

https://dspace.org/

Debates of Parliament (Hansard)

South Africa Parliament, House of Assembly

1989
Cape Town Government Printers
http://hdl.handle.net10539/13581

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Then, as I have said, there are other governments one can also approach—if one has good relationships with them—to exert the necessary pressure behind the scenes, specifically to serve as a warning. Then one's warning has substance. Then it means something, particularly if those governments agree with one. [Interjections.]

Let us take the position in the north of South West Africa, south of the 16th parallel. We are, of course, aware that there are still Swapo elements present, but the question is how serious the relevant threat is. On 1 April it was very serious, but on 1 April we managed to have certain restrictive provisions set aside so that the troops we had at the ready and the SWA Police could effectively perform their task. It was a great achievement for South Africa—I reiterate it here today—that the security forces, in conjunction with the SWA Police, could take such effective action. There is absolutely no doubt about that.

Every morning that he is in Windhoek, from 08:15 to 09:15, the Administrator-General of South West Africa has a meeting at which he, in conjunction with the chief of police, examines the security situation in South West Africa as a whole. Incidents do, of course, occur in South West Africa—for example the fatal shooting of Mr Lubowski. That is also a violation of the idea of peaceful settlement. Complaints have been levelled at the DTA about their committing acts of intimidation. Complaints have been levelled at Swapo about their committing acts of intimidation.

The question is: What do the countries that have concluded these agreements say to one another? At this moment they are meeting in Cuba specifically in order to thrash out among one another alleged breaches of the obligations. What is more, this week there will probably be further meetings with certain neighbouring states. But we do not come along here and shout about it from the rooftops each time like a country that is panic-stricken. We adopt the course we have adopted in Africa to indicate that we are a regional power which, owing to our economic strength and other strengths, has a responsible say in the determination of peace and stability in our region. With all due respect, I think that we have thus far had great success in warding off threats and actually deserve appreciation instead of the innuendos we have heard here today.

Reference has also been made to the alleged Swapo build-up on South West Africa's northern border, ie the Botswana border. We have harnessed all our intelligence services and information-gathering structures to go into reports of this nature. We could find no confirmation. The closest we have been able to come to an answer is that they are eastern Hereros who possibly want to return to register as voters.

Those are the facts I have. If the hon member has better facts than that, I would be very grateful if he would reveal his reliable source to me, because South Africa's security services, with all their capabilities, have not succeeded in having that confirmed.

The same applies to rumours in regard to the Cubans in Mozambique. Newspaper reports appear, but not one of our intelligence services, not even the services of other countries who are mindful of this, could obtain a single word of confirmation in regard to that aspect. If the hon member over there, however, has better sources than the intelligence services, I invite him please to provide the information.

This goes much further. The course of events in South West Africa is being monitored from day to day. From time to time I am personally in touch with Dr Perez de Cuellar about these matters in South West Africa. Only yesterday I had someone ask Mr Ahtisaari what the present position was in regard to Swapo elements south of the 16th parallel. In the opinion of the Administrator-General this does not, for the present, constitute any appreciable threat that could get out of hand, but we are prepared for any unexpected contingencies such as that on 1 April. [Interjections.]

I should like to quote Mr Ahtisaari's reaction yesterday here. He told me:

> I still stand by my earlier assessment that Swapo elements and numbers in Angola have been reduced to a bare minimum. They are now in the hundreds, presently believed to be less than 500, with the diminishing trend continuing. It is my belief that the numbers remaining cannot pose a military threat anywhere.

This does not mean that I should necessarily accept Mr Ahtisaari's assessment, but with this he has at least taken a certain responsibility upon himself if something were to go wrong. Further-

more the SA Government reserves the right, as in the past, to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure a free and fair election, and to restrict intimidation from any side to a minimum.

Therefore, because there is no confirmed factual basis for the hon member for Soutpansberg's motion, we feel that the following motion would be much more suitable in the present circumstances. I should like to move the following amendment to the draft resolution, as moved by the hon member for Soutpansberg:

To omit all the words after "That" and to substitute "the House—

(1) expresses its appreciation to the Government for the steps taken and the agreements concluded to clear the way for the independence of South West Africa/Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola; and

(2) while—

(a) taking note of the recent unrest in the Western Cape, with the attendant damage to property and loss of life;

(b) deploring these events; and

(c) extending its sympathy to all who have suffered as a result,

(i) requests the Government to establish as soon as possible, by means of the existing machinery at its disposal, what the circumstances were that led to the death of those concerned;

(ii) appeals to all parties and interested bodies and persons, in the light of the repeated positive declarations made by the Acting State President, to join the negotiating table in a spirit of goodwill and to take note of the statement made by the Acting State President on 12 September 1989, in particular his statement that 'the door to a new South Africa is open—it is not necessary to batter it down';

(iii) appeals to everyone to act within the framework of the laws of the country, as was proved to be possible during the gathering in Cape Town on 13 September 1989; and

(iv) expresses its thanks to the South African Police in general for the sacrifices made by them under difficult circumstances."

If we look back on the past months in the process of independence for South West Africa, the outstanding feature is still that firstly, as early as 1 April, we were prepared—in spite of the fact that at that stage our troops were confined to their bases—to effectively halt Swapo's incursions across the border. [Interjections.] We did so without causing the process of independence to collapse, with Mr Ahtisaari's concurrence. This highlighted South Africa as a stabilising, responsible and well-balanced power. [Interjections.]

Secondly it is as plain as a pikestaff that in contrast to 1976's unrelenting demands that we should get out of South West Africa, and hand over the territory to the UN, we succeeded in negotiating an agreement in terms of which the Administrator-General of South West Africa would administer the territory until independence, in terms of which we could have 1 500 troops stationed at Oshivelo and Grootfontein until the election had taken place and in terms of which the South West African Police Force, under the control of the Administrator-General, would maintain law and order.

What is more—and this is the greatest achievement—we negotiated a timetable for Cuban withdrawal. By the middle of August 17 000 Cuban troops had already been withdrawn, together with a large number of tanks, heavy artillery and vehicles. By 1 November they must have withdrawn 25 000 troops—there is every indication that this target is attainable. I think it is a major achievement for South Africa that it could succeed in doing so.

Another achievement was that after 1978, namely in 1982, we negotiated a deal in terms of which a new constitution for South West Africa could only be adopted by a two-thirds majority.

These are milestones, particularly if one bears in mind that hon members of the Official Opposition, who were on this side of the House at that time, were prepared to accept and support the resolution in 1978, without a timetable for Cuban withdrawal. [Interjections.] I think the hon

member for Soutpansberg ought to rise—I hope he will have a chance at a later stage—to give this amendment his heartfelt support. On his part that would be conduct based on facts and not on hearsay evidence.

*Dr Z J DE BEER: Mr Speaker, the input which we would like to make to this debate also pertains to the security of our country and its citizens, but concerns other aspects of that important subject than those that were mentioned by the hon member for Soutpansberg.

I received the amendment that was moved by the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs, only two seconds ago. According to what I was able to hear whilst the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs was speaking, there are, in fact, certain aspects of it which correspond to certain things which we wish to say, although I have not yet had time to read through it thoroughly.

I move as an amendment:

> To omit all the words after "That" and to substitute "the House, noting with alarm—
>
> (1) the serious conflict and violence which have taken place in South Africa and particularly in the Western Cape;
>
> (2) the loss of life and extensive damage to property which have occurred;
>
> (3) the extensive adverse publicity with consequent serious harm to South Africa's external relationships and to human relationships within the country; and
>
> (4) the disputes about what has actually happened,
>
> calls upon the Government forthwith to appoint a judicial commission to investigate fully and report urgently upon the facts of what has taken place and the causes of the unrest, and also calls upon all political organizations immediately to commence dialogue which can lead to effective negotiations aimed at achieving long-term solutions and stability in South Africa."

This amendment deserves the support of the House for the reasons expounded in it, but also owing to other, more deep-seated considerations. One must, as it were, examine the position on two levels.

I shall first discuss the contents of our statement— the outward and visible signs of the tragedy that has unfolded. Firstly, it is a fact that conflict and loss of life have occurred. Because censorship is still being applied in our country in terms of the state of emergency, none of us is really sure of what has happened, but the very fact that the hon the Minister of Law and Order became involved in an argument with leaders of the extra-parliamentary movement with regard to how many people had died, is proof of the fact that violence of the gravest order has taken place. There is also credible medical evidence regarding wounded persons who were treated in the hospitals.

