

MINUTES OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEES REGARDING
THE DEMARCATION/ DELIMITATION OF SPRs

MINUTES OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEES REGARDING
THE DEMARCATION/ DELIMITATION OF SPRs

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: EAST LUNATANE/STERN CAPE-KIB

Addendum 1: 22 October 1993 18
Addendum 2: 2 November 1993 19

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: PRETORIA

Addendum 8: 22 October 1993 25
Addendum 9: 23 October 1993 28
Addendum 10: 2 November 1993 41

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: WESTERN CAPE/ NORTHERN CAPE/
NORTH WEST/ OPS

Addendum 11: 23 October 1993 43
Addendum 12: 23 October 1993 47
Addendum 13: 2 November 1993 51

CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

Addendum 14: 28 October 1993 54
Addendum 15: 2 November 1993 59

ADDENDA

MINUTES OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEES REGARDING THE DEMARCATION/ DELIMITATION OF SPRs

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: KWAZULU-NATAL/EASTERN CAPE-KEI

Addendum 1:	22 October 1993.....	2
Addendum 2:	25 October 1993.....	5
Addendum 3:	2 November 1993.....	8
Addendum 4:	3 November 1993.....	13

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: NORTHERN TRANSVAAL

Addendum 5:	22 October 1993.....	18
Addendum 6:	2 November 1993.....	20
Addendum 7:	3 November 1993.....	22

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: PRETORIA

Addendum 8:	22 October 1993.....	25
Addendum 9:	25 October 1993.....	38
Addendum 10:	2 November 1993.....	41

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: WESTERN CAPE/ NORTHERN CAPE/ NORTH WEST/ OFS

Addendum 11:	22 October 1993.....	43
Addendum 12:	25 October 1993.....	47
Addendum 13:	2 November 1993.....	51

CO - ORDINATING COMMITTEE

Addendum 14:	25 October 1993.....	54
Addendum 15:	2 November 1993	59

COMMISSION ON TRAILERS

MINUTES OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON KWAZULU-NATAL/EASTERN CAPE AND
KEI HELD ON 12 OCTOBER 1991

PRESENT

T Meyer (Chair)

E Nogués

D Jongilang

T Botha

M Nel

T Delpont

AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATON/DELIMITATION OF SPRs

KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape, Kei

1. Mr Nel requested the Committee to allow Mr E Tross to act
as an advisor to him. The Committee agreed to his request.

2. The principles for the demarcation of regions were briefly
discussed.

3. Two points of view were held by the Committee with regard
to the region.

3.1 Some members of the Committee were of the opinion that
this should be one region. The following arguments
were given in favour of one region:

- Regions should be economically viable and not
just functional.
- The importance of the continuity of the region
in language, culture etc was raised.
- By dividing the region into two regions, the
problems experienced which power would not be
solved.
- Economic stability would be brought to the
region.

ADDENDUM 1

COMMISSION ON REGIONS

MINUTES OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON KWAZULU NATAL/EASTERN CAPE AND KEI HELD ON 22 OCTOBER 1993

PRESENT

T Meyer (Chairperson)

R Nogumla

D Jongilanga

T Botha

W Nel

T Delpont

1. Mr Nel requested the Committee to allow Mr E Trent to act as an adviser to him. The Committee agreed to his request.
2. The principles for the demarcation of regions were briefly discussed.
3. Two points of view were held by the Committee with regard to the region.
 - 3.1 Some members of the Committee were of the opinion that this should be one region. The following arguments were given in favour of one region:
 - * Regions should be economically viable and not just functional.
 - * The importance of the continuity of the region ie, language, culture etc was raised.
 - * By dividing the region into two regions, the problems experienced with poverty would not be solved.
 - * Economic stability would be brought to the region.

