FRIDAY, 21 AUGUST 2026

_____

PROCEEDINGS OF MINI-PLENARY SESSION OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

_____

Members of the mini-plenary session met on the virtual platform at 10:00.

The House Chairperson, Mr W Horn, took the Chair and requested members to observe a moment of silence for prayer or meditation.

Announcement

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon members, before we proceed, I would like to remind you that this virtual mini-plenary session is deemed to be in the precinct of Parliament and constitutes a meeting of the National Assembly for debating purposes only. In addition to the Rules of virtual sittings, the Rules of the National Assembly, including the Rules of debate, apply. Members enjoy the same powers and privileges that apply in a sitting of the National Assembly. Members should equally note that anything said on the virtual platform is deemed to have been said to the House and may be ruled upon.

UNREVISED HANSARD

All members who have logged in shall be considered present and are requested to mute their microphones and unmute only when recognised to speak. This is because the mics are very sensitive and will pick up noise that might disturb the attention of other members. When recognised to speak, please unmute your microphone and, where connectivity permits, connect your video.

Members may make use of the icons on the bar at the bottom of their screens, which have an option that allows a member to raise their hand for points of order. The Secretariat will assist in alerting the Chair to the members requesting to speak.

Lastly, when using the virtual system, members are urged to refrain or desist from unnecessary points of order or interjections.

PREVENTION AND COMBATING OF CORRUPT ACTIVITIES AMENDMENT BILL

(First Reading debate)

Ms D E JAMES: Hon House Chair, Action SA’s Zero Tolerance Corruption Bill has been in development for more than a year as part of its broader anticorruption reform package. It flows directly from our policy commitment to declare corruption public

UNREVISED HANSARD

enemy number one. However, this Bill is also deeply personal. It is shaped by what I have witnessed since arriving in Parliament more than two years ago, and by the many stories I hear from ordinary South Africans whose lives have been destroyed by corruption.

The destruction caused by corruption is not distant or abstract. Every year, according to the Public Service Accountability Monitor, between R27 billion and R100 billion is stolen through corruption in South Africa. And the truth is, we are simply not angry enough. Because when corruption steals billions, our communities pay the price.

When I conduct oversight at the police stations on the Cape Flats and find that only one working police vehicle is servicing tens of thousands of residents while gangs terrorise communities, that is a consequence of corruption. When our roads become more pothole than road, that is the consequence of corruption. When the National Drug Master Plan receives only a few million rand to fight the devastating scourge of addiction, tearing our moms, our families, and our communities apart, that too is the consequence of corruption. When there are not enough social workers to rescue children from the pella pos [drug den], that is a direct consequence of corruption.

UNREVISED HANSARD

So, what have we done? When individuals accused of corruption appear before parliamentary committees and are greeted as heroes and as grootman [respected man], we must confront the painful truth. As a Parliament, as the people's representatives, we have allowed a culture to develop that rewards corruption instead of punishing it. There is no fear of consequences. People commit corruption openly because they know that, in many cases, nothing will happen to them. And if they are caught, too often, the punishment amounts to little or nothing more than just a slap on the wrist.

Corruption has become a high-reward and low-risk crime.

Afrikaans:

So kan dit nie aangaan nie.

English:

We must change that. This is where this Bill intervenes. At its core, this Bill does three critical things. Firstly, it introduces mandatory minimum sentences for acts of corruption, something that South Africa has never had before. These minimum sentences are linked to the level of the court in which the cases are tried. For the magistrates' court, we propose a minimum sentence of five years; for the regional court, a minimum

UNREVISED HANSARD

sentence of 15 years; and for the High Court, a minimum sentence of 18 years.

The message is clear. Corruption will no longer be treated lightly. Courts must impose sentences appropriate to the seriousness of the offence, with lesser sentences permitted only in exceptional circumstances.

Second, the Bill doubles the fine for those who fail to disclose that they have been blacklisted to R500 000, while increasing the possible prison sentence from three years to five years.

Third, the Bill lowers the reporting threshold for fraud and forgery from R100 000 to R30 000, placing a stronger obligation on accounting officers to report corruption before it becomes another massive scandal.

In short, the Bill begins to end an era of impunity. It ensures that the culture of corruption and paying must come to an end, but there is much more work to do. That is why Action SA has developed a corruption reform package. It includes our fallen Whistle-Blower Protection Bill, our Blacklist Corrupt Supplier Bill, and today, the Zero Tolerance Corruption Bill, as well as future legislation to reform the NPA.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We do this with a clear understanding that we must take a holistic approach to combat corruption, protect those who expose it, strengthen prosecution of it, and ensure that committing corruption carries stern and unavoidable consequences.

For me this morning, it is a great honour and a privilege to take up this fight to ensure stern and unavoidable consequences, securing the knowledge of the co-ordinated work of my other Action SA colleagues. This is for the residents of the Cape Flats who call the police and wait hours for a van that never comes; for businesses and residents whose lives are affected because basic services are collapsing around them; for those struggling with addiction who are left without support that they desperately need; for the children trapped in the pella posse [drug dens] waiting for help that seldom arrives, and for the millions of South Africans who simply want to see those who steal from the public held accountable and placed behind bars in orange overalls where they belong.

So, I ask every party in this House to seriously consider whether we, as a nation, support the continued erosion of our social and moral fabric through corruption, or do we support strong, unavoidable consequences for those who commit it? Do you support corruption or are you willing to fight it? The people of South

UNREVISED HANSARD

Africa are watching us closely this morning, and we dare not fail them. I thank you.

Mr V G REDDY: Hon House Chairperson, the time limit, as we were informed by the Table staff, for declarations is normally four minutes. Please clarify that. Thank you.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Yes, it is the same sequence as declarations, but input is limited to three minutes for all parties. So, every party has three minutes. Thank you.

Declarations of vote:

Ms Z S ABADER: Good morning, Chairperson. Thank you for the opportunity. I greet you all in the name of peace.

Arabic:

[Unofficial language spoken.]

English:

The MKP welcomes the opportunity to debate the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Amendment Bill. The MK Party has no sympathy for corruption. We have no sympathy for those who steal public money, and we have no sympathy for those who use political office, government contracts, and public institutions

UNREVISED HANSARD

to enrich themselves. Corruption is not a victimless crime. Every rand stolen is a classroom not built, a hospital that does not receive equipment, a road that is not repaired, and a South African family denied a better life.

We therefore support the principle of stronger consequences for corruption, but we must not fool the people. South Africa does not suffer from a shortage of laws against corruption. South Africa suffers from a shortage of enforcement. We already have the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act, we have the Hawks, we have the National Prosecuting Authority, we have the Special Investigating Unit, we have the Asset Forfeiture Unit, and we have the Auditor-General, yet corruption continues. So, the question is not simply how many years a convicted corrupt person will spend in prison. The real question is why corrupt people are not being arrested, prosecuted, and convicted in the first place.

This Bill proposes tougher minimum sentences and seeks to lower the reporting threshold for certain offences from R100 000 to R30 000. That is welcome, but, if we increase the number of matters reported without increasing investigative and prosecutorial capacity, we risk creating more dockets without more convictions. The MK Party therefore calls for a complete

UNREVISED HANSARD

anticorruption chain: detection, investigation, prosecution, conviction, asset recovery, imprisonment, and permanent consequences for those who abuse public office. We also need accountability for officials who deliberately sit on credible corruption allegations because corruption flourishes not only because corrupt people steal; it flourishes because people in authority sometimes allow them to steal.

We must recover stolen assets, we must expose the beneficiaries, we must follow the money, and we must stop treating corruption as an occasional scandal. It is an assault on the Republic. Therefore, the MK Party supports the objective of strengthening the law, but we demand that Parliament goes further. We want consequences that are real, enforcement that is relentless, and a state that is incapable of protecting the corrupt. South Africa does not need another piece of legislation that looks tough on paper. South Africa needs a state that is tough enough to put the corrupt behind bars.

I thank you. Vote MKP on 4 November. Thank you.

Ms M R MOHLALA: Chair and hon members, the EFF rises to declare its support for the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Amendment Bill. We support this Bill because

UNREVISED HANSARD

corruption in South Africa is not simply a criminal problem. It is a class problem. It is a political problem. It is a problem of elitism and the protection of powerful interests.

For too long, our country has operated a two-tier system of justice: one law for the poor and another for the politically connected, wealthy, and powerful. A poor South African can spend years in prison for a minor offence, whilst those who steal millions from the public purse, often connected to the current regime or its allies, use their wealth and influence to delay justice and escape with lenient consequences.

