TUESDAY, 11 AUGUST 2026

_____

PROCEEDINGS OF VIRTUAL NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

_____

The House met at 14:00.

The Speaker took the Chair and requested members to observe a moment of silence for prayer or meditation.

The Speaker announced that the virtual plenary sitting constituted a meeting of the National Assembly.

CONSIDERATION OF INDEPENDENT MUNICIPAL DEMARCATION AUTHORITY BILL AND OF REPORT OF PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE ON COOPERATIVE GOVERNANCE AND TRADITIONAL AFFAIRS ON AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY NATIONAL COUNCIL OF PROVINCES

Dr Z L MKHIZE: Hon Speaker, and the hon members of this House, in 2022, the then Minister of the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, CoGTA, introduced this Bill to Parliament. At the time, as is the case today, the administration had identified serious flaws in the legislation governing municipal demarcation. Amongst challenges identified

UNREVISED HANSARD

included; the frequency of disputes in relation to demarcation, lack of meaningful participation, and independence. The Bill has exhausted all legislative processes since 2022.

The Portfolio Committee on CoGTA welcomed the concurrence to the Bill by the NCOP, as we all are aware, this Bill falls under section 76 of the Bills that affect provinces. We appreciate the role played by different stakeholders who are involved in the processing of the Bill and hope that the intended vision of the Bill will achieve the desired outcomes.

In the main, the Bill introduces an independent demarcation authority, which is a crucial step for the vibrancy and credibility of the democratic process. This will ensure the independence and accountability while restoring public trust.

There are a number of clauses that have been amended in the Bill. Clause 5, which deals with the public participation, ensures that the public is aware of the mandate of the authority. Clause 38 deals with independence and impartiality of the authority to perform its duties without fear, favour or prejudice. The other clauses deal with issues such as political insulation of the authority and its board members

UNREVISED HANSARD

and the other minor but politically and administratively important issues.

The committee deliberated on the Bill and by majority agreed with the NCOP to support the Bill. We are tabling this report to the House to canvass for its support having satisfied ourselves as a committee that the processes were followed to the logical conclusion.

We have the view that the Bill is an important piece of legislation that will strengthen our democracy and ensure that the management of local government is administered in a way that recognises its importance and agency as a vehicle for service delivery and broadly to correct the past injustices. We urge this House to support the Bill.

Thank you very much.

Mr C M DUGMORE: Speaker, we recommend that the report be adopted, as amended.

Declarations of vote:

Mr G TAAIBOSCH: Hon Speaker, hon members, fellow South Africans, the Bill raises a fundamental constitutional

UNREVISED HANSARD

question. Are we genuinely strengthening the independence of the municipal demarcation board or merely refining the mechanisms through which executive influence can continue to operate? Section 155 of the Constitution envisages local government founded on democratic accountability, responsiveness, and effective governance.

The Municipal Demarcation Board, whose decisions fundamentally shape the architecture of local government, must therefore be independent, impartial, and credible.

The MK acknowledges the stated intention of this Bill. However, we remain concerned that the amendments adopted by the NCOP do not go far enough to guarantee that independence.

The first concern is the appointment and removal of board members. An institution cannot be genuinely independent if the people who sit on it can be appointed or removed through processes that are insufficiently transparent, accountable, or insulated from political influence.

The question is simple. Who controls the process of selecting those who determine the boundaries of municipalities? If the answer ultimately points back to the executive, then we have

UNREVISED HANSARD

not adequately protected the board from political interference.

The MK therefore calls for a process that is transparent, merit-based, publicly accountable, and capable of commanding confidence across the political spectrum.

Secondly, political interference does not always arrive through an explicit instruction. It can occur through appointments, it can occur through administrative decisions, can occur through procedural control, it can occur through institutional and budgetary dependence. That is why simply declaring an institution independent in legislation is not enough independence must exist in substance and not merely on paper.

If the executive retains indirect levers, through which it can influence the board then the legislative protection of independence becomes little more than a paper safeguard.

Thirdly, public participation cannot be reduced to a box ticking exercise, demarcation determines political representation, access to municipal services, allocation of resources, and the viability of municipalities that can

UNREVISED HANSARD

determine whether a community is incorporated into another municipality, whether its municipality is dissolved, or whether its political representation is fundamentally altered.

For those communities, public participation must be meaningful, accessible, and capable of influencing the outcome. A notice in a government gazette followed by an invitation to make submissions does not automatically amount to meaningful democratic participation. Communities must not merely be heard; their representations must matter.

The portfolio committee recommends that this House accepts the amendments made by the NCOP, by accepting amendments cannot mean surrendering Parliament’s responsibility to interrogate whether the final framework genuinely serves the public entrance.

Parliament must be prepared to say when an opportunity has been missed, and this is one such opportunity. Municipal demarcation is not a technical exercise involving lines on a map. It determines political representation, access to services, allocation of resources, and ultimately, the lived reality of millions of South Africans.

UNREVISED HANSARD

When communities believe that boundaries are being manipulated for political purposes, they lose faith not only in the demarcation brought by the Parliament and the democratic process itself.

The MK will not support a system where communities are consulted only after decisions have effectively been made, no one where institutional independence exists in the name, but not in substance.

Our position is clear. We support reform. We support a credible and effective demarcation board. We support meaningful public participation, but we will not give the executive a blank check under the banner of reform.

The people of South Africa deserve a demarcation process that is independent of political manipulation, transparent in its operations, accountable to Parliament and responsive to the communities whose lives, it directly affects.

The MK therefore cautions that this Bill in its present form does not go far enough. The MK supports the principle of reform, but we will not endorse half measures where the Constitution demands institutional integrity.

UNREVISED HANSARD

I thank you.

The SPEAKER: I just want to encourage members to look at their time allocation and be able to regulate that process.

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: Speaker, we participated in the committee process, which dealt with the amendments proposed by the NCOP on this Bill. There are no fundamental changes that will warrant us changing our support for the Bill. As previously argued, we support the Bill, as we view it as an essential legislative reinforcement of a crucial component of our democracy - the demarcation of municipal and ward boundaries.

We emphasized then, as we do now, that poorly planned demarcation processes can exacerbate existing inequalities within municipalities. If boundaries are drawn in a way that concentrates resources and power in certain areas while neglecting others, it can deepen socioeconomic disparities in access to services and decision-making opportunities.

We were part of the committee process, and we had the same concern regarding the Bill as the National Council of Provinces. We support the amendments to the Bill proposed by the NCOP. We support the certainty this Bill will bring to the

UNREVISED HANSARD

demarcation process by extending the time period in which the boundaries can be revised. This brings certainty to the planning processes.

It also guards against the uncertainty of revising ward boundaries to suit the ends. The only concern we have with the Bill, which we will also express when we debate it here, is that resourcing election processes is becoming more difficult all the time. The nature of the work that the new independent authority will have to do essentially involves ongoing consultation with communities and affected organisations. Without this consultation process, the aim of this Bill will never be realised.

This, in turn, requires funding to enable the authority to do its work, and without a clear resourcing plan, the necessary work required will fall flat. With that understanding, we support this Bill. Thank you very much.

Inkosi N Z BUTHELEZI: Hon Speaker, good afternoon to everyone in the House. Good afternoon, fellow South Africans. The IFP supports the Independent Municipal Demarcation Authority Bill because municipal boundaries directly affect every South African. They determine how municipalities plan, allocate

UNREVISED HANSARD

resources, and deliver services to communities. For South Africans, particularly poor urban and rural communities, demarcation must strengthen, and not weaken, local government capacity.

We welcome the Bill strengthening municipal capacity assessments, which consider administrative, financial and operational capacity, infrastructure, economic growth and social cohesion. Demarcation must never run ahead of a municipality's greater public.

The IFP also welcomes greater public participation and the amendments that require the authority to promote public understanding of its work. Communities must have a meaningful voice in decisions that affect their identity, their representation, and, of course, access to services.

As we look to the upcoming local election, we understand that these decisions must provide security to communities. We cannot redraw boundaries without asking whether the municipality that emerges will have the financial, administrative, and institutional capacity to succeed. The IFP therefore supports a demarcation process that puts communities

UNREVISED HANSARD

first, strengthens local government, and protects the quality of service delivery.

The test is simple. Will these boundaries help municipal governance, enable municipalities to deliver better, and give South Africans greater confidence in their local government? The IFP supports the report. I thank you.

Mr S H M VAN WYK: Speaker, the PA supports this Bill and the NCOP amendments. The 12-month cooling-off period is a non-negotiable shield against political manipulation. This is about justice, not convenience. For decades, poor and marginalised communities, especially in coloured working-class areas, have been carved up by decisions made in boardrooms, not in their streets or community halls. Not anymore.

This Bill puts evidence and people first. But allow me to be clear. The DA abstained, not opposed, not supported. They sat out when it mattered the most. Why? Because when real independence threatens their comfort, they freeze. They talk of viability and transparency ... [Interjections.] That silence ...

UNREVISED HANSARD

The SPEAKER: Hon member, please, stick to the Bill. Hon Van Wyk, can you conclude, but stick to the Bill?

Mr S H M VAN WYK: Can I conclude? Somebody was bothering me here.

The SPEAKER: Order, hon members! I have said that hon Van Wyk must stick to the legislation at hand, not bring in other cross-party matters. Can we please conclude?

Mr S H M VAN WYK: The PA does not sit on fences. We stand for fairness, for accountability, for every community that has been ignored. We support this Bill without hesitation and without reservation. Thank you very much.

Afrikaans:
Ons baiza [huiwer] nie.

English:
Salute!

Ms L M NGOBENI: Hon Speaker, and good afternoon to all members. Municipal boundaries should never be drawn to serve narrow political interests. They must be drawn to serve the

UNREVISED HANSARD

people. And that is why the independence of the municipal demarcation authority is not just a technical matter, but rather a constitutional safeguard that protects the integrity of our local democracy. Therefore, the Bill before us, together with the amendments proposed by the NCOP, strengthens that safeguard by reinforcing the independence of the authority and reducing the risk of political interference in decisions that shape the lives of millions of South Africans.

Although this legislative process began before Action SA entered Parliament, we have carefully considered both the Bill and its underlying principles. As ethical leadership is at the heart of Action SA, we believe that institutions tasked with making decisions of such significance must be independent, credible, and guided solely by the public interest and not by political expediency or electoral calculations.

An independent municipal demarcation authority gives South Africans greater confidence that municipal boundaries will be determined by evidence, fairness, and good governance rather than by those who stand to benefit politically.

Therefore, we support this Bill, but our support does not end here. Once enacted, we will closely monitor its

UNREVISED HANSARD

implementation, because legislation only has value when its promises are honoured in practice. Therefore, the true test of this law will not be the support we afford today, but whether every future municipal boundary reflects the prioritisation of the public good and not the ambition of politicians and their political interests. I thank you.

Mr W M THRING: Hon Speaker, the ACDP welcomes the amendments to the Independent Municipal Demarcation Authority Bill, particularly those aimed at strengthening the independence, impartiality, transparency and accountability of the demarcation authority.

However, this Bill must not detract from serious allegations concerning the Municipal Demarcation Board's conduct and decisions. Municipal demarcation is not a mere administrative exercise. It determines boundaries that profoundly affect communities, service delivery, political representation, and the allocation of public resources. These decisions must therefore be objective, lawful, and firmly grounded in the Constitution.

The ACDP is deeply concerned by allegations of political interference, inadequate consultation, inconsistent

UNREVISED HANSARD

application of criteria, and flawed boundary determinations. Such allegations cannot simply be ignored or swept under the carpet. They demand credible investigation, accountability, and where wrongdoing is established, consequences must follow.

The requirement that the demarcation authority must act independently, impartially, and without fear, favour, or prejudice must be more than legislative language; it must be demonstrated in every decision.

The ACDP also welcomes stronger vetting and screening of board members, including scrutiny of qualifications and restrictions on recent political office holders. Public confidence must be earned. Communities must know their voices genuinely matter, and that boundaries are determined by objective criteria, not by political interests.

As Kingdom builders, the ACDP calls for a demarcation process that is transparent, independent, lawful, and beyond political manipulation. Thank you.

