

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DA-49.

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

(HANSARD)

SECOND SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

25 January to 19 June 1985

(Vols 2, 3 and 4—DEBATES;

Vol 5—QUESTIONS; and

Vol 6—INDEXES.)

Price per set
R22,00 (plus GST)
Abroad R27,50
Post Free

ISBN 0 621 09346 7 (Vol 3)

ISBN 0 621 09344 0 (Set)

DA49

DA49

House in London. No one has ever thought that we were only there temporarily.

Tomorrow I shall deal with the issue of relations between Black and White people and among communities within the Black population. I do not wish to discuss the matter further on this occasion.

The hon member Prof Olivier raised the issue of citizenship. He also put a question to me in that regard. I shall have more to say about citizenship as well tomorrow. However, the hon member asked me whether my predecessor had given an undertaking to President Mangope in regard to citizenship. I have no knowledge of it. If such an undertaking was given, then this was done either verbally or by letter. If it was done by letter I should like to see it. However, I am unaware of any verbal assurances or of letters to that effect. If the hon member could give me further information in that regard I should appreciate it.

†The hon member for Umbilo raised the question of loyalty to the Head of State when toasting the Head of State. Let me tell the hon member that I really do not care whether people toast me or not. That reminds me of the story that was told of a previous State President, the late Mr C R Swart. He once used these words: "Ladies and gentlemen, the State President having been drunk; you may now smoke". I do not want to appear cynical but I want to tell the hon member that most of the time I think the toast is used to enable people like the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the hon the Minister of Home Affairs to start smoking. [Interjections.] It is of course the custom in South Africa to drink a toast to the Head of State and I think we should leave it at that. I do not think we should prescribe to people to drink a toast to South Africa or to the State President. That is a voluntary matter and we as a Government have already decided that we will not prescribe to the country on this matter. That is my reply to him. I think all reasonable South Africans will know how to behave when a toast is proposed to the Head of the State.

The hon member then raised the matter of a fourth chamber. I shall deal with that later.

*The hon member for Pietermaritzburg North said something that I cannot allow to

pass unchallenged. In reply to one of the other hon members he said that positive nationalism meant nothing; it was like mother love. Does the hon member realize what he said? I do not believe that the hon member realizes what he said. I do not believe that the hon member himself understood what he said, viz: It means nothing, it is something like mother love. I think that the hon member should really go and think about it again. I cannot take it amiss of him if he does not want to be nationalist, but I can take it amiss of him if he makes a statement like that about mother love. I think he ought to be ashamed of himself.

I now wish to dwell for a moment on the hon member for Durban Point. Over the past few years that hon member has really made positive contributions in this House. One had begun to think that as a person who has been sitting in this House for many years, he has developed a feeling that he should at all times make a positive contribution and see a little further than party politics. In total contrast to the spirit of the debate that was begun by the hon the Leader of the Official Opposition, in contrast even to the spirit of the debate conducted by the hon member for Waterberg, he stood up here and wanted to break and destroy everything before him. He dealt out blows right, left and centre among the members of the Government. Surely that is not true. The hon member makes the statement that anything good that is done by any member of the Government or any official, is immediately demigrated. Surely that is not true. If the hon member goes and think about it for a moment he will realize what an unreasonable and unwise speech he made here. There are forces seeking to destroy every positive step taken in South Africa. That is true. There are forces that abuse the slightest error or human shortcoming that may sometimes be revealed. That is true; but surely those forces are not all combined in this Government, as if we are simply out to create confusion. Good heavens, the hon member knows what difficult circumstances prevail in the entire Western world at the moment, and that there is an onslaught on the entire Western world. That does not apply to South Africa alone. The onslaught is aimed at the entire free world and one of the spearheads in that struggle is aimed at South

Africa. The hon member knows that from experience, because he is better informed than he gave out this afternoon. He should have said this afternoon, speaking from experience, that insofar as this House can make a contribution—and he, with his knowledge, can make a contribution—he would help the Government resist those forces of destruction, confusion and destabilization. However, he puts all the blame on the Government. What is his aim in doing so? Whose cause does he seek to further thereby? He cannot even further the cause of his own party in that way.