Let us be clear: Corruption did not end with the Zuma presidency. It persisted under the current administration of President Ramaphosa, whose tenure has been met by scandals such as Digital Vibes, COVID-19 personal protective equipment corruption, investigations involving the National Lotteries Commission, the National Student Financial Aid Scheme, Eskom, Transnet, and many more. The unresolved questions surrounding Phala Phala remain a stark reminder that no individual, regardless of position, should be above scrutiny.

The EFF’s stance is simple. No person, including the President, must receive special treatment. When serious allegations

UNREVISED HANSARD

involving money, security, or public office arise, accountability must be universal. The era of state capture revealed how political power and private interests can work in tandem to undermine our institutions. The Zondo Commission exposed great failures at Eskom, Transnet, and other state-owned entities, demonstrating that corruption remains entrenched at the highest level of government.

This is why the EFF supports stronger mandatory consequences for serious corruption. There can be no impunity. If someone steals money meant for hospitals, they are depriving sick patients of medicines. If they steal from municipalities, they deny communities access to water. If they loot schools, they steal the future of our children. Corruption is an attack on the working class and the poor.

We welcome the reduction of the mandatory reporting threshold from R100 000 to R30 000. There must be no hiding corruption in government offices, boardrooms, or internal communities anymore. We also support measures for strong accountability for those who deliberately ignore corruption, silence whistle-blowers, or conceal audit findings because silence in the face of corruption is not neutrality; it is complicity. Parliament must also empower law enforcement agencies, including the Hawks, with sufficient

UNREVISED HANSARD

investigators, forensic specialists, technology, and resources. Without capacity, even the strongest laws are ineffective on paper. Protecting whistle-blowers is crucial. The murder of Babita Deokaran remains a painful reminder of the risk faced by those who dare to expose corruption.

The EFF supports this Bill because we reject a society where the poor are punished for survival but where elites are shielded from their crimes. We reject political connections as a substitute for justice. We reject corporate boardrooms and safe havens for corruption, and we reject the idea that billions stolen from our poor can be reduced to negotiations between the lawyers. The public purse belongs to the people.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Thank you, hon member.

Ms M R MOHLALA: Whether you are a Minister, municipal officer, company director, billionaire, or politically connected individual, if you steal from the poor, you must face the full might of the law. The EFF supports this Amendment Bill. The era of impunity must end.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon member, your time has now expired. Thank you.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr M A MNCWANGO: Hon Chairperson, corruption is not a victimless crime. Every rand that is lost through corruption is a rand that cannot be used to improve schools, hospitals, infrastructure, local government, or the lives of ordinary South Africans. A government that seeks to reduce poverty, inequality, and unemployment must first ensure that public resources are protected and that those who abuse their positions face meaningful consequences.

The Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Amendment Bill responds to this kind of challenge by strengthening the consequences for corruption offences and lowering the reporting threshold for certain offences from R100 000 to R30 000. Corruption and financial misconduct cannot be confronted only once they reach the largest amount. Smaller acts of fraud and abuse can also undermine institutions and erode public trust.

However, tougher sentences will mean little for increasing public trust if the state cannot detect, investigate, and prosecute corruption effectively. Lowering the reporting threshold will potentially bring more matters into the criminal justice system. We must therefore closely monitor if existing institutional capacity will be sufficient to deal with this increased

UNREVISED HANSARD

responsibility. The IFP welcomes this Amendment Bill, hon Chairperson. Thank you.

Mr E HENDRICKS: Chair and hon members, this Amendment Bill is presented in good faith, but there are, however, some issues with these amendments.

The first would be the unconstitutional infringement of judicial independence and the introduction of right mandatory minimum sentence, ranging from five years in the magistrate's court to life imprisonment in High Court. It strips the judiciary of its constitutional discretion by removing a judge's ability to weigh the unique mitigating factors of an individual's case. The Bill risks imposing disproportionate punishment that violates the right to a fair trial.

The second would be overburdening the justice system. Lowering the mandatory reporting threshold under section 34 from R100 000 to R30 000 will flood law enforcement agencies with low-level financial infractions. The Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation, the DPCI or the Hawks, and the National Prosecuting Authority are already facing severe resource constraints. Clogging the system with minor reporting obligations

UNREVISED HANSARD

will dilute focus away from high-level systematic state capture and grand corruption.

The third would be the negative economic and administrative impact, including the steep escalation of financial penalties to R500 000 and extended jail time for minor administrative compliance failures in procurement. Blacklisting creates an environment of overregulation. Instead of deterring corrupt actors, it places a punitive administrative burden on small, medium and micro enterprises and local municipalities that lack a sophisticated compliance framework.

We should consider alternative recommendations. The current Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act already provides a robust statutory framework to prosecute corruption. The collapse of corruption cases in South Africa is not caused by a lack of severe legislative penalties but rather by a systematic weakness in investigative capacity, forensic auditing resources, and prosecutorial implementation.

In conclusion, the Amendment Bill should be revisited, and alternative recommendations should be taken into consideration. I thank you, Chairperson.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr W W WESSELS: Hon House Chairperson, the FF Plus has no objection to this Amendment Bill by the hon James and ActionSA, and it is most welcome.

The hon Hendricks is mistaken. There is nothing wrong with imposing minimum sentences, and the proposals in this Amendment Bill with regard to stricter and more serious sanctions for corrupt activities are most welcome, and that should be supported by this House.

Section 34 of the principal Act obligates reporting of theft, fraud, extortion, and forgery of R100 000 to the DPCI, the Hawks. The Hawks are already understaffed and underfunded, and we know how long investigations by the DPCI take, and the decrease of that obligated amount of R100 000 to R30 000 will have the unintended consequence of flooding the DPCI with even more backlogs and cases. That does not mean that it should not be done. What we need is also to address the shortcomings in our corrupt activities fighting sector and to increase the budget but to also think of, really, the independence of these crime-fighting bodies and the whole system of corruption investigations that is currently incoherent and underfunded.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Just the asbestos case of Ace Magashule is an example of how long justice takes to really take place. That case has been in the court for almost a decade, yet there's still no progress. We need to have consequences, and I want to echo what other members have said — that legislation is one thing, and it's good, but to have enforcement and actual practical consequences for corrupt activities, that is what is needed. Currently, we don't have that. Criminals and those that are guilty of corruption are still roaming free, and the people are suffering because of that. Thank you, Chair.

Ms D E JAMES: Hon Chair and hon members, I rise to close this debate with gratitude, with disappointment and ...

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): ... hon James, it's not yet your opportunity to close. It's now the opportunity of ActionSA to contribute to the debate. There's still other parties to make contributions.

Ms D E JAMES: Yes, Chair. I'd like to address those who supported and who rejected.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Okay.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms D E JAMES: First, my gratitude to the parties and the members who supported this Bill. I say thank you. You did not support me, you supported a principle. You supported the people of South Africa. This Bill was never about politics. It was about saying, enough. Enough with looting dressed up as leadership and enough with irregular expenditure that robs clinics of medicine and schools are feeding.

Second, my disappointment to those who did not support, such as the PA. Those who did not support this Bill, I listened carefully to your arguments, and I must say, with respect, they hold not water. To be honest, the reason why some cannot support an anticorruption Bill is because corruption has become comfortable. It has become the business model for some parties and this Bill threatens that business model. Finally, my resolve, if this Bill does not pass, we will bring it back again and again because the people did not send us here to be comfortable, they sent us here to be accountable.

So, I thank this House and I thank the parties who chose the country over a party. To those who chose otherwise, the people are watching and they will remember. I thank you.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr S N SWART: House Chair, I greet you all in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. The ACDP has taken note of this draft Bill and commends Ms James for the initiative. Fighting corruption in South Africa is vital because it loots public money, hinders the provision of basic services and infrastructure and prevents economic growth. By stopping corruption, we can protect jobs, build better schools and hospitals and ensure a better future for everyone in the country.

Regrettably, however, corruption has reached staggering levels in society, where criminality has even infiltrated to the highest levels of our criminal justice system. It is crucial, then, to apply effective existing laws far more effectively, and to amend laws where there are perceived gaps, as this Bill seeks to do. The ACDP supports the proposed mandatory minimum sentences in the bill. Stiffer minimum sentences can be a useful deterrent to corrupt practices and have been found to be constitutional by our courts.