Mr V G REDDY: Hon Speaker.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The SPEAKER: Hon Reddy, I have noted you. I have just given Bosa an opportunity to ... [Interjections.] Hon Reddy, can you please close your mic?

Dr M A MAIMANE: Hon Speaker, as BOSA we support the independence of the demarcation board as proposed by the Bill. We genuinely believe that more than anything, demarcation processes always require transparency. They cannot by any matter of means be to the benefit of political interests. They need to serve our communities.

The point we want to make, and more crucially, is the fact that the administrative burden in supporting the achievement of transparency, submission of comments by the public, their engagement, will be a matter twofold. One, it should always be transparent, and two, it should be well funded.

If we fail that basic task, it’s almost immaterial how the decision post facto is made. It does mean that mobilisation and the interest of a few could be done in a process that seems legitimate, but ultimately, achieves what historically was the case. So, we support the Bill.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The fundamental cause is, we need to also achieve the financing thereof and the support thereof so that we achieve the administrative support that we need to make sure this Bill is functioning. I thank you, Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Hon Reddy, you have your hand up for a point of order.

Mr V G REDDY: No, it's not a point of order, Speaker. I just wanted the staff to check in the waiting room. There are members that are waiting to join in. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Can the information and communications technology, ICT, staff please check so that members are not locked out when they are supposed to declare.

Ms T L MARAWU: Hon Speaker, the ATM welcomes the amendments to the Bill because it removes politics from boundary changes that will better the service delivery at a local municipality level by creating viable municipalities. What is of critical importance is that, public participation is built in.

What we have observed is that it will ensure that municipalities are viable, accountable and ready to deliver

UNREVISED HANSARD

services to their communities. We support the Bill as ATM, that puts the communities first and we'll monitor it closely. Thank you very much, hon Speaker.

Mr I ISMAIL-MOOSA: Hon Speaker, Al Jama-ah welcomes the Bill and we accept the Bill as it is presented. No declaration. We support the Bill. Thank you, hon Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Al Jama-ah. NCC ... NCC.

Mr V G REDDY: He's having problems with his laptop, Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order, hon Reddy. You are not an NCC member.

Dr L W MAHLATSI: Speaker ...

Sesotho:

... kgotso, Maafrika.

English:

The UAT welcomes the consideration of Independent Municipal Demarcation Authority Bill. It is fundamentally about power, resources, representation, development and dignity of communities.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We support the establishment of an independent authority and the creation of demarcation appeal authority. These are important safeguards against political interferences and arbitrary decisions. The Bill also strengthens consultation, which is essential because communities have historically experienced demarcation as something imposed upon them rather than something shaped with them.

Parliament itself has recorded concern that past demarcation processes contributed to community conflict, litigation and disruptions to the service delivery. However, independence must mean independence in practice, not merely independence in the name of the institution. The authority must be protected from political manipulation, patronage and executive interference.

Its importance must therefore be transparent, competency-based and subject to meaningful parliamentary scrutiny. Lastly, demarcation must consider more than administrative convenience. It must consider economic sustainability, municipal capacity, historical communities, geographical realities, access to service, infrastructure, traditional communities and the developmental needs of rural and township population.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Xitsonga:

Khanimambo!

Ms A M VAN ZYL: Speaker, as the DA, we today oppose the Independent Demarcation Authority Bill. Demarcation is not only a footnote or only about the drawing of boundary lines on a map. It determines who gets water, who gets roads, who gets refuse removed, who pays for rates and taxes, who the local councillor is and whether a municipality will be financially sustainable. For that reason, any official that is involved in the demarcation of municipality boundaries must be free from cadre employment and free of any possibility of manipulation. This Bill in its current form fails that test.

The DA’s clause-by-clause analysis makes this very clear. While the stated purpose of independence is supported, the actual reality of mechanism within the Bill still leaves room for political influence. The selection panel for board members remains dangerously close to the executive and political structures. A person who has been involved in politics nearly 12 months before application can still be eligible to become a board member. That is not good enough. People should not be able to resign today and be deployed to the body that

UNREVISED HANSARD

determines ward and municipal boundaries tomorrow. The risk of manipulation to suit a certain party is just too high.

The appeal's authority suffers from the same weakness. To call it independent does not make it independent. Independence must be built into the appointment process through transparency, parliamentary oversight, public interviews, published shortlists, reasons for appointments and proper safeguards to guard against conflicts of interest.

South Africans have already paid the price for a careless demarcation. In the local municipality where I live, two dysfunctional municipalities were amalgamated into one even more dysfunctional municipality. Residents receive less services, communities continue to suffer due to financial woes and the Eskom debt is nearing R900 million. It is clear that this municipality is worse off than the two erstwhile municipalities.

In JB Marks, the amalgamation of Tlokwe and Ventersdorp did not magically create a stronger municipality. In fact, it did the opposite, as service delivery and internal capacity declined from merger. In Matatiele , years and years of disputes was caused by demarcation when residents understood

UNREVISED HANSARD

that provincial and municipal boundaries affect their access to resources, identity and services. Quite recently, we can see how Kopanong and the Free State being split into two municipalities has put residents at risk.

The Municipal Demarcation Board says that it will improve service delivery as the area is too big, but parliamentary oversight has already warned that it is not sustainable and it could increase dysfunctionality. Now this is exactly the danger. Demarcation decisions very often are sold as the solutions, but residents are left with weaker municipalities, duplicated administrations, unfunded mandates and failed services.

The DA simply cannot support a Bill that does not sufficiently guard against these risks. We need a board that truly is independent, technically able and 100% accountable to the public. We need proper capacity assessments before boundaries are changed. We need meaningful public participation, not tick box exercises. We need residents to be able to see the maps and to understand the financial implications and we need our objections to be heard properly, not filed in the dustbin. Demarcation should never be the instrument to save failed cadres, to punish communities, to manipulate wards, or to move

UNREVISED HANSARD

residents from one broken municipality to the next just because the next round of demarcation is happening.

The people of South Africa deserve municipalities that work. They deserve clean water, pothole-free roads, reliable refuse removal, functional sewage systems and accountable councils. So long as this Bill does not remove the possibility of political influence, improve transparency, improve public participation to be meaningful, and protect communities from manipulation, gerrymandering and the total collapse of service delivery, the DA will oppose it. Boundaries must serve residents, not politicians and their interests. I thank you.

The CHIEF WHIP OF THE LARGEST MINORITY PARTY: Madam Speaker, good afternoon to you and good afternoon to all hon members. Madam Speaker, first and foremost, let me convey my apology for joining the sitting late and because of which I was not in the position to make the intervention that I would have wanted to make in the beginning of this debate. Therefore, I will plead for yours and the indulgence of the hon members on the platform. When the matter of this Bill, the preparation for the Order Paper was being finalised, some parties had raised concerns about certain aspects of the Bill. Therefore, in line with what we usually do, where there are valid concerns that

UNREVISED HANSARD

are coming from any of the parties represented in the National Assembly, it is always our effort to find a way in which, where the possibility exists, we can have a consensus in the resolution of any matter before the committees.

Of course, where we don't succeed, we allow democracy to prevail. Now, this was the case for this Bill. What I had wanted to propose, I hope that with your authority and what the rules would permit, we can still allow that to happen, was that we do not necessarily take a vote on this Bill here and now, but rather allow an opportunity for the remainder of this week for us as parties who are represented in the affected committees to deal with whatever concerns that, as I said, were raised and bring the Bill next week for finalisation. Once again, I'm apologising because I was not in the position where I could be able to access the sitting of the National Assembly because of the situation where I was.

However, that is what I wanted to say on behalf of the African National Congress, but equally acting on behalf of my other colleagues who are party Chief Whips which whom we work in that way, that if there is a concern, firstly, we have an attempt to deal with that concern. If we don't succeed, so that we don't ... [Inaudible.] ... the work of Parliament, we

UNREVISED HANSARD

then subject the process to the vote. I would propose that if we can, let's have the matter deferred to next week to give way for the remaining days of this week to see if we can iron out whatever areas of concerns that other political parties have raised. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: Speaker, we can't agree on that proposal by the Chief Whip of the ANC. If you remember very much, Speaker, this is not the first time we defer this matter. You can't allow this matter to be presented and then we debate, while the Chief Whip of the ANC find that the DA does not agree with them on the very same matter. Now, he comes and chicken out. It means that we are taking people of South Africa for the ride because they can't find each other with the DA on this Bill. Then he comes and wants to disorganise all of us here. This Bill has been here, Madam Speaker, for more than enough to be debated and then agreed upon. We can't get in the way that the Chief Whip wants us to get in because there is a fundamental problem between the DA and the ANC and the Government of National Unity, GNU ... [Interjections.]

The SPEAKER: Order! Hon Mlotshwa, can you please mute? Hon Mkhaliphi, can you conclude ... [Interjections.] ... Hon Mlotshwa, can you please mute? Hon Mkhaliphi!

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: Yes, Speaker, no, we disagree with an approach of the Chief Whip of the ANC. We can't start the debate. Therefore, in the middle of the debate we are told that we must ... [Interjections.]

The SPEAKER: Hon Mlotshwa! Hon Mlotshwa, can you please mute?

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: Yes, thanks, Speaker, for protecting me. I'm saying that this is not the first time. This matter was supposed to be resolved a long time ago. We keep on postponing because the ANC and the DA don't find each other. Therefore, all of us must be inconvenienced because of the GNU that is not finding each other. This is tantamount to taking the people of South Africa for a ride. Therefore, as the EFF, we submit that we don't support the approach and the proposal of the Chief Whip of the ANC. They must go and find each other with the DA as the partners of the GNU.

The SPEAKER: Hon Mkhaliphi, are you finished?

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: Yes, Speaker, I'm finished.

The SPEAKER: Okay, thank you. Hon Ngobeni!

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms L M NGOBENI: Speaker, I think I want to concur with hon Mkhaliphi. It was just quite irregular that the Chief Whip comes in at this time. What would have been helpful, because I'm sure they didn't ... [Interjections.] ... now. Can hon Mlotshwa just be muted, Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Hon Mlotshwa, can you please mute and not disturb the proceedings? Otherwise, I will have to ask you to be taken off the platform, because I've now spoken to you three times ever since the meeting has started. Hon Ngobeni!

Ms L M NGOBENI: Thank you, Speaker. No, I just wanted to say that I'm sure this just didn't arise an hour ago. The Chief Whip could have written formally to request that this matter be handled in this manner much, much earlier than now. I mean, we already have debated far down the line. We are taking the second round so that we can finalise this matter. We don't believe that that should be the case at all, that this should be supported by the members.

Also, what I did not hear the Chief Whip explaining was what are the issues that need to be ironed out, because surely, those issues should not be ironed out at this platform. They should be ironed out prior and, you know, to put the matter to

UNREVISED HANSARD

the vote is what now is at play. Let the Chief Whips follow where they might, because all political parties that are represented here who have decided to make declarations have considered the Bill in its current form as amended and as concurred by the NCOP. We believe that this is highly irregular and we would implore all the members to not support the Chief Whip in this regard. Thank you, Speaker.

Adv G BREYTENBACH: Good afternoon, hon Speaker. Thank you very much. Forgive me for not putting on my camera. I don't know how to fix my background. Hon Speaker, we support the suggestion by the hon Chief Whip of the ANC. We have serious concerns with this piece of legislation, and we have made suggestions as to how we would like to see it remedied. We would support that suggestion that it be deferred. Thank you, hon Speaker.

Mr V G REDDY: Hon Speaker, this is quite unprecedented, but it's also not unexpected. We cannot be expected to be mending marriage issues between the ANC and the DA. When they got into bed, they should have found a mechanism to deal with the problems outside of Parliament. Now, it is only the DA. I thought it was other parties, but it's only the DA that has a problem with this report. Because of that, we are told that

UNREVISED HANSARD

this report must go back. Unfortunately, Speaker, we cannot support that. The DA and ANC must find their own way of dealing with their GNU problems. This is really GNU issues. That's why this country is going down the slippery slide it is going in, because they can't find themselves. Thank you.

Mrs E N NTLANGWINI: Speaker, I concur with the members of the progressive caucus, what they have said. We won't support this proposal by the Chief Whip. The programme of Parliament has been out for two weeks now. Therefore, for the Chief Whip to come today and say that we must put over this matter, it's really unbecoming and let us look clumsy and unprofessional. If we wanted any intervention or the matter to have stood over like we have done with other several matters, if we could not find each other, there's a platform in the Chief Whips' Forum and elsewhere that Parliament do provide.