*Mr W V RAW: It is a warning to you that reform entails danger.

*The STATE PRESIDENT: No, no, the hon member is adopting a totally wrong approach. He is a senior member of this House and his speech is publicized abroad. Even the American Minister of Foreign Affairs, who was very critical of South Africa, said that evening that tremendous progress have been made in South Africa during the past five years with regard to reform. He admitted it, and he was critical towards South Africa. Now a front-bencher of my own Parliament comes along and puts all the blame for what goes wrong on the Government. I do not think that that is right. I think that after due consideration the hon member will think differently about the matter.

Business interrupted in accordance with Standing Order No 19.

House Resumed:

Progress reported and leave granted to sit again.

The House adjourned at 18h00.

FRIDAY, 19 APRIL 1985

Prayers—10h00.

REPORT OF STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE

Dr M H VELDMAN, as Chairman, presented the Sixth Report of the Standing Select

Committee on Mineral and Energy Affairs, relative to the Petroleum Products Amendment Bill [No 64—85 (GA)], as follows:

The Standing Committee on Mineral and Energy Affairs having considered the subject of the Petroleum Products Amendment Bill [No 64—85 (GA)], referred to it, your Committee begs to report the Bill with amendments [No 64A—85 (GA)].

M H VELDMAN,
Chairman.

Committee Rooms
Parliament
19 April 1985.

Bill to be read a second time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

(Committee Stage resumed)

Vote No 1—"State President" (contd):

*The STATE PRESIDENT: Mr Chairman, before I deal with other matters I want to draw hon members' attention to the Vote of the State President in the printed Estimate. Appearing there is the amount of R10,908 million, which is the appropriation for the 1985-86 financial year. Proceeding from the Government's further economizing measures, the Commission for Administration addressed a request to all departments to make an effort to effect a saving of 8% on personnel expenditure. The Office of the State President tried to comply with that request, and it was decided that a further amount of R368 000 could be saved. This amount represents a saving of 8.7%. The total estimated expenditure therefore amounts to R10,540 million, instead of the printed amount.

Sir, the hon member for Umlazi, in a positive contribution yesterday, appealed to people to guard against a spirit of pessimism. I am in full agreement with him. I should like to see all of us take this further and warn against pessimism in this country.

The hon member for Ermelo emphasized the fact that better human relations ought to

be promoted in accordance with the demands of fairness and confidence so that South Africa can be a country of hope. With that, too, I should like to associate myself.

The hon member Mr Van Staden correctly pointed out that the NP, in its years of participation in politics in South Africa, had consistently adopted a policy of reform; it had done so under the late Genl Hertzog, under the late Dr Malan and all those who succeeded them up to my predecessor.

The hon member for De Kuilen singled out one truth which I shall have more to say about later this morning. It is that the ethnic diversity of South Africa cannot be denied.

The hon member for Standerton emphasized what is indeed an important aspect of the decentralization effort, namely that the private sector must also make its full contribution to it. This is in line with the appeal which I made only last week when I opened the Rand Easter Show.

The hon member for Roodepoort stressed the importance of positive nationalism. That was followed by the blunder of the hon member for Pietermaritzburg North.

*Mr G B D McINTOSH: Are you opposed to mother love?

*The STATE PRESIDENT: No, but the hon member said it meant nothing. I do not know what his mother would have said about that.

The hon member for Stellenbosch also touched upon the point that the NP must of course be able to amend its strategy. The NP does not alter its course. It does not alter its objectives. However, it does alter its strategy and its policy from time to time to cope with the demands of the times. I am in full agreement with that.

Now—before I express a few thoughts on our inter-group relations—I first want to refer, by way of background, to certain security problems in our country. I think it is a big mistake to discuss inter-group relations without taking into account the security problems with which South Africa has to contend.

In this connection I want to say that since the 1960s in particular, more and more signs were evident that elements of Marxism and Leninism were becoming more strongly and openly present in the publications and state-

ments of the ANC. The Communist Party, with its headquarters in London, regards the ANC as an instrument to achieve its particular form of liberation in South Africa.