We also support tougher proposed sanctions for hiding corrupt blacklisted status. The sad reality, however, is that out of 500 referrals made by anticorruption bodies like the Special Investigating Unit, SIU, hundreds of companies still receive state tenders because they have not been blacklisted. So, whilst

UNREVISED HANSARD

doubling the fines and jail sentences may help, the issue is why aren't these companies being blacklisted in the first place?

As far as the reduction of the mandatory reporting threshold for corruption is concerned, the question is similar, how effective will it be? How many people have been prosecuted for non-compliance with the existing section 34, where the threshold is 100 000? Very few, if any, to our knowledge.

The amendment commendably does, however, seek to address the possible loophole where similar but repeated offences below the threshold may go unpunished. If, then, one is to increase the sentences for not blowing the whistle, then those that do blow the whistle must be far more effectively protected, particularly given the victimisation and even assassination of whistleblowers like Babita Deokaran. The new Protected Disclosure Bill goes some way in improving that protection.

In addition, harsher sentences for victimising and harming whistleblowers should be introduced and financial incentives. Lastly, the ACDP welcomes this initiative to strengthen the fight against corruption and looks forward to engaging with this Bill in the Justice Portfolio Committee. It's time for the looters to be looted and the plunderers to be plundered.

UNREVISED HANSARD

It’s time for justice and righteousness in the country. I thank you.

Xitsonga:

Tat S M GANA: Mutshamaxitulu, ...

English:

... let me also thank hon James for this important amendment. From ourselves as Rise Mzansi, we are friends to those that fight corruption and any efforts that are made to fight this cancer of stealing. Sometimes we use the concept of corruption and we don’t call it for what it is. Because, it is stealing from the public.

Actually, I feel, hon James, that the amendments are not going far enough and I hear those that say, no, the mandatory sentences ... You know, what we have argued as Rise Mzansi, we have said that those, especially the state employees, that are caught stealing from the public purse they should not have their pension, we must withhold their pension. You can’t steal from the people and then the only punishment that you get is that you are fired and then you walk away with your pension. That’s number one.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Those that are employees of the state, political leaders, Ministers, premiers, mayors, they should not have their pension. one which this bill must go far enough, hon James and those that are in the Justice portfolio, is that the people that are convicted of stealing from the public, that which we call a corruption, when they are in prison, they must wear a different kind of uniform.

They must wear a lime green uniform so that everyone that goes in there, they must be able to point out that these people in lime green are the ones that have stolen from the people of South Africa. On weekends, in their lime green uniform, they must be on the streets cleaning the streets of South Africa because they have stolen from the people of South Africa. That is what will help us deal with corruption in this country.

So, we accept the amendments that you have put forward, hon James, but we are saying, as Rise Mzansi, it’s not going far enough because we need to be able to see when we visit these correctional facilities, those that have stolen from the people, they must be differentiated with a kind of uniform and the overalls that they are wearing there. It must be lime green.

UNREVISED HANSARD

It must be different from the other ones so that we can see these are the people that have stolen from the people of South Africa. These criminals, they are convicted of stealing from the people of South Africa, but we support all the efforts that are made to combat and arrest those that have made it their life mission to steal from the people of South Africa.

Xitsonga:

Ndza khensa, Mutshamaxitulu.

Adv G BREYTENBACH: Hon House Chair, the DA certainly supports the underlying objective of this Bill. Corruption must carry real and serious consequences and this Bill must certainly come from a good intention. Corruption plagues our society and citizens are the ultimate victims. It threatens the very foundations of our constitutional democracy.

It should make us very angry, but Parliament should not support legislation simply because its title sounds tough. The Bill proposes increased minimum sentences, raises penalties and lowers the reporting threshold for certain offences. This will have the effect of flooding an already struggling criminal justice system.

UNREVISED HANSARD

This Bill is not as targeted as ActionSA suggests. The provision for mandatory minimum sentencing does not establish a framework based on the amount of money involved. Instead, it applies minimum sentences to a list of offences in the Act, regardless of monetary value.

The law should distinguish between sophisticated corruption and offences involving much smaller amounts. Justice requires proportionality. We already have minimum sentences for serious corruption, but if people are not being convicted in the first place, increasing sentences does not solve the problem.

Investigations take too long, politically connected individuals evade prosecution, evidence is lost, witnesses are not protected and we lack investigative and prosecutorial capacity. South Africa needs consistent enforcement. The DA has long argued for a permanent specialised and genuinely independent anticorruption commission with the capacity to pursue connected corrupt individuals. This is the reform South Africa needs. Sentencing policy alone does not constitute an anticorruption strategy. Corruption flourishes because people believe they will not be caught.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The greatest deterrent is the certainty of detection, prosecution and conviction. The DA proposes a specialised anticorruption commission and that the National Prosecuting Authority, NPA, have budgetary independence. This will provide the skills and resources required to prosecute complex corruption cases. We should not pass laws for political theatre, we must pass laws that work. South Africa cannot legislate its way out of corruption through harsher sentences alone. We need prevention, detection, investigation, prosecution, conviction, asset recovery and consequences.

We need procurement systems that can’t be abused, competent officials and protection of whistleblowers. When corruption is proven, we need to implement existing serious consequences. The DA cannot support a legislation because it looks tougher on crime. Our laws must be enforceable and effective. The DA’s message is simple. The DA does not want corruption to become more severely punished only on paper.

ActionSA wants to look tough on corruption, the DA actually wants to fight it. We need an independent anticorruption commission that will restore public trust, protect taxpayers and build a South Africa that is governed in the interests of all its people, rather than the politically connected few.

UNREVISED HANSARD

I thank you.

Mr M S CHABANE: Chairperson, the African National Congress welcomes the opportunity to participate in the First Reading Debate on the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Amendment Bill introduced by hon James.

Corruption remains one of the most serious threats to our democracy and developmental agenda. It diverts public resources away from the people and undermines confidence in the state and its institutions. The ANC, therefore, supports firm and consistent actions against corruption.

The Bill proposes two key amendments to the prevention and combating of corrupt activities. It seeks to introduce mandatory minimum sentences for certain corruption offences ranging from five years in magistrates' courts to 18 years in High Courts, with the possibility of life imprisonment. It also proposes reducing the threshold for mandatory reporting of certain offences from 100 to 30 000. We recognise the intentions behind these proposals. Those who abuse public office or entrusted resources for personal gain must face meaningful consequences, and suspected corruption must be reported and acted upon. However, this proposal requires careful consideration.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mandatory minimum sentences must be assessed against our constitutional framework, particularly the principle of proportionality and judicial discretion. We must ensure that the punishment fits the offence and that legislation is strengthened, rather than complicating our criminal justice system. The proposed reduction in the reporting threshold also requires consideration of capacity. Lowering the threshold may significantly increase the number of matters reported to law enforcement agencies, including the Hawks. We, therefore, must ensure that the institutions responsible for receiving, investigating and prosecuting these matters have the resources and capacity to respond effectively.

The fight against corruption cannot depend on the tougher sentence alone. It requires prevention, effective investigation, successful prosecution, asset recovery and consequence management. It also requires strong institutions that are able to act independently without fear and favour. The lessons arising from state capture demonstrate the consequences of weak institutions and inadequate accountability. We must ensure that legislative framework addresses these weaknesses and strengthens the integrity of the state.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The ANC, therefore, will engage constructively with this Bill as it proceeds through Parliament. We will consider the proposal against the Constitution, existing legislation, institutional capacity and the practical reality of implementation. Our objective must be clear: to prevent corruption, ensure that it is properly investigated and prosecuted, and that those found guilty face appropriate consequences. The ANC supports the strengthening of anti-corruption frameworks, and we look forward to meaningful public participation. Thank you.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon James, this is now your actual opportunity to reply to the debate. You have, in part, already done, sir, but I will afford you another opportunity to reply to those who have come after your previous intervention.

Ms D E JAMES: Hon Speaker, let me close now by thanking those members and parties who have supported this Bill today: the EFF, IFP, Freedom Front Plus, ACDP, RISE Mzansi, DA and the ANC. Your support shows that despite our political differences, there is common ground when it comes to confronting corruption.

I also want to address those who have not supported this Bill. The PA has rejected it and, frankly, their arguments demonstrate that they have not properly read this legislation. The Bill does

UNREVISED HANSARD

not blindly impose punishment without discretion. It expressively provides for judicial discretion where there are extenuating circumstances, with judges required to place those circumstances on record. So let us be honest about what is being argued here. Are we really saying that corruption should be excused based on the amount that is too small?

