

DAG ?

I am following up on your letter dated August 7, 1995 and subsequent letter dated August 10, 1995. I had to delay my reply because the contents and the tone of your correspondence and further oral exchanges found me dumfounded, since they are totally destitute of any factual basis or of any immediately recognisable professional or even psychological justification. Not wanting to ascribe your behaviour to emotional instability, or bad faith or some hidden political agendas or sinister machinations, I felt it necessary to investigate the facts of the matter and to acquire any relevant information. I met yesterday with our Director-General Mr. P J. Colyn, requesting the he also sets out in writing the relevant information in his possession so that further progress can be made. At the end of this process I am left with even greater unresolved questions on what prompted your written and oral actions and on your motivations. Since I have respect for you and the important office which have been charged to hold, I will candidly set out the elements of the issues which you have raised, which, once objectively considered, are quite mesmerising.

1. You alleged that "in a fit of anger" I remarked to our Director General, Mr PJ Colyn that you would no longer be consulted on policy matters of our Department. The facts are that (a) I never made such remarks, (b) the Director General indicates that he never told you that I made such remarks, (c) it is not true that you have not been consulted on policy matters of the Department, (d) I do not have "fits of anger" irrespective of what some political propaganda wish to make to believe.
- 1.1. I wish to start from this last element. I find it intolerable and quite unprofessional, if not juvenile, on your side that you insinuate that I would have fits of anger or let my emotions have any bearing on my professional life. There has been a lot of propaganda aimed at demonising me, but this is no justification for your statements, for after more than a year of professional cohabitation I am sure that you may not point out a single

occasions on which I might have shown any anger, nor indicate any one who might specifically recall, or testify to my having had a fit of anger in my over 40 years of public life, even considering what I had to go through.

- 1.2 Neither I nor the Director General know of any policy matter followed by our Department in which you did not have an opportunity to make policy inputs through the standard departmental channels or directly to me during our discussions. In this respect I can mention your comments to Parliament in which, of your own accord, you described our professional relation as very constructive, comfortable and relaxed. As you know in terms of section 94 (3) (b) of the Constitution, you are to perform executive actions only as I assign them to you and only on my behalf, and yet I have allowed you to carry out important departmental functions in autonomy and on the basis of your own initiative. I have been in Government for a very long time, worked in the past with deputies, and am comfortable with delegating functions and powers, and you have enormously benefitted from this fact, which, perhaps because of your relative lack of experience, you are not realising.

- 1.2.1 Among specific examples of the latitude you have thus far been given, I can also mention the fact that I allowed you to summarise parliamentary debates on bills presented by our Department, even when an MP specifically requested that I performed such task. More importantly, I allowed you to represent our Department in the Cabinet Committee of Intelligence and Security and on the Cabinet Committee of Social and Economic Affairs which are the fora in which the Minister of Home Affairs has the greatest opportunity to make inputs in Cabinet policy formulation, and on several occasions you led the discussion on behalf of our Department. Therefore, I do not see the factual basis for your remark about "getting access to Cabinet decisions affecting Home Affairs", also because you have been given a very large professional staff which may liaise with Cabinet structures.

1.2.2 You mentioned the opening of an Home Affairs office in Ulundi, as a matter on which you were not consulted, also suggesting your concern in this respect. Had you researched this issues, you would have realised that the initiative to open this office came not from me, but from within the Department and I was only asked to formally open it, merely because Ulundi is a town founded because of my political initiative and is somehow my home town. I would have not objected, had you expressed to me the desire to open such office on my behalf, as I am sure you have opened other offices of Home Affairs without having to seek any specific authorisation from me. What I find almost puerile is your tying the opening of an office which renders services to a large and important community in the most important administrative centre of northern KwaZulu-Natal to the so-called IFP's 20 Point Plan. This connection is so outlandish that can not be answered, and I can only think that you are somehow detached from the nature of such document and the underlying institutional issues.