However, for him to, after all members have done presenting their views from our political parties, then you say, no, let's take the Bill back. It's really taking members of Parliament and South Africans for granted. For this whole hour we are sitting and debating the matter just to be told by the ANC and DA, no, we want the matter to be re-investigated. It is unbecoming and it should never be allowed, Speaker, for

UNREVISED HANSARD

this kind of unprofessionalism shown by the DA and the ANC in their marriage. Thank you so much.

Mr M V DANIELS: Good afternoon and thank you, hon Speaker. I don't see anything wrong in the proposal made by the hon Chief Whip of the African National Congress and the support given by the Democratic Alliance. It is within our right to make such proposals, and I don't see it in any way translating to challenges within the GNU, not at all. Of course, it's expected from those on the outside to cast such aspersions and calling it that is disorder. However, be that as it may, I just want to express the support of the Patriotic Alliance by the proposals made by the ANC and supported by the DA. Thank you so much, Speaker.

Ms A M VAN ZYL: Thank you, Speaker. Just on a point of order, hon Reddy must maybe read hon Taaibosch's speech again. He was not in support of the Bill, but we are in support of the Chief Whip. Thank you very much.

Ms P MKHIZE: Hon Speaker, as the uMkhonto weSizwe Party, we are rejecting the suggestion of the Chief Whip of the ANC. You shouldn't have waited for us to first debate on the matter and maybe listen where other parties are falling on this matter,

UNREVISED HANSARD

then come and suggest. Therefore, as the uMkhonto weSizwe Party, we are rejecting the suggestion of the Chief Whip of the ANC. Thank you.

Dr L W MAHLATSI: Speaker, as the United African Transformation, we reject the ANC Chief Whip and who appear more interested in accommodating the political interest of Government of National Unity than in defending the institutional independence of Parliament. We know that the DA is a central component of GNU, but the Parliament must not become an arena where political convenience take precedence over constitutional accountability. Let us be clear, Parliament is not an extension of GNU, where you can come and stop the processes. I think that they must go and negotiate somewhere else. Therefore, as the UAT we reject this proposal.

Ms T L MARAWU: Hon Speaker, as the ATM, we totally reject the proposal of the ANC Chief Whip because this is not a platform to address that. We cannot be taken to and from by the Chief Whip of the ANC. There was enough time for him to address that long before we used this time debating about this matter and have a clear position around it. Thank you very much.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The CHIEF WHIP OF THE LARGEST MINORITY PARTY (Mr M Ntuli): Madam Speaker, thanks for the comments of my colleagues who are Whips of other parties. Let me just make this point. I was raising this issue because, as we usually work in the Chief Whip's Forum, when a matter like this has been raised, it has to be discussed by the Whips of the parties and sometimes the portfolio committee that is relevant.

Now, if the other parties are vehemently opposed to that approach, and I would imagine the opposition is about the timing as opposed to the principle. If they are vehemently opposed to that approach today, and I want to be very clear that as the Chief Whip of the ANC who convenes and chair meetings of all Whips in Parliament, I treat all political parties equally. It doesn't matter that the concern is from the DA or from the ATM. If there is a concern, we always find a way in which that concern must be constructively attended to, such that we have a consensus. And if there is no consensus as I'm saying, Parliament has got a way in which to resolve areas of disagreement, which is by vote.

Now, if the parties are opposed to the proposal that I was making, I want to be clear that this is not a proposal because, as the ANC, we have any peculiar interest to the

UNREVISED HANSARD

concerns that were raised by these other parties. If the House is of the view that the horse has bolted, we should not go back to that, there's no problem, then the House will have to take that decision. I thought it was incumbent upon me as a Chief Whip of the ANC and as a chair of the Chief Whip's Forum to raise the concerns if there are parties that are saying to me, we think this matter can still be handled next week because we've got one or two issues that can be discussed. And if the discussion does not bring us into a consensus, we all know, including the parties that have raised the matter, the matter will have to take a known vote for a decision.

So in short all I'm saying is that if the Rules no longer permit what I suggested needs to be done, I have to be understood properly. I am not standing on the way of Parliament to take a decision here and now on the matter, as it has been the case on other issues where we don't agree but I thought it was appropriate for me to raise this matter so that it is entertained by my colleagues as they have done, who are the party Whips. Thanks.

The SPEAKER: Thank you very much, hon Ntuli, for your response on the matters that have been raised by parties. I have taken note of the apology you made in the beginning, because ideally

UNREVISED HANSARD

it would have been better had this issue been raised in the beginning so that we are aware that there are such concerns that require parties to persuade each other. And I also want to note that there are concerns that parties have raised, even though they did not object to the report, but they did raise concerns.

Hon member Taaibosch raised serious concerns in his intervention, even though at the end he never said support or reject. But he literally raised major concerns as the party in terms of this legislation and even the interventions that might have been made by the NCOP.

Hon Mkhalipi raised the issue of financing, even though she supported the report. We have had parties reflecting that it is unfortunate that this matter comes at this point now. I am not sure whether parties, having listened to each other and to yourselves, still stand by saying let us proceed and ask if there are objections to the motion as moved by the Whip. I just want to get consensus from parties whether we put this decision to a vote from parties or we allow you space to have a discussion further.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms O M C MAOTWE: Speaker, the Chief Whip of the ANC is extremely out of order and he knows it. Firstly, when this session started, he was not on this session. You called him twice and then he was nowhere to be found. And now he comes at the end when he's supposed to be doing the declaration on behalf of the ANC and wants all of us to now destroy what we've already done. And you're allowing it, which is very wrong because it's not in the agenda of Parliament for today. There's an Order Paper that your office issued to all of us. The world is watching us while the ANC Chief Whip wants to change or amend the order paper of today. There's no such an item in the Order Paper today.

The ANC has done their declaration. We are now moving forward with the voting. What they've put on the table now, he knows that it's extremely late. The flight has left, so he must not come here ...

The SPEAKER: Hon Omphile, we have heard you.

Ms O M C MAOTWE: ... You must not allow it because if you do, tomorrow we're going to do the same thing, and you must allow it. We've spent now almost 30 minutes debating a matter that should have been done already. I'm ready to do the debate on

UNREVISED HANSARD

the sight visit of Parliament. So please let's go into the vote without any further delays.

The SPEAKER: Let's allow for the other two members with their hands up. Hon Mkhize.

Ms P MKHIZE: Madam Speaker, I agree with the comrade that just ended off now that we should continue with the vote. Thank you very much.

Adv G BREYTENBACH: Madam Speaker, might I suggest that we perhaps take a vote on whether we should defer the matter or proceed with the matter and solve this problem. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Inkosi N Z BUTHELEZI: Madam Speaker, I also feel that if nothing else, maybe the timing of this matter being raised maybe must have been the biggest problem because I think that where the danger lies is that if we move now to a debate, we are setting a precedent that next time if the matter is not on the Order Paper, it can come through like this. Some people can call it gatecrash. So if I hear the mention of the debate, I don't know on what basis if it's not on the Order Paper. Some of us have already declared.

UNREVISED HANSARD

When I talk about timing, we declared our standpoint, debated it to death and showed our hand. I think if nowhere else, it falls down on the timing which has been acknowledged. Also, I don't think we need to go to the debate because the hon Chief Whip has already said he's not married to this thing to the point where he is going to go for the option of bringing the pillars down. I really think that we should proceed. That is our feeling as the IFP.

The SPEAKER: Thank you very much, hon member. If other members would allow me, let's just go to the procedure. Just to indicate that there was no debate allowed. I had allowed members to reflect on issues that has been raised, not because we are removing the issue on the agenda. And I also gave my summary on my own observation on what happened in the debate. Can we now move in terms of the procedures?

Question put: That the Bill, as amended, be passed.

Division demanded.

The House divided.

The House suspended for 5 minutes

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: Speaker, just be clear that we are voting on the Bill, not on Ntuli’s proposal.

The SPEAKER: Hon Mkhaliphi, I’m not sure where you were. I clarified that we are voting on the Bill.

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: Oh, thanks Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Hon members, the Speaker has determined that in accordance with the Rules, a manual voting procedure will be used for this division. Firstly, in order to establish a quorum, I would request the Table to confirm that we have the requisite number of members present on the virtual platform to take this decision. Secretary? Yes, we do. We have 348 members on the platform, which is above the quorum required.

Party Whips will then be given an opportunity to confirm the number of their members present and indicate if they vote for or against the question. A member who wishes to abstain or vote against the party vote may do so by informing the Chair.

Order! Having confirmed that we have the requisite quorum, we will now proceed. The question before the House is that the motion as moved by the Chief Whips be agreed to.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Voting will now commence. No member will be admitted on the virtual platform until the division is concluded.

Whips, could you confirm the number of your members present on the virtual platform and indicate if they vote for or against the Bill? Are the party Whips ready to record the votes of their members who are present?

Voting [Take in from minutes]

Question agreed to.

Bill as amended, accordingly passed.

Ms B E MACHI: Sorry, Speaker, will you please ask the staff to allow those who are still waiting to be let in? There are still those who are out.

The SPEAKER: Yes, we will do so because the votes have been counted and announced. Those who were not there when we started to vote were locked out. Can ICT please make sure that members who were in reception when we were voting are allowed in now? Thank you. We now move to the Second Order.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We proceed to the Second Order of the day, which is Consideration of the Report of Joint Standing Committee on Financial Management of Parliament on Site visits undertaken to inspect progress made in the rebuilding of infrastructure destroyed in 2022 fire and installation of Nieuwmeester Dome. Hon Lekganyane.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF PARLIAMENT ON SITE VISITS UNDERTAKEN TO INSPECT PROGRESS MADE IN REBUILDING OF INFRASTRUCTURE DESTROYED IN 2022 FIRE AND INSTALLATION OF NIEUWMEESTER DOME

Mr M S LEKGANYANE: Hon Speaker and fellow hon members, the report that we are introducing before the House is on oversight work that has been conducted in terms of the provisions of section 4 of the Financial Management of Parliament and Provincial Legislatures Act 10 of 2009.

Let me indicate that, following the outbreak of the fire which caused damage to Parliament’s infrastructure, an agreement has been reached between the executives of Parliament and the Ministries of Public Works and Treasury that Parliament will be responsible for the management of the restoration process,

UNREVISED HANSARD

and further that the appropriations for the project will go straight to Parliament.

We must indicate that visits were conducted to both the site of the erection of the dome — the Nieuwmeester building, I mean the Nieuwmeester site — and Parliament where the restoration is happening. The visits in terms of Parliament were conducted on the 6th of November last year and for the dome on the 3rd of December 2025, and the 13th and 16th of February 2026.

We report to the House that the dome has been completed and handed over to Parliament, and that the restoration project is at 76%. There is going to be a lag with regard to the envisaged completion date. This was caused by unforeseen hydrogeological conditions that were detected later.

I accordingly introduce the report before this House and ask the House to accept it. Thank you, hon Speaker.

There was no debate.

Declaration(s) of vote:

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr D D D VAN ROOYEN: Hon Speaker, allow me to make this declaration on behalf of my party, the MKP and reiterate the party's position on the need to expeditiously restore the Parliament building, so that it is able to deliver on its mandate as the voice of the voiceless masses of our nation. As the MKP, we further lambast the clumsy nature of how this National Key Point was subjected to the destructive fire in 2022. The expeditious completion of this project will lead to massive cost savings when Parliament's forced reliance on external venues for its business is stopped. It will also go a long way to save Parliament from inherent project escalation costs. The MKP appreciates Parliament's effort to save costs in the long term by purchasing instead of hiring broadcast equipment, and in so doing, avoided spending R45 million annually on hiring equipment, which will ultimately not belong to Parliament. It is worth noting, hon Speaker and the House, that for each plenary sitting, Parliament was paying almost R1 million for broadcasting services. Purchasing its own equipment is indeed a strategic investment. Our site visits, *inter alia*, exposed how desperate the DA is to use this restoration project and the Public Works Ministry for political profiling and expediency. The DA Minister misled you, Speaker, and the nation when he prematurely handed over the incomplete Dome project without involving the legitimate

UNREVISED HANSARD

Parliament committee. As if this is this was not enough, the same DA is now questioning the legitimacy of the restoration project handover conducted in the Sixth Parliament.