Those that did not even appear, shame on you: UDM, BOSA, ATM, Al Jama-ah, NCC and Good. This is not how you change a culture of corruption. Corruption is corruption. If we continue creating excuses and loopholes for it, we should not be surprised when it becomes normalised.

To the hon members from the DA and ANC, this bowl forms part of ActionSA's broader holistic anti-corruption reform package. We have brought forward this package because there is no single silver bullet for corruption. We need stronger laws, greater transparency, tougher consequences and institutions capable of enforcing them. We are clear-eyed about what is needed.

To those who supported this Bill again, we thank you. To those who reject it, we will continue to hold you accountable for that decision. It is on record today for all South Africans to see. To the House, let us not allow this Bill to disappear into

UNREVISED HANSARD

parliamentary machinery. We know how private members' Bills are treated.

ActionSA is ready to work constructively within a committee with every party that wants to strengthen this legislation and get it passed. I, therefore, call on the House to move the Zero Tolerance Corruption Bill forward swiftly. South Africans have waited long enough for political parties to stop talking about corruption and start doing something about it. Thank you.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon members, that concludes this First Reading Debate on this Bill, and you are reminded that no decision on the Bill is taken at this point in time, but the Bill is regarded as having been read a first time.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE ON POLICE ON PERFORMANCE OF OFFICE OF DIRECTORATE FOR PRIORITY CRIME INVESTIGATIONS JUDGE FOR 2024-25 FINANCIAL YEAR

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): We now move on to the second item on the Order Paper, which is the consideration of a report of the Portfolio Committee on Police on the Performance of the Office of Directorate for Priority Crime Investigations Judge for

UNREVISED HANSARD

the 2024-2025 Financial Year. The hon Cameron will introduce the report.

Is the hon Cameron on the platform to introduce this report? If not, is there another member of the Police Portfolio Committee who has been tasked to do so? Am I still audible?

An HON MEMBER: You are audible.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Thank you. Look, we can't deal with a report that has not been ... once more before we move on to the next item in the Order Paper. The hon Cameron?

If not, then we move on to the Third Order or we at least attempt to, which is the Consideration of a Report of the Portfolio Committee on Police once again, the Performance of Private Security Industry. So, it would seem we will have the same problem. Hon Cameron? [Interjections.]

IsiZulu:

Mnu C V SHONGWE: Angazi, Sihlalo, noma ubusuzwile ngensizwa ye-4 billion le ye-DA, kodwa sizobuye siyixoxe.

English:

UNREVISED HANSARD

I submit.

English:

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): No, hon members. Let's remain disciplined. I think considering the circumstances, let's take a five-minute comfort break. The Table Staff can maybe assist us to inquire as to whether the hon Cameron or another member of the Police Portfolio Committee will introduce the report. So, let's reconvene within five minutes. [Interjections.]

Ms L SCHICKERLING: I am online, Chair, to present the report. I am here. Hon Cameron just had an emergency that he had to deal with urgently. [Interjections.]

Ms C M PHIRI: Chair, you are unfair. Now, because your member is back and says he wants to introduce the report, you are no longer breaking for five minutes. You are unfair.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Thank you, hon member.

I see a hand. Hon Breytenbach, why do you want to be recognised?

Adv G BREYTENBACH: Chair, yes, I want to apologise for hon Cameron. He was dealing with a very serious issue that arose very

UNREVISED HANSARD

urgently. It's unfortunately a suicide issue. He will be on the platform within the next three minutes. He offers his sincerest apologies, as do I.

Ms M R MOHLALA: We all have issues, but we organise ourselves, as different political parties. We're also on the ground doing the work. We're dealing with issues like those ones. It is not the first time that we hear things like that. People on the ground are suffering. We are also dealing with that, but we've organised ourselves properly so that when I'm busy, someone takes over.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon Schickerling, do you want to proceed as a member of the Police Portfolio Committee to introduce the report on the investigations judge?

Ms L SCHICKERLING: I will proceed, thank you, Chairperson.

Good morning, colleagues. Sorry for the delay. Hon House Chair, on behalf of the committee, we support the report of the Portfolio Committee on Police on the Performance of the Office of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigations, DPCI, Judge for 2024-25 Financial Year.

UNREVISED HANSARD

This report recognises the critical role played by the Office of the DPCI judge in providing independent oversight of the Hawks. If the DPCI is expected to investigate serious and organised crime and corruption, then those who exercise those powers must themselves be subjected to credible oversight. The report records that the office dealt with 163 complaints and case matters during the year under review. Of the 49 matters finalised within its mandate, only 19 resulted in adverse findings against the DPCI and its members, which is incredibly concerning.

These complaints included allegations of improper investigations, undue delays, failure to provide feedback, abuse of power, interference in investigations, unlawful arrest, search and seizure, intimidation and violations of privacy. This means that in almost four out of the 10 matters finalised, the office found wrongdoings. These are serious allegations. They go directly to the integrity of policing, the protection of constitutional rights and the public’s trust in law enforcement.

A particular concern to the committee is the allegations of interference in investigations. The committee was advised that these related to interference within the DPCI, including by supervisors. This raises a fundamental question. How can the Hawks effectively investigate corruption and organised crime if

UNREVISED HANSARD

investigators themselves are subject to interference from within the organisation? If investigators can be pressured, obstructed or influenced by their own superiors, then we have a huge integrity problem, and investigations are placed in question. This really looks like a serious threat to the integrity of the investigations.

Another concern is the capacity of the DPCI judge. The office has only 12 funded posts and just two investigators nationally. This is wholly inadequate for the institution expected to investigate complaints against a specified crime fighting organisation operating across the country. We cannot demand effective oversight while providing an oversight institution with resources to do little more than keep its head above water.

We, therefore, support the committee’s recommendations. The committee is more than happy with what’s going on. However, the capacity is only one problem. The report highlights the recommendations of the DPCI judge that are not legally binding. This is a significant weakness. An oversight institution must be able to ensure that its findings result in meaningful corrective action. An adverse finding cannot simply become another entry in an annual report. Where misconduct is established, there must be consequence management.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Parliament must therefore be able to follow the entire process from complaint to investigation, finding to disciplinary action and where appropriate, criminal proceedings. While the committee supports legislative amendments to strengthen the powers of the Office of the DPCI and improve accountability for the implementation of its recommendations, if the DPCI judge finds wrongdoing, there must be a clear obligation to act, not as an option; we cannot ignore the findings.

We also welcome the efforts to increase public awareness of the complaints mechanism. Oversight is only effective when members of the public know where to complain and trust that their complaints will be handled independently. The fight against corruption requires strong institutions, but strong institutions must also be accountable institutions and act above the law. The Hawks must be fearless in investigating corruption and organised crime, but no member of this committee or of the Hawks should be above scrutiny.

We support the report as the committee. We want to say that oversight without consequence is not accountability. Adverse findings must lead to action, misconduct must have consequences and Parliament must continue to hold the Minister, SA Police

UNREVISED HANSARD

Service, SAPS, and the DPCI accountable for this implementation. I, therefore, propose the report to Parliament. Thank you, Chair.

Mr C V SHONGWE: Hon Chairperson, uMkhonto weSizwe Party rejects this Report. We reject it because Parliament created the second mechanism of the Office of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation, DPCI, Judge precisely because IPID general oversight of SAPS was not enough to police the Hawks.

Yet this report shows that even dedicated mechanisms remain under-resourced and toothless, leaving the same question unanswered. Who holds the Hawks accountable when they are accused of abuse, intimidation, unlawful address, and interference in investigations? The Report tells us that the office dealt with 163 complaints and case matters. Of the 49 matters within its mandate that were finalised, 19 resulted in adverse findings against the DPCI or its members. That is a 99% adverse finding rate. That is not a minor inconvenience. That is a pattern of abuse inside the body entrusted with investigating a serious crime and corruption.

The complaints included alleged abuse of power, interference in investigation, unlawful address, unlawful searches and seizures, threats, intimidation, and privacy evaluation. Yet the

UNREVISED HANSARD

committee's answer is essentially to give the office more capacity to conduct more awareness campaigns and consider legislative amendments. No, Chair not enough.

We cannot keep producing reports which identify wrongdoing and respond with accommodation dressed up as future intentions. The Report itself admits the office has only two investigators nationally to police a body accused of wrongful doing in over a third of its finalised cases. That is a fake leaf. Even more disturbing, the recommendations of the DPCI Judge are not legally binding. An oversight mechanism whose findings can be ignored by its own institute. It's not an oversight at all.

