February, and it may be desirable, in the public interests, to remove some misconceptions that appeared in those commentaries.

Both articles sought to convey the impression that Dr. Bernard Friedman, of his own volition, has arrogated to himself what was implied by the "Rand Daily Mail" as almost an impertinence in his seeking to persuade Parliamentarians to appoint the select committee.

It is well known throughout the journalistic profession of this country that the motion proposed by Dr. Friedman, with his customary brilliancy of presentation originated in the South African Society of Journalists, the sole body of organised journalists in South Africa. The motion now before Parliament was passed in the form of a resolution by an overwhelming majority of the delegates attending the National Congress of the Journalists' Society at Pietermaritzburg, in January, 1946.

The "Rand Daily Mail" should be familiar with the genesis of the Parliamentary motion and have known that the full official support of the South African Society of Journalists stands behind Dr. Friedman, who very kindly accepted the invitation of the journalists to submit their request to Parliament. Disturbed by allegations that the powerful influence of the S.A. Press was being abused by monopoly control and misapplied through policies of misdirection, the journalists, for the honour of the profession they serve so unselfishly, felt it was incumbent upon them to ascertain whether the allegations were true or false. They felt that Parliament was the only arbiter in so grave a matter. So the title of your leading article had only the phonetic symbolism of a mere catch-phrase to recommend it.

That is what the Journalists' Society think of the editor of the "Rand Daily Mail". I won't continue to quote the letter but the point is this, that here was an editor of a paper who, because he alone could decide, wrote brilliant editorials on the motion dealing with the Press, and when the journalists who were most vitally concerned said: "You have expressed your views and given it to your hundreds of thousands of readers; let us now state our point of view." The editor of the "Rand Daily Mail", in his own wisdom, decided that the Society of Journalists was not significant enough and

not of great enough importance to get space and to give its views to the paper's readers. The hon. the Prime Minister has been taken to task for what he stated in his Bloemfontein speech when he said that the South African Press was most undisciplined. In the course of a speech in this House the Prime Minister made the interjection in which he reiterated that point of view and said that if we compare the Press of South Africa with that of other countries, we will come to the same conclusion. When the hon. the Prime Minister made that statement, I think he displayed an attitude that is disturbing most of us. From his point of view the South African Press is undisciplined, and that brings me back to the earlier point I made, namely, who is going to determine what is undisciplined and what is self-discipline, and along what lines could the Press of South Africa be disciplined. The Prime Minister may have in mind that it means denying the reporters and the pressmen the right to express some criticism of the Government of the country or of the Opposition, or what they mostly do, express criticism on the small group occupying these benches. There are others who believe that discipline of the Press should mean that the columns of the Press of this country should not sink to indecency which would shame the country. There are others who believe it means that the Press should not be disciplined by high finance and moneyed interestes in the country. That is what we on these benches say. But whatever it may be, it is most essential that we should maintain the freedom of the Press. The freedom of the Press means the freedom of Parliament, and if the freedom of the Press disappears, then the freedom of Parliament will disappear. That is the most important thing to remember.

The Society of Journalists, as it so happens, has had a meeting while this motion was in progress in the House, and in a public statement the Society said—

Their members feel that they have nothing to fear or be ashamed of and, in view of the repeated attacks on journalists, welcome a commission of inquiry to bring all these facts clearly before the public. The S.A.S.J. feel, however, that the commission should be as unbiased as possible, and therefore ask that it be a judicial commission. Should a judicial commission not be appointed, the S.A.S.J. ask that the Commission should be as representative as possible and that the S.A.S.J. should be represented on it.

And that is the standpoint of members on these benches. We quite agree with the Society of Journalists that they can have no fears in regard to an impartial inquiry into the activities of the Press of this country, but we do hope such an inquiry will concentrate on the financial aspects of the

present monopolistic tendencies in the Press; we also feel that the Society of Journalists should be represented on such a commission.

Dr. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Speaker, no less than four Ministers, including the hon. the Prime Minister, have taken part in this debate. That, Sir, is the measure of the great importance they attach to the subject of the Press of this country. The hon. Minister of the Interior, in order to prove that the approach of this Government to the question of the Press is entirely disinterested and dispassionate, made a big point of the fact that many people were concerned about the Press before the advent of the present Government to power. It is perfectly true that many people were concerned about the Press before the present Government assumed office, but they were not to be found in the ranks of the Nationalist Party. No, Sir; it is significant, that when the Press was debated on a motion which I had the privilege of introducing in this House, just before the election, not one of these Ministers took part in that debate; and not a single Nationalist front-bencher was present throughout the course of that debate. Their benches were conspicuously empty. They were not interested. Alone in their deserted benches sat the hon. member for Swellendam (Mr. S. E. Warren). It was left to him to state the Nationalist Party's point of view on the subject of the Press, and the hon. member for Swellendam was very lukewarm about the proposed inquiry. Speaking for his party, he said they had no objection to an inquiry, but in their opinion the inquiry would produce no solution. Well, how times have changed. Now that they have assumed office, the Press has suddenly become a burning issue, and an inquiry, which they said would be useless, has suddenly become a matter of vital urgency. Yet the Minister of the Interior, in discussing the background of this debate, has the colossal nerve to tell this House that their sudden concern about the Press has nothing to do with the attacks on the Government. He placed himself on a high pedestal, did the Minister of the Interior, and in his "holier than thou" attitude he lectured the hon. member for Salt River (Mr. Lawrence) for daring to question the purity of their motives, and for daring to suggest that their new-found concern for the Press was due to their hypersensitive reaction to criticism. If the Minister of the Interior really flattered himself that he had lulled the suspicions of members on this side, that illusion must have been completely shattered by the intervention of the hon. Minister of Economic Affairs in the debate. The Minister of Economic Affairs is not as skilled in the art of political dissimulation as his oleaginous colleague. In fact, Sir, he is rather an adept at pouring oil on the troubled

flames. In no time he had again stirred up the misgivings which the Minister of the Interior sought to allay, and provided fresh grounds for apprehension in regard to the designs of the Government on the Press of this country.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine some of the pronouncements of the Minister of Economic Affairs. The Minister of Economic Affairs said he was not against the freedom of the Press in the acknowledged sense of that term, but he objected to the abuse of that freedom. It is abundantly clear that the Press abuses its freedom when it prints something of which the Minister disapproves. This is apparent from the Minister's arbitrary and high-handed action against "The Star". Because the editor of "The Star" is unable to reconcile certain words used by the Minister with the innocent but belated interpretation the Minister placed on those words subsequently, the Minister breaks off relations with "The Star". He puts "The Star" on his private black list; he treats his Ministerial Department as if it were his own private property, and deprives the readers of "The Star" who, mark you, are all taxpayers, of that information to which they are entitled as a matter of right. And, in fact, the Minister, in his folly, makes the position worse by trying to draw a distinction between the editor and the paper for which he is responsible. So, according to the Minister, he penalises the readers of "The Star" in order to avenge a private grudge against the editor. His conduct is as illogical as that of the petty tyrant who whips his own children because his wife questions his fidelity. There is no precedent for the high-handed action of the Minister. His conduct is not that of a responsible Minister, but of a would-be despot who would like to wield an authority which he does not possess and which will always be beyond his capacity.

The other day the Minister of Economic Affairs tried to explain his use of the words, "Russians, Indians, Siamese, and God knows what". This is his explanation. I will read it from Hansard—

I was given a welcome by a large gathering at Hermanus on my return, and I expressed my joy that I was among my own people again and not among foreigners. I did not have the slightest intention of insulting any nation. I might have created that impression, but I can assure you that it was not my intention.