As to the publicity which is given to events such as these, I am sure I need not remind any hon member of this House about it—nor about the consequences in terms of international relations and lack of economic confidence. It is precisely at a time like this, when we are suffering as a result of a lack of investment capital, with the associated low growth rate and consequently a high unemployment rate in the country, together with everything which this implies in terms of domestic instability, that we can least afford incidents like this occurring.

This scarcely requires any argument. What has happened during and since the recent election holds the gravest possible implications for our domestic peace, our foreign relations and our economic problems. A eudicial inquiry which would lay the matter wide open, has been justified over and over by what has happened.

Allow me to say at once that the history of the past few weeks has also had its encouraging aspects. Right at the beginning, when Blacks presented themselves for treatment at White hospitals on the Witwatersrand, the conduct of the doctors and nurses was first rate. The effect of their understanding and their tact was that potentially explosive situations were not only defused, but dealt with in such a way that this must even have made a positive contribution to good human relations.

Then I should also like to mention the exemplary manner in which the police performed their task on the Durban beaches. Alas, this stands in stark contrast to what happened earlier on certain beaches here in the Cape! Last but not least, we are probably all sincerely grateful for the way in which yesterday's church service and march in Cape Town were handled, by the Government as well as and the participants. I like to give praise where praise is due, and I also want to say that

the hon the Acting State President is deserving of gratitude for his statement and for the tolerant attitude which he and the Government have adopted.

Furthermore, I want to personally attest to the fact that whereas there were, in fact, certain aspects of the occasion which gave me cause for concern, I was deeply moved by the true friendship, across the colour line, which characterised yesterday's proceedings. This encourages me to believe that if and when we are able to jointly determine common objectives for ourselves, it will still be possible to build a united nation here in South Africa. [Interjections.]

†And that, Sir, brings me to the second part of what I must say today. The events to which I am referring all arose from the decision by leaders of extra-parliamentary organisations to hold demonstrations in protest against the exclusion of their people from effective participation in the election which was in progress. Now the first question we must all ask ourselves is this: Are adult human beings—parents, workers, taxpayers—entitled to ask for effective participation in the political process, or are they not? Surely there can be only one answer in terms of the Western civilised heritage which we all claim as our own. Political rights cannot be withheld from these fellow citizens of ours. When we say this, Sir, we do not mean some gerrymandered vote on a separate roll somewhere. We mean what the Government's own Law Commission calls an equal and equivalent franchise. This was a phrase used by the hon the Minister of Justice at a congress held by the governing party early in the election campaign.

It is possible that there may be hon members on the Government benches who, at this stage, are tempted to argue that political rights have been granted to people of colour here in South Africa.

As far as the Black people, in the sense of the Africans, are concerned, that would be so ludicrous a claim that I hope no hon member will insult the dignity of the House by making it. As far as so-called Coloured and Indian people are concerned, I think that we must all take cognisance of the fact that the tricameral system has once again failed to win the confidence of the people it is intended to serve, quite apart from its other deficiencies which we have discussed on other occasions.

At bottom, what we are talking about is government by consent. Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. All the people need not support the government in any party-political sense, but all, or very nearly all the people, must accept the legitimacy of the government or the alternative is endless conflict, with all that that entails. It is not pointed out often enough in this House that for well over three years now, South Africa has been governed not by consent, but by force, for that is what a state of emergency means. I do not believe or claim that our Government wants to maintain a state of emergency in our country as a matter of preference. I do not believe that. I believe that they are maintaining it because they can do no other. That is not a state of affairs which this House can or should continue to accept.

I come now to the last paragraph of our amendment. We ask, firstly, for a judicial commission to report on both the fact and the causes of the recent unrest. These are the very matters I have been dealing with. We then appeal to all political organisations immediately to begin dialogue leading to negotiation. My hon colleagues will go into this matter in greater detail than I can do, but I declare today that it is the conviction of our party that all South Africans have need of one another, and—more important—that we all know it. The question is not whether we shall live together or apart. That question was settled when the apartheid policy collapsed. The question is whether, living together as we must, we are going to co-operate or fight.

Clearly, we all claim certain rights and opportunities for ourselves and we all want these protected in the future. There are instances where the claims of some South Africans seem to conflict with the claims of others. There is no way to resolve those situations save by negotiation. Until now, South Africans of all parties have far too often been inclined to define preconditions for negotiation in such a way as to make it difficult for others to sit down with them. Is it too much to hope that, out of the bloodshed of 1989, this good may come: That South Africans will say to each other, not that there are many reasons why we cannot reason together—but: Let us meet to seek the conditions under which we can reason together, about the common future which we must share?

*The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Mr Speaker, I want to refer to the question of a full comple-

ment. It is a fact that seven people who believe in their cause are a full complement. [Interjections.]

The hon member for Parktown made a very well-balanced contribution. He motivated his case well and it was clear that he had given serious thought to it. On this side of the House we say, with the necessary respect for this very momentous matter, that it does nevertheless seem to us that he is *victor ludorum* on the DP side. We do want to recommend, though, that he makes certain that no one moves the tape forward. With the necessary respect for the very useful contribution made by the hon member for Parktown I therefore want to deal with one or two specific points.

With reference to the question of a judicial commission of inquiry, I must point out that the hon the Minister of Law and Order issued a statement on the twelfth in which he specifically designated Major-General Jaap Joubert, the Chief Deputy Commissioner of the Detective Branch, as the investigating officer in this case.

He also referred to the role of the Attorney-General in this matter, who will immediately become involved; something which has a special significance. What it amounts to in practice is that the Attorney-General acts in conjunction with the investigating officer and advises him, as it were, on the facts which must be sought. In the case of a commission it also ends up with the Attorney-General, but does so after a far longer period of time has elapsed. The situation as it is here is that it will end up with the Attorney-General very quickly. We appeal to witnesses to come forward in connection with this investigation.

Therefore the normal legal procedure in connection with complaints about alleged crimes has already been put into operation. If the witnesses come forward the Attorney-General will take a decision. He will now co-operate with the investigating team and keep me informed of its progress. To allocate a time-scale is not possible, but the matter bears the stamp of urgency. Depending upon the circumstances, inquests will also be considered, for example when it is clear that deceased persons died of unnatural causes, such as gunshot wounds, but that there is insufficient evidence to indicate that any person can be held criminally responsible. The decision to hear evidence formally at a judicial inquiry rests with the discretion of the presiding magistrate.

To appoint a commission of inquiry under these circumstances will mean a duplication of work. As I have already said, the gathering of evidence for such a commission may hinder and even obstruct the gathering of evidence. Experience has shown that a commission of inquiry is not a magical formula for providing immediate answers. It is quite simply the case that in order to place evidence before a commission, witnesses have to be found and consulted. Who does that? It is also done by the police. Who is of assistance in the disclosure of evidence? The Attorney-General. What has in fact happened here is that a short-cut has been taken. The same people who would deal with this matter before a commission are dealing with this matter, the only difference being that a decision on the question of whether or not there should be a prosecution will be taken far more quickly. In this case it is clear that judicial steps will be instituted in any event, whether by way of a criminal case, or by way of an inquest. These steps may be delayed through the work of a commission of inquiry, as we have found on previous occasions elsewhere in the country.

All indications are therefore that a commission of inquiry is not the proper means to adopt at this stage, but I am not excluding it completely; on the contrary, the normal legal procedure must take its course, but without any delays, which the appointment of a commission at this stage would in fact imply.

I have therefore committed my department to a situation of no delay. The Attorney-General and I have made an arrangement to the effect that if the steps are not adequate to enable him to arrive at a conclusion soon, he will inform me of this, and I shall inform the Government and then further steps will be taken.

I want to remind hon members of the statement made by the hon Acting State President a day ago, when he in fact said that if powers had been exceeded, remedial steps would be taken.

In conclusion I want to point out that in spite of the state of emergency, the effectiveness of the combined action of the Attorney-General and the police has in fact been proved time and again. Where human lives have in fact been taken, where powers have been exceeded, where there has been destruction of property—it makes no difference by whom this was done—this team has

demonstrated in the past few months that they can bring cases to the Supreme Court efficiently and quickly. In the Eastern Cape a large number of cases have already been tried, and more are awaiting trial.