The Parliament cannot congratulate itself for documenting a problem while refusing to confront the architecture that allows it to continue. The problem records a 31-year-month vacancy before the appointment of the current DPCI Judge. It records institutional weakness, adverse findings, complaints, interference, and the absence of a binding enforcement mechanism. Yet the committee concludes expressions of appreciation and accommodations to expedite, consider, continue, and strengthen. That is precisely a half-hearted approach that the MKP rejects.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We need enforced accountability. We need an adequate investigative capacity matched to the Hawks' national footprint. We need binding mechanisms ensuring adverse findings carry real consequences. We need clear timelines for disciplinary and criminal actions where wrongdoing is established, and we need Parliament to stop treating oversight as a paperwork exercise. The people of South Africa do not need another report telling them that corruption is serious. They need institutions that act.

For this reason, MKP rejects this report. We will not lend our vote for a report that documents serious weaknesses in fighting against corruption yet offers no advice or remedy.

IsiZulu:

Angazi Sihlalo ukuthi ngabe ubusuzwile ngalensizwa ye-R40 bhiliyoni, lena ye-DA kodwa sizobuye siyixoxe.

English:

I submit.

Mr M KHOZA: Hon Chairperson, the EFF rejects this Performance Report for a Directorate of Priority Crime Investigation. The Hawks, together with the South African Police Service in general,

UNREVISED HANSARD

are a monument to the failure of the democratic state to develop sufficient capacity to fight crime and keep our communities safe.

In the Cape Flats, right where Parliament is, we have an average of 50 murders every weekend. This has been going on for years. If we are the functioning directorate for priority crimes, we should have long detected the root causes of this violence and eliminated them.

The entire country has become a haven of extortion gangs. These people are terrorising communities and have effectively created a parallel state ruled by a barrel of a gun. The Hawks are silent on this sort of crimes too, leaving old women who depend on an informal market at the mercy of thugs.

We cannot ask ordinary South Africans to trust the Hawks while complaints of wrongdoing inside the institution remain unresolved and consequences remain unclear. The capacity of the DPCI Judge’s office is also incompletely adequate, with only two investigators nationally dealing with a growing and complex caseload. You cannot fight corruption with a weak institution, empty offices, and insufficient investigators.

UNREVISED HANSARD

That is how criminals and corrupt officials escape accountability. We are particularly concerned that the recommendations of the DPCI judge are not legally binding, which weakens the entire oversight mechanism. The EFF therefore demands stronger legislation so that findings and recommendations cannot simply be ignored by those investigated.

While we welcome the recommendation for additional investigators and support personnel, we cannot forever endorse recommendations while there is no capacity to implement those very same recommendations. We further welcome stronger reporting requirements on complaints, adverse findings, referrals, and where recommendations are actually implemented, while supporting the move towards straightening the DPCI judge’s office’s investigative capacity, legislative powers, and oversight of the Hawks. We cannot, with a clear conscience, support this report.

Chairperson, the EFF rejects this Report in its entirety because it doesn’t represent the consent on the ground, and the House must know that this is the kind of attitude that we experience from the Chairperson of the police. He’s absent, he’s not here, there are no clear signs of responsibility for someone who happened to lead the Portfolio Committee on Police.

UNREVISED HANSARD

This is embarrassing and that's the kind of attitude that we experience here in the Western Cape, in particular in the Cape Flats. Our people are being left with no government. From the municipality, from the mayor, the provincial leadership, our people are on their own. We know that it is political and that it is the attitude of the DA toward the black communities. We reject this Report.

Mr A K NGOBESE: Good morning, Chairperson, and hon members on the virtual platforms, the Inkatha Freedom Party recognises the role of the office of the DPCI Judge in promoting accountability, transparency, and public confidence in the work of the Hawks.

The findings of this report raise concerns regarding limited institutional and investigative capacity. The increasing complexity of complaints and the need for stronger follow-through on recommendations and referrals. We note with concern that the effective oversight requires more than identifying wrongdoing.

The office must have the capacity to investigate the complaints effectively and recommendations and referrals must lead to meaningful action and accountability without delays.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The IFP supports the effort to strengthen the powers and the capacity of the office, addressing vacancies timely and fostering awareness of the complaint's mechanisms. Public resources allocated to oversight institutions must support capable administration, effective investigation, and public confidence. The IFP therefore supports this Report and reaffirms its importance of strengthening oversight accountability and integrity within the DPCI. I thank you, hon Chairperson.

Mr E HENDRICKS: Yes, hon Speaker, and hon members, the Patriotic Alliance rises today to affirm a simple principle. South Africans deserve a Police Service that is honest, accountable, and fully committed to justice. That is why the performance of the Office of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation Judge is so important. Oversight of the Hawks is not symbolic. It is essential to protect the public from abuse of power and ensure that high-priority crime investigations are conducted lawfully.

The committee's 2024-25 report makes one thing clear. The judge's office is doing its work, but it's doing so under severe strain. Complaints continue to rise; backlogs remain stubborn and investigative capacity is far below what is required. Oversight cannot succeed when the institution responsible for it is under-resourced and overstretched.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The Patriotic Alliance supports the Report because it confronts these realities directly. It calls for stronger co-operation from SAPS and the Hawks, improved case tracking systems, and increased staffing for the judge's office. These are not optional improvements; they are constitutional obligations. If we expect the Hawks to fight corruption, organised crime and state capture networks, then Parliament must ensure that the oversight body has the tools to hold them accountable.

We also note the troubling pattern of selective participation in committee processes. When members abstain on matters of justice and public trust, they weaken the very institutions meant to protect our people. The Patriotic Alliance rejects that behaviour. We do not run from accountability. We stand in it.

Hon Speaker, our communities are tired of excuses. They want a Police Service that works, an oversight system that acts and a Parliament that puts the people first. The Patriotic Alliance stands with those communities in every sitting, in every committee and in every decision. We support the report and call for the urgent implementation of its recommendations. Oversight must be strengthened, co-operation enforced, and justice restored. I thank you, hon Speaker.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms D E JAMES: Hon House Chairperson, South Africans expect the Hawks to investigate corruption, organised crime and the most serious threats to our country. However, we cannot demand accountability from criminals while failing to demand accountability within the institution tasked with fighting them. The report before us makes this clear. During 2024-25 the Office of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation, DPCI, Judge managed 163 complaints and cases. Of the 49 matters within its mandate that were finalised, 19 resulted in adverse findings against DPCI members.

Complaints included abuse of power, interference of investigations, unlawful arrest and searches, intimidation and unacceptable delays. These are not administrative inconveniences. These are allegations that strike at the heart of public trust in our criminal justice system. Yet the office itself has only two investigators nationally, 50 within mandate matters remain under investigation at year end.

This is simply not good enough. Even more concerning is that the recommendations of the DPCI Judge are not legally binding. What good is an adverse finding if there is no guarantee that action follows? Government must strengthen this office. Appoint

UNREVISED HANSARD

additional investigators and give the judge meaningful enforcement powers.

We must also demand answers on what consequences followed those 19 adverse findings. Accountability cannot be optional. It cannot depend on who is been investigated and no member of the Hawks should ever be above the law. I thank you.

Rev K R J MESHOE: Hon House Chairperson, the ACDP will not support this report for a number of reasons. The first one is the concern raised by the fact that the recommendations from the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation, DPCI, Judge are not binding. So, if they are not binding, obviously, there would be no capacity to enforce the powers and ensure that the recommendations are adhered to.

Secondly, while we all know that crime in South Africa is too high. South Africans are crying and unsafe in their homes and in their streets and communities.

The Hawks also do not have a clean record. So, far there are people that have complains against the Hawks that have failed to investigate serious crimes.

UNREVISED HANSARD

So, the ACDP believe that the Office of the DPCI Judge has to be strengthened and given more powers so that people can know that whatever recommendations made would be applied and implemented so that South Africa can be made a safer place.

We believe that South Africa deserves an efficient and effective police service. This will not happen if those that should be ensuring that their recommendations are taken seriously is not happening. So, the ACDP is not going to support the recommendations of this report. Thank you, hon House Chairperson.

Mr I CAMERON: Good morning, hon House Chairperson.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon Cameron, before you proceed, let me just address you.

We have been informed by your Chief Whip that you were dealing with – let us say an issue either in your constituency or otherwise that has arisen. However, it is very important that specifically our chairpersons who are to introduce reports ensure that either they are available or another member of the portfolio committee is available to introduce a report. The way in which this unfolded has not showcased the type of efficiency we want the National Assembly to be known for.