- * It was noted that the argument for the separation of the region was a political and not a technical one, and that group interests are being protected.
- 3.2 Some members of the Committee were of the opinion that this region should be divided into two regions. The following arguments were given in favour of two regions:
- * Economic development as the key to the debate was pointed out.
- * It was noted that the central government would have to carry the burden of the disadvantaged, and that it is the responsibility of the whole of South Africa to ensure that imbalances are changed.
- * It was noted that the whites in the area would not be able to make a difference should this be one region.
- * It was brought to the attention of the Committee that one region, as point of departure, would cause economic decline.
- 3.3 The possibility of starting off with two regions and combining them should the need arise, was raised. It was counter-argued that one might just as well start off with one region and divide it into two regions at a later stage.
- 3.4 The Committee was unable to reach agreement on this issue and decided to refer it to the Co-ordinating Committee for further attention.

The Committee decided to schedule a meeting for Monday 25 October 1993 at 10:00, in order to address the Umzimkulu issue.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON KWAZULU NATAL/EASTERN CAPE AND FREE STATE HELD ON MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1993, AT 10:00 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE, REMPTON PARK

PRESENT: Mr T Ndlovu (Chairman)
Chief D Jonghanga
Mr W Nel
Mr R Noguema
Minister D Schutte

MINUTES: Mphahlele Cleary (Administration)

APOLOGIES: Mr T Delpont
Mr T Meyer

1. NOTICE OF MEETING:

The meeting had been convened to address the North Transkei District of Umzimkulu and East Orangeburg issues.

2. UMZIMKULU DISTRICT

Minister Schutte stated that he had been requested to attend this meeting to present various submissions presented and discussed at the meeting he had attended on Saturday, 23 October 1993, as follows:

- 2.1 Inclusion of Umzimkulu into Natal - Meeting in Pietermaritzburg, 23 October 1993, together with a Statement signed by nine representatives of the Council of Chiefs, Umzimkulu, representatives of the National Party of Natal and the Natal Agricultural Union. Annexure A.
- 2.2 Copy of the letter from Goss & Co. dated 18 September 1993 addressed to Dr Renosi Mokae together with the Resolution of the Qawukeni Regional Authority signed by the Paramount Chief, J M Sioceq. Annexure B.
- 2.3 Memorandum dated 17 September 1993 from the Principal Chiefs, Headmen, Councillors and Advisors of the People of the Umzimkulu District.

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND RESTRICTED TO MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE, THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE COMMISSION ON REGIONS. THE MINUTES ARE STILL TO BE RATIFIED BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON KWAZULU NATAL/EASTERN CAPE AND KEI REGIONS HELD ON MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1993, at 10h15 at THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE, KEMPTON PARK

PRESENT: Mr T. Botha (Chairperson)
Chief D Jongilanga
Mr W Nel
Mr R Nogumla
Minister D Schutte

MINUTES: Miriam Cleary (Administration)

APOLOGIES: Mr T Delpoit
Mr T Meyer

1. NOTICE OF MEETING:

The meeting had been convened to address the North Transkei, District of Umzimkulu and East Griqualand issues.

2. UMZIMKULU DISTRICT

Minister Schutte stated that he had been requested to attend this meeting to present various submissions presented and discussed at the meeting he had attended on Saturday, 23 October 1993, as follows:

- 2.1 Inclusion of Umzimkulu into Natal - Meeting in Pietermaritzburg, 23 October 1993, together with a Statement signed by nine representatives of the Council of Chiefs, Umzimkulu, representatives of the National Party of Natal and the Natal Agricultural Union. Annexure A.
- 2.2 Copy of the letter from Goss & Co. dated 28 September 1993 addressed to Dr Renosi Mokate together with the Resolution of the Qawukeni Regional Authority signed by the Paramount Chief: J M Siccau. Annexure B.
- 2.3 Memorandum dated 17 September 1993 from the Principal Chiefs, Headmen, Councillors and Advisors of the People of the Umzimkhulu District.

Annexure C.

- 2.4 Document dated 27 June 1993 from the African National Congress and EG-Kei Development Forum regarding a meeting to discuss boundaries of the new regions. Annexure D.

Minister Schutte stated that there was overwhelming evidence that the people of the Umzimkulu District wished to be included into Natal/KwaZulu and recommended that the Ad Hoc Committee should consider this. He gave various reasons to support this recommendation such as historical when this district was part of Natalia Province, and administration considerations where health, rail, road and agricultural links could be better served by the Natal Region than by Umtata, minimum inconvenience and with greater opportunities for employment to the residents of the Umzimkulu District.