In fact this team, with this style and this method, has proved itself recently. I therefore want to request the hon member to adopt this course of action. While I am dealing with this, I want to place on record that when the South African police investigate cases, including cases against themselves, it is done objectively, judiciously and expeditiously. I want to thank my colleague, the hon Minister of Law and Order, for this objective conduct on the part of the South African police.

The hon member also referred to the question of the events which occurred yesterday, namely the march that took place. We believe in the freedom of assembly, but a balance must be struck between the right of the individual and the right of the State. The hon member quoted the Law Commission to me. The Law Commission does indeed say, in regard to this matter, that defined human rights are subject to legislation and authorised executive action which comprise an invasion owing to considerations of State security. They do in fact state that qualification. The hon member is aware that we have had the same situation in numerous court judgments, namely that freedom of speech and freedom of assembly continue to find their limitation in the rights of other individuals.

In Israel we had the situation that there was a very lengthy inquiry and also a judgment to the effect that these things were circumscribed by the rights of others, for example the proprietary rights of others and perhaps, too, the right of a court which could be intimidated while a march was in progress. That is why our hon the State President said that we believed in this, provided that it took place within the framework of the law.

In regard to this matter I just want to place it on record that yesterday's march took place within the framework of the law. Certain assurances were given to me by an organiser of that march. In fact he ultimately abided by those assurances, namely that it would take place in an orderly way, under control and without any incidents. They deserve credit, but on the other hand those who operated within the framework of the law by applying for the right to march also deserve credit, because we need that provision in order to determine where the balance lies between the rights of the State, the rights of the community and the right of the individual to protest and to hold a meeting.

This style is now being adopted throughout the country. I have great appreciation for those who are doing so. On 13 September the magistrate of Durban granted permission, on request, for a peaceful protest by a 100 people on the steps of the city hall. The protest was a peaceful one. That is correct. It testifies to the faith of this Government in the freedom of speech, the freedom of assembly and the freedom of expression of political ideas. The magistrate of Pietermaritzburg granted a similar request on the same date. Everything went off peacefully. Today the magistrate of Grahamstown notified us that he had granted permission to the Students' Council of Rhodes for a march by 500 students from the University to the police station in order to hand in a petition. He granted permission for this to take place.

*An HON MEMBER: There have been many other applications!

*The MINISTER: How that march went off, I do not know yet. The fact however remains that permission was granted.

I am making an appeal—in the words of our hon the State President—for everyone who wants to participate in this to come to the conference table. They ought to send their leaders. There is a specific process by means of which this is going to be done, but in the meantime this will happen and we are making an appeal to everyone—I know the hon member for Parktown and the hon members on that side support me in this—to ensure that everything will occur within the framework of the law of this country because if we do not adopt that procedure, nothing will in fact remain of anyone's freedom.

*Mr M J MENTZ: Mr Speaker, I have a few comments arising from what the hon the Minister of Justice said concerning the Attorney-General's involvement in such investigations. I want to issue a word of warning in this regard because I consider it an incorrect approach to have an Attorney-General involved when a case is investigated. This reduces him to the level of a person prosecuting in a case which he has investigated

himself and I want to say, with respect, that this is something which the hon the Minister should look at. [Interjections.]

*Mr J H VAN DER MERWE: Kobie, you had better think about your . . .

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon member for Overvaal knows what the ruling of the Chair is regarding the shouting of persons' names across the floor. The hon member for Ermelo may proceed.

*Mr M J MENTZ: The SA Police shoulders the enormous task and responsibility of maintaining law and order in the Republic. This is always the responsibility of the police, regardless of who constitutes the government of the day. We know this. In the same way the authorities have an obligation toward the police and this is to support their lawful actions within the parameters of their task. This reciprocal loyalty which should exist between the authorities and the police is essential for any stability concerning the security situation in the RSA. I should like to view the events of the past few days from this perspective.

Firstly, there are the open and condemnatory statements which have come from the Press which supports the NP. I am referring particularly to the attacks which have been made on the police by this Press and in this connection to *Rapport* in particular in which it was stated under banner headlines "Wanneer gaan die polisie leer?" They had been told that the unrest situation had been dealt with improperly and that there had been improper action toward demonstrators. It was actually proposed in this that a judicial commission of inquiry be instituted into police actions in this connection. This could just as well have been pursued by the DP, as they in fact did.

The foreign editor of the same newspaper also found division in the Police Force on the question of whether proper action had been taken or whether there had been excessive violence on the side of the police or some of its members.

I want to dwell for a moment on the evidence put forward in support of the adoption of this point of view by this pro-Government Press. They rely in the first place on the unproved allegations and statements of a certain Lt Rockman, a Brown police officer, a man who lays claim to credibility simply because he is a policeman. In disregard of any discipline and the authority of his immediate superiors, this policeman then makes these gross allegations against his colleagues.

Let us simply ask at whom he is levelling these allegations. Are they aimed at all the members of the police; are the riot police as a whole the object? No, it is not the riot police; White police are the object of his charge. I quote what this man said as it was reported in the Press:

> Without being racist, he says the riot police's handling of demonstrations is bound to erupt because many members of riot squads are white.
>
> "They are outsiders coming in; they don't understand our problems. White heartbeats are not the same.
>
> They already have biased views when they come in. They treat people as bunches of 'hotnots'.
>
> But we are not prepared to take it anymore . . ."

Sir, there is no doubt that it is White police who are being singled out. It then strikes one that these statements are relied upon and lead to condemnation by the Nationalist Press. It is amazing that this Press actually takes the lead in the attack on the police.

In all fairness and justice one could say that it was to be expected that this Press—knowing that there is another side to the question too, that we have a well-trained Force, that we have a specially trained riot unit and have experienced people—would have taken that fact into account before they acted in this condemnatory manner.

One would also have expected the fact to be taken into account that we had weathered the recent election in great calmness and peace under the supervision of these very people. No, Sir, this is the immediate reaction concerning the police without their side being heard.

In consequence we say that the NP Press has given White police the cold shoulder and certainly contributed to the disparagement of the SAP and this can in no way contribute to retaining the loyalty of the police which, in our opinion, is absolutely essential to stabilise the security situation in the Republic.

Secondly, one may ask whether the Government itself, in its conduct over the past weekend and

yesterday, fulfilled its obligations to support the police in taking lawful action. We return an unequivocal "no" to this. The events of the weekend which led to yesterday's protest are disturbing. In order to set the supposed negotiating process in motion, the Government leant over backwards to satisfy radicals but turned its back on the police in the process. The Government calls this a gesture to create good relations, but we call it stabbing the police in the back.

We say that the Government was given a very specific choice. They had to decide whether to range themselves on the side of the police or on that of radicals. That decision had far-reaching consequences in our country. After all, the object of yesterday's march was to protest against what was called "the brutality and excessive violence of the SAP". It was also expressed like this in a challenge by Archbishop Tutu to the hon the State President Designate. He said, and I quote:

> You, the Acting State President, must condemn what the security forces have done.

The fact is that the hon the State President Designate did not do this. He did not do it in so many words but by his actions. He did it by permitting a protest march. The question is no longer whether the police in fact acted improperly. The protest became a condemnation of the police. Merely by his permitting the protest, the police were condemned. The question is no longer whether the police acted correctly or not. [Interjections.]

Hon members will disagree with this. I say, however, that this is the feeling and impression which exists about these events. They placed the police in the dock. They permitted them to be condemned without trial. This is an unforgivable sin. These events will be construed as proof that the police are the oppressors, guilty of excesses and violence, and the demonstrators will be held up as the peacemakers. This is the overall image which will result from this.

The state of emergency will be regarded as useless and powerless in future. The hon the new State President failed dismally in the first decisive choice which he had to make. While an election was in progress, it was necessary and they came out in support of opposing protest, whether violent or whatever its nature, but the moment the election was over this protest was entirely permissible. [Interjections.] This decision which was taken is a great stride along this Government's road to capitulation. This represents a breach of faith with the police and, if the loyalty of the security forces starts to waver as it must waver at this stage, this is a clear indication that the Government is on the way . . . [Time expired.]