Well, Sir, it seems that we pay the Minister too high a compliment when we credit him with sufficient ability to clothe his intentions in suitable words. On his own admission, the Minister has reached the stage where he is no longer aware whether the words he uses are insulting or not. In order to escape the charge of impropriety, the Minister convicts himself of stupidity. I would be content to leave the matter at that; but

I take such a serious view of the Minister's high-handed action in relation to "The Star", that I have taken the trouble to examine his famous Sandbaai speech. I wanted to see whether the rest of the speech was in keeping with the Minister's innocent interpretation. That speech is a characteristic utterance. Like all the Minister's speeches, it is a series of genuflections to himself. It is an account of his great triumph at UNO. And you know, Sir, in ancient days when a victor returned in triumph, it was the practice to adorn his brow with a laurel wreath and a bard was chosen to celebrate his triumph in words of immortal fame. On this occasion the Minister modestly contented to dispense with the laurel wreath, but he insisted on being his own bard. He told the epic story of his struggle at UNO to his listeners at Sandbaai; and hearken, Mr. Speaker, to the lyric strains—

He, Mr. Louw, found the prestige of South Africa particularly low when he arrived at UNO. So he went over to the offensive and sent them running and yelping for protection to the Chairman.

The spectacle of the Minister going over to the offensive and scattering the United Nations like chaff before the wind, must have been a truly remarkable spectacle. Like Coriolanus, he is entitled to exclaim: "Alone I did it." I do not know whether the Minister compared his exploit with the charge of the Light Brigade or the scaling of the Heights of Abraham. Personally, it reminded me of a celebrated hymn, which goes as follows—

Oh, may Thy powerful word
Inspire the feeble worm,
To rush into Thy Kingdom, Lord,
And take it as by storm.

On this occasion the Minister, inspired by his own powerful word, rushed into the United Nations and took them by storm. Unfortunately I doubt whether history will accept that highly coloured version of the Minister's exploit. But then, Sir, historians are just as undisciplined as journalists and no doubt it will be necessary to bring them under some form of control.

But the point I want to make is this, that the whole tone of this speech is contemptuous of the United Nations and is a studied affront to that august institution. It will not improve our relations with the other delegates. But Heaven help the newspaper that dares to say so or refuses to accept the Minister's interpretation. The Minister would regard it as an abuse of freedom. Any and every newspaper in the land will be treated in the same way as "The Star" if it dares put its own interpretation on the Minister's words. When the Minister, therefore, says he is not against the freedom of the Press but against the abuse of that freedom, his state-

ment has a familiar ring. It is precisely the sort of doctrine the late Dr. Goebbels laid down for the regulation of the German Press under his control; and I am sure the Minister of Economic Affairs would love nothing better than to play the role of the South African Dr. Goebbels. It is a role he would embrace with alacrity, sustain with energy and discharge with enthusiasm.

Let us take another pronouncement of the Minister of Economic Affairs. He told us he had his own plan of dealing with the foreign correspondents of overseas newspapers who are resident in South Africa and who are not citizens of South Africa. He said he would register them, and if they slandered South Africa he would deport them. Now the question is what in the opinion of the Minister is slanderous matter and whom would he deport? The question is easily answered. The House will recall that last Session, the hon. Prime Minister complained very bitterly about the false and malicious reports on the Durban riots which were sent to overseas newspapers. The Society of Journalists promptly asked for chapter and verse; and subsequently the Minister of Economic Affairs made a statement, a long and well-documented statement, to support the Prime Minister's allegations. After the sweeping allegations made against the Press, the House obviously expected the most startling and sensational revelations. The Minister exonerated completely Sapa and the journalists working on the South African newspapers. This is what he said—

I have gone through these reports very carefully and I want to say quite frankly that as far as the South African journalists are concerned — by that I mean the men attached to our own newspapers, our own South African journalists — it would appear that as far as they are concerned there would be no reason to allege that they themselves had been guilty of this type of misreporting . . . I also want to say — and I think it is only right that I should say so . . .

So impressed was he by a sense of what is right—

. . . we have in South Africa a Press Association known as Sapa, and as far as I have been able to ascertain, I am happy to say that the Sapa reports were, generally speaking, fair and objective. None of these features to which the hon. the Prime Minister referred, were to be found in the Sapa reports; they were fair and they were objective.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that completely knocks the bottom out of the case for control of internal reporting. The Durban riots constituted a crucial test, and our journalists

emerged from that test with their reputation and honour untarnished. I hope, therefore, the Minister of Economic Affairs will appear before the commission and will offer this handsome testimony to the character and integrity of our South African journalists.

But let us turn to the reports sent to overseas newspapers by their correspondents. The Minister was particularly irate about the report in the "New York Times", sent by their own correspondent in this country, Mr. Archambault. Let us read one or two extracts which the Minister quoted in his statement—

The disturbing aspect of the riots is how and why they happen. Ostensibly it all began with a rumour, later proved false, that a vendor in the Indian market had beaten and killed a small Negro boy. Thereupon the Natives sought vengeance and violence bred more violence.

That is one extract. Here is another—

Obviously there must have been deeper causes, traceable partly to the general feeling of unrest among both Whites and non-Whites. . . . The Zulus do not like the Indians and the antipathy is mutual. In the case of the Zulus it is fostered by the example of the Whites of Natal who fear the encroachment of the "Coolies" and seek not only their complete segregation but their repatriation.

I can assure hon. members the other extracts are no worse. But it is plain that if the Minister of Economic Affairs had his way, he would deport Mr. Archambault. We can imagine the repercussions that would ensue if the correspondent of one of the greatest newspapers in the world were booted out of this country. I wonder what prospects the Minister of Finance would have of raising a loan on the New York market if the correspondent of the "New York Times" were expelled from South Africa. And, Sir, if the correspondent of so eminent and respected a newspaper as the "New York Times" were to be expelled from South Africa, how long would it be before every foreign correspondent would be expelled from these shores; and how long would it be before the iron curtain descended completely on South Africa, cutting us off from a free and enlightened world? Yet a Minister holding these pernicious views about the treatment of foreign correspondents is allowed to continue in office, to sit in a Cabinet which professes to be democratic, and to share collective responsibility for the government of the country. Apparently the hon. the Prime Minister is prepared to countenance that sort of thing. If the Prime Minister is so strong on discipline why does he not look nearer home? It seems to me the Prime

Minister has the most undisciplined Cabinet in the world. Before he starts on the Press, let him make himself master in his own house; let him place some restraint on the unruly and unbridled Minister of Economic Affairs. I urge it in the national interest, although from our point of view it suits us to have him in the Cabinet. He is making a very considerable contribution to the downfall of the present Government.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Randfontein (Dr. Diederichs), in seconding the motion of the hon. member for Bethlehem (Dr. van Rhyn), drew attention to the motion which I had the privilege of introducing in this House a few years ago, and called upon me to support their motion. Let me assure the hon. member that, whilst in principle I am in favour of an inquiry, I am not going to be trapped into supporting their motion. Their motion, Sir, has only a superficial resemblance to mine. It is true their motion talks about monopolistic tendencies, but its essence is contained in par. 3. Par. 3 is the core of their motion. It is the active ingredient in the pill; the rest is mere sugar coating to make it more palatable to those of us who in previous years have argued in favour of an inquiry. In the light of par. 3, it is clear that the issue is no longer monopoly control. That has been superseded by a far graver issue, namely, the danger of State control. And against State control, even against an element of State control in the form of Government representation on a Press council, I shall fight as long as I can draw breath.

Members on the other side have paid me the dubious compliment of quoting freely from my previous speech to support their motion. That has caused me no embarrassment, because I have comforted myself with the reflection that Satan can quote Scripture for his purpose. I am not going to be a party to the damnation of the Press. The differences between my motion and theirs are vital and fundamental. My motion was sponsored by the Society of Journalists. I had the privilege of pleading their cause in this House. Their motion was fathered upon the hon. member for Bethlehem, but we know who its real parents are. The Ministers who took part in the debate certainly did not treat it as a founding upon their doorstep. The alacrity with which they adopted it testifies to its real parentage. Their motion is a step in the campaign of threat and intimidation which they have been waging against the English-language Press, a campaign which is designed to force the English Press into a state of docility and acquiescence. My motion, my purpose, was to safeguard the status of the journalist, and to secure working conditions for the journalist which would continue to attract men of talent and high integrity to the profession of journalism. That, Sir, is the

best guarantee of a reputable and honest Press. Their purpose, Sir, is to reduce the journalist to a state of subserviency and complete conformity to Government policy. In short, my purpose was to remove restraints, their purpose is to impose even cruder restraints. My purpose was to safeguard the freedom of the Press, their purpose is to safeguard the Government from criticism. That being so, I have no alternative but to reject their motion and I shall have no hesitation in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Salt River (Mr. Lawrence).