†The ANC is, according to the SA Communist Party, the main immediate instrument for the achievement of the aims of the so-called national democratic revolution. Whether or not the SA Communist Party or the ANC will eventually be the dominating factor, is immaterial to this argument. The fact is that they influence one another to overthrow this State. They want to bring about a dictatorship supported by a so-called people's militia which will replace the present South African Defence Force and the Police Force.

One has only to study the works of Dr Voslensky, for instance, his recently published *Nomenklatura*, to see what these forces—dictated to by Moscow—really have in mind. Through intimidation and dictatorial control, masses are exploited and used to serve the interests of the governing élite. In this connection, I am reminded of what Alexander Solzhenitsyn said:

The situation in the world is not just dangerous; it isn't just threatening. It is catastrophic.

We have to recognize that the concentration of world evil and the tremendous price of hatred is there (the Soviet Union) and it is flowing from there throughout the world. We have to stand up against it and not try to give it everything which it asks for. There is only one thing which can be raised against violence, and that is firmness.

No political party represented in this House can satisfy the demands of these forces of hatred—not the hon the Leader of the Official Opposition nor the hon leader of the Conservative Party nor the hon leader of the NRP nor I. We cannot satisfy the demands of these forces of hatred.

Consequently my plea is that we should stand up against these forces of hatred and that we should do so as a united effort. I want to go even further this morning, however, and I want to state that it is my conviction that these forces are not representative of the majority of South Africans. Any as-

assessment of the security threat against the Republic of South Africa is at present dominated by a drastic escalation of the spirit of revolution in the country—led and instigated by these forces. The process of politicization and mobilization, in which especially the UDF plays an important role and which is taking place in a still deteriorating economic situation at the present time, has attained such proportions that the potential for extensive countrywide violence and disturbances has increased markedly.

While it is accepted that the real grievances exist which create unrest among Black people, the aim of the UDF and of most of its substructures is not peaceful socio-economic and political change. Their end goal is the destruction of our system of government and of civilized values. Although the UDF professes its opposition to violence, the results of its actions indicate the contrary, as is clearly evident from murder, arson and intimidation in, *inter alia*, parts of the Eastern Cape.

The immediate aim of the UDF is to mobilize the masses and to incite them to confrontation with the authorities. They hope in this way to create a spiral of increasing violence which will culminate in revolution.

Regarding the instructions by the ANC to the UDF to make the country ungovernable, Godfrey Motsepe, the ANC representative in the Benelux countries, said the following in a recent interview with a Dutch publication:

Fantastic work has been done by ANC cadres in the country, including those operating legally within mass organizations. We have said to them: "Make South Africa ungovernable", and the country became ungovernable.

The extent to which supporters of the UDF have executed these instructions given by the ANC appears, *inter alia*, from a statement made by Thami Mali, the chairman of the committee which organized the stay-away in November 1984. After the stay-away he said that their purpose was to make South Africa ungovernable and to force the South African Government to declare so-called liberated zones. Furthermore, leading ecclesiastics such as Dr Beyers Naudé in effect propagate conflict with the authorities when he pleads

for a campaign of responsible civil disobedience because, as he puts it, the Church has no choice but to organize meaningful resistance. Neither Dr Naudé nor any other church leader of his type can, however guarantee that their calls for and planning of responsible disobedience will not lead to violence and loss of life. They plead for peaceful disobedience but when the violence starts one does not see them.

It has become particularly clear that the UDF not only acts in its own right but has also become an internal extension of the ANC and of the South African Communist Party. Motsepe in the interview which I have already mentioned refers to the support the UDF has received from the ANC by way of the distribution of pamphlets during the elections for the House of Representatives and the House of Delegates in the UDF's boycott campaign at that time, and he adds the following:

There are innumerable ANC people active in legitimate organizations but who, for understandable reasons, cannot stand up and say: "I am a member of the ANC". That would amount to signing your own death warrant.