UNREVISED HANSARD

So, please do not allow a repeat of this situation to happen.

Mr I CAMERON: Hon House Chairperson, my profuse apology and to the hon members for my late arrival this morning.

I want to put it on record that on my way I was called to a scene where someone very close to me has taken their own life. I was just waiting for the authorities to get there on the horrific suicide scene. So, I apologise for being late. That is the reason and as you know from all the committees I led before I am always timeous with my attendance.

I want to start by recognising that there has been progress in the Office of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation, DPCI, Judge over the past year. After the position of the judge himself was vacant for quite some time I think we have now better stability in that office. Spending has improved significantly. A 107 of the 163 cases dealt with during the year were finalised.

However, I think we need to ask the fundamental question, hon House Chairperson and that is, is the office actually having the impact that Parliament intended it to have because an Ombud cannot simply become another place where complaints are received,

UNREVISED HANSARD

processes referred somewhere else and eventually closed. Its value lies in what happens as a resolve.

As all of the hon members said we need to see some kind of consequence and something that is legally binding. So, the nature of the complaints coming before the office should concern us. We are seeing allegations of improper investigations, unreasonable delays, failures to provide feedback, abuse of power, interference, etc.

These are not just complaints that are just simply nor mistakes here or there, they go directly very often to the integrity of the Hawks. That is why I think we need to move beyond simply asking how many cases were opened and closed and processed? But need to go and look at what happened then. You know we need to ask the question: Then what? What happened to the 19 findings that were made and those resulted adverse finding and who was held accountable and what was the result of it and what action was taken and does the DPCI Judge actually know what happened after making the findings?

We need proper tracking systems for this something in the broader Civilian Secretariat is also pushing for and every adverse

UNREVISED HANSARD

finding or referral should remain visible until there is an outcome.

The same applies to the 56 cases carried forward into the current financial year. We need timelines and we need to know how old those cases are? Why they remain unresolved and when and how they will be completed?

Then hon House Chairperson, it is critical for us as with many other departments that we need a simple type of dashboard that can tell the committee what cases received look like, cases finalised, the age and outstanding cases, adverse findings, etc. That would allow us to better measure the impact rather than just the activity.

There is also the bigger structural issue that I think Parliament needs to confront. The DPCI judge exist specifically to provide independent oversight where there are allegations of abuse of power by Hawks members or interference with the Hawks investigations, yet the office remains financially and administratively located under the Civilian Secretariat of Police. We should ask whether this arrangement actually gives them the necessary operational independence.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We should also ask present the mechanism is largely complaint-driven, and we should then say is the DPCI should the judge simply sit and wait for complaints? We should seriously consider whether there needs to be reviews that allow the judge in defined circumstances and with appropriate safeguards to initiate and investigate on his own accord. That is already one of the questions identified for consideration in previous annual report analysis.

We also need much better co-ordination between this office Independent Police Investigative Directorate, Ipid, Civilian Secretariat and other oversight structures.

Finally, we need to look at protection of complainants. I cannot stress this enough. So, my view is fairly straight forward. The office has stabilised and there has been progress but now we must go and measure impact. I thank you.

[Interjections.]

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Before we proceed, the hon Meshoe please remain muted until recognised to speak. The hon Moela.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms J L MOKOENA: Hon Chairperson and hon members, the fight against serious and organised crimes requires capable law enforcement institutions supported by effective system of accountability that strengthen public confidence. It is within this great context that the ANC supports the Report of the Portfolio Committee on Police on the performance of the Office of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation, DPCI Judge for 2024-25 financial year.

The office provides an important complaints mechanism concerning the exercise of powers by the DPCI. Its work contributes to ensuring that the Hawks can fulfil their mandate while maintaining professionalism, accountability, and respect for the law. During the reporting period, the office managed 163 complaints and case matters comprising 125 matters carried forward from the previous financial year and 38 new complaints.

Of the 107 matters finalised, 49 fell within its legislative mandate. Of this, 19 resulted in adverse findings against the DPCI members, 28 were found to be unsubstantiated and two were referred to relevant authorities. These figures demonstrate the value of an accessible complaints' mechanism. They also highlight the importance of ensuring that matters are dealt with

UNREVISED HANSARD

efficiently and that appropriate follow-up takes place where findings are made.

We therefore take note of the case management system introduced to improve monitoring and reduce delays. The report further identified requiring complaints concerning delays in investigation, inadequate feedback to complainants, alleged abuse of power, unlawful arrests and searches, intimidation and interference in investigations. These matters warrant continued attention while recognising that many DPCI investigations are complex and require extensive engagement with SA Police Service, SAPS, the National Prosecuting Authority, NPA and substantial case documentation.

The continued improvement of case management should assist in balancing through investigation with the need for the matters to be finalised within reasonable period. Hon members, a key consideration arising from the report is the capacity of the office. It operated with 12 funded posts and only two investigators nationally, despite dealing with complaints from across the country. We therefore support the stance already taken towards a structural review and the engagement with the National Treasury regarding additional investigator posts.

UNREVISED HANSARD

As public awareness of the complaints' mechanism grows, it is important that the office is supported with sufficient human resource, to respond effectively while maintaining the quality of its investigation. This brings us to the importance of public awareness following his appointment, Judge Legodi undertook engagement with the DPCI offices across all nine provinces. The office also reached communities and other stakeholders through radio broadcasts, community outreach and digital platforms. These initiatives are important because an accountability mechanism can only be effective when people know about it and understand how to access it.

We therefore support the continued expansion of this engagement. The financial performance of the office also reflects responsible budget utilisation. Of the final appropriation of the R6,738 million, R6,603 million was spent representing 98% expenditure and an improvement in under expenditure compared with the previous financial year. The report also records R1,089 million in irregular expenditure that remains under investigation. We note that the appropriate processes are being followed and trust that the matter will be dealt with in accordance with the relevant legislative and financial management framework.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The committee also raised the importance of suitable accommodation for the office, particularly given the sensitive and confidential nature of its work. Efforts to secure appropriate accommodation are therefore important to protecting information and supporting the effective functioning of the office. Hon members, the report also raises an important question regarding the implementation of recommendations made by the DPCI Judge. At present, these recommendations are not legally binding.

We support the committee's recommendation that possible legislative amendments be considered to strengthen the effectiveness of the complaints' mechanism. Such consideration should take place carefully and within our constitutional framework, with the objective of ensuring that recommendations receive proper consideration, and that there is appropriate accountability regarding their implementation.

The reporting requirements recommended by the committee will allow Parliament to continue monitoring progress in relation to complaints, adverse fining, referrals, and the implementations of recommendation. This is important because effective oversight is not only about identifying challenges, but also about supporting institutions to improve their performance and fulfil their mandates.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The Office of the DPCI forms an important part of the broader criminal justice system. As we strengthen the Hawks capacity to combat organised crime, corruption, and serious economic offenses, we must also ensure that accountability mechanism remains accessible, effective and properly resourced.

The ANC therefore supports the committee's recommendation to strengthen the capacity of the office, expand public awareness, improve the implementation of recommendation and ensure that vacancies are addressed timeously. These measures will contribute to a stronger complaints' mechanism and greater public confidence in the work of the DPCI. The ANC supports the report. I thank you, House Chair.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon members, that concludes this debate. You are reminded that the decision on the report will only be taken in a full plenary session of the National Assembly. We now move on to the last item on the Order Paper, which is the Consideration of Report of Portfolio Committee on Police on Performance of Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority, Psira for 2024-25 financial year to introduce the report, the hon Cameron.

UNREVISED HANSARD

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE ON POLICE ON PERFORMANCE OF PRIVATE SECURITY INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY, PSIRA FOR 2024-25 FINANCIAL YEAR

Mr I CAMERON: House Chair, the Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority plays an increasingly important role in South Africa's safety and security environment. The committee acknowledges that the regulatory authority achieved all of its annual performance targets and conducted, as they reported, 43 000 security officer inspections.

Its enforcement activities resulted in over 1 000 arrests, close to 250 finalised prosecutions, and confiscation of over 850 firearms. These operational achievements, as with the previous report, must be considered alongside other challenges that are faced. Now, in the Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority, Psira's case, there are serious governance and financial concerns. Psira again received a qualified audit opinion, while the material irregularity arising from the Unemployment Insurance Fund, UIF funded training project remains unresolved.