In conclusion, I want to say that if the Government insists on setting up a commission and not a Select Committee, I hope they will agree to the request of the Society of Journalists. The Society of Journalists wants, firstly, a judge to preside over the commission — they want it to be a judicial commission. And, secondly, they want the society to be represented on the commission and I have been asked officially to make this request to the Government.

In view of the fact that quite a few Ministers are directors of newspapers, and, as party leaders, have a direct interest in the ownership and control of newspapers, the Government must exercise the utmost circumspection in the appointment of that commission. Recent commissions have been open to criticism, they have not enjoyed the complete confidence of the public. In respect of one commission, the Minister of the Interior was able to tell us what the findings would probably be. Now, Sir, in connection with the Press, we do not want a commission whose report will be based on the Minister's forecast. The commission must not only be impartial, it must appear to be impartial. We want a judicial commission, well balanced, fully representative, a commission above suspicion and beyond reproach; and its proceedings should be open to the full light of day. The hon. the Prime Minister in reply to an interjection by my friend the hon. member for Alberton (Mr. S. J. M. Steyn) said that certain sections of the Press might wish to give their evidence in private. As

far as the English-language Press is concerned they have made their position abundantly clear. They want a full and open inquiry. They have made it clear that they are prepared to lay all their cards on the table, face upwards; and they expect other sections of the Press to do the same. Sir, if there is one section of the Press that wants to draw a veil of secrecy over its activities, it can only be that section of the Press owned and controlled by the Nationalist Party. The hon. member for Alberton made it clear that the most lurid examples of malpractice have come from the Nationalist newspapers. They have frequently poisoned the wells of public information; and I hope they will not be allowed to take skilful advantage of the right to be heard in private to secure immunity from public scrutiny. The guiding maxim of a commission on the Press must be "fiat lux".

Mr. TIGHY: The motion before the House requests the Government to consider the advisability of appointing a commission to inquire into the Press. To that our side of the House has moved an amendment in favour of the appointment of a Select Committee. Speaking personally, I am convinced that if that motion, as proposed by the hon. member for Bethlehem (Dr. van Rhyn) is adopted, it will mark the beginning of the end of the free Press in South Africa and my motto has always been "Hands off the South African Press".

I understand that it is the desire of hon. members to go home early today and I therefore move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. MORTIFEE: I second:

Agreed to.

Debate adjourned; to be resumed on 17th March.

On the motion of the Minister of Finance, the House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

a considerable danger, that these methods and modes of repression may cause to arise among non-European people a "Gandhi", a Coloured or Native "Gandhi", who may some day employ the legal means of passive resistance. If the non-Europeans ever do that, Sir, driven frantic by measures such as these, they may easily within a matter of weeks bring down in ruins the social and economic structure of this country. That is something we should guard against. Mr. Speaker, we have shown that machinery is being created for a police state, reminiscent I may say, of the Gestapo. No man or woman, white or dark, under this Bill which we are discussing, has any guarantee that they will be safe against molestation. We ask ourselves this, Sir, with the record of the Nationalist Party, with the record of the Government before us: Can we trust them to resist the temptation to use the pernicious machinery which they are creating under this Bill? I think the answer of the people must be "No". Many speakers have pointed out the danger of using unqualified enumerators and the lack of sufficient safeguards against arbitrary classification. We have shown how the onus of proof in this Bill is being inverted and how the doors are opened to the poison-pen informer. We have shown, Sir, that the expense will be far greater than has been anticipated. We have shown that this cannot be a truly national scheme and that it cannot be made workable. The hon. member for Pinetown (Mr. Hopewell) showed today that technically it is impossible and that the cost might be very high indeed. We have shown that without the willing co-operation of all the people the Bill is useless. And we will not get that co-operation. We have shown — the hon. member for Hottentots Holland (Sir de V. Graaff) has shown — some of the anomalies and contradictions of this Bill, particularly referring to the foolish seven-day notification of a change of address in the Native territories, where Natives do not know the use of the post and where they may have to go fifty miles to the magistrate's office.

We have shown, Sir — and this is most important — that the evidence submitted by the Minister to this House was faulty. We have shown that his evidence, particularly concerning the "pass-carrying principle" as practiced in other countries, was faulty. He mentioned Canada. But he was wrong. Only in one State of Canada, viz., Alberta, is a "pass" carried and even there the carrying of the "pass" is observed more in the breach than the performance. He is quite wrong about Holland, too. The original "Bevolkingsregister" exists, but the "Persoonsbewys" and "Ausweis" was discontinued as soon as Holland was liberated from the Nazis. The hon. member for Hottentots Holland, who has been there recently, told us that it is not carried any

longer. The same is true of France. Frenchmen do not carry "passes". That system, too, was abolished when the French were liberated from the Vichy-Nazis. In France foreigners carry a "pass" for purposes of hotel registration, but Frenchmen don't carry "passes" in France now. Australia, of course, abolished them at the end of the war. Sweden has no "pass", though they have a registration system and there is even some doubt as to whether that is national. Denmark threw the "pass" out with the Nazis. They don't carry "passes" in Denmark.

An HON. MEMBER: Is that so?

Mr. RUSSELL: There is no racial significance in the "passes" they carry in Belgium and Italy. And as far as Kenya is concerned the hon. the Minister seemed to be painfully ill-informed in his opening speech. I hope in the interval he has had he collected more information for us. In Kenya anyhow the White women certainly don't carry "passes". In Israel there are special reasons connected with displaced persons, and they also have a quota between Arabs and Jews. There are special circumstances there. But except in this case there is no racial discrimination in the identification "passes" of the countries I have mentioned. Now the hon. the Minister made great play of England. He told us that in England they carry a registration "pass". He knows of course that it was introduced as a war measure, he knows that it has no racial significance. He said that it was unconnected with rationing, but is it, Sir? It is maintained now, because it is the ready means of identifying a man when he applies for a ration card. If the hon. the Minister will look at the debates in the Hansard of the House of Commons, he will see the motives behind the introduction of their "Registration Bill". Just so, anyone reading the debates of this House will see the real motives behind the introduction of this measure here. In Great Britain it was introduced by the Minister of Health and the Minister of Health, I think, urged its acceptance in order to facilitate occasions of hasty evacuation, the finding of children and parents after a blitz. He stressed its use for rationing purposes. In England it was introduced for security purposes also, but I make bold to say that as soon as rationing is discontinued, the carrying of a "pass" will be absolutely a dead letter there. Mr. Speaker, the Minister mentioned with smug glee, in answer to an interjection, that the German does not carry a "pass". Of course Germany does not now have a "pass". But under the Nazi regime they carried a variety of passes; there was the Gestapo pass, the S.S. pass, the Jugend Bund pass and the Jewish pass, all happily abolished now in Western Germany. We are the only country in the world where this "pass" is being introduced in time of peace and where the introduction is not caused as the result of

war or the aftermath of war, and where it is not introduced by a dictator — like in Holland in Napoleonic times, in Italy in 1920 under Mussolini, in Germany under Hitler and in the countries overrun by Hitler. In all the other countries like Denmark, France and Holland, they were all introduced by a conqueror and the “passes” disappeared as soon as the conqueror disappeared, thrown away very happily indeed.

But, Sir, I must come to an end. My time is getting very short indeed. In a few minutes the Minister is due to reply. I would like to say something to him and to this House and to South Africa: Knowing the Minister as I do, I presume that he will try to drag “red herrings” across the trail of our very logical and concise arguments. I know he will say that we are an irresponsible Opposition. I know he will accuse us of inciting opposition against this Bill. It is the usual practice of this Government, Sir, first of all to introduce repressive measures and then, because we point out their oppressive nature, to accuse us of inciting people to oppose these unjust measures. We are, of course, merely carrying out our duty, our legitimate and proper duty as the Opposition, in pointing out the falsity and the wrongness in all of these measures which are descending upon us in greater and greater flood since this Government came into power. I think that he will probably again blame this Opposition for “forcing” the Government to carry out their policy of apartheid. I think he will say that by our out-and-out attack on this policy of apartheid we are placing the Government in a position of being compelled to carry out these policies that they may have watered down. The Minister, I know, will use every argument to deceive the people of South Africa in regard to the true intent of this Bill. In conclusion, Sir, I would like to quote Shakespeare to him and to say this that—

In law, what so tainted and corrupt,
But, being season'd with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil? . . .