There are strong indications that the South African Communist Party has strengthened its grip on the ANC to such an extent that little doubt remains as to who really sets the pace in the organization. As recently as January 1985 Joe Slovo declared to the *Washington Post* that the ANC has over years received extensive support from the Soviet Union and that the South African Communist Party enjoys a precious and unique position within the ANC.

The refusal by Mr Nelson Mandela to renounce violence, and the insistence by the ANC, SACP and UDF conglomerate on the convening of a so-called national convention clearly illustrate that they remain intent on the acquisition of power by any available means. In this regard Oliver Tambo declared in the New Year's message in 1984:

All revolutions are about state power. Ours is no exception.

Various ANC leaders have recently, as a result of my conditions for dialogue and nego-

tations, emphasized that dialogue has since its creation been part of the ANC's policy. However, they also emphasized that the time for dialogue was not yet ripe because the ANC would have to negotiate from a position of weakness. The ANC, according to them, is only prepared to negotiate if the transfer of power is part of the agenda and if political prisoners can participate unconditionally. An analysis of these conditions which include the dismantling of the SADF and the SAP makes it quite clear that it is expected of the Government to abdicate before it will be granted the highly dubious privilege of participating in such a convention.

By making use in particular of susceptible youth as a trigger for radicalization, attempts are also made to incite parents, communities and workers' organizations to solidarity actions and to challenge the State to confrontation. They do not do this because they are interested in the masses. They do not do this because they are interested in the parents or in the youth. They do so because they are interested in power and power alone. Once they have achieved this and they have the power, they will use that power to establish an elite government which will be the privileged, and will neglect the masses as they are neglected in Africa, as they are neglected in the Soviet Union.

This state of affairs cannot be accepted. I know I have the majority of South Africans supporting me that this cannot be accepted. If I say that the Government will not abdicate to these forces of hatred, I know I have the support of this House too.

*This is the background against which we should view population relations in South Africa. There are two forces confronting one another in this country. There are the forces of hatred and devastation, and there are the forces of civilizing principles and belief in Christian norms, things which this country has always striven for. These forces are not representative of Whites only. There are Whites with the ANC, as well as Coloureds, Indians and Blacks, but the forces of hatred are fed from Moscow because South Africa is of decisive importance in the global struggle. Unfortunately I must say this morning that to my astonishment there are Western governments which, for some inexplicable

reason, are furthering the might of Moscow against South Africa. One fails to understand it. Whether it is for the sake of political expediency, or whether it is for the sake of trade interests or whether it is born out of weakness, one does not know. On the other side are the majority of the Whites, Coloureds and Indians, as well as Black people from all the population groups which they comprise, people whom I believe long for peace, who long for peaceful co-existence and who are prepared to hold a dialogue with one another in a proper way to ensure this country's stability and progress.

At the opening of the Parliamentary session this year I emphasized, as I had done on previous occasions, that we were resolved, together with all communities, to pursue peaceful and democratic solutions that satisfy the requirements of fairness and justice. Secondly, I emphasized that it was the Government's general constitutional goal, while maintaining security, stability and self-determination for each group, to give all the country's people a say in decision-making processes that affected their interests. Thirdly, it remained the Government's point of departure that, because of the diversity of South African society, it was neither desirable nor practicable to accommodate all communities in the same way. We are experiencing this daily in our practical co-existence with the various communities.

I do not wish to mention any examples here, because I could give offence by doing so. Consequently I do not wish to mention specific examples that we have experienced. I am prepared to inform the hon the Leader of the Official Opposition and all the leaders of the various parties in this House personally of what our experience has been. Every day we have to deal with this problem of accommodating opposing population groups in the political sphere, and if it had not been for our contribution to peace, there would have been greater bloodbaths between Blacks and Blacks in South Africa.

I also agree with what the Chief Minister of kwaZulu said some time ago—that it was a tragedy that Blacks were now being incited to murder Blacks. Inherently there is the potential conflict between Black communities. There are threats of a bloodbath in respect of the re-allocation of a single district from one Black community to another. We ex-

perience this daily in our dealings with these people. In South Africa, therefore, one cannot, with the best will in the world, accommodate all communities in the same way. Structures will inevitably differ, without this implying that there are less effective or inferior structures.