They didn't question the parliamentary solution then but are only doing it now because they want to use the Ministry to control Parliament’s ecosystem and value chain with the sole intention of political profiling and expedience. The MKP calls for a parliamentary institution that is independent from executive capture and fully capacitated to execute its mandate. The reliance on generators to power the Dome and the subsequent noise is an inconvenience to the plenary settings. Instead of using the restoration project to sort apparent Government of National Unity, GNU, differences and internal competition, we urge the DA to talk sense to the DA-led City of Cape Town to install electricity to the Dome. We thank you, hon Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Once again, hon members, can you please be conscious of the time that you have for declarations? EFF.

Ms O M C MAOTWE: Speaker, this is one of those instances where we are reminded of how we need to seriously reconsider

UNREVISED HANSARD

Parliament's programming. Today is the 11th of August, and we want this House to consider a report of an inspection of the Dome installation which we did in May. We are talking about the Dome that has stood there empty for months on end because we were given a structure that was incomplete and was not ready.

Chairs and tables were hired, and they just sat there. The sound system was installed, but no one was using it. We even had cooling facilities, mobile air conditioners, just standing there when the Public Works Department was struggling to bring the standard of the Dome to an acceptable level for use by the National Assembly. We even had X-ray machines and metal detectors, some of which even got rained on. It was the EFF that had to fight because there were some people who wanted Parliament to continue to meet on Zoom, like what they do in the City of Cape Town, treating Parliament and Council like some caucus meeting. If you did not fight the incompetent Minister of Public Works, the Dome would still be under construction even today. We were even promised that the 2026 Sona was going to be held in the Dome when it was obvious to everyone that it was not going to happen. And indeed, it did not happen. A contractor was appointed for R31 million to complete the work in February 2026. A lot of excuses were

UNREVISED HANSARD

made. When we went there for the first oversight visit, it was obvious that the contractor made empty promises. They even handed over a site that was not ready for use. Even when we went for the second visit, it was still not done.

Now we want to adopt a report which says that Parliament must provide a detailed breakdown of what Parliament has spent since the burning of Parliament, instead of having that report included here. Even the suggestion that the Dome should be hired shows that you have people who are obsessed with avenues of private interest more than the public service. Why not use the Dome for government events at no cost instead of paying contractors? People are going to end up abusing the Dome and starting their own companies to rent the Dome, relying on Parliament's assets. Even the idea that this cost more than R30 million on its own is still highly contested. But there is no interest in holding people accountable. You can just steal public money and get away with it. The EFF does not support such an outdated report that could contain more details than what is here. The intention is not to inform the public, but to pretend like we're doing something and we're being responsible. I thank you, Speaker.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms B E MACHI: Hon Speaker, the IFP is pleased with the progress in the National Assembly's infrastructure repairs as well as the installation of the Dome as its temporary replacement. However, previous oversight visits have highlighted areas of concern that require additional attention. R68 million has been funnelled into purchasing equipment for the Dome to avoid a costly annual hiring process.

We reiterate the committee's call for a detailed breakdown of this expenditure to be provided. Additionally, we stress the importance of being future-forward when considering this structure. Although the Dome represents a temporary solution, its high cost means we must leverage its full potential. We highlight the growing need to consider alternate uses for the venue once it has fulfilled its intended purpose. The IFP emphasises the need for increased clarity and practicality going forward. We must ensure that the taxpayers’ funds are used and accounted for responsibly. Although these structures are occupied by parliamentarians, they belong to all South African citizens. It is essential that their functionality is prioritised above all, and that we maintain the utmost transparency in the movement of their funds. The IFP accepts the report. I thank you.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms M L MATHOPA: Madam Speaker, hon members, I rise in support of the report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Financial Management of Parliament. The destruction of Parliament was not merely the loss of buildings; it disrupted the functioning of a critical institution of our constitutional democracy. Rebuilding Parliament must, therefore, be urgent, transparent, accountable and financially responsible.

The Nieuwmeester Dome handover was premature, and the committee was right to call it out. The executive must learn that theatrics are not delivery. The committee site visits demonstrate the importance of hands-on oversight. We cannot govern from paperwork alone. We must see the progress on the ground and ensure that what is reported is what is delivered.

We welcome the progress made, including the installation of the Nieuwmeester Dome, but progress must be measured against approved budgets, timelines, quality standards, and value for money. Every rand spent on rebuilding Parliament belongs to the people. There must be no room for waste, irregular expenditure, unnecessary delays or unchecked cost escalations. The committee's recommendations must not gather dust. They must translate into action, regular monitoring and accountability.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Where deadlines are missed, or commitments are ignored, there must be consequences. As we rebuild Parliament, we must also build an institution that is safer, stronger and more resilient against future disasters. Rebuilding Parliament is not about bricks and mortar; it is about restoring the ability of our democracy to serve the people. I, therefore, support the report and commend the committee for its continued oversight. I thank you, Speaker.

Mr A D BEESLEY: Hon Chairperson, having served in Parliament, I have seen firsthand the consequences of delays in delivering public infrastructure. The rebuilding of Parliament is a clear example of how delays can affect not only an institution but the functioning of our democracy.

The fire that destroyed the National Assembly and parts of the Old Assembly happened in January 2022. We are now more than four years later, and Parliament is still operating without its original buildings. The reconstruction has required temporary arrangements, alternative venues, and significant disruptions to the normal functioning of Parliament. Whilst we recognise that a project of this scale is complex, with heritage considerations, construction challenges, and unforeseen conditions, we cannot allow complexity to become an

UNREVISED HANSARD

excuse for indefinite delays. The committee has undertaken several oversight visits to assess progress, and these visits have shown both progress and continued challenges. Even the dome, which was intended to provide a temporary solution, was handed over before it was ready for use.

South Africans expect government to deliver. Parliament must lead by example. We need urgency, accountability, and clear timelines. The people of South Africa should not have to wait indefinitely for Parliament to return to a fully functioning precinct. We must also remember that these delays come at a cost. Parliament has had to rely on external venues and temporary arrangements since the fire, yet the full cost of transport, venue hire, catering, and other related expenses has still not yet been clearly accounted for. The committee has called for that breakdown, and it must be provided. I thank you.

Mr S N SWART: Madam Speaker, the ACDP has taken note of this report. Psalm 127 teaches us that unless the Lord builds the house, the builders labour in vain. Unless the Lord watches over the city, the guards stand watch in vain. These wise words of Solomon mean that any human effort or planning done without God’s help, blessing, or guidance ultimately lacks

UNREVISED HANSARD

lasting value or success. True security and success only come from depending on God’s foundational blessing. As kingdom builders, we agree with this sentiment.

We as leaders need to commit everything we do to Father God for his wisdom and guidance, given the many challenges facing our nation and the challenges that we have faced within the rebuilding of Parliament. As we rebuild the walls of our fire-ravaged Parliament, may we rebuild and restore the moral fibre of our nation as leaders setting a godly example. May we be called oaks of righteousness ...

The SPEAKER: Hon Mvana! Hon Mvana! Order! Hon Mvana, can you please mute? Hon Swart, you can proceed.

Mr S N SWART: Thank you. May we be called oaks of righteousness, a planting of the Lord for the display of his splendour, understanding that, when the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice. May we, as servant leaders, understand stewardship of state resources, including every rand spent on rebuilding Parliament. Proper oversight is critical, as costs escalate beyond initial estimates.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Having regard to the tree design of the new National Assembly interior, may the Seventh Parliament be the symbol of the Tree of Life referred to in Revelation 22, whose leaves, will, we pray, be for the healing of our nation ravaged by crime and violence, high levels of unemployment and poverty, as well as to the nations around us. This we pray and trust for as kingdom builders. I thank you.

Dr M A MAIMANE: I want to speak just from an appropriations point of view, to say that, Speaker, it is going to become crucial that, as Parliament, we set the deadline to say: What is the complete cost that this project is going to be? What we are beginning to see is that from, time to time, again, in the Minister of Finance's Budget, there are new appropriations being made on a regular basis towards the rebuilding of Parliament. Therefore, I want to urge that this House, inasmuch as the project timelines are required, ensure that there is a cap on how much can ultimately be spent on this project.

It cannot be an endless budget with an endless timeline. Therefore, I want to urge, Speaker, that at least, even from your office and financial management of Parliament, there be a

UNREVISED HANSARD

cap, a projected cap, as to what this project is going to be. I thank you, Speaker.

Dr L W MAHLATSI: Speaker, the UAT believes that Parliament must be rebuilt, but we cannot support the culture in which reconstruction becomes an excuse for delays, escalating costs, and weak accountability. The committee itself criticised the premature handover, stating that it created a false impression that the facility was ready for parliamentary use, whilst the very committee responsible for oversight was not invited to the handover. That is unacceptable.

The oversight cannot be treated as an afterthought or as an inconvenience to public relations. We also note the millions invested in the audiovisual equipment, alongside the committee's findings that Parliament avoided approximately R45 million annually that would otherwise have been spent hiring equipment. This may constitute a sensible long-term investment, but Parliament must provide details of expenditure breakdown. Saving money in the long term does not eliminate the obligation to account for every rand spent today. Most importantly, the UAT demands that the full cost arising from the 2022 fire, including external venues, transport, catering and other temporary arrangements be disclosed.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Parliament must not merely rebuild its building; it must rebuild public confidence. We therefore call for strict project timelines, quarterly public reporting, comprehensive cost disclosure, effective fire safety measures, and uncompromising parliamentary oversight. A reconstructed Parliament must be more than a new building. It must symbolise a Parliament that is independent, transparent, accountable, and genuinely responsible for the people of South Africa. Therefore, the UAT rejects this report.

Xitsonga:

Khanimambo! [Thank you!]

English:

Dr C H H HUSINGER: Hon Speaker, the DA rises to speak on this report, and we do so with one guiding question. Are South Africans getting value for the hundreds of millions of rand spent to recover from a fire that never should have destroyed this institution’s home in the first place?

Let us be fair to the facts before us. Under considerable pressure and a punishing timeline, the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure delivered a functioning temporary chamber, the Nieuwmeester Dome, in time for Parliament to

UNREVISED HANSARD

continue its constitutional work. That the dome now works is no longer in dispute. Parliament’s own fourth quarter report confirms that R18 million was saved in that quarter alone, simply because sittings no longer needed to be hired out to external venues. That is a real, measurable return on the department’s delivery, and this House should say so plainly.

Hon Speaker, it is only right that we consider the report before us here today, the site visit report of 26 May 2026, but the DA will not pretend time has stood still since 26 May.

A further quarterly report covering the second and fourth quarters of 2025-2026 was subsequently tabled,
dated 7 August 2026. It is not before this House today, but it is public. It speaks directly to this very project, and there is no harm — it is indeed a duty — in placing its facts on record. Those facts are harder, not simpler, than what was before us in May. By the end of the fourth quarter, that is, 31 March 2026, only R925,8 million of the R4,1 billion annual rebuilding fund budget had been spent. That is 22%. Even after adjusting for completed work not yet capitalised, spending rises to only 33%.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Hon Speaker, two thirds of the R4 billion budget remain unspent more than five years after the fire. More damning still is what the committee itself now says. In its own words, in that report, it says that notwithstanding the administrator’s insistence that the project is proceeding well, concerns remain that the project will not be delivered by the November 2026 deadline. It is not the DA’s characterisation. It is the Joint Standing Committee on Financial Management of Parliament’s own finding and voice, tabled after the report before us here today, and it should weigh heavily on every member in this House.

Let us be equally clear about where responsibility lies. The Nieuwmeester Dome falls under the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure and is delivering. The National Assembly and the Old Assembly rebuild falls under Parliament’s own administration and the Development Bank of Southern Africa as implementing agent. It is that rebuild, not the dome, that is now at real risk of missing its deadline. Parliament’s own management must explain in detail and without delay how it intends to close a R3,2 billion spending gap in a matter of months.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The DA therefore calls on the executive authority to bring the November 2026 target and credible steps to meet it before this committee with urgency, not at the next scheduled briefing sometime in future but now. We support continued site inspections and insist that any further slippage be reported the moment it becomes apparent, not months later.