Chief Jongilanga asked who these Principal Chiefs were and stated that he did not know them, and as such, enquired into the credibility of the document and authenticity of the list of signatures. Minister Schutte stated that he had been given a mandate to speak at today's meeting on behalf of these Principal Chiefs. He had included the document of the A.N.C. - Annexure D - as he believed there were very strong arguments for Umzimkulu to be included into Natal/KwaZulu. This A.N.C. document was not handed in as evidence of the A.N.C. proposal (the meeting had never been held by them) but as support of the structures.

[After this discussion Minister Schutte had to leave to attend another Ad Hoc Committee but he stated that he would be available for further discussions immediately after lunch-time.]

3. NATAL/KWAZULU - SPR BOUNDARIES

After lengthy discussion and due to the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee could not reach consensus on a suitable final southern boundary for Natal/KwaZulu the following compromise was suggested:

3.1 That the current Provincial/State boundary between Natal/KwaZulu and Transkei should be retained as an interim measure. That would imply that the district of Umzimkulu would remain with the remainder of Transkei whilst the magisterial districts of Alfred and Mount Curry would remain with Natal/KwaZulu.

3.2 Any one of the following three areas, namely:

3.2.1 North Transkei/Pondoland (comprising the magisterial districts of

Lusikisiki, Bizana, Tabankulu, Flagstaff, Mt Ayliff, Mt Frere, Mt Fletcher and Maluti);

3.2.2 District of Umzimkulu, and

3.2.3 East Griqualand

could petition a referendum within 18 months of the national election to determine with which SPR they wished to be permanently included. Such petition for a referendum must be supported by at least 20 000 signatures from residents from within that particular area.

3.3 The result of the referendum should not be subject to any special entrenched constitutional provisions for future alterations to SPR boundaries, but a decision would be taken on a simple majority for each area.

On the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the SPR of Natal/KwaZulu, the Ad Hoc Committee concurred with the recommendations of the Commission.

4. EASTERN CAPE - BORDER/KEI

On the issue of whether the Eastern Cape and Border/Kei should constitute a single or two separate SPRs the Ad Hoc Committee was deadlocked and **it was agreed that** this matter would be referred back to the Co-ordinating Committee for further consideration on a possible resolution of the dispute.

As a result of this fundamental deadlock the Ad Hoc Committee did not proceed with further detailed discussions on the western and southern boundaries.

5. The abovementioned compromise would be typed up as a draft immediately so that the members of the Ad Hoc Committee, as well as Minister Schutte, could take it for consultation and report back.

6. CLOSURE

6.1 The meeting ended at 15h00

6.2 The minute taker would hand deliver/fax the minutes to each member of the Ad Hoc Committee, as well as to Minister Schutte.

MINUTES OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON KWA-ZULU NATAL/EASTERN CAPE AND KEI HELD ON 2 NOVEMBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE, KEMPTON PARK

PRESENT

Mr T Botha (Chairperson)

Chief D Jongilanga

Mr W Nel

Mr Mogumla

Mr F Trent

Mr T Delport

Mr B Alexander

1. It was noted that point 3, under 3.1 of the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 1993 did not reflect the position held by a member of the Committee. The creation of two regions would lead to a rich white region and a poor black region.

2. Eastern Cape - Border/Kei

2.1 General

- 2.1.1 It was noted that the feelings of the people in those areas should also be taken onto account before a decision was to be made.
- 2.1.2 As a result of the time constraint, the Committee would not consider new evidence/submissions.
- 2.1.3 The possibility of revisiting the boundaries at a later stage was raised.

2.1.4 Criteria mentioned as being important in terms of a decision:

- * Development interest
- * The will of the people
- * Economic functionality
- * Development issues
- * Culture

2.2 One Region

2.2.1 It was noted that the aim is to reincorporate the bantustan territories into the greater South Africa, in order to inject economic strength into the region.