Interdependence does exist—this is another truth—which must be accepted as a reality on the basis of co-operative co-existence. There is interdependence. There are matters of common concern in many spheres. We cannot get away from this. It is not our cross. It is not our burden; it is our challenge.

Today, after these statements, I want to say the following in the most practical way possible: At the opening of Parliament I referred to the fact that I, as State President, also bore a special responsibility, as spelt out in our Constitution, towards our Black peoples of the Republic of South Africa, and that the special Cabinet Committee would devote particular attention to aspects of our relations policy. It has always been the case, since 1910, that the head of state has been placed in a special relationship to the Black communities as well, and I cannot imagine that this will ever change.

As a result of further negotiation and deliberation the Government decided that it was possible to go ahead with full individual property rights for those Black urban communities and persons who qualified for the 99-year leasehold system. This followed from what I said at the opening of Parliament. With that we did not change the position of permanence. The fact that it was decided years ago to grant a 99-year leasehold system, was a recognition of the permanence of these communities. It was accepted by everyone in this House. All we are doing now is to introduce a more reasonable scheme so as to establish individual property rights as well.

The accusation which is being levelled at us is that we want to establish a middle class among the Black communities. Actually, that accusation is being made by the leftist radicals, by the ANC and those who collaborate with them. The accusation is that we wish to establish a middle class among the Black communities.

I make no secret of this. I should like to see a middle class coming into existence

among the Black communities. I should like to see a responsible middle class coming into existence which will have possessions and will be prepared to protect what they possess.

This principle has no implications in respect of the retention of existing political rights. That is being effected by other measures. Therefore we need have no fear that taking this step will have any political consequences. We shall have to face up to political consequences in any case.

We also accepted that Black communities outside the national states would be able to develop effective governmental structures on local level, would be able to develop structures with far greater authority, and that it had to be possible to create points of liaison in regard to matters of common concern.

Naturally, because this is, practically speaking, the only option, one must talk about energy. We must talk to one another about water. One must talk about other services because if one does not want to discuss them, one is failing to do one's duty.

These structures will have to come into existence after and through negotiation. In this connection we have already made progress in some spheres. We have made progress with the establishment of the regional services councils and this will enable us to submit legislation to Parliament soon.

At the same time, of course, an urbanization process is taking place, one which is assuming major proportions. The hon the Leader of the Official Opposition is fond of discussing this subject. I do not blame him for doing so. It is because of his training and background that he perceives these problems.

I do not pretend to be an authority in this field, but I have at least had some experience. Experience has taught me that to proceed from this standpoint that we should solve the problems of the urbanization process with metropolitan areas is a foolish idea.

I am not saying that our metropolitan areas will not grow. As a matter of fact I stated at the Rand Easter Show the other day that our metropolitan areas would definitely continue to grow, but in the growth of those metropolitan areas, surely we must take a few aspects into account.

The first is where would we get the water

from, for people cannot live without water. One cannot make water; one can only convey it from one place to another. The second is where would we find the land for housing, even if we built upwards into the air. We already see what this is costing us in transport amenities. People complain that we ostensibly created this situation as a result of apartheid. Let us leave it at that for a moment because I think it is merely politicking.

Surely we could not have accommodated all these people in the central parts of our metropolises. Surely we had to accommodate them somewhere. Surely we could not have allowed them to continue to live in the Sophiatowns, the Windermers and the Cato Manors. Surely we had to take them out of those areas, for otherwise they would surely have perished in the Sophiatowns, the Windermers and the Cato Manors. Consequently we would have had to make provision for these people in any event, and we would have had to provide them with transport services. The only question is whether those wishing to use them should not contribute more to the transport services.

In spite of our adopting all these measures, the metropolises alone cannot solve the problems of the urbanization process. Decentralization, with which the Government has made a start, will have to be introduced. We have made a start with this north of Pretoria, and it appears to be a success. Naturally we are experiencing growing pains but must we always exploit these growing pains at one another's expense as we are now doing?