Hon Speaker, the DA supports the adoption of this report. We commend the professionals who delivered a working Chamber under difficult conditions, showing that delivery is possible when it is properly managed. We now expect Parliament's own administration to prove the same is true of the buildings this Parliament actually calls home. I thank you.

Mr C M DUGMORE: Speaker, I also rise on behalf of the ANC to support the Report of Joint Standing Committee on the Financial Management of Parliament, dated 26 May.

I think it's important, Speaker and hon members, to explain that in regard to the rebuilding and matters related to it, the Development Bank of South Africa is contracted to deal with the National Assembly, the Old Assembly Chamber and has also been involved in the work at 90 Plein Street where additional offices for members, boardrooms, etc. have been

UNREVISED HANSARD

constructed. As the chairperson explained, that arises from a decision that was made in the previous administration, and that work is proceeding.

The issue of the Dome is a separate issue. I actually want to use this occasion to commend you, Speaker, for initiating the process out of discussions at the Chief Whips' Forum and the joint standing committee to make sure that this Dome, which had been utilised for the funeral of our late President Comrade Nelson Mandela, to make sure that it arrived in Cape Town. We then oversaw the additional work in regard to the Dome. So, I just want to say that we have oversight, as a joint standing committee, into both the work being overseen by the Development Bank and the partnership between Public Works and Parliament, specifically on the issue of the Dome.

I think what's important is also to say that, yes, although this report is dated 26 May, we went back for another visit on Friday, 7 August. It is a pity that hon Hunsinger was not there. He did submit an apology, but he would have then received an update. I advise and urge him and also the members of the EFF, who had also apologised ... that we are going to have a detailed discussion this Friday, 14 August, where we will discuss in detail the Development Bank's progress report,

UNREVISED HANSARD

where we are, the levels of expenditure and so on. So, it's not as though this report is happening in a vacuum.

As recently as Friday, the committee was back there. We need to commend those who have been involved and continue to be involved in this project, but also understand, as we saw for ourselves on Friday, that the massive boulders that have been uncovered cannot be blasted in the normal way, given the heritage issues related to the Old Assembly Chamber. Therefore, other more time-consuming methods have to be used in terms of the rock that was found and the challenge of water.

In my view, it's important that the refurbishment and rebuilding is done completely. We take into account the delays because at the end of the day, what we are looking for is a Parliament rebuilt according to the design that all of us saw and were involved in, and which some of us gave input into so that it is ready for occupation. Both the New Assembly, which is now going to be able to accommodate over 1 000 people, which is a huge improvement, the Old Assembly Chamber as well. So, that report and the visit that we conducted as recently as Friday, 7 August, will now be discussed on 14 August, where members can further engage.

UNREVISED HANSARD

I want to support what hon Van Rooyen has indicated, the fact that the generators for the Dome clearly are a concern. I think there's no reason why the request to the City of Cape Town to provide a transformer right outside of the Dome should not be pushed. I think that will ensure that noise levels are kept down. It is disappointing that there has not yet been a response from the City of Cape Town regarding that issue.

It's also important to note that there's a specific paragraph, and a number of members have raised this issue about what happens to the Dome after the completion. You would see under Part E that there's a specific recommendation there which was made by the committee in regard to the future use of the Dome. Both Public Works and Parliament must present a proposal so that this facility, in the heart of the city, can be utilised for different events or seminars. It could even be used for cultural events, music and so on. This would be a way that the investment that has been made into the Dome, once Parliament is ready, can be realised. I think that's a very exciting opportunity where the state itself can utilise an asset, like we have utilised the Dome as an asset that was used for the funeral of Comrade Madiba, that that particular asset can also be used as well.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Members have pointed out the wise investment in audiovisual equipment that Parliament has purchased, meaning that we will not have to hire that system any time. We have saved money, in fact, through the construction of the Dome. It's important not to come here, hon Hunsinger, and raise political points, because I could also point out the huge number of Public Works projects that are supposed to be completed on the precinct that are not. Let us, rather, as a committee, have oversight and without fear or favour, whether it is the Development Bank or Public Works, make sure that we hold those institutions accountable to build the Parliament that all of us can respect and that the building itself can serve the needs of members. We, therefore, welcome this report and urge that oversight is continued.

In conclusion, I also want to thank our own Executive Authority, the Speaker and the Chairperson of the NCOP, for giving leadership in this matter. Thank you.

The CHIEF WHIP OF THE LARGEST MINORITY PARTY: Madam Speaker, good afternoon again. I propose that the report be adopted. Thank you.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The motion is that ...

[Interjections.].

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: It is not withdrawn, Speaker ...

The SPEAKER: [Laughter.]. Hon Mkhaliphi, I missed what you were saying, but here we are now on this report. The motion is that the report be adopted.

Motion agreed to (Economic Freedom Fighters and United Africans Transformation dissenting).

Report accordingly adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF PARLIAMENT ON PARLIAMENT OF REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA'S 2024/25 ANNUAL REPORT

Mr M S LEKGANYANE: Hon House Chair, greetings to you. Greetings once again to the Speaker and fellow hon members. We introduce to you the annual report under review and note progress on the following.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We start by congratulating the Speaker and the administration of Parliament on the eleventh consecutive clean audit that has been achieved. Secondly, we report on the restoration project like we did in the order that has just been dispensed with. We also wish to report on the innovation with regard to legislation and public participation, in particular, the advancement in data and information management. The automation of the e-petitions process is related to this.

We also indicate that Parliament has been able to realise 80% of its performance targets in the financial year under review and we congratulate Programme 2: Legislation and Oversight for 100% achievement. Hon House Chair, we also note the progress made with regards to organisational design. Of course, we are concerned with the underspending of almost R1,5 billion. We want to advise that there should be improvements in that regard. Lastly, there has been wasteful expenditure which was caused by fraudulent payments of R227 million.

I table this report before this House for consideration and urge hon members to support the report. Thank you so much.

Declarations of Vote:

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr D D VAN ROOYEN: House Chairperson, the conducted survey cited in the annual plan confirms the deteriorating satisfaction levels on members' wellness services. Among other things is poor maintenance of sports facilities and the absence of gym facilities in parliamentary villages. The dysfunctionality of the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure has caused parliamentary villages' sports facilities to dilapidate.

Millions of investments done to these facilities went to waste due to the department's poor service delivery record. Hence, as the MK Party, we call for Parliament to be capacitated to manage its own facilities. Parliament must also improve on how it funds various sporting codes. Hence, our call for a transparent and equitable funding model for all sporting codes.

Government failure to realise majority of the National Development Plan, NDP targets renders most of Parliament plans, plans like Oversight Priority Plan and Country Outcome Indicator Dashboard useless because they provide for focused oversight on key things such as reducing poverty, unemployment and inequality. As we all know, these are areas where government has dismally performed.

UNREVISED HANSARD

As the MK Party, we fully support and agree to the need of Parliament to assess the impact of its own legislation on the daily lives of our people and hold the executive accountable, with the sole intention of improving on service delivery. Our only concern is the restrictive budgetary provision perpetuated by fiscal consolidation and austerity measures.

Strengthening in public involvement in Parliament business is the cornerstone of public participation democracy. We appreciate Parliament’s efforts of addressing the limitation of the existing manual system for managing petitions. As the MK Party, we call for the initiated online petition system to be extended to rural areas and traditional councils across the length and breadth of our beloved country.

We call for a conclusion of fruitless and wasteful expenditure gains of R2,2 million incurred in this financial year, as well as irregular expenditure of R7,5 million carried over from the previous financial year. The MK Party reiterates its call for enhanced and robust oversight by Parliament committee on the execution of Parliament’s restoration process.

Indeed, we should continue to ensure regular reporting on the implementation plan by the presiding officers to the joint

UNREVISED HANSARD

committee until the building is done and commissioned accordingly. No amount of political profiling and expediency should be allowed to distract our focus. This project must be completed as soon as yesterday. We thank you Chairperson.

Ms O M C MAOTWE: House Chair, we want to state categorically that we don't support the adoption of this report. We do so for reasons known to you and everyone because we have objected to this report on sound reasons that the chairperson of the committee chooses to ignore.

There are three things that make this report not worth the paper it is written on, let alone the fact that it is just a copy and paste of the previous reports with very little substance to account to the people of South Africa. The report hides the fact that the Secretary to Parliament, Mr Xolile George, was appointed through a corrupt, irregular and questionable process.

The National Treasury raised concerns about the salary of the Secretary to Parliament which just kept increasing for no reason. The job was profiled at R2,6 million. The advert was issued for R2,6 million. The advert was withdrawn without following the proper procedure. Mr George was appointed

UNREVISED HANSARD

without a contract. He worked for months on end without a contract and signed documents of Parliament without a contract with Parliament. The SA Local Government Association, Salga continued to pay him nearly R5 million.

Some study by a company called 21st Century, a company that was getting tenders from Salga when Mr George was its chief executive officer was used to justify the salary increase. Today, Mr George earns more than R5 million. Only the ANC and hon Dugmore think this is acceptable. We don't know why the ANC thinks everything needs to be resolved by court, even when it is clear.

Can the former liberation movement be this broken that even people like the Speaker are willing to put their careers on the block for this kind of madness? But we will be patient and we know that this appointment will be set aside. We'll demand those involved to pay back all the money that has been paid to the Secretary to Parliament.

Secondly, we're going to need a commission of inquiry on the rebuilding of Parliament. The project started at R2,6 billion, now it is well over R4 billion. We have all the files and documentation. We are studying them, following the evidence,

UNREVISED HANSARD

and it’s already clear that the deal is rotten. The burning of Parliament was an opportunity to loot. This is why people were so hell-bent to reject our proposal to rebuild Parliament than to move to the capital city in Tshwane, and to have the administration of the state in one city instead of continuing with the colonial arrangement. The report ignores this fact. The joint committee pretends like there are no serious questions that we’ve asked.

Lastly, we maintain that the Seventh Parliament, at nearly the halfway mark of the term, is possibly worse at preserving the gains we made in the Fifth and Sixth Parliaments since the EFF arrived in this Parliament. We continue to fight for the translation of all services and committee meetings, not only English and Afrikaans, like we are some colonial Parliament. The quality of committee meetings, the content scheduling, the resources, and all of the things that make this Parliament a people’s Parliament.

If we are not careful, by the end of the Seventh Parliament, we run the risk of having a Parliament that only pushes paper for the sake of it. The EFF does not support this report. I thank you, Chair.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Ms B E MACHI: Hon Chairperson, we, as the IFP, welcome Parliament's 11th consecutive clean audit. This demonstrates that sound financial management and accountability remains possible within our institutions. However, a clean audit cannot become a substitute for effective performance and value for money. We are concerned by the over R2,2 million in fruitless and wasteful expenditure arising from payment to a fraudulent account, as well as the more than R7,5 million in irregular expenditure.

These matters must be resolved decisively within accountability for wrongdoings. We are equally concerned about the delays in rebuilding Parliament following the 2022 fire and the institution's creditor payment period increasing from 39-48 days. We welcome the progress made in strengthening Parliament's capacity through the committee planning framework, legislative impact assessment framework and digital tools for evidence-based oversight.

We support stronger oversight, constituency management, timely procurement and greater financial independence for Parliament. A Parliament that holds government accountable must itself exemplify accountability, efficiency and a responsible

UNREVISED HANSARD

stewardship of public funds. In considering these matters, the IFP accepts the report. I thank you, Chairperson.

Ms S M PETERS: House Chair, the PA welcomes the report on Parliament's 2024-25 annual report and notes its 11th consecutive clean audit. However, a clean audit cannot be the measure of success on its own. Parliament must not only account for how money is spent but demonstrate that public money delivers results. We are concerned that Parliament spent only R3,2 billion of its R4,7 billion budget, leaving an underspending of approximately R1,4 billion.

Most concerning is the 85% underspending on infrastructure, despite the urgent need to rebuild Parliament following the 2022 fire. The rebuilding of Parliament cannot become an intercycle of delays, procurement challenges and missed deadlines. Parliament must provide clear timelines, stronger oversight and measurable progress. We are equally concerned by the R2,27 million lost through a fraudulent payment, as well as R7,5 million in irregular expenditure that remained under investigation.