And the same is true of the Nationalist Party policy—

. . . In religion,
What damned error, but some sober brow
Will bless it, and approve it with a text,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament?

The same is true of Nationalist Party politics. I ask you, Sir, I ask this House, I ask the country not to allow the dexterity of his mind and conscience to hide the “grossness” of this measure, not to let him hide by his eloquence the “show of evil” in this Bill.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: I did not intend to take part in this debate, but certain things have been said which provoke me to reply. The attitude of the Labour Party on this measure is well known. We are absolutely opposed

to it. We do not even want it to go to a Select Committee. We believe that it is unnecessary legislation. I won't deal with that aspect of it now, but I would like to refer you to one of the aspects of this type of legislation that disturbs the minds of us who believe in democracy and freedom. It was suggested that the idea which lurks behind this legislation would be regimentation of the people of this country and would be discrimination against certain racial and religious groups. During the course of this debate I have heard from two or three members on the Government side of the House, speeches that quite clearly showed the House that they are so deeply infected with anti-Semitism that they might like to see the Population Registration Bill used to discriminate against a religious group in this country.

Mr. POTGIETER: Don't be silly.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Perhaps the hon. member was not in the House when the hon. member for Vereeniging (Dr. Loock) made an attack on a colleague of mine because he happens to be of a different faith from most of us. He attacked him in this House. The hon. member for Groblersdal (Mr. Abraham) who followed the hon. member for Benoni (Mr. Lovell), he too made an attack and made a reference in his speech inferring that the hon. member for Benoni was not of the same calibre as us of a different faith. And I say that those of us who love democracy and freedom, shudder when we hear these things, because we see what was done under the registration scheme against Jewish people in other parts of the world and those of us who are not Jews cannot stand aside and see this sort of thing beginning to grow in South Africa. When Holland had a population registration scheme, it was quite an innocent affair. It was handled by the boroughs and municipalities, but when the Nazis came in and took over they issued identification cards and if a man happened to be Jewish, a big green J was superimposed on his card. The population registration of this country can go the same way if we are to take notice of the sentiments that are expressed by members on the other side of this House. I am not trying to scare members. I am disturbed when I listen to certain members on the other side of the House and I say that when we have the legislative machinery available in this country to those who want to oppress minorities then certainly they are going to adapt that machinery to their own nefarious ends like the Nazis did in Europe. I would like the hon. the Minister who smiles, who smirks, I would like the hon. the Minister to deal with this matter. I am quite sure that he is not going to support the views that have been expressed by some of his colleagues, but I think he owes it to South Africa to tell them that

he dissociates himself from such sentiments and that as long as he is Minister he will fight any attempt to use the population register for such purpose. And furthermore I would like him to tell this House and the country that he will ally himself on the side of those who oppose any measure to use the population register to those ends. I don't want to keep the House long, I have just another two minutes, and I would just like to put a few points to the hon. the Minister in connection with this Bill which I would like him to deal with when he replies. First of all I would like to ask the hon. the Minister whether he has examined this Bill in its application in so far as the poorer people of South Africa are concerned and by that I mean the majority of the people in this country. According to the Bill, as I read it, it will cause untold hardship to the poorer people in this country. Those who have the financial means will be able to engage legal assistance when we have difficulties. They will be able to employ secretaries and typists. But what about the poor man and the man who works from early in the morning and returns home late at night? He has to sit down and write letters to make application, to challenge the group in which he was placed; he has to have his photo taken and send two copies to the Director. All these things are hardships. I wonder if the Minister has estimated what this measure is going to cost the country, in so far as it will interfere with everyday working life. A colleague of his spoke about wage incentives and the stepping up of production in this country. How is the Minister of the Interior going to apply this scheme to the working people of the country, without disturbing the everyday work — because they have no other time — if they have to comply with the regulations under this Bill? There is also a provision in the Bill that where people cannot afford to pay for the photographs required, exemption will be granted. But they will have to make application and they will be subject to a means test. The average poor man in the country, in order to comply with the law, will have to subject himself to further inquiry and to further investigation into his daily life, and he will have to plead poverty in order to be able to comply with the law. I would also like the Minister to deal with that aspect. And finally, the Minister by way of interjection asked a member on this side whether he objected to carrying his Railway pass. That was a very foolish interjection, because the Minister knows that the Railway pass is a ticket to travel on the train.

Mr. S. E. WARREN: It is called a pass.

Mr. HEPPLE: It is a Railway ticket. It is just as foolish as to ask whether you want to travel on the train without a ticket. It is the same thing. The Minister also asked

whether he objected to having a driver's licence.

Mr. S. E. WARREN: It is called a pass.

Mr. HEPPLE: No, it is a ticket to travel on the railway. If you do not buy a ticket you do not travel. You have the option, but here you have no option. You have to carry it. The same thing applies to the driver's licence. There is an option. If you want to drive a car, you must have a certificate of competency. [Interruptions.]

Mr. S. E. WARREN: [Inaudible.]

*Mr. SPEAKER: I want to ask the hon. member for Swellendam to refrain from interrupting.

Mr. HEPPLE: If you want to drive a car, you have to have a certificate of competency. You are not compelled to have it. But here, if you want to be a citizen of South Africa and if you want to have freedom of movement, you are not permitted under this legislation unless you carry an identity card. I want to ask the Minister how he arrives at this calculation of £300,000 as the estimated cost of applying this measure. I want to tell him that he will come on the Supplementary Estimates and ask for more money, and next year he will ask for more than that. We are going to find that this particular piece of legislation, in direct cost to the State, is going to run into probably a million pounds, if not more, by the time the Minister is finished. And as far as the country itself is concerned in the application of it, as it affects the daily life of people and the output of our factories, it is going to run into millions of pounds. This country will live to regret it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Mr. Speaker, before I deal with the debate itself, there are a few excrescences of the debate which I want to dispose of. The first is the hare that has been raised by the hon. member for Woodstock (Mr. Russell). He read out with great gusto a questionnaire that had apparently been sent to departmental schools. He read the questions that were asked and he said that was an example of the prying and spying of this Government. I should have thought that it would have been fairer if the hon. member had given the Minister responsible, the hon. Minister of Education, some notice that he was going to raise this matter here tonight. I think it would have been the fair thing to do. But it may be that he was inhibited from doing that, because of the facts I am going to place before the House now. Now, Mr. Speaker, this form which was read out here tonight was from a questionnaire on the private lives of teachers—

Emosicnele en sosiale aanpassing; persoonlikheid en intellektuele bekwaamheid; houding teenoor die professie en leerlinge . . .

And all those things; I think there are some amendments in regard to minor matters.

Mr. RUSSELL: What about religion?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: I am coming to that — the religion. This is all here —

Huwelikstaat; ouderdom; kwalifikasies en ondervinding; huidige betrekking; lees u koerante en ander tydskrifte (ja of nee)? Opvoedkundige, sielkundige en sosiologiese publikasies; (spesifiseer; noem u eie publikasies.

Then. —

Liefhebber; noem sake rakende u werk wat u graag met die inspekteur wil bespreek.

And then the part that must be filled in by the principal or the vice-principal, the man who must do the prying and the spying on his colleagues.

Mr. RUSSELL: You have said nothing about the questions in regard to his religion.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: What section is that?

Mr. RUSSELL: This is the question: „Is u lidmaat van 'n kerk; so ja, spesifiseer.”

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: What is the number?

Mr. RUSSELL: Paragraph 17.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: I am coming to that. We will have all of it —

Intelligensie; fisiese voorkoms . . .

This is what the hon. member was so concerned about —

Is hy voorbarig of beskeie?