2.2.2 It was noted that poor regions needn't be created in order to attract investment.

2.2.3 It was noted that people in rural areas and in townships hadn't been approached for opinions in this regard.

2.2.4 The central government would not be able to fully supply the whole region with funds. A region could not be developed on handouts from the central government.

2.2.5 The infrastructure in this region would be an important attribute to development of the rest of the region.

2.2.6 It was noted that people couldn't be stopped from moving into urban areas and that it would take a long time to make Transkei and Ciskei economically independent.

2.2.7 It was noted that development programmes have failed in the past and the Committee should be careful not to make the same mistakes.

2.2.7 The Committee was cautioned to create a land-hunger situation which would cause problems in the long term.

2.3 Two Regions

2.3.1 It was noted that a perception exists that Port Elizabeth and its functional areas would have to develop the surrounding underdeveloped areas. The fact that the two areas could be apart and still function together, was raised.

2.3.2 The responsibility of the central government in the upliftment of the region was raised. Every region would be entitled to a per capita share of VAT and income tax of the country and not of the region. It was noted that wealth belongs to everybody.

2.3.3 The following findings came out of a report by the Eastern Cape Regional Economic Development Forum:

- * Subsidies of socio-economic spending cannot be financed by the Eastern Cape region, because the Eastern Cape needs financing itself.
- * The two regions need different economic policies.

- 2.3.3 The Problems of the disadvantaged would be hidden if it is to be one region. It was noted that there is only one way of developing an area and that is to develop it. The problem would not be solved by including it into another region.
- 2.3.4 Problems would not disappear by merely combining the regions.
- 2.3.5 Proper development strategies need to be developed within the framework of the central government in order to solve existing problems.
- 2.3.6 It was noted that more regions are preferred to less regions.
- 2.3.7 It was noted that the Eastern Cape Economic Development Forum as well as other development agencies came out in favour of two regions.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The Committee was in a deadlock on whether the Eastern Cape and Border/Kei should constitute a single or two regions.
- 3.2 The possibility of starting of with two regions and combining them should the need arise, and vice versa, was raised.
- 3.2.1 It was decided that the members would prepare arguments for and against starting of with a single or two regions, and that it would be discussed at a meeting scheduled for 10:30 on Wednesday 3 November 1993.

REPORT OF THE
NATAL/EASTERN CAPE

3.2.2

The Chairperson would after discussion, compile a report, stating both views, which would then be forwarded to the Negotiating Council for a decision. It was noted that the Council could even consider short term mechanisms to invite inputs from the public in order to finalise the matter.

After lengthy discussion, the committee was unable to reach consensus on the following proposals:

1.1 That the current Provincial boundary between Natal/KwaZulu and Transkei should be retained as an interim measure. That would imply that the district of Umzimkobe would remain with the remainder of Transkei whilst the magisterial districts of Alfred and Mount Curry would remain with Natal/KwaZulu.

1.2 Any one of the following areas, namely:

1.2.1 North Transkei/Pondoland comprising the magisterial districts of Lushaka, Bontata, Tshankulu, Flagstaff, Mt Ayili, Mt Fane, Mt Shushu and Mahuli;

1.2.2 District of Umzimkobe; and

1.2.3 East Griqualand

could petition a referendum within 18 months of the national election to determine with which SPR they wished to be permanently included. Such petition for a referendum must be supported by at least 20 000 signatures from residents from within that particular area.

1.3 The result of the referendum should not be subject to any special entrenched constitutional provisions for future alterations to SPR boundaries, but a decision would be taken on a simple majority for each area.

On the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the SPR of Natal/KwaZulu, the Ad-Hoc Committee concurred with the recommendations of the Commission.

2. Eastern Cape - Border/Kei

2.1 On the issue of whether the Border/Cape and Border/Kei should constitute a single or two separate SPRs the Ad-Hoc Committee was deadlocked.

2.1.1 The Democratic Party, National Party and the Pan Africanist Congress support two separate regions, whilst the African National Congress, Transkei Government and the Cape Traditional Leaders support a single region. No agreement was reached on this matter.