*The DEPUTY MINISTER OF DEFENCE: Mr Speaker, the speech by the hon member for Ermelo to which we have just listened, is typical of the level at which that party conducts its politics. They do not care who they trample underfoot or who they degrade, as long as they can achieve short-term political objectives by doing so.

This afternoon we have witnessed a typical example of the use and misuse here of the SAP, the pride of the people of South Africa, to institute political suspicion-mongering. The hon the Minister of Law and Order and my colleague the hon the Deputy Minister will reply fully to the allegations, to the nonsense the hon member for Ermelo spoke here this afternoon.

I only want to reply to one of his questions. This Government will side with the police against radicalism. If the hon member understands Afrikaans, he can accept that. [Interjections.]

I want to come back to the motion of the hon member for Soutpansberg and associate myself with what the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs said with reference to what the hon member had said at the beginning of his motion regarding his uncertainty about the "apparent inability" of the Government. It is clear that this hon member is not sure of his facts. The chief spokesman on defence matters is simply sitting at the back there conducting affairs and is not getting a turn to speak in this debate. I find that strange. Perhaps the hon member for Overvaal could have given the hon member for Soutpansberg a few facts.

Mr J H VAN DER MERWE: [Inaudible.]

*The DEPUTY MINISTER: I am not finished with that hon member yet; he must just settle down. I shall talk to him again later.

The hon member for Soutpansberg alleged that the Far North was becoming unsafe; that the people were becoming afraid of what was going on there.

This afternoon the hon member was simply casting suspicion on the SADF, as well as the

SAP, by implication. As the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs said, the hon member does not know what is going on in his own constituency. He does not know what is being done to ensure his security and the security of his voters, because he would seem to be asleep most of the time.

The hon member referred to one incident in his motion. In his speech he referred to another incident. However, I want to tell the hon member that since 1 January there have been 21 incidents involving terrorists in that area. Because of their presence there the SADF ensured that 22 insurgents were killed and 10 were arrested. A total of 10 land-mines were removed and one was detonated. Not a single South African citizen was killed or injured. However, one does not hear a single word of thanks from that hon member. He does not express his thanks to this Government and the SADF which helped to safeguard the people in his constituency. [Interjections.] I say that is a disgrace!

The hon member cannot only be speaking out of ignorance. He was fully briefed. I requested a report from our commanding officers in that area. According to the report this hon member and the hon member for Pietersburg were briefed in June 1989. In August 1989, last month therefore, the hon member for Pietersburg and the hon member for Potgietersrus were informed precisely what was going on there. Then he introduces an inane motion like the one he has moved here today.

The commanding officer there told me that the CP MPs objected to the so-called no-shooting war, because they only believe in shooting and killing. They do not believe in the diplomatic and reform successes we have achieved thus far. No, simply kill the people. They have forgotten that they admitted that the solutions to this country's problems were only 20% military and 80% political. In this morning's report to me that commanding officer said that Mr Langley, MP, had agreed throughout with the person concerned. He said his main objection . . .

*Mr J H VAN DER MERWE: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: It is customary for all military briefing to take place in the strictest confidence and possibly even in secret . . . [Interjections.] I now want to ask the Chair whether it is fair and correct for the hon the Deputy Minister to be able to divulge in public what took place during a confidential briefing. [Interjections.]

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order and it is for the hon the Deputy Minister to decide. [Interjections.] The hon the Deputy Minister may proceed.

*Mr D S PIENAAR: He is talking through his hat. He does not even know what happened there!

*The DEPUTY MINISTER: Mr Speaker, I did not divulge any confidential or secret information. What I do want to object to, however, is that it was said that the hon member for Soutpansberg agreed with the information. However, his only objection was that there were too many Blacks in the SA Defence Force. [Interjections.] Hon members therefore again see the racism which we heard about a while ago—only the White policemen count. Hon members on this side of the House pay tribute to all the security forces of our country—White and Black. [Interjections.]

*Dr W J SNYMAN: Mr Speaker, may I put a question to the hon the Deputy Minister?

*The DEPUTY MINISTER: No, Sir . . . [Interjections.]

*Mr J H VAN DER MERWE: You are in trouble. [Interjections.]

*The DEPUTY MINISTER: There will be enough time on a subsequent occasion for the hon member to ask questions.

However, I shall go further. I was informed that the attitude of the hon member for Potgietersrus was harsh and acrimonious throughout, and that he tried to drag politics into the briefing. Whereas this officer was satisfied with the contributions of the other two MPs, he said that the attitude adopted by Mr Pienaar was not conducive to open discussions on Defence Force matters. [Interjections.] I seriously object to people and a party that treat the security of our country in this way, coming here and making petty politics by saying that they are taking up the cudgels for South Africa, the SADF and the SAP.

The CP with their right-wing radical extra-parliamentary appendages and the DP with their left-wing radical extra-parliamentary appendages are creating a climate of disaster in South

Africa. [Interjections.] They are playing straight into the hands of the enemies of South Africa by casting suspicion on everything which has to do with the security of our country from virtually every political platform. These two parties are not only soft on security in South Africa, but they are reckless, and neither of them can be trusted with the security of our country and its people. [Interjections.]

*Mr A L JORDAAN: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: Is it permissible for the hon member for Kuruman to say to the hon the Deputy Minister that he is a disgrace to the Defence Force and a disgraceful Minister?

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! Did the hon member for Kuruman say that?

*Mr J H HOON: Yes, Mr Speaker. I said he was a disgraceful Minister.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon member must withdraw the word "disgraceful".

*Mr J H HOON: Mr Speaker, I withdraw it.

* Mr S S VAN DER MERWE: Mr Speaker, I should just like to remind the hon the Deputy Minister of Defence that the election is over. [Interjections.] I have also been listening to the way he talks, giving the impression that the Defence Force and the Police Force belonged to the NP; I want to warn him against talking like this, because any such suggestion is outrageous.

It is pernicious and highly irresponsible. [Interjections.] The hon the Deputy Minister knows this. He knows that the arguments he is using against the CP and against our side do not hold water. He knows they are meaningless. However, I shall not devote any more time to him. [Interjections.]

The violent death of a considerable number of people in South Africa over the past few weeks is a tragedy for the country. It is not only a tragedy in the personal sense that a number of families and circles of friends have suffered the loss of a relative or friend, but also a tragedy for human relations in South Africa. Hate, resentment and political polarisation arose and increased within the space of a few days. It will require a great deal of patience, hard work and sound judgement to repair the damage that has been inflicted in this way. However it is of the utmost importance to determine exactly what went wrong in this process, why it went wrong and what must be done to prevent it happening again.

It is seldom that there are such divergent standpoints and information with regard to what exactly happened as there are in this particular case. My hon parliamentary leader has indicated that there are even enormous differences in estimates of the number of people who died. That in itself is an indication of the situation that has arisen. In all probability the truth lies somewhere between the various claims that have been made.

I want to point out that a further two people were shot dead with shotguns in Khayelitsha last night. This is the nature of the conflict and anarchy prevailing in South Africa at present. [Interjections.] I call it a situation of anarchy precisely because the public's confidence in the maintenance of order in the country has been shattered to such an extent that people no longer feel they can lodge complaints about these events. They have also been shocked by the actions of certain police units and policemen. Their confidence has been so shattered that they no longer feel they can turn to the South African Police for protection to the extent to which they should be able to do so.

This is a tragedy since it is precisely because of this condition of mistrust that political polarisation is further promoted and an impossible situation created in South Africa. I want to put it to the hon the Minister of Justice that it is precisely this climate which makes it so vitally important for a judicial commission to be appointed. The hon the Minister must understand that the mere participation of the police in this process is not good enough for members of the public who were on the receiving end of this violent action. It is simply not enough. A judicial commission would create the opportunity for normal members of the public to come forward and make their complaints known in public before such a judicial commission. If ever there was a time when such a body was needed, it is now.

We have no objection to the police playing a role in this process. The police must necessarily undertake investigations and even submit information to the commission. However, the fact of the matter is that the police are unfortunately an involved party in this conflict. For this reason one cannot expect the police to act as the judicial

authority in this regard too. In these circumstances it is very clear that the Government's information on what happened, particularly on the evening of 6 September, is extremely inadequate. It is very clear that they do not have comprehensive information about what happened. There was, among other things, a television interview with a spokesman of the Department of Law and Order from which it was very clear that the information available to that spokesman was very unreliable. It is iniquitous that this should be the case.