All those things are there. This is the original copy and it was compiled during the time when the late Mr. Hofmeyr was Minister of Education, and it was approved by the late Mr. Hofmeyr as a means of trying to find some objective standard of qualification for teachers and their suitability for their particular jobs. The copy I have here is dated 28th September, 1947.

Mr. RUSSELL: Mine is dated 19th October, 1949.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Yes, I know. That is when it was sent out. But the form was prepared and was approved by the late Government, and that is the Government, if there is any truth in the remarks of the hon. member, which was busy prying and spying on the private lives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I have given you this example. I do not want to belabour the point. I merely want to say that this is the type of argument used by the hon. member, and if this is his type of argument and if the rest of his arguments are on a par with this — well, I do not think we are doing the hon. member an injustice if we say that the rest of his arguments was on a par with this. If the hon. member wants further examples of prying and spying, I would recommend to him to go and get hold of the cumulative record cards of scholars, also instituted by the late Government, and if he wants to know particulars about the private lives of the children, of their home life, he will find it there. But this paragon of virtue, this protagonist of all that is holy and freedom-loving in the country, never saw fit to belabour his Government because it was prying and spying on the lives of the population of South Africa. I think we can leave the hon. member to stew in the juice he has prepared for himself.

There is another excrescence I think I should remove at the start, and that is the speech of the hon. member for Cape Western (Mr. Kahn). I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a speech beneath all contempt. I think I would be doing this House an injustice and insult this House by trying to deal seriously with such a scurrilous speech as that of the hon. member. If such a speech had been delivered in Russia — if they have a Parliament there, which I very much doubt — I am quite sure the speaker would have been liquidated before sunrise tomorrow. Talking about a regimented state, a police state, by an hon. member with the ideological convictions of the hon. member for Cape Western, forsooth! It is too ridiculous to comment on.

Now let me come to the debate itself. I have listened, I think, for four or five days; I have heard the vials of simulated wrath poured on my head and poured on the Bill; I have heard hon. members opposite indulge in extravaganzas of over-statement and under-truth; I have heard the Bill subjected to ordeal by repetition. And yet I think, after listening for five days to this debate, one can say of this Bill what was said of the Bruce —

As motionless as rocks that bide the wrath of the advancing tide, the Bill stood fast.

tax so that John Citizen could get an abatement on his medical expenses, both for himself and for his family. I should like to have some provision made in that respect, because it is something which John Citizen is entitled to, as today no recognition in that respect is extended to him.

How does this Budget affect the poorer classes? There are prospects of employment and of cheaper fat products. The food subsidy remains. An amount of £8,500,000 is put down again for housing; as far as the farmers are concerned, other members on this side of the House will discuss their position.

The increase in the price of petrol will increase production costs; of that I am convinced, but I do realise that it will eventually bring about a reduction in the cost of transport. We must realise that the increase in the price of petrol will, in the long run, mean better roads and less money for repairs to motor vehicles and I, representing a part of the country where long distances have to be covered, know the tremendous need there is for better roads and we find in this Budget that for the very first time the Government has now said to the Provincial Councils: "We are making this a national task; we are going to complete our roads, and we are going to subsidise some of your roads, and you in turn can take over other Divisional Council roads and you can subsidise them." I think that the platteland, generally, once they realise the great asset they get in having £5,000,000 set aside annually for the improvement of roads, will most heartily welcome this. The people are anxiously looking forward to the return of normal conditions, and a healthy and sound household can only come into being when ordinary economic laws prevail. The people have to come out on their incomes and not on their savings and their capital. If they have to live on their capital or their savings, they will go under and that was why I was so pleased to read in the newspaper this morning the following remarks by Dr. T. W. de Jong, statistician of the Reserve Bank. He said this—

In the fourth quarter of last year South Africa actually had a favourable balance of about £39,000,000 in its dealings with overseas countries.

*Mr. BARLOW. Read the whole of it.

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: He further said—

According to a preliminary estimate by the Division of Economics and Markets the value of the Union's Agricultural products from 1947-'48 to 1949-'50 dropped by one per cent., but on account of the fact that the price index rose by nearly twelve per cent., the drop in actual pro-

duction for the year was about eleven per cent. During the same period the national income increased slightly and the value of South Africa's export to the sterling countries as well as to the non-sterling countries was also higher.

This is an improvement there—

As the result of larger employment by the mines and the higher price of gold through devaluation, the Union's production of minerals rose from £126,800,000 in 1948 to £146,000,000 in 1949.

There we have a further improvement — an increase in production. And then he goes on to say—

According to a preliminary estimate which excludes gold, the Union's current deficit with overseas countries dropped from £266,000,000 to £211,000,000.

If our gold production, excluding the Union's own gold consumption, is taken into account, the current deficit with overseas countries of about £167,000,000 in 1948 dropped last year (in 1948) to about £109,000,000.

And then he says—

In the fourth quarter of last year South Africa in actual fact had a favourable balance of about £39,000,000 with overseas countries.

Mr. KENTRIDGE: Why don't you read what he says about the cost of living?

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: It would appear that the hon. member for Troyeville (Mr. Kentridge) is sorry that there has been such a favourable change in this country. He is very sorry that South Africa now has a favourable trade balance which it did not have before, and I think the country is very grateful for this change.

Mr. BARLOW: Why don't you quote everything he says?

*Mr. J. H. CONRADIE: The Budget is an earnest attempt to establish a normal, perpetual norm. When we have derived the benefits which we expect, we shall be able to initiate further enterprises, as the Minister has said. When one considers this Budget and weighs it up, it makes one think of what happened, especially in Canada, during the last war. There they had a Government in power which immediately realised that enormous importation was going to take place. They thereupon restricted imports into Canada so that great expansion of industries took place and today they still have import restrictions. We must thank the Minister of Finance for the fact that he has faced and dealt with actualities. I

know that some hon. members will take him to task for having been orthodox and for lacking imagination, but I don't think this is the time for imagination; one has to deal with actual facts — this is the time to deal with actual facts. Furthermore, when one looks at this Budget one is reminded of what happened in America in the second half of the previous century. They had an experience similar to what we are having today. They required capital for further development and America's experience tells us that as they did not consolidate in America, they did not get the necessary capital from these rich old countries like England, France, Germany and Switzerland; but as soon as the world realised that they had consolidated their position and that there was security in America, the requisite capital flowed in for the country's development with the result that America is now the powerful factor which it has become in the economic world. We on this side of the House want to pay tribute to the contributions made by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Economic Affairs to this consolidation which they are trying to bring about in South Africa. We are grateful for what they are doing. I am convinced that if we carry on in that spirit the Minister of Finance ere long — just as happened in Canada last year — will also be able to introduce a sunshine Budget, a sunshine Budget which will give fresh privileges and fresh concessions to the people of South Africa. No, Mr. Speaker, we are very glad that a period of consolidation is going to prevail in South Africa because we know that after that we shall be able to break fresh ground and to initiate new things.

Mr. HEPPLE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Gordonia (Mr. J. H. Conradie) has attempted to cast a ray of brightness into the gloom presented to this House by the hon. the Minister of Finance last week. Like most other members in this House I remain unconvinced. The hon. the Minister of Finance has told us that the time has come for us to put our house in order. He has framed his Budget in this light and he feels that we have reached the stage where we have to prepare for a very gloomy future. It is significant though that the hon. the Minister of Finance omitted to paint the full picture in that he failed to point out to this House and to the country that one of the chief difficulties facing his Government and facing him in the framing of his Estimates, is the fact that he is trying to reconcile the social policy of his Government with economic policies, and he is finding it a most difficult task. For that reason he has attempted to divorce himself from the Government and to stand alone as the keeper of the public purse who is being harassed from all sides, and while he is being harassed