Parliament cannot demand accountability from the executive while failing to demonstrate the same standard within its own

UNREVISED HANSARD

administration. The increase in creditor payment times from 39-48 days against the required 30-day period is also unacceptable. Delayed payments can place significant pressure on businesses, particularly small businesses that depend on government contracts.

We acknowledge the progress made in strengthening oversight, public participation and digital systems. However, Parliament achieved only 80% of its annual targets, demonstrating that there is still much work to be done. The PA therefore calls for stronger oversight, faster investigations, recovery of lost public funds, strict adherence to payment timelines and greater accountability for underperformance.

Parliament must hold itself to the same standard it demands from government. South Africans deserve a Parliament that is efficient, independent, accountable and focused on delivering value for every rand. We support. Thank you.

Declaration of Votes Cont.

Mrs H DENNER: No declaration, House Chair.

Ms L M NGOBENI: Chairperson, ActionSA supports this report but with an important distinction that needs to be made. Despite

UNREVISED HANSARD

the fact that Parliament has achieved its eleventh consecutive clean audit, that is commendable and we acknowledge the work behind an unqualified audit with no material findings. However, a clean audit must never become a shield against scrutiny. Parliament must hold itself to the same standard of accountability as it demands from everyone else.

The most concerning issue is the over the R2 million loss after a payment intended for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association was deposited into the fraudulent bank account. More troubling than the fraud itself is that the criminal and internal investigations remain incomplete. The committee itself expresses concern about these delays and falls for urgent progress. This raises a simple question about accountability and where it is.

If Parliament expects departments, municipalities and public entities to investigate losses, recover public money and hold those responsible accountable, it must do the same. We also note that Parliament's creditor payment period increased from 39 to 48 days, well above National Treasury's prescribed 30-day standard.

UNREVISED HANSARD

These are not mere administrative shortcomings. They affect the credibility of an institution entrusted with overseeing billions in public expenditure. We also want to remind this House that the ANC might have gotten away with murder in the past, but it won't get away with it under the current dispensation. Parliament will no longer be bullied and browbeaten into accepting or defending the indefensible.

ActionSA therefore welcomes the committee's recommendations and will closely monitor their implementation. A clean audit is not a measure of accountability. It is, in and of itself, a minimum standard.

I thank you, hon Chairperson.

Mr S N SWART: House Chair, the ACDP takes note of the report and the sincere efforts undertaken to improve Parliament's performance in respect of lawmaking, oversight and public participation. As far as the funding model is concerned, we as the ACDP previously raised concerns which are now repeated in the report about Parliament being funded in the same manner as government departments.

UNREVISED HANSARD

We agree that it is untenable for Parliament to be reliant on the very executive it is obliged to hold to account for its budget. The State Capture Commission has raised a similar concern and recommended this weakness be attended to.

We as the ACDP share concerns with the slow progress in negotiations towards the funding process which is appropriate for Parliament as a separate arm of state. This remains a grave concern as it impacts on Parliament's ability to execute its constitutional obligations.

We agree that the collaboration between Parliament and the Financial and Fiscal Commission towards developing a solution to this should be fast tracked to resolve this funding issue before the end of this Parliament.

We welcome the unqualified audit outcome with no material findings, but the recommendations of the Auditor-General, AG and Audit Committee must be implemented and reported on a regular basis.

Lastly, the ACDP welcomes the development and piloting of the Legislative Impact Assessment Framework. Reviewing the impact of legislation that has already been passed will ensure that

UNREVISED HANSARD

Parliament is able to identify and address shortcomings in the legislative process.

This will contribute to Parliament having a positive impact on the lives of all South Africans. We previously had the pre-legislation Socio-Economic Assessment Studies by the Presidency. This move will now be post-legislation, which is to be welcomed. The ACDP supports the report.

I thank you.

Dr M A MAIMANE: House Chairperson, no declaration, we support.

Mr I ISMAIL-MOOSA: Chair, Al Jama-ah welcomes and supports.

Dr L W MAHLATSI: Chairperson, no declaration from the UAT.

Dr C H H HUNSINGER: Chairperson, the DA acknowledges what this report gets right. An 11th consecutive clean audit and 80% of annual targets achieved is genuine institutional achievement, and Parliament's administration deserves credit for it. But a clean audit is not the same as good financial management, and this report contains warning signs the DA cannot let pass in silence.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Starting with the headline figure, Parliament underspent its R4,7 billion budget by R1,46 billion, that is 31%. The single largest driver is capital expenditure. Of R1,29 billion budgeted for property, plant, equipment, and heritage assets, only R194 million was spent, an 85% underspent, almost entirely the rebuild and restoration project following the 2022 fire.

Chairperson, this is not new information sent to this House. More recently, reporting confirms the pattern was continued. By the fourth quarter of 2025-26, the rebuilding fund had still only spent 22% of its R4,1 billion budget, even as National Treasury kept injecting fresh money into the project. This is now a multi-year structural failure to executive Parliament's own flagship capital project, not a once-off delay.

The DA calls for an independent forensic project review, published in full before any further transfers be approved. The 33% underspent on goods and services tells a related story. Oversight activities themselves were delayed because committees of the Seventh Parliament were established late. This is a self-inflicted wound to Parliament's core

UNREVISED HANSARD

constitutional function, and the DA expects that lessons to be learned into transition planning for future Parliament.

We are also concerned about basic financial discipline. The Auditor-General found that Parliament's credit payment period grew from 39 days to 48, a breach of the National Treasury's 30-day rule. Small businesses doing business with the institution should not be made to wait.

The DA supports the committee's call for quarterly reporting on this specific metric, and nothing less. Fruitless and wasteful expenditure more than doubled to R2,28 million driven by the payment made into a fraudulent account, irregular expenditure remains unchanged at R7,53 million, still under investigation.

These figures, however modest against a R4,75 billion budget, point to control weaknesses and erode public trust. The DA insists these matters be concluded with consequences applied where warranted, not left indefinitely.

Chairperson, the DA strongly endorses the committee's own observation on Parliament's model. An institution

UNREVISED HANSARD

constitutionally required to hold the executive to account cannot remain funded like a line department of some executive.

This is not a new concern. The State Capture Commission raised it too, and the slow pace of negotiation with the Financial and Fiscal Commission on a genuinely independent funding mechanism for Parliament is untenable.

We call for this to be resolved before the end of the Seventh Parliament, not left to drift. We also note the rising cost of the post-retirement medical aid benefit, now supporting 1 118 former members at R91,5 million, up from R967 at R80 million the year before.

The DA supports reclassifying this as a direct charge against the National Revenue Fund, as the committee recommends, so that pressure no longer distorts Parliament's own operating budget.

Chairperson, the DA's position is consistent. Celebrate genuine achievement but never let clean-ordered opinion substitute for scrutiny on how efficiently fairly and accountably public money is actually spent. We support this

UNREVISED HANSARD

report's recommendations and expect real, time-bound corrective action, not another year of the same explanations.

I thank you.

Mr C M DUGMORE: Hon House Chairperson, once again I would like to rise on behalf of the ANC in support of this particular report. I think it’s no small achievement to obtain the clean audit 11 years in a row. I agree fully with members that clean audits don’t necessarily tell the whole story.

However, I wonder if it is not worthwhile informing the House that the accounting officer who since his appointment has also overseen a clean audit for Parliament is no other than the Secretary to Parliament, STP, Mr Xolile Goerge. Who unfortunately continues to be insulted and undermined by certain members of this House. What I am holding up here is a letter that I would like to read from the Auditor-General dated 12 August 2024. It is addressed to the hon Speaker and the hon House Chairperson. For what we have heard here is again an hon member, standing up here and claiming that the Secretary to Parliament’s appointment was untoward and corrupt, etc. All of us know that that appointment was not done by the Seventh Parliament, it was done by the Sixth

UNREVISED HANSARD

Parliament. However, this particular Standing Committee has gone into the issue in detail. In terms of all the evidence presented resolved as a committee as we have on other matters that this matter is now closed and this is what I would like to read because it goes directly to the defamatory allegations.

[Interjections.]

Ms O M C MAOTWE: Your time is over.

Mr C M DUGMORE: Against an official who is not here to defend himself and that report says, furthermore this letter is to confirm that we reviewed the recruitment and appointment process, the approval process of the salary offered and the subsequent adjustment to the salary after the appointment of the STP and no irregularities were identified based on the information that was provided to us and yet you have people coming here calling for forensic audits. The reality is, it is strange that for instance the hon Maotwe and others from her party said nothing about the fact that the Chief Executive Officer, CEO, of the Road Accident Fund, Raf, earns R8,7 million. The suspended CEO who members of the EFF

UNREVISED HANSARD

continue to defend at Standing Committee on Public Accounts, Scopa, and other levels.

Ms O M C MAOTWE: Hon House Chairperson, on a point of order.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Order, hon members!

Ms H O MKHALIPHI: So, we must not debate here! We must be told how to debate!

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon members! Hon Mkhaliphi and hon Maotwe, please make use of the raise hand button if you want to intervene. I have the participants list open.

Ms O M C MAOTWE: Alright. Hon House Chairperson, please recognise me!

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon Maotwe, I will recognise you.

Ms O M C MAOTWE: Yes, thank you, House Chairperson.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Hon House Chairperson, I think you must rule the hon Dugmore out of order. He has left the debate. He is now venturing into Raf. I do not know why he is crying about Raf.

We are talking about a matter that is in court. There is nothing that he can do to protect Xolile George. He is going to answer in court. That appointment is going to be set aside. He is going to pay back all the money that was paid to him.

An HON MALE MEMBER: What kind of a point of order is this?

Ms O M C MAOTWE: There is nothing you can do!

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Order! Hon Maotwe, thank you.

An HON MALE MEMBER: It is a point of debate!

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Thank you, I do not need assistance from members. Please do not unmute and interject. I will get to you just now hon Reddy, unless it is on the same point.

Mr V G REDDY: No, actually it is not, hon House Chairperson.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): No, no. Thank you. You can just stand down I will get to you just now.

Mr V G REDDY: Thank you.

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

Yes.

Hon members, we are busy with a political debate. I think it is fact comment of the hon Dugmore to issue comparisons in terms of what people in similar circumstances would be paying. The fact that this is apparently headed to the courts, etc as is all seemingly part of the debate. The hon Dugmore must have the opportunity to respond to allegations that were made during the debate.

The hon Reddy.

Mr V G REDDY: Hon House Chairperson, on a point of order.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon Reddy why did you want to be recognised.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr V REDDY: I will stand down, hon House Chairperson. Thank you.

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

Hon Dugmore please continue.

Mr C M DUGMORE: Hon House Chairperson, thank you.

Could you just indicate if you do not mind, how many minutes am I left with.

Ms O M C MAOTWE: Five seconds!

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): [Laughter.]

That is a good question, hon Dugmore.

I will take advice because on my end I did not pause you. I will just ask the table staff if they could just advice.

It is three minutes and six seconds, hon Dugmore.

Mr C M DUGMORE: Thank you very much.

UNREVISED HANSARD

So, hon House Chairperson, as I was just saying I would just like to read this clause again in this paragraph.

Ms O M C MAOTWE: No, no, no.

Hon House Chairperson! I am sorry.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon Maotwe, why do you want to be recognised now?

Ms O M C MAOTWE: Hon House Chairperson, you just said his time is three minutes and six seconds. So, his time is over. Why is he still continuing to speak?

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): No, he has three minutes and six seconds left, hon Maotwe. He has six minutes in total at his disposal. Please allow us to manage the time.

Mr C M DUGMORE: Thank you.

I quote:

> It says, furthermore, this letter is to confirm that we reviewed the recruitment and the appointment process, the

UNREVISED HANSARD

approval process of the salary offered and the subsequent adjustment to the salary and no irregularities were identified based on the information that was provided to us.

This is because the information that the committee received was that there was a benchmarking process. It is really unfortunate that this House is misled to say that the 21st Century Company that was used to do the benchmarking process was recruited from SA Local Government Association, Salga. This company has been used by Parliament for 10 or 15 years. It was not appointed by the Secretory to Parliament.