The committee is particularly concerned about the advance payments made before services were delivered, the recovery of

UNREVISED HANSARD

public funds and the absence of timely consequence management. The prolonged absence of a properly constituted Psira Council has further weakened governance and accountability.

The Police Committee has therefore called for urgent appointment of the council, stronger internal audit and financial controls and improved contract management, and consistent action against officials responsible for misconduct or financial losses. High performance against predetermined targets is important, but it cannot compensate for weak governance. Operational performance, financial accountability and consequence management must advance together.

The committee will closely monitor the audit recovery plan, the UIF funded project, the R52 million legal claim, disciplinary proceedings and the recovery of any losses. On behalf of the Police Committee, I thank Psira’s management and officials as well as the members of staff of the committee for their work in this regard. Hon House Chairperson, I commend the report to the House for adoption. Thank you, Chair.

Mr C V SHONGWE: Hon Chair, the MKP rejects this report. We reject it because the report is a case study in how the establishment wants Parliament to normalise failure, document the failure,

UNREVISED HANSARD

express concern, make recommendations, request another report, and move on. We refuse, Chair. The Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority, PSIRA, received a qualified audit opinion again for 2024-25. The Auditor-General identified unresolved prior-period errors, weaknesses in data reconciliation, deficiencies in cash flow statements, procurement weaknesses, contract management failures and weak internal control. This is a pattern, not a first offence. Then we arrive at the Unemployment Insurance Fund training project. The programme, worth almost R130 million, was established to train unemployed security officers. Payments were made to a service provider before the service was delivered. More than R30 million remained outstanding for services not received.

The Auditor-General found that PSIRA had not used its resources economically and effectively and concluded that insufficient action had been taken on consequence management and recovery. This is public money. This money, intended to benefit unemployed South Africans, and yet, years later, we are still discussing verification, litigation, arbitration, recovery, and investigation. The forensic investigation reportedly identified possible indicators of fraud. The matter was referred to the Special Investigating Unit, SIU, but the investigation remained

UNREVISED HANSARD

pending because a presidential proclamation had not yet been issued.

Meanwhile, Parliament is being asked to accept a recommendation telling PSIRA to strengthen internal controls and ensure accountability. Strengthen and ensure, right? Where are the consequences? Who approved the payment? Who benefited? Who failed to perform due diligence? Who is being held personally liable? How much money has been recovered? These questions remain unanswered, Chair. And then, and then there's governance. The PSIRA council was removed at the time of the committee's consideration. There was still no duly constituted council. The CEO was placed in the position of acting accounting authority. The report itself acknowledges this created instability. Yet the committee wants us to accept a report celebrating 100% achievement of performance targets. What is that actually? We cannot achieve 100% on paper while failing on governance, accountability and financial control. You cannot measure success by accounting activities while the institution cannot account for public money. You cannot confuse administrative performance with institutional integrity. The private security industry is not a minor sector. It controls firearms. It employs hundreds of thousands of security officers. It operates in communities, businesses, and strategic infrastructure. PSIRA's own figures

UNREVISED HANSARD

record 151 firearms confiscated, 1 265 arrests, and 245 finalised prosecutions. These statistics demand a regulator that is clean, competent, and properly governed.

Instead, this report gives us another cycle of promises. The MKP will not rubber-stamp that. We reject the culture of half measures. We reject a report that identifies serious financial and governance failures but does not deliver decisive consequences management. We reject the normalisation of qualified audits. We reject the idea that public monies disappear into contractual dispute while Parliament awaits. The people deserve accountability now, not after a round of meetings, litigation, and correspondence. For these reasons, the MKP rejects this report. We call on ... [Inaudible.] ... decisive action against officials found ... [Inaudible.] ... Thank you, Chair. [Time expired.]

IsiZulu:

Silungise indaba ka-R4 billion!

Mr M KHOZA: Chairperson, the EFF rises to fight a system that has allowed failures, corruption, and weak accountability to become normal in the regulation of the private security industry. PSIRA cannot continue hiding behind statistics while PSIRA's governance

UNREVISED HANSARD

failures, qualified audit, and weak consequence management persist year after year. An institution regulating one of the largest security industries in South Africa must be clean, competent, stable, and accountable to the people. The continued absence of a properly constituted PSIRA council is unacceptable and undermines effective governance oversight and accountability.

The recurring qualified audit findings demonstrate that previous warnings have not produced sufficient corrective actions. Public money is not the property of the officials. Every rand lost through negligence, corruption and maladministration belongs to the people. The UIF training project raises serious concerns, particularly where substantial payments were made before services were properly delivered. Where wrongdoing is established, those responsible must face real consequences, including the recovery of public funds and criminal accountability where appropriate. The EFF rejects the culture where officials fail, institutions investigate themselves, and nobody ultimately takes responsibility. We, therefore, demand that recommendations on an internal audit, financial controls, procurement and consequence management become measurable actions, and not another report gathering dust.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We acknowledge serious enforcement reports, including more than 43 000 inspections, 851 firearms confiscated, and 1 265 arrests. But enforcement statistics mean little if the private security industry remains vulnerable to criminality, exploitation, illegal firearms, and weak regulation. PSIRA must work decisively with the SA Police Service, SAPS, to establish or ensure that firearms in the hands of private security personnel and individuals, more especially in KwaZulu-Natal, are concerned, and how they are properly controlled and never become instruments of violence or organised crime.

The EFF further demands that security workers are treated with dignity, paid fairly and protected from exploitation by companies that profit from their labour. We will continue to expose corruption, demand transparency and hold PSIRA accountable because South Africa cannot afford a security industry that is powerful enough to protect the rich but unaccountable to the poor. We support the report because our support is not just a blank cheque. It is a demand for a stronger, cleaner and more accountable PSIRA that serves the people of South Africa. And we shall continue scrutinising and holding them accountable. And we forever say the security guards belong to the EFF, and the security guards deserve better treatment and fair wages in their workplaces. Thank you very much.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr A K NGOBESE: Good day, Chairperson, and good day to all the members on the virtual platform. The IFP acknowledges the committee's report and notes the importance of regulatory authorities, especially concerning the security industry. We wish to acknowledge PSIRA's improved financial performance and congratulate the authority on achieving its performance targets.

However, it would be remiss not to mention our concerns. These include poor governance, financial mismanagement and inadequate accountability. In particular, the unresolved UIF training project and associated financial irregularities raised serious concerns regarding accountability and the protection of funds. This ties into the notion of integrity, a value that the IFP has constantly held dear. We, therefore, call for stronger governance measures, including an improved auditing system, disciplinary processes and greater financial accountability. It is perhaps an apt reminder that public trust is earned through institutional integrity. The IFP supports the report and calls for the recommendations contained herein to be implemented steadfastly. I thank you, hon Chair.

Mr E HENDRICKS: Hon Chairperson, hon members, the PA rises today to reaffirm our commitment to clean governance, strong oversight and the protection of South Africans who rely on the state to

UNREVISED HANSARD

regulate powerful industries fairly and effectively. We have considered the performance of the Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority, PSIRA, for the 2024-25 financial year and the findings are deeply concerning.

The committee's report makes it clear that the PSIRA entered the year in a state of instability. The dissolution of its council left the entity without a legally constituted accounting authority, weakening financial oversight and undermining compliance with the Public Finance Management Act, PFMA. This is not a small administrative issue; it is a fundamental governance failure.

The private security industry is one of the largest and most influential sectors in our country. Millions of South Africans depend on it for safety and thousands of workers depend on it for their livelihoods. A regulator in distress puts all of them at risk.

The PA cannot accept a situation where such a critical institution operates without proper leadership, without stable governance and without the internal controls required to protect the public's interests.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We acknowledge that the PSIRA continues its regulatory work despite these challenges, but recurring audit findings, missed performance targets and weakening institution capacity shows that the entity is struggling. Oversight cannot be effective when the regulator itself is unstable.

Our communities deserve regulators that work, institutions that are accountable and leadership that does not collapse under pressure. The PA stands firmly for restoring stability, enforcing accountability and ensuring that every entity entrusted with public responsibility meets the highest standards of governance. We support the report and call for the swift implementation of its recommendations. I thank you, hon Chairperson.

Ms D E JAMES: Hon Chairperson, South Africa has reached a point where people are paying twice for their safety. They pay the state through their taxes and then they pay private security companies because they no longer trust the state to protect them. That is the uncomfortable reality we must confront.