REPORT FROM THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON KWA-ZULU NATAL/EASTERN CAPE AND KEI - 3 NOVEMBER 1993

1. Natal/KwaZulu - SPR Boundaries

After lengthy discussion and due to the fact that the Ad-Hoc Committee could not reach consensus on a suitable final southern boundary from Natal/KwaZulu the following compromise was decided on:

1.1 That the current Provincial/State boundary between Natal/KwaZulu and Transkei should be retained as an interim measure. That would imply that the district of Umzimkulu would remain with the remainder of Transkei whilst the magisterial districts of Alfred and Mount Curry would remain with Natal/KwaZulu.

1.2 Any one of the following areas, namely:

1.2.1 North Transkei/Pondoland (comprising the magisterial districts of Lusikisiki, Bizana, Tabankulu, Flagstaff, Mt Ayliff, Mt Frere, Mt Fletcher and Maluti);

1.2.2 District of Umzimkulu, and

1.2.3 East Griqualand

could petition a referendum within 18 months of the national election to determine with which SPR they wished to be permanently included. Such petition for a referendum must be supported by at least 20 000 signatures from residents from within that particular area.

1.3 The result of the referendum should not be subject to any special entrenched constitutional provisions for future alterations to SPR boundaries, but a decision would be taken on a simple majority for each area.

On the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the SPR of Natal/KwaZulu, the Ad-Hoc Committee concurred with the recommendations of the Commission.

2. Eastern Cape - Border/Kei

2.1 On the issue of whether the Eastern Cape and Border/Kei should constitute a single or two separate SPRs the Ad-Hoc Committee was deadlocked.

2.1.1 The Democratic Party, National Party and the Pan Africanist Congress support two separate regions, whilst the African National Congress, Transkei Government and the Cape Traditional Leaders support a single region. No agreement was reached on this matter.

2.1.2 The Committee agreed to a request of the Democratic Party to include as addenda motivations in support of either a single or two separate SPR's in a preferable initial dispensation, given that the issue might have to be reconsidered in the future.

2.1.3 The Committee agreed that further consultation with the people from the region is necessary and that the will of the people should be tested in this regard. The Committee therefore requests the Planning Committee to make recommendations on a way forward.

3. Petition by certain Traditional Leaders

The Ad-Hoc Committee received communications from certain traditional leaders from Umzimkulu and the Qawukeni Regional Authority of Transkei respectively, requesting an opportunity to meet with the Ad-Hoc Committee to discuss the boundaries between Natal KwaZulu and Eastern Cape Border-Kei.

The Ad-Hoc Committee having previously agreed that soliciting or receiving further submissions or meetings with delegations fell outside of its brief, resolved to refer the abovementioned requests to the Planning Committee (see Addendum A).

Addendum A ^{CC}/_{TE}

DATE: 2 November 1993

FAX NO: 011-3972211 (MR THEUNS ELOFF, CBM)

PLEASE GET THIS INTO THE HANDS OF WESSEL NEL BEFORE 10:30 TODAY, TTHANK YOU.

FAX TO : WESSEL NEL, MP for Mooi River (which includes Mount Currie District and East Griqualand.)

We, the undermentioned, leaders of the Umziinkulu district of Transkei, do urgently request that we be permitted to meet with yourself and other members of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Boundaries, appointed by the Negotiation Council, to discuss the recommendations of the Commission for the Demarcation of SPR's in respect of the southern boundary of the Natal/KwaZulu region.

We consider the matter as extremely urgent in view of the fact that the opinions of the people need to be heard via their elected representatives.

Please advise us at your earliest convenience whether our request will be acceded to, and if so, with whom we shall meet, what the venue will be and at what time.

Thank you

Prince Dhlamini
Princess Masingapantsi
Chief Masingapantsi
Chief Sonzaba
Chief Bly
Chief Mchunu
Chief Sidoya
Chief Mgunu

Senior Advisors and Counsellors

Bada
Mkize
Mgani

plus 3 other to be advised

PLEASE RESPOND WITH YOUR REPLY TO FAX N° (0331) 429801

DATE: 2 November 1993

FAX NO: 011-3972211 (MR THEUNS BLOFF, CBM)

PLEASE GET THIS INTO THE HANDS OF WESSEL NEL BEFORE 10:30 TODAY, THANK YOU

FAX TO : WESSEL NEL, MP for Mooi River (which includes Mount Currie District and East Griqualand.)