I want to associate myself with my hon leader in this regard and say that the availability of information provided by the normal media also has a role to play in this regard. It does have a role to play.

The fact that there are all kinds of restrictions on the presence of journalists at incidents of unrest, and the fact that there are restrictions on the publication of information, suggests that things are being covered up. This does nobody any good. It does not help us. It does not help the Government in its task of maintaining order. In this regard I want to ask the hon the Minister of Law and Order, in particular, to take a serious look at the emergency regulations, because they no longer contribute towards the maintenance of law and order in South Africa.

Furthermore, it is clear at this stage that elements of the police were in fact involved when things went wrong on the evening of 6 September and subsequently. Naturally this situation is considerably aggravated by the suspicion which exists because the Government's record with regard to the combating of acts of terror perpetrated by elements on the far-right is a poor one—a totally unacceptable record!

What then is wrong, for things like this to be taking place? There is a climate of conflict owing to our political situation. There is tension among the police because many of them are overworked, because there is often an overreaction on the part of the Government, which creates problems for the policemen themselves, and because vindictive and undisciplined action is often tolerated when it should not be.

I want to make the following point, and I am directing this not only at the Government, but also at the CP. If no steps are taken against the black sheep in the South African Police, we are neglecting our duty towards the majority of good policemen in this country, and we dare not allow this to happen. We dare not allow this to happen! One dare not cover things up in order to protect a person who has overstepped the mark.

*An HON MEMBER: Must we also take steps against the rebels?

*Mr S S VAN DER MERWE: One must act, because it is only in those circumstances that one creates a climate in which a normal, decent policeman can do his job properly.

Reference was made to yesterday's protest march here in Cape Town, and this was in sharp contrast to previous action by the Government in such cases. Throughout the entire election campaign the hon the Minister of Law and Order went out of his way to make it clear to the public that anything done or financed by the so-called MDM was *ipso facto* evil, led to violence and could under no circumstances be tolerated.

There you have it. For the first time the hon the Minister has had a little faith in human nature and afforded the people an opportunity to give political expression to their frustrations and strong feelings. In spite of the fact that thousands of people participated in the march, it went off perfectly and was a disciplined march. I sincerely hope that the hon the Minister . . .

*The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Mr Speaker, is the hon member prepared to answer a question?

*Mr S S VAN DER MERWE: Yes, but it will have to be quick.

*The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: Will the hon member for Green Point concede that the very reason it took place in an orderly fashion was because it took place within the framework of the applicable rules and regulations? [Interjections.]

*Mr S S VAN DER MERWE: Let me tell the hon the Minister that nobody outside this House is going to believe that argument, because the hon the Minister knows full well that that protest march was initially organised in spite of a whole string of legal provisions which made it impossible. The hon the Minister is also well aware that the Government made concessions and allowed that permit only because it had been driven into a corner by political circumstances and had virtually no choice but to do so. I respect and compliment him on this. I say they acted cor-

rectly and in a responsible manner. [Interjections.]

However, I want to add that this must be a lesson for the future. Why does the Government not allow such protests to become part of normal democracy in South Africa, rather than an embarrassment to the Government—as yesterday's events undoubtedly were—because no one would believe that that protest march took place with the Government's approval. No one would believe that. They were driven into a corner, and that is why they had to make that concession-.[Time expired.]

*The DEPUTY MINISTER OF LAW AND ORDER: Mr Chairman, the hon member for Green Point passed a remark at the beginning of his speech with which I want to associate myself fully. Any person's death, a loss of life, is a traumatic event for everyone involved, and I should like to associate myself with the statement issued by the hon the State President on 12 September in which he expressed his sympathy and condolences in respect of all loss of life.

I should, however, like to cross swords with the hon member for Green Point. The hon member asked what had happened. I want to invite him to hold discussions with members of the LP, so that they can also tell him what happened there, so that they can also inform him what pressure they were under on that specific day. Then he will find that the remarks which the hon the Minister of Law and Order passed during the election campaign and the build-up to 6 September, were justified. [Interjections.]

I also want to invite him to talk to members of the public who are not members of the LP, but were involved in that neighbourhood and wanted to participate in the election, so that they can repeat to him the appreciation they expressed to the police.

In one respect I felt the hon member was not fair, namely as regards his remark that there was tension in the police owing to the failure to take action against culprits—the covering up of certain things. Does that hon member not realise that what the hon the Minister of Justice related here, were established facts anyone could go and read later on in the annals—how the police, with great compassion, prosecuted other policemen, brought people to justice and convicted them? Why does the hon member not give credit for this? Every time this happens, the hon member should say that the Police Force allowed the law to take its course and the law prevailed. However, the hon member has launched what is nothing but a gossip-mongering campaign about a cover-up in respect of policemen who did not comply with the rules of law and order. I do not think this befits him, and the Police Force certainly does not deserve this.

In the course of my speech I will link up with what was said by the hon member for Ermelo, who is not here at the moment.

The violence during the election campaign and on 6 September 1989 did not appear from nowhere. I submit that it was not spontaneous. Similarly the peaceful nature and course of yesterday's protest march was not achieved without work and planning. If the SAP had not taken timeous preventive steps, 6 September 1989 would have been a more dramatic night than it in fact was. For that reason I feel that the police and the Government deserve nothing but our praise and appreciation for their vigilant and timeous action.

What were the three elements—for which we are now being blamed—which gave rise to the events prior to and on 6 September 1989? I think the opening shots—I want to mention this in full for the record; this is my function—were fired by Oliver Tambo on 8 January 1989 when he called for "militant mass defiance". Our experiences of 1984 taught us that this meant necklace murders, the destruction of property, the enforcing of boycotts, awareness and mobilisation. [Interjections.]

I heard the hon member for Randburg say I should be ashamed of myself. I am stating this. This was the behaviour during the mobilisation and enforcing of awareness in 1984, 1985 and 1986. [Interjections.] Will the hon member for Randburg give me a chance to advance my argument or does he want to make this speech? I submit that this is what we learnt from that specific period.

These statements were followed by a direct call from the SACP for "mass action" and "armed activity". This is a fact. And this embodied the elements of violence, terrorism, revolts and rioting. There was no suggestion during its seventh congress that the SACP intended to

renounce this. Following on this a group of persons visited the ANC/SACP alliance and held discussions with them, and there was an express understanding and directive that they would continue to oppose the election.

Now the hon members want to argue with me. Why do they not hold discussions with members of the Labour Party or the CP? I contested an election with the latter, and won it—with a majority seventeen times larger than the previous one. [Interjections.] If someone tampers with your special votes, he is looking for trouble. These people's special votes were forcibly removed from their kombis at gun-point. Does that constitute fair, peaceful protest marches and behaviour? That was their objective.

A second aspect is the following. The instruction was to create a total atmosphere of unrest and violence. What is interesting—seeing that I have just taken issue with members of the DP—is that the express understanding and instruction to these gentlemen was also to sabotage the reform and negotiation initiative. In other words I think it is fair to say that these activists and radicals are as afraid of Government initiatives and reforms as my friends in the CP are. It is quite clear that the objective here was to focus international attention on South Africa. It is clear that they wanted to create the perception that we would enforce apartheid at all costs. The people who propagated this were the people who lost yesterday. Through sound judgment, discussions and planning, yesterday's protest proceeded peacefully.

One can ask who won. South Africa won, in contrast to what the hon member for Ermelo implied. The hon member for Ermelo, and I take this amiss of him, said this was a stab in the back of the SAP. [Interjections.] It was a victory for the SAP and for South Africa, for the tolerance of the police, and for fairness and reasonableness. We are on the side of law and order. We are fighting side by side with the police for South Africa.

*Mr C D DE JAGER: Mr Speaker, this debate had considerable political content. I must say, however, that I was very disappointed in the participation of the hon the Deputy Minister of Defence.

I can recall that the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs and also the hon the Minister of Finance, who are sitting there, once spoke to some of us. We said that we wished to have some information explained. He requested our co-operation in the matter and we agreed to give this. We appreciate this but we do not appreciate that discussions which we hold with a Minister or a Deputy Minister . . .