Apart from deconcentration, for that, too, will not be enough, decentralization will have to be introduced. I am referring to the decentralization of industries and underdeveloped areas. I am not saying this out of ideological considerations but out of the considerations of a balanced economy in South Africa. I am also pleased to see to what extent our decentralization policy is succeeding.

The question that is now being asked is what are we paying for these things. Surely they cannot come into existence free of charge. If we had not incurred expenses in this sphere we would in any case have had to take care of these people somewhere else. Is it not better to take care of the underdeveloped areas, where some people still remain,

so that everyone may derive benefits from a balanced economy?

Apart from these things, we shall have to make greater use of agriculture in the underdeveloped areas. We shall not, with the decentralization of industries, be able to ensure the same measure of employment we are able to ensure with agriculture. Now I specifically want to discuss the Black population. The Black peoples are established in those parts of the country which have the highest rainfall and the best soil. Fifty per cent of South Africa's arable farming land is situated there. If we develop agriculture in those areas correctly, we can provide an additional 25 million people with food and we can provide millions more people with employment under less disruptive circumstances than one would be able to establish for them in the metropolitan areas.

I want to return to the matter of property rights. Property rights are not confined to the urban areas of South Africa outside the national states only. Property rights in the national states will also have to be addressed. One of the greatest errors made in Africa was that the question of property rights was not addressed. We shall have to negotiate on this matter and convince people that property rights in the national states will have to be dealt with on a different basis than has been the case up to now.

From our experience and the negotiations we have conducted it is now apparent that there are no problems in principles. We shall now have to proceed, in co-operation with the leaders there, to allow the practical implementation of the principle to take place. Then we shall succeed in giving people a new livelihood on a large scale in the decentralized or underdeveloped areas.

If we look to the future, I am convinced that we must promote the objectives of security, progress and freedom. Those are our objectives. In these we wish to seek security for the descendants of all the population groups, progress for all, and disciplined freedom. It must not be a reckless freedom, but a freedom which, in accordance with the oldest terms still pays heed to discipline and law.

I said at the outset that South Africa was a country of minorities. It is not only a country of minorities, but a country of minority rights and we shall have to respect this in our

future approach. We shall have to succeed in preserving these rights through a future political dispensation. This means self-determination as far as possible. However, I have already stated in earlier debates that self-determination is a relative term. Even the mighty USA cannot speak of full self-determination. They must also have regard to what other people say. Self-determination over one's culture in the broadest sense of the word and over one's community life, which includes the right of the parent to have his own schools—these are what we wish to preserve for the minority. This must be assured beyond any doubt. Consequently the devolution of power is the cornerstone of any future constitutional development. One cannot get away from that.

Look at our population structure—I do not wish to furnish the figures now. The Zulus will not allow themselves to be governed by the Xhosas and the Xhosas will not be allowed themselves to be governed by the Zulus. A one-party state and a one man, one vote system in a unitary state, are unacceptable to this country. They will lead to serious danger and to threats to minority rights. In fact, the Official Opposition joined us in making this statement when we were doing the preparatory work which led to the first President's Council.

On the other hand it is right that the State should as far as possible avoid discriminatory practices in legislation and administration. This is not the first time I have said this. This is why our administration is at present being improved. In my opening address during January this year I emphasized that the improvement of the everyday circumstances of Black communities could be effectively promoted by giving searching attention to attitudes and relations in the daily human contact situation. This matter is of so much importance to me that I do not wish to leave it as it is. Consequently we have already taken steps to improve the everyday circumstances of Black people. Firstly, approval was granted for the Human Sciences Research Council to institute an investigation into relations at points of contact between certain departments and members of the Black communities. The project must be given high priority, and must be geared to Black people themselves identifying and indicating the problem areas. After that, we can look into them.

In the second place, all governmental bodies must again make certain that Black communities are involved in decision-making on socio-economic matters which affect them. Such participation in decision-making fosters greater confidence in the purpose and the integrity of proposals that have to be considered.