The Qwukeni Regional Authority of Transkei has taken note of the initiative taken by its counterparts in the Umzimkulu District to discuss the recommendations of the Commission for the Demarcation of SPR's in respect of the southern Natal boundary, with the Ad-Hoc Committee on Boundaries on which you serve.

In the absence of Paramount Chief Siquau, who is presently indisposed, we his elders and advisors make a tentative request to meet with you and the other members of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Boundaries to present a case for the inclusion of our Regional Authority Area into the Natal/KwaZulu region.

We await your response.

Thank you

PLEASE RESPOND WITH YOUR REPLY TO FAX N° (0331) 429801



**Demokratiese Party
Democratic Party**

3 November 1993

**SUMMARY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY POSITION ON THE ISSUE OF EASTERN CAPE /
BORDER KEI SPR BOUNDARIES TAKEN IN THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE AD-HOC
COMMITTEE ON KWA-ZULU NATAL / EASTERN CAPE BORDER-KEI REGIONS**

1. Purpose of Submission

The Ad-Hoc Committee deadlocked on the question of whether the Eastern Cape / Border-Kei should constitute one or two separate SPRs. It was resolved that this deadlock be reported to the Planning Committee for further advice. It was further agreed that representatives on the Ad-Hoc Committee table synopses in support of their preferences for an "initial" SPR scenario given that a possible compromise is to have an initial dispensation subject to subsequent revision on a basis to be agreed. (ie. that parties to motivate why it would be more appropriate to begin with 2 separate SPRs or vice versa.)

2. DP overall position

The DP's position is clear; two separate SPRs are supported inter alia because:

- there are compelling arguments that it would promote a more effective and direct delivery system for services and administration;
- development initiatives can be better structured and implemented;
- the two SPRs each require unique and different policies and have radically different priorities;
- in a general sense the two SPRs can be said to have different community characteristics and established separate identities;
- the Negotiating Council has agreed that the constitution cater for devolution of power and regional autonomy. Most of the valid and logical reasons that resulted in consensus being reached with regard to this fundamental principle, taken in a regional context, also supports the creation of two separate regions in the Eastern Cape / Border-Kei area.

However, the DP recognises that a more definitive expression of the peoples' choice in the affected areas is, at some point, required to confirm the initially proposed boundaries or to serve as justification for change.

It must be stressed that no party / organisation has opposed the creation of two separate SPRs on the grounds that any one of the two

suggested would have no basis for separate existence due to, for example, insignificant size, economic base etc. Rather, the submissions and the debate have turned around the balance of desirability and advantages or disadvantages.

3. Summary of DP arguments in support of commencing with two separate SPRs (Border / Kei and "Eastern Province" respectively) as an "initial" SPR dispensation.

a) The sea ports of Port Elizabeth and East London were both established during the early part of the 19th Century and have developed progressively as service and development nodes to two distinct hinterlands with which people historically identify.

As a point of departure therefore, recognition must be given to the two de facto regions which already exist, and changes thereto must be a process, not a sudden event.

b) Administrative infrastructure and capacity exists and already functions in a fashion which can appropriately accommodate two SPRs.

c) Two separate SPRs will bring the seat of government closer to the people in the crucial and sensitive initial phases of legitimate democratic government.

d) Development fora exist respectively for two SPRs (voluntarily formed) and will separately be far more effective in delivering appropriate development programmes quickly and efficiently. This will have the effect of creating public confidence in the new political dispensation and grassroots participation in the planning and implementation of programmes will be more easily achieved.

e) Two separate SPRs, as envisaged by the proponents thereof would serve to emphasise the particular and unique developmental backlogs in each region at a time when rapid and focussed remedial action by government structures and the fiscus are urgently required.

f) A process of amalgamation of two separate SPRs, each with its' own democratically elected and legitimate representative structures would in practice be an accurate, logical and fair test of the real will of the people in each separate region. By contrast, attempting to separate one region at a later date would cause unnecessary conflict and disruption and has the potential of being a seriously divisive exercise (marriage is an easier process than divorce).