I think it is unfortunate that there are ad haminem attacks on an individual who in terms of his leadership of Parliament has helped to deliver a clean audit and has overseen the rebuilding project and so on.

I would also like to support those members who say and it is on the agenda of the Joint Standing Committee chaired by the hon Lekganyane and our hon Chairperson Ndhlovu from the National Council of Provinces, NCOP, that the issue of Parliament’s funding is absolutely critical. We are a separate arm of government, we have the judiciary, we have the

UNREVISED HANSARD

executive and we have the legislature. It is absolutely critical that Parliament should not be dependent on an arbitrary process by the Treasury to decide what is our funding to complete our oversight function. That matter is on the agenda of the Joint Standing Committee in this year, and the Speaker will be making a presentation in terms of how we deal with that.

It should also be said that there was no fault on this part of Parliament regarding the fraudulent account given to Parliament by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association for the R2,2 million annual subscription. That matter has been reported to the Police. All of us are concerned about the delays but there should not be an impression created that there was fraud on behalf of anyone from our SA Parliament.

I also want to indicate to this particular gathering that the work of the Standing Committee which has oversight over Parliament must be robust. We look at issues affecting all financial matters of Parliament. It is important that in this particular process we confide in each other as members around the medical aid issue for instance which is been raised and it remains a continuing issue that Members of Parliament have

UNREVISED HANSARD

raised that we need to deal with. Issues of gratuities, those are important issues.

I think after this report, the next report that this House will be getting is the issue that affects the future of Parliament. That is accommodation and the parliamentary villages. If Parliament feels that it might actually be better for Parliament to have control over the parliamentary villages, let us debate that not just because that it is public works, but what is the best for Parliament. Thank you, hon House Chairperson. [Time expired.]

Question put: That the Report be adopted.

Division demanded.

The House divided.

The House Chairperson Mr W Horn announced that, the Speaker had determined that, in accordance with the Rules, a manual voting procedure would be used and that the whips would conduct a headcount of members on the virtual platform for the purpose of ascertaining quorum and voting.

UNREVISED HANSARD

A quorum being present in terms of Rule 98(1), voting commenced.

Ayes – 234: (ANC – 129; DA – 74; IFP – 10; PA – 7; FF Plus – 3; ActionSA – 4; ACDP – 3; Rise Mzansi – 1; BOSA – 1; Al Jamaha – 2).

Noes – 77: (MKP – 50; EFF – 26; UAT – 1).

Queston agreed to.

Report accordingly adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW AND AMEND THE PARLIAMENTARY VILLAGES MANAGEMENT BOARD ACT (ACT NO 96 OF 1998) ON OVERSIGHT VISIT TO PELICAN PARK AND ACACIA PARK PARLIAMENTARY VILLAGES ON 13 MARCH 2026

Mr M C MASINA: I rise to present the report of the ad hoc committee to review and amend the Parliamentary Village Management Act following the oversight visit at Pelican and Acacia Park on 13 March 2026. This visit was undertaken to ensure that the ad hoc committee legislative review of the Parliamentary Village Management Board Act is grounded in a

UNREVISED HANSARD

direct observation, factual assessment and a clear understanding of the realities lived within the Parliamentary Village.

The Parliamentary Village exists to provide a secure, dignified accommodation for Members of Parliament. They are an essential part of the infrastructure that supports the functioning of our democratic institutions. This is therefore an incumbent upon Parliament to ensure that these facilities are safe, well managed and compliant with all relevant laws and standards.

The committee’s visit revealed both strengths and shortcomings that require our urgent attention. The committee began its work with a detailed briefing from SA Police Protection Services Division, which is responsible for safety and security of the villages. Staff outlined its daily operational responsibilities, including access control, verification of identities, document, canine patrols, visible policing and crime intelligence monitoring.

However, the SA Revenue Service, Sars, also highlighted a significant structural gap being part of the Parliamentary Village are not included in the National Risk Management

UNREVISED HANSARD

Support System, RIMAS, framework, as adopted by the Cabinet. This exclusion limits the staff's ability to apply standardised national coordinated risk management approach to the villages. Staff further briefed the committee on the findings of the most recent safety and security assessment which was planned in March 2020. Some of the recommendations have been implemented, some are still outstanding. That will make sure that the Parliamentary Village is safe and according to standard. The committee then toured the residential unit and communal facilities. Members observed poor maintenance, including worn finishings, damaged furniture and general deterioration of some of the units.

The Department of Public Works and Infrastructure acknowledged the shortcomings in the performance of the current facility management company appointed for the villages but also reported that it is engaging with the company on service improvement plans. A matter of particular concern relates to 112 fabricated units at Acacia Park, which contain asbestos and do not comply with Occupational Health and Safety regulation.

Members walked through some of the units and observed the risk firsthand. The Department of Public Works has initiated a

UNREVISED HANSARD

project to demolish these structures and construct new units. At the time of the oversight, the project was at a bid agitation stage. We look forward to this project being implemented.

One of the most depressing findings relates to the domestic workers quarters at Pelican Park. The delegation observed deplorable living conditions, including overcrowding in rooms intended for single occupancy, deteriorating communal kitchens and bathroom facilities, and general lack of maintenance.

The Department of Public Works reported that no maintenance budget is allocated for these quarters, and the domestic workers are responsible for maintaining the facilities themselves. Furthermore, despite the requirements set out by the Department of Labour in 2009, domestic workers have not been registered with the Unemployment Insurance Fund. These conditions are unacceptable and must be addressed as a matter of urgency.

The report therefore sets out a series of clear and practical and urgent recommendations. These include, amongst others, that the Minister of Police ensure and recommend the inclusion of the parliamentary village in the Risk Management Support

UNREVISED HANSARD

System, RIMAS, framework, thereby strengthening the national coordination of security and risk management as the facility involves members.

Second, that the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure finalise its occupancy audit within one month of adoption of this report to ensure that unlawful occupants evacuate the villages within the next financial year.

Finally, that the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure, the board as well as the recent committee, enforce compliance with the parliamentary village rules, in particular as it relates to occupants and other conduct.

This oversight visit has provided the ad hoc committee with a clear, first-hand understanding of the challenges facing parliamentary villages. The recommendations contained in this report aimed at strengthening governance, enhancing security, and ensuring dignified living conditions for all residents.

The ad hoc committee believes that the implementation of these recommendations will significantly improve the functioning of the parliamentary village. I submit this report of the oversight committee. I thank you.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Declarations of vote:

Mr V G REDDY: Speaker, can you hold on with us? We will come back. [Interjections.]

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon members, please remain muted until you are recognised. Hon Reddy, no, we cannot hold opportunities. You either declare or you do not. [Interjections.] Is the MK Party going to declare? If not, I now see you.

Mr J S NGUBANE: Yes, I am here.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): Hon Ngubane, please proceed.

Mr J S NGUBANE: Chairperson, as the MK Party, we always participated in the parliamentary village ad hoc Committee. What the Chairperson Masina is saying, it is a true reflection of the report. We realised that the Department of Public Works has lost its focus not only in maintaining parliamentary villages of all members who stay in Parliament, but the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure has a tendency of not maintaining or taking care of all the government buildings, including us as parliamentarians.

UNREVISED HANSARD

In Acacia Park, there are sewage running all over on some of the houses. It is smelly, faeces are smelly, and the Department of Public Works is failing to negotiate with DA new partner, the City of Cape Town, to fix the Acacia Park residents of parliamentary villages. Some other houses are deplorable. They are still on asbestos today, and they are falling apart, and there are houses where some of the members cannot even stay in them. In most all other villages, the Public Works has not been maintaining all those houses.

So, in that nutshell, Deputy Chair, as the MK Party, we agree with the move of the parliamentary village from being managed by the Public Works to being managed by the Parliament, and then the involvement of the board, as well as the police, to start not only just guarding the parliamentarians in the villages, but to give us as well the little services of securing Members of the Parliament in villages, and to be able for us as MPs to utilise the police that are guarding us for little items of SAPS services, so that it is not just that we have a police on the guard, but when you need a small service, you cannot access them here. You must move out and go to the Goodwood Police Station while you have the police right here in your face.

UNREVISED HANSARD

So, as the MK Party as well, we feel that it is a good call that residents must move away from Public Works, and then the Parliament start to manage the villages for parliamentarians, that the improvement in the places of stay for all parliamentarians is far better than what Public Works has been failing for years in every government building. There are even outside of Parliament, there are buildings that are dilapidated by the Public Works that are not being maintained.

So, how much more are us as MPs on the villages we are staying on? So, we support what the ad hoc committee has decided as a recommendation to start managing its own affairs of the residences where parliamentarians are living. Thank you very much, House Chair.

Mrs E N NTLANGWINI: House Chair, every person who returns home expect that home to be safe, habitable and dignified. Parliament villages are not merely state properties, they are homes, workplaces and communities where safety and dignity must be guaranteed. The oversight visit exposes a disturbing gap between the standards Parliament demand from departments and the conditions tolerated within facilities which state bearers directly are responsible for.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The security infrastructure has not been sufficiently modernised. The latest SAPS assessment was completed in March 2020, yet key recommendations remain unimplemented. Parameter detection, expanded CCT, working intercoms and monitoring rooms are still required. Non-functional alarms, outdated occupancy records and allegedly unlawful subletting weaken security further.

Security cannot rest only on police officers at the gate, while the systems behind them fail and the governance problems continue. At Acacia Park, the prefabricated houses do not meet the occupational safety requirements because of asbestos. Sewage in E block leaves toilets unable to flush and pushes sewage up. These are not minor inconveniences. They are failures of basic safety and dignity.

The most disturbing and disturbing finding, as the Chair alluded, are the findings of the domestic worker quarters. A labour inspection found non-compliance in 2009, yet workers remain unregistered with no Unemployment Insurance Fund, UIF. The report also highlighted horrible conditions where three-by-three-metre room intended for one person is occupied by an adult and children and de-rated commercial facilities that is not maintained by Public Works. Dignity cannot be reserved

UNREVISED HANSARD

only for Members of Parliament, while workers who sustain this household live in conditions that need to be condemned and that is deplorable.

The committee is correct to recommend the inclusion of the RIMAS framework and the SAPS and Public Works operation and the upgrading of the security and the monitoring and the regular assessment and urgent finalisation of the occupancy audit. It is also correct to require UIF registration, maintenance and funding and action for all sewage crises as we can no longer live in these conditions. We adopt this report.

The HOUSE CHAIRPERSON (Mr W Horn): I do not know whether it is now my sound or the hon Ntlangwini, but I think her time has expired as it is.

Ms B E MACHI: Hon Chairperson, the effective management of parliamentary villages is fundamental to supporting Parliament in fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities and strengthening capable institutions. The IFP has consistently maintained that capable institutions are built on clear accountability, sound administration and effective oversight. We therefore support measures that strengthen Parliament’s oversight role and promote greater accountability through

UNREVISED HANSARD

distinct responsibility in the management of parliamentary villages.

The findings relating to maintenance backlogs, governance shortcomings and staff accommodation reinforce the importance of proactive maintenance, preventative planning and responsible asset management. The IFP supports efforts to ensure that employees residing within parliamentary villages are accommodated in conditions that uphold their dignity, safety and wellbeing, consistent with the values of an accountable public service. We welcome the committee's emphasis on strengthening governance and assigning clear responsibility for ... [Inaudible.]

The IFP believes that regular oversight, timely maintenance, and effective constitutional management are essential to uphold public confidence and ensure that parliamentary facilities are maintained efficiently and transparently. The IFP emphasises that effective oversight must be matched by effective implementation. We believe that the committee's recommendations will advance accountable governance, protect public assets, and promote a well-managed parliamentary environment. I thank you, Chair.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr E HENDRICKS: Hon Speaker, and hon members, the Patriotic Alliance is a constructive and accountable member of the Government of National Unity. I rise in full support of this report. We thank the ad hoc committee for its frank and unflinching oversight. What they found in Pelican Park and Acacia is nothing short of a national disgrace. These village houses are the servants of people, yet they live in conditions that no South African should endure.

Let us be blunt, Chair. Security is a joke. The fences are broken. Alarms don’t work. Intercoms are dead and an informal settlement is creeping towards Acacia Park while the DA-led City of Cape Town looks away.