Thirdly, all departments must devise and submit orientation programmes aimed at improving relations during the execution of their functions. These programmes will not be based on fictitious or imaginary problem areas, but on realities disclosed by the HSRC investigation.

Fourthly, the Commission for Administration is being held responsible for the general co-ordination of the orientation programmes of staff of all colours who daily find themselves in a contact situation with communities.

Fifthly, I want to make a very serious appeal to the media. I believe there are unlimited opportunities for everyone to help build better relations. I am not talking about a sickly spirit of obsequiousness emanating from guilt feelings. I am talking about an attempt at probity in this country. The media are able to help us, but they do not always do so. We have used threats, we have spoken appeasingly, we have consulted and we have appointed councils, but there are wilful elements among the media who are bent on bedevilling relations. I am making an appeal to them to evince a change of heart in South Africa. Months of tiring efforts to build up sound relations can be destroyed with one thoughtless deed or one inaccurate report. Inferences and comments may differ, but everyone has a solemn responsibility to acquaint themselves with the true facts and to use only truly reliable sources.

Mr D J DALLING: Whom are you talking about?

The STATE PRESIDENT: I am talking about all of us, including the hon member.

Mr D J DALLING: Who in the media?

*The STATE PRESIDENT: Sir, if that is the kind of reaction one gets, I can accomplish nothing. Then my hands are tied. I did

not come here in a spirit of accusation this morning. The hon member has shown me that he is not listening. [Interjections.] In the news media and among all the newspapers there are people who think of circulation in the first place and not of sound relations.

The task of creating sound attitudes rests equally heavily on everyone. Government employees and those in other governmental institutions are not the only people who have a responsibility in this connection. The greatest percentage of the personnel who serve Black people are already Black people. One sometimes finds that there is a lack of willingness among those people towards those whom they have to serve. The exercise of governmental functions must in all respect be decent and promote sound attitudes. By doing this, respect is engendered for the rules by means of which we wish to assure orderliness and stability in our society. At the same time I want to express thanks to the large number of officials who perform this tiring task every day. I want to express my thanks to them for the work they are doing.

I now want to say a few words about the concept of apartheid. It is well-known that I stated here in Parliament several years ago, when I became Prime Minister, that the concept of apartheid in a negative, oppressive sense was not acceptable to me. It was not a new approach. If hon members would read the speech which the late Dr D F Malan made when he made his first statement as Prime Minister of South Africa over the radio, they would see that he dealt with this aspect. It is unfortunately a word which has resulted in a false image of South Africa's internal relations. It is a parrot-cry which has become general among our enemies as well as among the ignorant who have been taken in tow by them.

Dr A L BORAINÉ: It gave birth to racist laws.

*The STATE PRESIDENT: I regard that as an insulting remark. [Interjections.] Of course. What is more, I am not talking to the hon member; I am talking to the hon the Leader of the Official Opposition.

That is why I prefer to talk about co-operative co-existence. I have stated repeatedly that I talk about co-operative co-existence,

because we must exist side by side in this country and we must also co-operate with one another. In the process I want to continue to eliminate as far as possible the unpleasant things attaching to this parrot-cry, without jeopardizing my own survival. This is my reply to the hon member for Rissik, who made a very unsavoury speech in this House yesterday, directed at my person. I want to tell him this morning—in all fondness—that he cannot spell out to me the rules of Afrikanership. He is still too green for that. [Interjections.]

I also wish to emphasize a second point. We cannot achieve this objective, namely the elimination of all the unpleasantnesses in our inter-group relations, with a single stroke of the pen. Even a person such as Mr Nelson Mandela admitted that if the ANC were to come into power—and this can be found in certain available documents—they, too, would not be able to eliminate it with a single stroke of the pen. An evolutionary development must take place. If the hon the Leader of the Official Opposition were to come into power tomorrow . . .

*HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear! [Interjections.]