he pleads with everyone to assist him to make his task a little lighter, as no one seems to realise the doom that is awaiting South Africa if we continue to spend money at the rate at which we have spent it in the past. Yet, Sir, so often do we have from the Government benches the boast that industrial development is proceeding apace that new capital is coming to this country, that industrialists are setting up industries here and that we can expect a continuation of industrial development in which, in the words of the hon. the Minister of Finance himself, every section of the community will get its fair share. This Budget does not indicate that there is going to be any of that fair sharing. Before I deal with that, I would like to remind the hon. the Minister who complains about the growing size of his Budget, that South Africa is also growing, and it is a natural thing for us to expect that our Budget should grow from year to year, and the more rapidly our Budget grows the more it indicates that we are growing. The Minister pointed out that in 1939-'40 the Budget was £44 million and that it has now risen to over £140 million, but he should remember too that the national income has almost doubled itself in that period. Although many of us believe that the national income should be much greater than it is, we appreciate the fact that it has risen from £432 million in 1939-'40 to over £830 million in 1948-'49. The real trouble with budgeting in South Africa today is not so much that we are spending too much but that we are not encouraging production on a sufficiently large scale, and we are not encouraging those forces in this country that can build up our economy. The Minister has not indicated to this House in what respects we must put our house in order. He has merely indicated that we must stop spending as much money as we have spent in the past, but he has not suggested to this House in what way, by curtailing expenditure and by reducing our social services, we are going to continue to have what his colleagues on the Ministerial benches often boast about and that is industrial expansion in South Africa. I wonder if the Minister believes that the economy he is effecting, the halt he is calling upon the expansion of our social services, are going to check inflation? Surely this is the first indication that the Minister anticipates some form of depression; that he has not got the same buoyant hopes as some of his colleagues, that much of what is said from the Government benches to this House from time to time is nothing but idle words and that they have no meaning behind them. Last year the hon. the Minister said that the main theme of the Budget was one of caution and precaution. He has followed the same pattern this year. At that time he estimated that he would have a deficit of £590,000 which he optimistically told this House would pro-

bably disappear in the course of the year. Well, as we know, it did not disappear. Instead of that, we have now a deficit of £750,000. But I am not one of those who worry about deficits. We on these benches would be happy to see a bigger deficit provided there was no curtailment of social services, and provided the Government had some sort of plan and some sort of idea of the direction it was taking. The speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance and that of the hon. member for Gordonia (Mr. J. H. Conradie) indicated very clearly to this House the confusion that exists on the Government side of the House as to what the direction of the Government should be. We have seen legislative measures brought before this House, measures that will cost the country a lot of money, and it is surprising to most of us that the warning of the hon. the Minister was not able to prevent that costly legislation because most of it was very unnecessary; it was most unnecessary.

An HON. MEMBER: So you think.

Mr. V. G. F. SOLOMON: And he is quite right, too.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Furthermore, we constantly hear from the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs the boast that he has halted the rise in the cost of living. But the hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs is one of the most unfortunate Ministers in this House, because every time he makes a statement of that kind there is a further rise in the cost of living. The cost-of-living index figure continues to go up month by month, despite the assurance we had in this House only a few days ago from the hon. the Minister of Finance, when he said—

I am doing my best to prevent the cost of living from rising, but when people talk glibly of reducing the cost of living, and accuse this side of having said in the past that we are going to reduce the cost of living and ask us when we are going to do it, that brings the matter no further. Let us get away from that. Is that going to help the country? It may gain a few votes for my hon. friend, but it is not going to help the country. No, Sir, let us get rid of all this; we should all do our best to keep down the cost of living as far as possible, and as far as that is concerned, my colleague, the Minister of Economic Affairs, has done a great deal and has succeeded very largely in preventing any considerable increase.

In spite of that statement, the index went up another five points last month. Then the Minister of Finance ended in this way. He said—

If the question is whether I said that I have solved the cost-of-living problem, my

reply is that I would not be such a fool as to say that. The Government has not done it and no Government in the world has succeeded in doing it.

This is a direct contradiction of the statements which are constantly being made by the Minister of Economic Affairs and his colleagues. The country would like to know from this Government whether they have any hope of reducing the cost of living; whether we are to believe the Minister of Economic Affairs or the Minister of Finance. They would like to know if this Government really can do something to reduce the cost of living or whether it cannot. The cost-of-living index figures which are being quoted so often in this House and which are being quoted time and again because we are really disturbed at the trend in the cost of living, must be repeated when we see that the latest figure has gone up another five points, and has reached the all-time record of 155.1. The hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs is not in the House, but I hope he will take advantage of this debate to inform us what further plans he has to halt the cost of living. By that I mean halting it—not in the way he halted it once before, by an increase of four points—but halting it so that it will not go higher than this 155.1. The Minister of Economic Affairs boasted two and a half years ago in this House that he had a plan for reducing the cost of living. He made great play of it and ridiculed the hon. member for Vasco (Mr. Mushet). But what has he done? He has done nothing but boast that he has a plan, that he has halted the cost of living, and that we should wait and see. Well, we continue to wait but nothing happens, and it is in this direction that I hoped the Minister of Finance would have something in his Budget, to give some concessions to the wage and salary earners of this country in order to offset this rising cost of living. The Minister's statement that concessions are made to the poorer sections of the community does not bear fruit when we examine the fact that incomes remain static and the cost of living continues to rise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with another point which was made by the Minister in connection with the general economic situation in South Africa, and which I think requires elucidation. The Minister in the course of his speech pointed out that we must not lose sight of the consequence of the policy regarding the development of the non-European in this country. He said—

We are, I think on all sides of the House agreed on the principle that these people (the Natives) should not be hastened on the path which leads to their becoming a black proletariat. For that reason, as well as for historical reasons, we maintain

the principle that the land constituting their reserves should be inalienable.

And then he said that we should not lose sight of the effect of this policy, and continued to explain that that limits the extent of his budgeting. The Minister says—

That means in effect that the application of modern capital and technique to increase the wealth and carrying capacity of the country can be applied to its full extent in the European areas only. In the reserves there is very little scope for private capital, and the application of advanced technique must be paid for from public funds.

This statement is tied up with the whole policy of the Government in connection with industrial development in South Africa and its relation to the part that is to be played by the non-European people. I do not know if the Minister expects that we can regulate the industrial development of this country, because if he thinks so he must face up to the consequences of a policy of halting the natural development of industry in this country. He must face up to the fact that that will mean a continued deficit, a struggle to make ends meet and a curtailment of social services.

In the course of his speech the Minister pointed out the amount of money that was being spent on social services, particularly for non-Europeans. The policy of halting the natural development and the raising of productivity of the non-European in this country places an additional burden on the European — the European has to pay for those services, but if the non-European was allowed to develop and he is able to pay his own whack towards the finances of the country, we would be relieved of a great part of this burden. But if the policy of this Government is to maintain the non-European in a state of semi-peasantry, half-skilled and half-trained, then we cannot hope that our economy will develop to the extent that every section of the community will be able to make its contribution.

The hon. Minister of Labour spoke about wage incentives. What is the use of giving wage incentives to a handful of Europeans who are handicapped because they have not sufficient auxiliary labour in the form of higher-trained and better trained non-Europeans? The answer to the question of wage incentives that was raised by the hon. the Minister of Labour in this House comes from our whole economy. The answer is that we have to see to it that we utilise every section of this community and see that they make the greatest possible contribution towards the economy of the country itself. The Minister also knows that in order to keep one European in employment it is necessary to have a minimum of five

non-Europeans. We have built our economy on that. But how long we will be able to continue in that way it is difficult to guess. But we must accept one factor, and that is that one European is making indirect payments in order to support the other five non-Europeans, as long as these non-Europeans are retarded in their normal progress.

When the hon. the Minister of Finance referred to the question of not allowing the non-Europeans to develop too rapidly his statement was enigmatical to me. I do not know whether he wants to use artificial means to retard development in this country, or whether he means that we must resist attempts to develop industry by means of cheap black labour which is not properly trained and which is inefficient. I think that this is a point that should be dealt with by some Minister or other during the course of this debate, because industrialists who have been established for a long time and industrialists who are coming to this country are very anxious to know the role that Natives are to play in the development of their industries.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: What do you suggest? Should we open the door for Natives?

Mr. HEPPLE: The hon. the Minister knows that this is a very long and complicated question and cannot be answered by way of question and reply. He knows also that most of our secondary industries today are manned by non-Europeans who are getting no training to make them fully efficient. He knows that those industries are being run by non-Europeans who are semi-efficient.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: Not as craftsmen.