g) The potential for destructive intra-SPR rivalry because of the inherently different priorities and needs of each area will be reduced by starting with two separate SPRs. This would be a safer option with which ordinary people and communities will easily be able to identify during the initial emotionally charged period of political reform.

h) All the current political parties have organised their regional structures on the basis of 2 separate regions. This constitutes de facto recognition that people feel comfortable and identify with political leadership in their own regions. Two regions will ensure

that those who represent the people at regional level have an intimate understanding of that particular SPR.

Similarly, most other organisations of civil society are also organised on the basis of separate regions.

- 1) Finally and most importantly, the preponderance of submissions from structures based in the affected areas advocate two separate SPRs. (Refer annexure A.) In the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary such preference should be respected as a point of departure. It should be noted that divergent views even prevail within individual political organisations.

4. Conclusion.

It is our view that initially, within reason, more rather than fewer regions will be the safest option to facilitate a peaceful transition from white domination to inclusive democracy. This accords with the important objective of bringing government closer to the people and thereby making it more sensitive to their needs

By its own admission the Commission on the Delimitation / Demarcation of SPR Boundaries has pointed out that the time available for the drawing of new SPR boundaries was totally inadequate. The DP submits, therefore, that the Constitution for the Transition provide for two separate SPRs being "Border/Kei" and "Eastern Cape" as an initial dispensation. The process for any suggested change should thereafter be handled by the respective legitimate SPR structures concerned, individually and in consultation, as appropriate.

-----o0o-----

NP Allot

ANC

IFP

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANC

ANNEXURE A

LIST OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE TASK FORCE OF THE COMMISSION FOR THE DEMARCATION / DELIMITATION OF SPR BOUNDARIES (SECOND ROUND)

1. SUBMISSIONS IN FAVOUR OF SEPARATE EASTERN CAPE AND BORDER-KEI SPRs

Organisation	Submission no.
Transkei Chamber of Business	68
Cape Provincial Administration	96
Democratic Party East Cape Region	160
Maclear Municipality	163
NRDAC	191
Government of South Africa	204
Grahamstown Ratepayers Association	218
NAFCOC	224
Federasie van Afrikaanse Kultuurvereniginge	269
Administrator: Cape of Good Hope	279
Teachers Federal Council	281
Midland Chamber of Industries, supported by:	283
Port Elizabeth Afrikaanse Sakekamer	"
Port Elizabeth Chamber of Commerce	"
Port Elizabeth Agricultural Society	"
Algoa Regional Services Council	"
Port Elizabeth Municipality	"
East Cape Regional Development Forum	"
Regional Development Advisory Committee, Region D	"
S A Communist Party (Eastern Cape)	287
Midland Regional Services Council	288
City of Grahamstown	289
Cape Performing Arts Board (CAPAB)	290
Oos-Londense Afrikaanse Sakekamer	291
T T van der Nest (Cradock) repr. business and agriculture	299
Swaershoek Boerevereniging (Somerset East)	431
Democratic Party of South Africa	438
Border Business Action Committee (Oral submission East London 24/9/93)	
Border Chamber of Business (Oral submission East London 24/9/93)	

2. SUBMISSIONS IN FAVOUR OF ONE SINGLE EASTERN CAPE SPR

NP Aliwal	164
ANC	217
SANCO	220
ANC various	281
Cosatu Border-Kei	285
ANC Youth League (E Cape)	285
Individual submission (student)	296
Aliwal North Community Structure	301
ANC Youth League (E Cape)	306
Transkei Government (oral submission at BKDF)	
Contralesa (oral submission at BKDF)	

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE
ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS:
NORTHERN TRANSVAAL
AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE
FRIDAY, 22 OCTOBER 1995 AT 0900

**AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE
DEMARCATON/DELIMITATION OF SPRs**

Northern Transvaal

AJ Fourie	(In the Chair)
EB Ngweni	
Q Vilakazi	INM
GG Zama	INM
MA Mashimbye	TVL Traditional Leaders
S Makhanya	Venda
RJ Dondo	UFP

1 Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed those present and outlined the brief to the Ad Hoc Committee.