1.2.3. With respect to the visit of Zimbabwe Minister of Home Affairs Mr. D Dabengwa, you should know that this was a Minister-to-Minister matter. Minister Dabengwa was not accompanied by a Deputy, and, on the basis of the international protocol as well of our Cabinet protocol, there was no matters in our discussion requiring your presence. You might recall that you went by yourself on a state visit to meet with the Deputy Minister of Home Affairs of Namibia, according to the same protocols. Deputy Minister of Safety and Security V J Matthews was involved in the visit due to the fact that the Zimbabwe portfolio on Home Affairs includes Police, and I was informed that Minister S Mufamadi was not available. Our discussions included police matters and Minister Dabengwa was accompanied by high ranking police officers. You may also know that the Deputy Commissioner of the Western Cape, General Blaw, was also at the meeting.

The visit of Minister Dabengwa was also a private one, motivated by private sentimental

reasons. In fact, his wife who accompanied him, is a descendant of King Mzilikazi and wished to visit the sites of her ancestors. For this reason we travelled together to the historical sites of King Shaka palace and the place where King Mzilikazi lived before he fled King Shaka. The private nature of this portion of the visit is testified by the fact that I personally borne the accommodation expenses for the Minister and his wife, and slaughtered one of my own cows for the occasion, in accordance to our customs. I hope that you realise that the way you raised this issue could turn into a rude affront to the feelings of our guests and into an international incident, should this matter became public.

- 1.2.4 There is a fundamental issue which will need to be addressed relating to why you would report Mr. Colyn as having made statements to you which he indicates never made, and which he could have not made since it is not true that I remarked that you should not be consulted on policy matters. This is a very serious issues, the gravity of which ought not to be underestimated. As you Minister, I am responsible for your conduct and must request that your behaviour complies with the highest standards of professional conduct.

2. Your August 10, 1995 letter contains a statement to which I take the strongest exception, and which I must believe you made without full consideration of what you said. You stated that I, as a Minister of the Republic, am guilty of a gross violation of the Constitution, and therefore, of my oath of office. I need not to stress to you that this is libel *per se*, not to speak of its political significance. I could excuse you, should I believe that you are unable to read the Constitution in so far as it states that no existing law gives you any executive power of your own, but only delegated executive powers, as I assign them to you and to be exercised on my behalf only. From this follows that, on the basis of basic rules of delegation, in terms of the Constitution you do not have independent or even autonomous powers of policy formulation, which in fact you have been exercising because of the trust I have had in you. However, the statement you made is a matter of

grave concern, not only as it relates to me, but also as it relates to your conduct. I would say that a Deputy Minister should not make such statements in such a lightness, and I wonder whether, should you not withdraw your statement, this matter might need to be reviewed by the Constitutional Court as a conflict between organs of the state in terms of section 98 (2) (e) of the Constitution.

3. Your conduct raises broader issues of a political nature. I was appalled by the fact that you had the daring of confronting me in front of my staff requesting a meeting to "discuss the complaint you had lodged against me". It might not be written in the Constitution that some basic standards of civilized behaviour, respect and protocol are to bind the conduct of a Deputy Minister, but I refuse to operate in this fashion. The President of the Republic will need to tell me whether this is the style of his Cabinet, or whether perhaps he has to reshuffle his Cabinet to give you a new Minister who can put up with lack of respect, emotional outbursts and rudeness.

In the past you have been very vociferous in attacking and denigrating me, and I had hoped that since now we sit in the same Government of National Unity bygones could be bygones, and we could learn to adjust our professional conduct to the task we are charged to accomplish together in the higher interest of our country and its people. As I witness your behaviour and read over the last part of your April 7, 1995 letter, I wonder whether you are really willing to undergo such an adjustment of behaviour, or you believe that you can talk to me, as you Minister, in the same way in which you used to talk about me when you were at the University of Zululand. Your threat to take public your perceived grievances and misplaced resentments is a matter which might need to be dealt with by the President of the Republic, but leaves quite perplex as per your real motives.

Indeed, this entire matters leaves perplex on your motives and objectives. You are a political

leader and a Deputy Minister, and if I have to give to your actions the significance which your position would demand, I really wonder what is the purpose of your outburst and what agenda it serves.

Mangosuthu Buthelezi

Minister of Home Affairs

c.c. President N. Mandela

PJ Colyn, Director General