*Mr T LANGLEY: Or a general!

*Mr C D DE JAGER: . . . or a general are distorted and used against us for political gain. That hon Deputy Minister knows as well as I do that not only NP members are national servicemen or comprise the security forces. There are CPs, NPs, DPs and people of colour too. We are not here to try to make political capital by publicizing in the Chamber confidential discussions which are to the benefit of the country. [Interjections.] We were requested to keep quiet and not to make a fuss about a mission to Maputo, and we kept quiet. I shall not go into this any further as I shall be disclosing more than should be disclosed.

If we analyse everything which occurred as a preliminary to the march, it had one object and that was to discredit the SA Police. It was a march which was arranged to protest at SA Police action; this was what the march was all about. The posters read: "Stop the killings!" There was reference *inter alia* to killings supposedly carried out by the SA Police.

Yesterday the MDM was granted permission to hold a march. I do not know whether the newspaper report is correct but it appears that nobody applied for permission. I deduce, however, from what the hon the Minister of Justice said that there had possibly been an application.

*The MINISTER OF JUSTICE: There was.

*Mr C D DE JAGER: I am pleased to hear this and I understand and accept it because I think the magistrate would certainly not have acted on his own initiative without an application from somebody. [Interjections.] I am saying that the newspaper reported this and I accept the hon the Minister's explanation of the matter, but unfortunately there are people who do not understand Afrikaans at all or do not have the ability to understand any language whatsoever. [Interjections.] Mr Speaker, this was initiated as protest against the police.

I want to revert to events earlier in the election campaign. The hon the Minister of Law and Order, the political head of the Police Force, frequently appeared on television during the past election. I think it was far more often than the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs. [Interjections.] I think he was actually the leading actor on television during the election campaign. Whenever he appeared—I well remember the few occasions when I was privileged to see him—he said: "We warn the MDM! We will clamp down on you! We will . . ." I nearly said that word. [Interjections.] The hon the Minister said that he would take firm action against the MDM and, when the police took steps on one occasion, what happened next? The hon the Minister of Finance said that he regretted that police action. [Interjections.] The ambassador to the Netherlands, Mr Nothnagel, said that he condemned the matter and that he apologised. These are the thanks which the police receive. They have one task in this country. They are not there to make laws but to enforce them—whether such laws are made by the DP, the NP or the LP. But if such laws emanate from this Parliament, and even if they are CP laws, the police will enforce them because the police are loyal.

The police are loyal to their duty and the oath which they have taken. That is why the police acted in terms of the laws of the country. But now the police are blamed, are placed in the dock and a mass protest march is arranged against the police. The police are the accused—"Stop the killings". If police action was improper, I want to assure hon members—here I agree with the hon the Ministers— the police will take steps. A policeman takes steps against a brother if his brother has committed an offence. We have learnt to expect this of the police and that is why we appreciate it. Consequently it is unnecessary for a commission to inquire into this. The Police Force has grown into a body which will maintain law and order in this country, regardless of whether it has to take steps against a brother, a father or mother. That is why we respect the police. That is why we say the police were stabbed in the back when a mass protest was permitted against the police as such, because that is all it was.

If it is the style to say that peaceful demonstrations are the order of the day, the Government in this country can also be taken over peacefully, by communism for example, if the Government merely surrenders. If one does not resist something which is wrong and protect the people who maintain law and order, this country will be taken over by radicals in a so-called peaceful way. This is what we are fighting against. This is why we will support the Government, but would they please not permit protest to take place in the shape of peaceful demonstrations and everything connected with them, in the name of peace. Peaceful protest poses no problem to me but it should not take place under the ANC banner, like the three ANC banners on this march. Not one of these hon members says anything about this. My friends in the DP do not mention that they marched behind that ANC banner. They do not talk about it. This is an offence. That peaceful demonstration was a contravention of the Internal Security Act because permission was given for the ANC to be propagated in a way not permitted before. That is why steps should be taken against those persons who took part in that demonstration under the ANC banner. I now ask the hon the Ministers whether they intend taking such steps or not.

*The MINISTER OF LAW AND ORDER: Mr Speaker, I just want to make a single observation on the speech made by the hon member for Bethal. There is no law in South Africa prohibiting the ANC flag. There is no such law in South Africa. [Interjections.] One cannot prosecute people because they may possibly be promoting the aims of a banned organisation.

Let us just get this out of the way, there is no such law. [Interjections.] Sir, we now have a jurist from Kuruman sitting here!

*Mr C D DE JAGER: Mr Speaker, may I ask the hon the Minister a question?

*The MINISTER: Please, Sir, I only have a few minutes. I cannot reply to any questions.

The colours that were being displayed there were not those of an ANC flag. They were colours which one could ascribe to the ANC. [Interjections.] Let us dispose of this here and now.

I listened attentively to all the hon members who spoke here. During the course of my speech I shall return and react to some of the statements and arguments that were raised.

I want to say at once that the SA Police and I deplore the fact that serious unrest and riots

broke out again in our country during the past six weeks. These were not planned and implemented by us. [Interjections.] Radicals and revolutionaries who—in the words of Joe Slovo—wish to "transform" this country into a "classless communist society" must bear the blame for this violence and unrest.

We are sorry that innocent people died. As far as we are concerned, the death of and injury to these innocent South Africans was quite senseless. However, the organisers and inciters of this violence and these riots must bear the blame for that and no one else.

The SA Police and I are also sorry that people were injured or died as a result of police action during the riots. Herewith I should like to convey our sincere sympathy to the injured and the next of kin.

I have already announced that a thorough and in-depth investigation is being instituted into all allegations concerning police conduct here in the Western Cape during the present spate of riots. This is being co-ordinated by the Chief Deputy Commissioner: Detective Branch of South Africa, Gen Joubert, and all evidence will be submitted without delay to the Attorney-General and/or the courts for evaluation and decision. The SA Police and I are not prepared to approve of any kind of police conduct which does not comply with the accepted and stated requirements and norms. If any mistakes occur, indiscriminate steps will be taken against the guilty parties.

I want to tell the hon member for Green Point that there is ample evidence of steps that have been taken by us. We are not afraid to take steps against people who commit offences. I thank the hon member for Bethal for having supported this standpoint of mine. The Commissioner and I have said this repeatedly, and I want to repeat it here today.

On the other hand I am under no circumstances prepared to allow policemen to be falsely accused and kicked around in a reckless and shameless way by unscrupulous radicals and revolutionaries. [Interjections.] The police are rendering excellent service to the country and all its people under the most difficult circumstances imaginable. For that I once again wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to them today. I accept that I have the co-operation and the support of all hon members in this House for this thanks and appreciation. [Interjections.] Do I have it? Thank you very much. I am receiving thanks from all hon members. [Interjections.]

*Mr J H VAN DER MERWE: Wait a minute, just as long as it is not in regard to the ANC flag!

*The MINISTER: The SA Police is not a Force for violence. We seek peace every day. Every day we make peace between people who are quarrelling, fighting and arguing with one another. [Interjections.] The latest example is the peace a policeman in Natal brought about between Inkatha and the UDF. We are also available to help the three leaders of the DP to make peace if they want to invite us to do so. [Interjections.]

I should like to place on record that we are delighted that yesterday's march was peaceful and that there was no violence. The hon member for Ermelo, in particular, is trying to drive a wedge between the Government and the police in regard to yesterday's march. The hon member will not succeed. The police are loyal to the Force, to South Africa and to the government of the day. [Interjections.]

*Mr SPEAKER: Order!

*The MINISTER: The hon member for Bethal also said that a moment ago.

The Government acts as a team. We consult right up to the highest level . . . [Interjections] . . . and we plan together as a team.

*An HON MEMBER: It is a losing team.

*The MINISTER: Yesterday's action by the Government was planned that way. It was not taken against the wishes of the police. After all the facts were available and had been considered, the police recommended that the march, as approved, could take place. I want to place this on record here.

The police do not prescribe to people what their political standpoints must be, but we do have a legal duty to protect life and property. Therefore we were present in sufficient numbers yesterday to perform our task if it had become necessary. We planned and acted in that way within our own discretion and on our own initiative, because we continue to bear the final responsibility for the safety of our country and our people.