*The STATE PRESIDENT: Yes, well, I shall not reproach the hon members for saying that. If he should come into power tomorrow, he will not be able to change this system with one stroke of the pen. He has already admitted to me that if he had to convene a national convention, and they took decisions with which he did not agree, he would reject them. If the hon member for Waterberg should come into power, he would be faced with the same truths I have been faced with since I became Prime Minister. If the NRP should come into power—which will not happen . . . [Interjections.] . . . if the NRP should come into power, they would be confronted by the same truths, and because some of their leaders perceived this, they are now sitting here on my side!

In conclusion I want to say a few words about a few remaining aspects. No government can in the space of one or even two terms of office cope with all the facets of a country's national life. New problems keep on cropping up. Particularly a country such

as the RSA confronts one with new situations every day; it is the way our country is constituted, and we cannot get away from it. Therefore deliberation and consultation will be a future task for everyone who has an unselfish interest in our country's future.

It is a fact that there still many important matters in respect of Black communities in which all of us in South Africa have an interest. There is firstly the important matter which was raised by the hon member Prof Olivier concerning citizenship. Investigation in depth has recently brought greater clarity to the Government, and for most Black people this is an important matter. I have found this to be the case from personal experience and from discussions I have had. The Government does not regard the loss of South African citizenship to be the inevitable result of a national state becoming independent. We are prepared to negotiate further on this matter and to seek solutions. I think there are examples which may fruitfully be studied.

Secondly, there is the need in respect of national states to progress to greater autonomy. I think it can be stated without any doubt that the TBVC countries and the self-governing national states consider themselves to be irrevocably autonomous entities. We cannot change that. None of the parties sitting here would, if it were to come into power, be able to do anything about that. Those states would not allow them to do so.

Further constitutional development, both individual as well as in an inter-state context, can only take place if geographic consolidation can be brought about in a meaningful way. Now I know that we have been wrestling with this problem since 1936. We have made a great deal of progress with the pledges of 1936, but consolidation is closely tied up with effective government and administration. It is also closely tied up with proper boundaries and the optimum development and utilization of infrastructure and land. For that reason we shall have to negotiate further on these matters. The negotiating process in South Africa can never be completely finalized. If we want peace, security and progress in this country, we shall have to keep on negotiating.

These matters constitute great challenges. I am not in any way suggesting that these tasks which I have sketched are superhu-

man, but they do require a great realization of responsibility on the part of political leaders and their followers. I am speaking from experience when I say that bitter partisanship and personal rivalry in dealing with these matters will cause out best efforts to fail, with disastrous consequences for our country. If the Republic of South Africa becomes paralysed and internally weakened, not only we but also our neighbouring countries will pay a heavy price.

If what I have said here today has the support of leaders of other political parties, I wish to issue an invitation to them and propose that we allow the special Cabinet Committee, as the central forum which I spoke about earlier, to act in such a way that those leaders may also be accorded a position there so that we may enter into negotiations on a non-party political basis with Black leaders who reject violence as a political solution. I am not advocating coalitions or any fusion of parties. There is enough over which we can strive with one another across the floor of this House and conduct debates. I am advocating the creation of a national team effort from this Parliament to seek solutions to our most burning issues in the way I have indicated. I am making that offer today. If they agree with me that we must thrust aside the proponents of violence, if they agree with me that we must oppose violence, if they agree with me on the general expositions I have presented here this morning, I am prepared to use the special Cabinet Committee which is the central forum for future discussion in such a way that they can be accorded a position on it, enabling them to make a contribution in a dialogue with peaceful Black leaders in this country.

I am making that offer. It is there for everyone who has an interest in these matters to accept or reject. I believe it is our opportunity to steer this country along a responsible course.

What does it matter if a leader goes under in this process? Leaders come and go; leaders are of an ephemeral nature. Leaders are not the most important factor. The most important factor is South Africa's welfare, South Africa's peace, South Africa's security, its progress and its place as a regional power on the southern subcontinent of Africa.

Collection Number: AK2117

DELMAS TREASON TRIAL 1985 - 1989

PUBLISHER:

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

Location: **Johannesburg**

©2012

LEGAL NOTICES:

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

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

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

This document is part of a private collection deposited with Historical Papers at The University of the Witwatersrand.