Private security guards are increasingly filling the gaps left by a failing SAPS. They protect our homes, businesses, schools, hospitals and communities because ordinary South Africans cannot afford to wait for a police vehicle that may never arrive.

UNREVISED HANSARD

This is not how a functioning state should operate. Private security is not supposed to replace the SA Police Service. Yet, as the SAPS' capacity deteriorates, communities are increasingly forced to rely on private security to provide the safety government promised them. That makes the PSIRA's role even more important. The regulator must ensure that this growing industry is professional, accountable and properly controlled.

The report shows that the PSIRA conducted more than 43 000 security officer inspections, confiscated 851 firearms and contributed to 1 265 arrests. However, the regulator itself received a qualified audit opinion with recurring governance, procurement and internal control failures.

We cannot have a failed state relying on a poorly governed regulator to oversee the people filling its security vacuum. Fix the SAPS, strengthen the PSIRA and restore the state's responsibility to keep South Africans safe. I thank you.

Rev K R J MESHOE: House Chairperson, in the Police Committee's report on the performance of the PSIRA for 2024-25, the committee raised concerns over weak oversight and the need for stronger compliance in the private security sector. In recent months, two serious matters have come to light:

UNREVISED HANSARD

Firstly, the PSIRA has launched an investigation into a disturbing incident in which six security officers in Durban were caught on film assaulting a homeless man; and

Secondly, President Ramaphosa has authorised a probe by the Special Investigating Unit, SIU, into the alleged maladministration of the PSIRA's training contracts. Despite millions of public funds spent, just 118 learners out of 6 500 have reportedly been accredited. When funds for training are misused, our economy suffers and learners are disadvantaged because resources meant to build skills and jobs are being wasted, and this is obviously a great concern to the ACDP.

The ACDP further notes that 851 firearms have been confiscated and stored in collaboration with the SAPS. Given recent reports this week that some 2 500 SAPS firearms were reportedly stolen or lost over the last four years, we would urge caution and ... fast-track the protocols and oversight on how firearms, whether confiscated or issued to police officers, are securely stored. [Time expired.]

Ms L SCHICKERLING: House Chair, I rise on behalf of the DA to participate in the consideration of the Portfolio Committee on

UNREVISED HANSARD

Police’s report on the performance of the PSIRA for the 2024-25 financial year.

This committee report states that the PSIRA achieved 100% of its annual performance plan targets and that really sounds impressive, but 100% of wrong things is still a failure, because the same report before us contains serious concerns about governance, financial management, consequence management and the use of public funds.

More than 9 000 business inspections and more than 43 000 security officer inspections were conducted by the PSIRA, but inspections are activities and effective regulation is the outcome. And, when we look at the outcome, we have serious reason to be concerned.

The PSIRA received another qualified audit opinion for the 2024-25 year with weaknesses in financial management and internal controls. Then there is the Unemployment Insurance Fund, UIF-funded training programme with almost R130 million. The programme was intended to train 7 071 unemployed learners, something we desperately need in our country.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Yet, of the 6 507 learners who completed the programme, only 118 received recognised accreditation. Let that sink in. Thousands of unemployed South Africans were promised skills and opportunities, almost R130 million was spent and only 118 people received recognised accreditation.

More than R30 million was paid to the service provider before services were even rendered. So, we must ask what is the value of achieving 100% of your target if a R130 million programme fails to deliver the outcomes it promised?

The committee also raised serious concerns about accountability at senior management level. In June 2025, the committee called for the PSIRA’s chief executive officer, CEO, and chief financial officer, CFO, to be placed on precautionary suspension in relation to the serious concerns surrounding the training programme.

Yet, according to the committee’s subsequent reporting, this issue remained unresolved. We therefore want to ask the Acting Minister directly why the CEO and CFO have not been placed on precautionary suspension? This is not about declaring anyone guilty. It is about protecting an investigation, preserving evidence and safeguarding public money.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Now we have the SIU investigation. President Ramaphosa has signed Proclamation 316 of 2025, authorising the SIU to investigate the PSIRA and the UIF-funded training contracts, including allegations of maladministration, improper and unlawful conduct and financial losses to the state. The DA welcomes this investigation, but an investigation cannot become a substitute for accountability.

We need to know where the SIU investigation currently stands. Has the PSIRA provided all the relevant documentation? What steps are being taken to preserve and recover public funds? And, when will Parliament receive a progress report?

This committee report also raises serious, broader concerns about the PSIRA. If the PSIRA can claim a 100% achievement while receiving a qualified audit opinion, facing serious governance concerns and having nearly a R130 million programme investigated, we then perhaps need to question what the PSIRA considers performance. We should be asking the following. Are security officers properly trained and accredited? Are security companies compliant? Are firearms properly controlled? Are irregularities detected and acted upon? Are public funds protected? And, when something goes wrong, are those responsible held accountable? These are the outcomes that matter to South Africans.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The DA cannot support a culture where institutional performance is reduced to ticking boxes while serious governance failures remain unresolved. This report must not simply be noted and filed away. The committee must continue to monitor the SIU investigations, the recovery of public funds, the disciplinary processes and the accountability of senior management.

The PSIRA's mandate is too important for Parliament to be satisfied with performance statistics alone. It is worth noting that the committee did not complete the annual report last year precisely because of the significant instability at the time. South Africans need fewer impressive numbers on paper and more results in reality.

The DA supports robust parliamentary oversight of this report and calls for clear answers on the SIU investigation, the R30 million plus outstanding amount, the training programme failures and the continued position of the CEO and the CFO. I thank you.

Mr M S MOELA: Hon Chairperson, the ANC rises to support the report of the Portfolio Committee on Police on the Performance of the Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority, PSIRA, for 2024-2025 financial year.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The private security industry is a vital partner in the broader safety and security landscape of our country. It employs hundreds of thousands of South Africans. It contributes meaningfully to protecting communities, businesses and critical infrastructure. Proper regulation of this sector, therefore, remains an important priority for us.

We note the appreciation of the progress recorded by PSIRA during the year under review. The authority achieved 100% of its annual performance plan targets and an improvement over the previous year. More than 43 000 security officer inspections and over 9 000 business inspections were conducted.

Enforcement actions included the confiscation of 851 firearms, 1 265 arrests, and 245 finalised prosecutions. Registration numbers increased, digital systems improved service turnaround times, and the authority posted a surplus of about R115 million within strengthened revenue and healthy liquidity.

These operational gains demonstrated that PSIRA continues to fulfil its core regulatory mandate. At the same time, the committee has correctly identified areas that require further attention. The qualified audit opinion and challenges relating to system reconciliations on the ongoing material regulatory matters

UNREVISED HANSARD

linked to the UIF-funded training project remain matters that must be resolved.

The committee has also highlighted the importance of finalising the appointment of the new council so that full governance and accountability structures can be restored without delay. We welcome the confirmation that the process to appoint a new council is underway with interviews scheduled, and we hope that this process will be concluded speedily so that institutional stability can be fully re-established.

The ANC also emphasises the importance of ensuring that PSIRA's enforcement activities translate to meaningful compliance across the private security industry. Inspections, arrests and prosecutions must ultimately contribute to improved standards and safer communities. This requires PSIRA to continue strengthening its regulatory capacity and working closely with SA Polise Service and other relevant institutions.

The ANC supports the constructive recommendations contained in this report. This includes strengthening internal audit capacity, improving financial and contract management systems, and enhancing consequence management where necessary. We also support deeper collaboration with the SA Police Service on firearm

UNREVISED HANSARD

oversight. The confiscation of 851 firearms demonstrates the importance of this function and its need for continued vigilance.

As the private security industry continues to grow, regulation must keep pace with the changing security environment. The PSIRA must strengthen compliance, professional standards and training while ensuring that security companies operate within the law. Stronger co-operation with the SA Police Service will also be important in addressing firearm-related risk and strengthening oversight in this regard.

The ANC believes that the continuous improvement in governance, accountability and operational effectiveness will enable PSIRA to play an even stronger role in professionalising the private security industry and contributing to safer communities. We therefore support this report, and we look forward to the implementation of the committee’s recommendations in a spirit of constructive oversight and strengthening. The ANC support this report, Chairperson. Thank you very much.

Debate Concluded.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Thank you. Hon members, that concludes this debate. You are again reminded that a decision on

UNREVISED HANSARD

whether we are to adopt the report or not will only be taken in a full sitting of the National Assembly. That concludes the business of this virtual mini plenary as well.

The mini plenary rose at 11:48.

UNREVISED HANSARD