We were able to deal with the situation yesterday. To everyone who is kicking up such a fuss now I should like to give the assurance that we were able to deal with the situation properly. However, we participate cordially in any attempts . . . [Interjections] . . . to arrive at a situation of real tranquility and peace in our country.

Our motto is—it is a good thing to mention this for a change: We protect and we serve. Every policeman and policewoman knows that motto. It is the philosophy of the Force. I now see that people are saying that the police should find a new philosophy. That is our philosophy. We do not need a new one. [Interjections.]

We try to live up to it every day we serve this country. The evidence is there to show that we are succeeding to an overwhelming extent in realising this motto of ours, throughout the length and breadth of our country in which policemen and policewomen are on duty 24 hours of the day. When all of us sitting here and the rest of South Africa are resting and sleeping, there are policemen on duty to look after them. The CP will not outbid us or me in saying thank you for the work that the SA Police are doing. [Interjections.]

They will not outbid the NP and this Government in saying thank you for what the police are doing for us. We are prepared to learn from our mistakes; to adapt to the new demands of the times. The police must keep pace with changing circumstances. We realise this and we are doing so. That is why the De Witt Committee, under the chairmanship of the present Commissioner of the SA Police, was appointed two years ago to institute a thorough investigation into these things to which so much publicity is now being given. Important recommendations have been made by this committee and have already been implemented, and this process will continue in the days which lie ahead.

The revolutionaries and the radicals, with their fellow-travellers, have during the past few days been castigating the police with almost devilish glee for our actions. Deliberate untruths and propaganda are being noised abroad as facts against us. Some hon members of the DP again made statements here this afternoon that were based on allegations which took no account of the facts.

I just want to tell the hon member for Green Point something. The other day, when we were engaged in our television debate, he was very friendly, but today he was very unfriendly. He came forward here with all kinds of distorted arguments today. He said the public were perturbed at what the police were doing. Are the public not also perturbed about the stone-throwers who stoned people to death? We hear nothing about that. The hon member attacks only the police. Today he is quarrelling only with the police, but he does not say a single word about those people who were stoned to death.

In the few minutes I still have left I should quickly like to tell this House what has recently been expected of the SA Police—matters we had to deal with. Since the beginning of 1989 the following number of unrest incidents occurred in the country: January 281; February 202; March 305; April 293; May 225; June 407—that is when these people began with their nonsense—July 345; August 1 381 unrest incidents; 1 to 5 September 198 incidents, and on the single day of 6 September there were 600 unrest incidents. [Interjections.] These are the facts, and the police cannot be blamed for that.

*Mr J H HOON: You said it would happen if the CP came into power!

*The MINISTER: The MDM was once again defended by their friends this afternoon. Let us put it this way—they are the so-called friends of the DP. This occurred after the MDM began with its so-called peaceful "defiance campaign". [Interjections.]

*The CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE: Order! The hon the Minister is not prepared to reply to a question.

*The MINISTER: Mr Chairman, on 6 September more than 2 000 members of the security forces here in the Cape Peninsula tried to ensure that voters were able to exercise their democratic right by voting. No hon member can find any fault with that. It is a democratic right, even if the system is faulty. These people wanted to go and vote. They wanted to go and vote in their thousands. The revolutionaries, as my colleague, the hon the Deputy Minister of Law and Order, has explained, wanted to prevent it—not peacefully, not with words, but with violence.

During this bloody day and night hundreds of people were violently prevented from going to

the polls. I wonder what the DP would have said if this had happened to them. What would they have said? I would have liked to hear what they would then have had to say. Burning road blocks were erected on the access routes to the polling stations and pedestrians were attacked by youths and skollie gangs and intimidated into not voting. People who dared to go out in their cars had petrol bombs and stones thrown at them. I have photographs here of petrol bombs raining down on people. I should like to make it available to hon members who wish to see it. In addition, shots were fired at policemen and in some cases private motorists were compelled, in sheer self-defence, to fire back at their attackers. Small groups of policemen on duty at polling stations—I have the names of the polling stations—had to fight back fiercely against hundreds of insurgents who stormed down on them hurling *stones and petrol bombs, as well as a new development of theirs, which is an iron pipe dipped in tar and set alight. These were thrown at people, and these policemen, as well as civilians who wanted to go to the polls, were beaten with them. When large crowds stormed the polling stations, we found that women with small children walked in front. They were placed in the front lines so that the police were not able to prevent these things from happening.

In the Western Cape alone the aftermath of this brutal campaign of preventing people from voting amounted to the following, and I should like to furnish hon members with the figures. Damage to more than 600 private vehicles amounts to more than R1,1 million. Damage to buildings amounts to more than R300 000. More than 70 buses were damaged, as well as several municipal and provincial vehicles. And then we are not even mentioning the vehicles of the security forces. That night 26 policemen were injured. Some of them sustained bullet wounds. Among these 600 incidents were 81 petrol bomb attacks and incidents involving arson. Almost 300 of these incidents—and this is important—occurred without the police even being on the scene.

*Mr J H HOON: That really sounds . . .

*The MINISTER: Oh please, Sir, I wish the hon member for Kuruman would keep quiet. He is really very irritating. It is a pity they elected him again. I cannot understand how there can be so many unwise voters in Kuruman. [Interjections.] In spite of this evidence accusations are still being hurled at the police implying that we are responsible for the unrest and that the unrest only arises when we arrive on the scene, but on this one single day—in 300 cases—the police were nowhere near the scene when these events occurred. [Time expired.]

*Mr W C MALAN: Mr Chairman, to start off with, in regard to the main draft resolution before the House, may I also say, on behalf of the DP, that we endorse the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs' rejection of the accusations it contains, and if it were possible to split up his amendment, there would be many matters contained in that amendment which we would support in a vote. I think that one of the Government's success stories is specifically its involvement in the Southern African region—the withdrawal from Angola and the specific implementation of Resolution 435. We must again take the opportunity to congratulate them on that. We do not get much chance to congratulate the Government. [Interjections.]

The hon the Minister of Justice's defence of the present action and approach in regard to the investigation and his rejection of the idea of a judicial commission was virtually dealt with by him on the basis of fundamentals, as if there were a fundamental approach in terms of which it was not regarded as being worthwhile to proceed with a judicial commission. The important point is that a political dimension is involved, that facts also dealing with political aspects must be brought into the open and that the Government, but also everyone in South Africa, must learn from that how we can move beyond the dilemma towards those answers they profess themselves eager to find, namely the consensus, the process, the negotiations, the open-door policy and everything that goes hand in hand with that.

There is another point I want to make very clear to the hon the Minister of Defence. We constantly say we reject violence. The kind of violent action he referred to, preventing people from voting, is something which we reject and which we consistently rejected throughout the election campaign.

The question, however, is actually that an approach has specifically been devised by the hon the Minister of Law and Order and the hon the Minister of Defence. Throughout the election the approach was that protest was not justified

because it gave rise to violence. When we defend the right of protest, therefore we are apparently defending the perpetrators of violence, because all the protest results in violence.

With reference to yesterday's action—not only as far as the march is concerned, but also specifically the Government's action—my information is that the hon the Minister of Justice himself said that he was involved in the discussions about how the protest march should be dealt with. That was a level-headed approach on his part. I know that within the context of his party it is sometimes difficult for him to defend policy and state his case, but yesterday's approach is a plus factor, a further point on which we can congratulate the Government. I specifically want to congratulate the hon the Minister of Justice on that. From those quarters I was also informed that it should also be regarded as a victory for the hon the Deputy Minister of Law and Order. I hope that is true. I hope that with the composition of the next Cabinet the hon the State President will have an opportunity to give the hon the Minister of Law and Order another post—if he has to give him another post—and promote the hon the Deputy Minister. [Interjections.]

Our dilemma is not caused by the police, but by the politicians. We can carefully examine statements made by that side. Approximately 10 to 15 days ago Brig Leon Mellet, as the spokesman for law and order, made an announcement indicating that police action against the media was taken in accordance with instructions. The instructions were that they should ensure that the publicity and propaganda involving the MDM did not appear abroad.

That is the dilemma we are faced with. What those people do is seen as propaganda, but when all is said and done they have no way of expressing themselves politically. They cannot participate. They cannot mobilise. Their leaders are in detention. They are not permitted to hold political meetings, even to obtain mandates in terms of which they can negotiate. In the process pressure is brought to bear on policemen and policewomen forcing them to implement crazy laws in terms of which people are not permitted to enter the water at apartheid beaches because they have the wrong skin colour.