Mr. HEPPLE: Not as craftsmen, but the Minister also knows that our craftsmen comprise a very small percentage of our workmen in this country.

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: I just want to be clear on what you suggest.

Mr. HEPPLE: I will deal with that when the hon. Minister's Bill comes up for discussion; I will deal with that very fully. But in the meantime I would like the Minister of Labour to remember one thing when he talks about wage incentives, and that is that the majority of the operatives in our secondary industries in this country are non-Europeans, and that they are not receiving proper training to make them fully efficient.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to deal with the question of taxation. The Minister has spoken about the need to spend less and to

economise. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Finance does not realise the great difficulties that face the average householder in his endeavours to make ends meet. The large drop in savings that have been shown in the last twelve months is evidence of the necessity for people in this country to live on their savings. They are forced to use their savings in order to make ends meet. The hon. the Minister of Economic Affairs has said that the people are taking their savings out of the banks and post office in order to speculate on the Stock Exchange. That shows how little he knows of the lives of the ordinary people of this country — it shows that the Minister has absolutely no idea how difficult it is for people to make ends meet today with the rising cost of living and with their fixed incomes — the cost of living is constantly rising, but their incomes are fixed and are not progressing at the same rate.

Now the Minister has made a remark to this effect: He said—

I know that there are countries in which the rates of taxation are higher. Can we blindly follow their example in a country circumstanced as South Africa is?

I say to the Minister, "More so than in other countries". The inequalities of incomes in this country should be levelled out to a far greater degree than they are being. The Minister has wide enough scope to tax those few people with enormous incomes. In Great Britain incomes over £10,000 are taxed 76 per cent. and more. Yet the Minister said that we cannot follow that policy. Why not? Surely there is a maximum amount on which a man and his family can live. When we see, for instance, that a man with an income on the figures given by the Minister himself, of £16,000, retains £7,000, it seems as if a large slice has been taken away from him. But £7,000 is a lot of money for a person to live on; £7,000 is much more than anybody needs; the Minister can take a large slice of it, he can even take much more than he is taking. In Britain on the same income the taxpayer is left with £4,000.

Mr. C. M. WARREN: What becomes of capital formation?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Capital formation in this country should first come through the hands of the State. I will deal with the question of capital in this country, too. The Minister has a way out of that difficulty.

The hon. the Minister also referred to the maximum number of taxpayers we have got in this country; but he misses a very important point, and that is that the mass of the people are so poor that even the Minister cannot bring them into his tax brackets. In his direct taxation in this

country he cannot bring in more than 320,000 people, and very very few of those are in the income tax groups today. But even if the Minister were to extend it to that, what a small percentage it is of our population. I know that the Minister wants to know whether I wish him to extend his income tax to the lower income groups, and I anticipate him by saying, "No, definitely no." We used to have 29,000 super-taxpayers. I do not know what the figure is today, but the super-taxpayers can pay a lot more than they are paying at present.

An HON. MEMBER: Tax the rich.

Mr. HEPPLÉ: Sir, the hon. member is quite correct. We say, tax the rich. The poor people make their money for them. On the question of the utilisation of capital, I think the hon. the Minister of Finance has seen the benefits of the National Finance Corporation, from which he was able to get quite a lot of money during the past year, and which proved very useful to the hon. Minister. I would like to repeat a suggestion I made to him last year, and that is that what we need in this country in a Capital Investments Board. At the present moment there is insufficient control over capital for investment; the Government is competing with private enterprise, and we find a lot of useful capital being directed into useless, or unnecessary, or less useful channels. If we could set up this Capital Investments Board it could do several things. First of all it could ensure the quick investment of savings in capital needs; it could direct investments to correct priorities; it could see that those industries or those capital requirements of this country are satisfied before others; and it could prevent the dissipation of savings in unnecessary and foolish enterprises; and it could also, which is most important, it could prevent the spending of large sums of money on redundant machinery. There is a considerable amount of duplication of plant and machinery in this country, which is part and parcel of the profit system, the competitive system. Industrialists and factories are becoming equipped with more and more machinery, most of which is going to stand idle — and a lot of it is idle today. But this, of course, is going to cut across the Minister's attitude towards private enterprise itself; this Government is committed to the protection of private enterprise. That is the reason why it cannot reduce the cost of living, that is the reason why it cannot tax the rich man more than it is doing. But when the Minister says that South Africa is drifting by the inevitability of gradualness to Socialism, I cannot help but smile. He says, "As things stand South Africa is achieving Socialism by a process of erosion of the public financial structure". And here he issues a warning to the two major parties in the country. He says—

The fact that they have received a candid exposition of the situation as it really is will give rise to a beneficial reaction. The rate at which the expenditure of our country has increased during the past forty years is truly alarming if viewed superficially and in this connection there was also some criticism from the other side of the House. We must not, however, forget that during the last decade it was not this Government, but those members on the other side of the House who set the pace for the increase of our expenditure and that the increase of £8,000,000 this year is also still largely due to the expansion of services introduced when the other side of the House was responsible for our financial affairs. But I agree with the remarks made here that the increase, however alarming, is still not entirely out of proportion to our national income, although, of course, it would be a bad policy if we were to hold out the prospect that our expenditure account will keep pace with our national income. As we have heard, the Budget was favourably received and I think I could describe it by saying that it is a conservative Budget, that it is courageous and that this Budget testifies to the essential economic principles which form part and parcel of the Minister's characteristic view of our economic affairs. During the period in which he has managed the economic affairs of South Africa he has lived up to those principles, and, indeed, the general public expected no less of him. On the contrary, I believe that the 325,000 tax-payers to whom the hon. Minister referred, would have been disappointed if we had not at this stage come forward with a budget of the type which we now have before us. The Minister has left our taxes untouched, except in the case of petrol, our posts, telegraphs and telephones, and I feel certain that the people will raise no lament on that score. The fact remains that the Budget has been favourably received and it will result in new capital flowing into the country and it will be exceedingly reassuring in respect of capital already invested here, it will give new industries established here opportunities of development and consolidation and it will encourage older industries and give them the opportunity of once more organising on a permanent basis. In short, the consolidation resulting from the Budget and the taxes announced cannot but increase confidence both in this country and abroad. The fact that the investors abroad will not have to pay double taxation must of necessity be a further encouragement to people wishing to invest their money and the fact that the Minister has once more earnestly insisted on saving, both by the State and by the individual, must needs create confidence and cannot but be favourably received on all sides. From time to time unavoidable con-

ditions have originated in our country, and there have been critical situations which have compelled the Government of the time to intervene. I remember how, in the beginning the State provided relief in drought-stricken areas and how, perhaps during the same Session of Parliament, relief had again to be granted to another part of our country in order to assist people afflicted by the ravages of a flood. At first this type of assistance was largely confined to the platteland, but the important point is that social services were being introduced with a view to helping the urban areas in particular, those measures gradually developed into a system which today has come to form part and parcel of the obligations and the task of the State, although at first these measures had been regarded purely as temporary expedients. Who, for instance, would have thought 30 years ago that it would become the responsibility of the State to provide housing for the European population? Who could have dreamt 30 years ago that attempts would be made to introduce free medical services throughout this country for citizens, for every citizen irrespective of his income? Who would have dreamt that the State would take over the task of providing for Native housing on such a scale as is aimed at today? If all these services are taken into account, not to mention the grants made to the cripples and the blind, the colossal sums spent on old age pensions and war pensions, how can one expect anything but an immense increase in State expenditure? But it must be borne in mind that all these measures, however well meant, have not always had such very satisfactory results and that they have not always served the purpose for which they were introduced. It must be remembered that we have millions of primitive Coloured people and Natives here and in their case these social services often have an effect which is exactly opposite to the effect on the civilised Europeans, because in many cases those who receive assistance from the State in the form of a few shillings do not see why they should provide for their own needs any longer. They prefer to keep on living at the expense of the State and they refuse to do another stitch of work. So these social services do not always have the desired effect and the results expected are not always forthcoming. Therefore, rightly or wrongly, I feel convinced that the time has come for the State to subject these social services which have been introduced on such a large scale, to a very thorough and searching investigation. They must be subjected to a total reorganisation and a drastic revision. I want to go further. Nobody appreciates the services rendered by the civil servants better than we on these benches. But, Mr. Speaker, the question also arises whether the cost structure of our Civil Service has not increased so much that a revision of the situation has

MEMORANDUM
 11/3/50
 10/3/50
 11/3/50
 12/3/50
 13/3/50
 14/3/50
 15/3/50
 16/3/50
 17/3/50
 18/3/50
 19/3/50
 20/3/50

The hon. member for East London (City) (Dr. Smit) has referred to an address given by Dr. Eiselen, prior to becoming Secretary, defining apartheid, which definition, as that hon. member has shown, has been repudiated by the Minister.