The committee has done its job. Now the executive must act or explain why they won’t. Sewage flows in Block E and the only solution is a honey-sucker truck. That is not governance. That is humiliation and the DA-led City of Cape Town must answer for it.

Domestic workers, women who serve our MPs, live in conditions that defy human dignity. A three-by-three metre room meant for one person holds an entire family. No maintenance. No UIF

UNREVISED HANSARD

registration. No protection. That is not an oversight. That is a moral failure. The committee has given us a roadmap.

Fix the fence. Repair the intercoms. Evict unlawful occupants. Register domestic workers and finally equip the empty gym that has sat unused for five years. The Patriotic Alliance supports every recommendation in this report. We call on the Minister of Police and Public Works to implement them immediately. Not in six months. Not next year - now. We are in the GNU to serve the people. Not to protect the powerful.

This report shows us exactly where the failures are. Let us fix them together and prove that this government can still deliver dignity.

Afrikaans:

"Ons baiza nie!"

English:

Thank you, Chair.

Mr P A VAN STADEN: No declaration, Chairperson. Thank you.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Mr A D BEESLEY: Hon Speaker, the state of parliamentary villages raises a much bigger concern than the condition of accommodation for Members of Parliament. It raises serious questions about how the government maintains public infrastructure across the country. During the oversight visit to Pelican Park and Acacia Park, the committee found basic maintenance challenges that should simply not exist.

Furniture and finishes require replacement. Surgery systems are experiencing ongoing problems. Security infrastructure has not been sufficiently modernised, and the department acknowledges poor performance by the pointed service provider. These are facilities directly managed by the government. If government cannot properly maintain infrastructure under its own responsibility, what does that say about millions of South Africans who rely on public housing, schools, hospitals, clinics, roads and other public facilities every single day.

For ordinary South Africans, poor maintenance is not an inconvenience. It means broken toilets, unsafe buildings, leaking roofs, serious problems, and infrastructure that becomes unusable because the government only acts once a crisis has developed. We cannot continue spending public money on infrastructure only to neglect it afterwards. Government

UNREVISED HANSARD

must plan better, manage contracts properly, and ensure that money allocated for maintenance actually results in functioning infrastructure.

If we cannot maintain what we already have, building more will not solve the problem. South Africans deserve infrastructure that is properly maintained, safe, and fit for purpose. And they deserve a government that takes that responsibility seriously. I thank you.

Mr W M THRING: Hon House Chairperson, the ACDP welcomes the ad hoc committee's report, but we must be frank. The conditions at Pelican Park and Acacia Park exposed serious and longstanding failures of governance, accountability, and oversight. The report rightfully identifies interconnected failures in security, infrastructure, maintenance, occupational health and safety, governance, and living conditions.

Asbestos-contaminated prefabricated housing, inadequate security, recurring sewage failures in Acacia Park, and the unacceptable conditions endured by domestic workers are not minor administrative shortcomings. In fact, they represent

UNREVISED HANSARD

failures of the state to protect people living and working on parliamentary premises.

Additionally, the ACDP asserts that the report does not go far enough in confronting accountability. How is it that the latest security assessments date back to 2020 while recommendations remain outstanding? How can domestic workers remain unregistered for UIF, despite a labour inspection as far back as 2009.

These failures demand more than recommendations. They demand answers, responsible officials, and consequences for nonperformance. The proposed co-ordination between the SAPS, Department of Public Works and Infrastructure, Parliament and the City of Cape Town is necessary, but co-ordination without deadlines, budgets, measurable targets and consequences risk producing yet another report without meaningful change.

As kingdom builders, the ACDP maintains that Parliament must lead by example and oversight must result in action, accountability and measurable improvement. Thank you, Chair.

Dr M A MAIMANE: Sorry House Chairperson, I was trying to find the famous button. No declaration. We support. Thank you.

UNREVISED HANSARD

Dr I ISMAIL-MOOSA: Hon Deputy Speaker. Aluta continua! Let us, as parliamentarians work towards maintaining and improving our beloved parliamentarian stays so that we can perform at optimum levels. We support this report is Al Jama-ah. I thank you.

IsiZulu:

Malibongwe!

Dr L W MAHLATSI: Chairperson, the UAT welcomes the findings of the committee concerning the serial security deficiencies, outdated infrastructure, unlawful occupation, service challenges and unacceptable living conditions. Parliament is a constitutional institution founded on the principle of human dignity, equality, and accountability. The people who provide essential services within the parliamentary villages are entitled to decent and dignified living conditions.

It is therefore unacceptable that workers connected to the functioning of Parliament should be subjected to conditions characterised by neglect of adequate infrastructure and insecurity. The UAT welcomed the committee’s observation that Parliament undertook to provide the gym and wellness facility within the villages. Yet these facilities have remained

UNREVISED HANSARD

unequipped for more than five years. We fully support the recommendations that Parliament must honour this commitment without further delay.

Wellness facilities are not luxury. They are important components of healthy and productive communities. If Parliament makes a commitment to residents, that commitment must be honoured. Promises made to communities cannot simply disappear into administrative processes and budgetary excuses. The UAT is deeply concerned by the pattern of delayed disclosure of financial information. The Department of Public Works and Infrastructure and Parliament must, when properly requested, provide comprehensive and timely information concerning outstanding rental obligations. Tenant areas and losses incurred.

Xitsonga:

Khanimambo!

Mrs M O CLARKE: Hon Chairperson, the DA welcomes this oversight report because it exposes some uncomfortable truths. Parliament cannot demand accountability from government while failing to insist on accountability in the management of its own parliamentary villages. Our oversight visits to Pelican

UNREVISED HANSARD

Park and Acacia Park revealed some serious problems that have been known for years yet remain unresolved. Let us begin with security. The most recent SA Police Service, SAPS, security assessment, was completed in March 2020.

Six years later, key recommendations remain outstanding. Perimeter security is inadequate, the closed-circuit television, CCTV, package is incomplete, alarm and intercom systems are not functional, and in most units and central monitoring units, CMU, have not been established. These villages accommodate Members of Parliament, their families and staff. Their safety cannot depend on recommendations gathering dust for six years. Allegations of unlawful subletting, outdated occupancy records and poor access control has demonstrated that security is not only about infrastructure, but also about enforcing the rules.

At Acacia Park, members inspected prefabricated structures containing asbestos. We welcome the plans to replace these structures with brick housing, but Parliament needs deadlines, budgets and accountability for delivery. The sewage problems affecting Block E are equally unacceptable. When sewage pushes back into residential units, it is not simply a maintenance

UNREVISED HANSARD

problem; it’s an issue of human dignity, sanitation and public health. A permanent engineering solution is required.

One of the most disturbing findings was the conditions of the domestic workers’ quarters in Pelican Park. Members witnessed extreme small rooms occupied by adults and children. Problems concerning the working conditions of domestic workers were identified by the Department of Labour as far back as 2009. Yet 17 years later, these workers have still not been registered for the Unemployment Insurance Fund, UIF. This is unacceptable and needs to be addressed. It is equally unacceptable that there is no proper maintenance budget for their accommodation. Their dignity cannot depend on the economic status of R8 a month rental attachment to their accommodations.

The DA supports allocating a basic maintenance budget and ensuring that residents employing domestic workers comply with UIF requirements. The recurring theme throughout this report is poor consequence management. Service providers fail to perform, maintenance is delayed, security recommendations remain outstanding and rules are breached. Yet accountability moves at a snail’s pace. Parliament cannot bear the municipalities and government departments for failing to

UNREVISED HANSARD

maintain infrastructure and enforce accountability while tolerating similar failures on state property.

The committee’s recommendations must therefore resolve immeasurable implementation. Security recommendations must be implemented and assessments regularly updated. Occupancy records must be accurate, and unlawful subletting and other contraventions must be investigated. The sewage problem requires a permanent solution; the asbestos structures must be removed safely, and without unnecessary delay. The domestic workers’ quarters must be brought to an acceptable standard. The visit demonstrated why physical oversight matters.

The reports might tell you that projects are progressing, and maintenance is being addressed. But when members walk through these facilities and see the conditions themselves, the gap between government reports and what people experience becomes impossible to ignore. The DA supports the recommendations of this report, but our support comes with warning. Do not allow this report to become another document filed away, but the same problems remain.

Oversight without implementation is merely observation; recommendations without deadlines become excuses; and

UNREVISED HANSARD

accountability without consequences is not accountability at all. Parliament must lead by example. Fix what is broken; enforce riles; protect the residents and hold those responsible for failure to be accountable. I thank you, Chairperson.

Ms A K RAMOLOBENG: Hon Chairperson, the ANC welcomes and supports this report and the opportunity it provides to strengthen legislation based on actual reality through oversight over Parliament’s own residential assets. The parliamentary villages are not merely accommodation; they are part of the institutional infrastructure that enables members, staff and their families to live and work in dignity, safety and under decent conditions.

The Freedom Charter teaches us that people shall share in the country’s wealth, and the ANC’s broader commitment to a capable, ethical and developmental state requires that public property be maintained to a standard that reflects respect for those who serve the Republic. This report shows why such oversight is necessary. The committee’s visit to Pelican Park and Acacia Park, the two largest villages with the largest number of residential units.

UNREVISED HANSARD

While Arborea Park was not included in the day's programme, the visit was preceded by the SA Police Service, SAPS, briefing and a talk, focused on the roles of the board, the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure, SAPS and the facilities contractor, Tefla Group. The ANC commends the committee for going beyond formality and examining the practical conditions in which people live. Legislation must reflect reality and ensure transformation.

The report is clear that security infrastructure has not been sufficiently modernised, despite the importance of those facilities and the necessity for security. It records a safety and security assessment completed in March 2020, yet several recommendations remain outstanding, including perimeter intrusion detection, expanded CCTV coverage, repaired intercoms and centralised monitoring rooms.

It also identifies serious governance concerns, including unlawful subrenting, outdated occupancy records and weak access control, as well as false alarms and non-functional systems. These are not minor administrative matters and should have been resolved by the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure. They speak to discipline, accountability and the integrity of public assets.

UNREVISED HANSARD

The value of public assets requires to be enhanced and not decrease in the value due to a lack of maintenance. The ANC is equally concerned by the physical conditions of some of the units and communal spaces. Members observed during the oversight that finishes and furniture required replacement, while the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure acknowledged poor performance by the service provider and indicated that the contract would be cancelled and re-tendered.

More alarming is the presence of asbestos in parks, including the 112 prefabricated houses and brick houses under the Eskom servitude, where a demolition and replacement project has now been initiated. From an ANC perspective, the protection of health and safety in public facilities is non-negotiable. Public infrastructure must be safe, compliant and properly maintained.

The report also exposes a social dimension that cannot be ignored. The domestic workers' quarters in Pelican Park, which most members would have alluded to, are described as being deplorable conditions with an approximately three metres by three metre room occupied by an adult and children, while UIF registrations remain unresolved. This is inconsistent with the

UNREVISED HANSARD

ANC’s commitment to human dignity and decent working conditions.

People who sustain the daily functioning of these residences must be treated equally, their welfare must be protected, and the responsibility of residents and the board and the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure must be explicit and enforceable. The report further records sewerage blockages in Acacia Park, the underutilised gym facilities and the need for a more co-ordinated response with the City of Cape Town.

Its recommendations are practical and deserve support, particularly the inclusion of parliamentary villages in the Risk Management Support System, RIMAS, framework. A memorandum of understanding between SAPS and the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure, improved entry and exit controls, central monitoring rooms, a revised occupancy audit, action against unlawful occupation, attention to the sewage problem, UIF compliance and the long overdue equipping of gym facilities. The ANC, therefore, declares support for this report, but support must be matched by implementation.

Oversight without consequence weakens public trust. We must ensure that the Department of Public Works, SAPS, the board

UNREVISED HANSARD

and Parliament act with urgency, discipline and co-ordination. This report is a call to restore order, improve living conditions and safeguard public assets in a manner consistent with the values of the ANC, the public duty of Parliament and the developmental obligations of the democratic state. Therefore, the ANC supports this report. I thank you.

Question put.

Motion agreed to.

Report accordingly adopted.

The House adjourned at 17:07.

UNREVISED HANSARD