*The CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE: Order! The hon member must withdraw the word "crazy".

*Mr W C MALAN: Sir, I withdraw it. They are, however, very strange laws which are made very difficult for those people to implement because they themselves do not want to do so. Pressure is brought to bear on these people because, weekend after weekend, they have to implement certain regulations and laws which they themselves cannot get rid of.

Once again I simply want to make the DP's position on protest very clear. We believe that the right to protest is a democratic right. We believe that from time to time people have no means to express themselves other than by way of protest. That right must be guaranteed. It must be organised on a peaceful basis. It cannot take place by violent means. We reject violence as a method for political change—from whatever quarter it may come.

It is also the police's task to be on hand, to be present, if any violence were to result from a protest campaign. Both sides have a responsibility, but the responsibility rests with the politicians, in particular, to allow this to take place. I want to reiterate that we cannot sufficiently emphasise how important yesterday's protest march was, in the light of South Africa's past history. If one could only create enough room to allow this to take place more frequently one would get somewhere close to some positive development.

I immediately want to link up with this. I again come back to the hon the Minister of Justice's participation today. He referred to the hon the State President's words that the doors were open and did not have to be battered down. He said that there were specific procedures in terms of which this should take place. That is the dilemma. The dilemma is that there are specific procedures.

Here I also want to turn again to the Official Opposition. We must examine our own history. I discussed this on a previous occasion, during a previous Parliamentary session. It has been recorded in Hansard. After the Anglo-Boer War Lord Milner also exercised colonial control of what were previously the Republics. He laid down specific negotiational and advisory procedures. He came to light with a recommendation

that a national council should be established in which the Boer leaders should participate in order to advise him on constitutional development.

*Mr S C JACOBS: That was after he had placed the women and children in the concentration camps. [Interjections.]

*Mr W C MALAN: Yes, it was just after that.

*Mr S C JACOBS: That is true, yes.

*Mr W C MALAN: In Dr A M Grundling's book, *Die Hensoppers en Joiners*, hon members may read his discussion of this history in which it is indicated how the Afrikaner generals refused to participate. [Interjections.] Ultimately there were only "hensoppers" and "joiners" who participated. [Interjections.] I am not drawing comparisons. I am merely saying what our own people did. During that period the Afrikaners held massive protest meetings and marches. They marched through the streets and gathered in large numbers to protest against the importation of Chinese mine labourers and the fact that they did not have political rights. [Interjections.] At one stage Lord Milner appointed other people, which got the whole process nowhere. This national council was in existence from 1902 to 1906. In 1906, however, another government came to power in Britain. What subsequently happened was that the government in the Cape immediately began discussions with the Boer leaders and representative government was instituted, leading to the National Convention and Union in 1910 with political and responsible rights for everyone.

The point is that the answer does not lie in having specific procedures. The answer lies in proceeding to hold discussions with the other people so that one can, in effect, have consensus procedures. If the method is unacceptable to one side, it is no use saying that doors are open, because then the wrong doors are open. [Interjections.] That is the appeal we are making. The Government is also engaged in jeopardising what we call our own First World interests. [Interjections.]

At the moment they are proceeding to comply with all the so-called prerequisites of the ANC. They are going to release Mandela. We all know that, do we not? There is not one single hon member sitting here who does not know that Mandela is going to be released. When that happens, the ANC will *de facto* have been unbanned. Then all these prerequisites will have been met. The "armed struggle" and the strategies of isolation will continue, however, and with every moment that passes we lose something.

If the Government wishes to display some wisdom, they must now proceed to hold discussions with the ANC about the conditions. All the conditions seem reasonable. It is surely reasonable to say they must abandon violence before discussions are held, and it is also reasonable to say that the ANC should first be unbanned, and its leaders released, so that they can actively participate in politics. The condition laid down by Chief Minister Buthelezi and others, ie that they would participate if one could ensure that the ANC could participate, because they alone do not want the chance to participate, is fair and reasonable. Unless everything is fair, there will be no development. I therefore ask the Government to speak to the people about these conditions so that this can lead to discussions being held. [Time expired.]

*The MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr Chairman, this has actually been an interesting debate. It is almost a pity that we could not stay here for a few days in order to continue this debate.

*Mr F J LE ROUX: We are prepared to!

*The MINISTER: The only problem is that although hon members of the Official Opposition and the DP—particularly them—tell us that the election is over, we have had to sit here the whole time and listen to a repetition of the election debates.

The only member who really aggravated me today—I have probably become used to the others by now—was the hon member for Green Point. I should like to give him a little advice, if he is at all still receptive to it. [Interjections.] Someone once said: "The worst form of immorality is selective morality." [Interjections.] That hon member's habit of generalising does not help to maintain a healthy image of our Police Force as a whole.

When will he give this House and the country a well-balanced image of all the functions of the police? Why is attention only focussed on certain actions in respect of a particular incident? Moreover, when will we ever hear—as the hon the Minister of Law and Order has indicated—about the negotiation work done by the police, such as

the significant instance in Natal, for example, where there had been disputes, strife and conflict for months on end and where a police officer succeeded, quietly, unobtrusively and without being honoured for it, in nipping any further potential conflict in the bud? Does that never warrant any mention? Does the wide spectrum of work done by the SA Police never deserve a little credit?

We who know what they do, are aware of the fact that they sometimes even help to bring children into the world. They are ambulancemen and fire fighters. Whenever there is a break-in or a theft, even the greatest liberalists in this country call the police to report their diamonds, jewels and rings stolen. And then the police must spring into action. The point I am trying to make here is simply that it would not do any of us any harm to be a little more objective whenever we conduct debates of this nature, and not to reinforce the impression that is being conveyed to the outside world of the SA Police being a bunch of brutes and oppressors who take pleasure only in murdering people and shooting and beating people to death. That is simply not true! There is no one in this House who would like to assert that it is true. If we are in agreement about this, why can we not all highlight this a little? I concede that the CP did so.

*Mr C UYS: What about Albert Nothnagel?

*The MINISTER: What harm would it do the hon member for Green Point if he were to say something positive about the police only now and again?

*Mr S S VAN DER MERWE: You did not listen. I said it in my speech.

*The MINISTER: The hon member said that we would place the rest of the Police Force in a poor light if action was not taken against those policemen whose actions were irregular. That may sound very attractive as a logical statement, but the fact of the matter is that the hon member has nothing good to say about any policeman.

*Mr S S VAN DER MERWE: You did not listen to my speech!

*The MINISTER: Furthermore, I can remind him that firm action is indeed taken in South Africa against those police officers who act irregularly—surely this is clear from official and newspaper reports.

*Mr J H VAN DER MERWE: Are you now the Minister of Law and Order?

*The MINISTER: There are approximately 60 000 to 70 000 policemen in the SAP. I wonder what the DP would have done if they had had to control such a Force. They say that they are going to double it to 140 000. Would that mean that their allegations against the police will also double?

Another important facet which I want to emphasise, is that the SAP itself decided on the handling of yesterday's events in conjunction with the hon the Minister of Law and Order and other members of the Government. It was a team effort and not merely the effort of one group or person.

†In conclusion, what happened yesterday confirms the South African Government's point of view that if protest marches or meetings are held and conducted peacefully and within the framework of the law the Government has no objection to such meetings. [Time expired.]

*Mr T LANGLEY: Mr Chairman, I would like to suggest to the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs that actions speak louder than words, and he should repudiate the remarks made by his ambassador in the Netherlands. [Interjections.] All we ask is that the hon the Minister should repudiate the remarks made by his ambassador in the Netherlands.

*The MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS: I would first like to hear what he said! [Interjections.]

*Mr T LANGLEY: I challenge the hon the Minister to repudiate it here in this House. I shall give him some of my time in which to do it. He does not have to say anything further. Otherwise all he is doing now is ingratiating himself with the Police because he renounced them yesterday.

*Mr S C JACOBS: That is correct! [Interjections.]

*The MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS: I do not react to newspaper reports! [Interjections.]

*Mr T LANGLEY: If the hon the Minister would give me a chance, I should like to continue.