Dr. VAN RHYN: The word "repudiate" is wrong.

Maj. VAN DER BYL: Let us then say he turned it down; he did not agree with it. I am prepared to accept anything that is reasonable. On the 16th February in Another Place, however, the Minister said he had appointed him because "he was a supporter of the present Government". I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what an admission! And that "he was satisfied he would carry out their policy". (Page 634, Senate Hansard).

An HON. MEMBER: What is wrong with that?

Maj. VAN DER BYL: May I ask the Minister on what grounds he infers that the eleven senior officers would not carry out the Government's policy? Let me point out that they were all loyal to a former Nationalist Government in which he was a Minister of Native Affairs. Will he tell us — were they ever disloyal to him then? Did they not carry out his policy? [Time limit.]

*Mr. NEL: I want to reply just briefly to the speech of the hon. member for Green Point (Maj. van der Byl) in reference to his attack on the appointment of Dr. Eiselen as Secretary for Native Affairs. In the first place I want to say that it is a tragedy for South Africa that we did not have a man like Dr. Eiselen as Secretary of Native Affairs years ago. In that event we would not have had the conditions we have around us today. Dr. Eiselen is a person who knows the Natives as few people in South Africa know them today, and that fact is recognised by all scientists inside and outside South Africa. He is an outstanding figure as far as his knowledge of the Native's mode of life and Native languages are concerned. That fact is recognised not only in South Africa, but in all parts of Africa and abroad. Perhaps the hon. member for Green Point is unaware of the fact that the British government appointed Dr. Eiselen to report on certain aspects of the Native problem in the protectorates. He must be ignorant of that fact, otherwise he would not have made that sort of accusation.

Not only that, but Dr. Eiselen is known amongst the Native population. They know him as a person who has their interests at heart, and I assure the House that few appointments have been made recently which have been more welcomed by the Native

population than the appointment of Dr. Eiselen as Secretary for Native Affairs. Let me give an instance of what happened at Umtata. A prominent member of the Bunga congratulated Dr. Eiselen on his appointment, and he said that in spite of the fuss made in the English Press the Natives were aware of the fact that Dr. Eiselen was their friend and would look after their interests, that he was a person who trusted them and who was trusted by them. Can there be better evidence of the approval of any appointment? You can go through the length and breadth of the country and you will find that the Native population have confidence in him because they know him to be a just and honest person. He speaks their language and he knows them inside out.

I also want to assure the House that even in the Civil Service, few appointments have given rise to so much satisfaction as this one, in spite of the terrific campaign that was launched. I have spoken to English-speaking officials in different parts of the country, and they did not hesitate to congratulate us on the appointment of Dr. Eiselen as Secretary for Native Affairs. I have no fears for the future. Within this short period he has already earned the respect of everyone with whom he has come into contact. He will be one of the mainstays of the Department. But, Mr. Chairman, members opposite do not want us to obtain the services of people who will render the best services to the country. No, they want to put those people into cold storage. They do not want to make use of their services because they do not consider the solution of this problem seriously.

Business suspended at 6.30 p.m. and resumed at 8.5 p.m.

Evening Sitting.

*Mr. NEL: When business was suspended, I was showing that the policy of that party has always been to put efficient people into cold storage. I also pointed out that the British government had ignored its own officials and a number of highly-placed officials in North Africa and South Africa and had asked Dr. Eiselen to make recommendations in connection with certain aspects of the Native problem in the protectorates. The British government could employ the services of that man but we dare not make use of him. For nearly 18 years Dr. Eiselen was chief inspector of Native schools in the Transvaal. He built up an administration there of which we can all be proud. Because of the tactful leadership and guidance given by him we have this position in the Transvaal today that the Natives are coming together there to establish their own schools, that to a great

know whether the hon. the Minister has examined the implications of that proposal and its effect on the economy of this country. I think that we all agree upon one thing and that is that we have not sufficient European labour to man our industries at the present time and if he wants to carry out the policy of industrialisation, which is the policy of the Nationalist Party as well as that of other parties, then we must have in the interim period before we start towards the goal that has been mentioned, this Native force. If we have to have this Native force, which the Minister of Finance referred to as the black proletariat, we must accept the fact that we have an urban Native population. The Minister has referred to this urban Native population and has put them into three categories, those that have work and homes, those that have work and no homes, and, thirdly, those that have no home and no work. He said that they will have to be dealt with under those three categories. As far as the first category is concerned, the Minister said there is no problem. What he really meant was this: Their problem is not so serious. Nevertheless, the homes of these Natives are not conducive to their health and the health of the European population. As far as the second category is concerned, we all know the seriousness of the problem of providing houses for Natives in urban areas. That presupposes, if we look at the second category that we have to embark upon large-scale plans for housing these Natives in urban areas. Associated therewith is the problem of where they have to be housed and where permanent sites for Natives should be placed. We know particularly in areas like the Witwatersrand how difficult it is to provide permanent sites for the setting up of Native townships, because as these townships are set up and develop, they begin to encroach on one another and these Native townships spread right on to the borders of adjacent towns. We have the problem at Germiston as an example. Germiston has not yet solved its problem of a Native township. It believed it had, but it hasn't. Others who are responsible for providing these townships realise the difficulties confronting them and as the Witwatersrand and the Transvaal urban areas develop, so also the problems of urbanised Native labour develop and become very much more serious than in the past. That is the problem which requires our thoughts and consideration, not only of the Minister, but of everybody, and I wonder whether the Minister and his Department have given consideration to this particular aspect. Then the second problem that arises is that if there has to be a limitation on the labour force for industry, what is going to happen to those industries? Is there a plan to decide quotas, which is the policy of the Nationalist Party? Is there going to be a plan? Are

industrialists going to be told that there is a ceiling on labour they will be entitled to employ? There are many other problems associated with the propositions put forward by the hon. the Minister.

There is the second proposition of the decentralisation of industries, the putting up of industries in rural areas. That is another problem which has exercised the minds of the people in this country for a long time, because there are reasons why industries are established in certain urban areas. There are sound technical reasons for that. Of course there are certain industries that are merely established in urban areas because it is the most convenient spot. But there are many other industries that are established in those urban areas for very sound economic and technical reasons. There are many reasons, but I will just give one. Certain industries are established in the port towns of South Africa. They cannot be decentralised and pushed into the rural areas, because that would be completely uneconomic. There is also the position of other industries that have been established inland, in the centre of urban areas for the reason that they are dealing with perishable goods and they have to have access to markets. The question of having close access to market is very important. These are only some of the aspects. I have not much time left, but I finally want to put to the Minister a question regarding his proposition for the ultimate establishment of European industries in European areas and Native industries in Native areas. I wonder whether the implications of that proposition have been examined to the fullest extent? We know that the Native population exceeds that of the Europeans by four or five to one and when eventually we have built up these industries in the Native areas, are we not sounding the death knell of European economic society in this country? This is an important aspect, too. As industries are built up, our descendants may be faced with the fact that the Bantu will become nationalistic, as they are becoming today, and say "Buy black, buy goods produced by black people", or "Do not support white industries".

Mr. VAN NIEKERK: Have they got factories?

Mr. HEPPLÉ: But you propose to give them to them. Your proposition is to establish industries in the Native areas. The point is this: The Minister of Native Affairs' criticism does not solve the problem. The question is what are you going to do. We talk about saving European posterity, but here the proposition is being put up about absolute apartheid and the establishment of large and big industries in the Native areas, which may be the death knell of

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.