2 Substantive Issues

Following debate on the various areas outlined in the Committee's brief the following was arrived at:

- 2.1 There was reasonable consensus amongst the members that Groblersdal be included in the Northern Transvaal Region.
- 2.2 There was flexibility in regard to Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest if consideration could be given to dividing the magisterial district boundaries on the watershed boundary.
- 2.3 The Committee were divided on the question of Bushbuck Ridge. With the exception of INM, those present agreed that this area should be included in the Northern Transvaal Region.

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE
ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS:
NORTHERN TRANSVAAL
AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE
FRIDAY, 22 OCTOBER 1993 AT 09H00**

Present:

AJ Fourie	SA Government	(In the Chair)
EE Ngobeni	XPP	
Q Vilankulu	IYP	
GG Zama	INM	
MA Netshimbupfe	TVL Traditional Leaders	
S Makhuvha	Venda	
RJ Dombo	UPF	

1 Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed those present and outlined the brief to the Ad Hoc Committee.

2 Substantive Issues

Following debate on the various areas outlined in the Committee's brief the following was arrived at:

- 2.1 There was reasonable consensus amongst the members that Groblersdal be included in the Northern Transvaal Region.
- 2.2 There was flexibility in regard to Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest if consideration could be given to dividing the magisterial district boundaries on the watershed boundary.
- 2.3 The Committee were divided on the question of Bushbuck Ridge. With the exception of INM, those present agreed that this area should be included in the Northern Transvaal Region.

- 2.4 There was reluctance to enter into debate on the Kruger National Park as it was felt that a decision on this area would be better dealt with by a separate committee.
- 2.5 It was felt that should agreement be reached on the question of Pretoria and KwaNdebele in relation to the Eastern Transvaal, this could affect the Committee's attitude on Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest.
- 2.6 The issue of the economic viability of the Northern Transvaal was addressed and the question posed how best the position might be improved.
- 2.7 Should the Commission's suggestion be accepted by the Committee a comparison would be made on GGP per capita.
- 2.8 It was felt a compromise within the Committee was possible on the question of Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest, viz a vis Bushbuck Ridge.

3 Closure

The meeting terminated at 10h40

ADDENDUM 6

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF SPRS AND MEMBERS OF THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE (NORTHERN TRANSVAAL REGION) OF THE COMMISSION ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS: HELD ON TUESDAY, 2 NOVEMBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE

Present:	AJ Fourie	SA Government	(In the Chair)
	EE Ngobeni	XPP	
	Q Vilankulu	IYP	
	GG Zama	INM	
	SG Moeti	Venda	
	RJ Dombo	UPF	

Apologies: MA Netshimbupfe TVL Traditional Leaders

1 Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed those present and outlined the Committee's revised brief.

2 Substantive Issues

Following debate on the various areas the following was arrived at:

- 2.1 There was general consensus amongst the members that Groblersdal be included in the Northern Transvaal Region.
- 2.2 There was reluctance to enter into debate on the Kruger National Park as it was felt that a decision on this area would be better dealt with by a separate committee.
- 2.3 It was felt that should agreement be reached on the question of Pretoria and KwaNdebele in relation to the Eastern Transvaal, this could affect the Committee's attitude on Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest.

- 2.4 It was felt a compromise within the Committee was possible on the question of Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest, viz a vis Bushbuck Ridge. There was flexibility in regard to Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest if consideration could be given to dividing the magisterial district boundaries on the watershed boundary.

3 General

The issue of the economic viability of the Northern Transvaal should be addressed because the question was posed how best the position might be improved. Therefore should the Commission's suggestion be accepted by the Committee a comparison should be made on the GGP per capita.

4 Closure

The meeting adjourned at 16h10

5 Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Committee take place on Wednesday, 3 November at 12h00.

ADDENDUM 7

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF SPRS AND MEMBERS OF THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE (NORTHERN TRANSVAAL REGION) OF THE COMMISSION ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS: HELD ON AT 12H30 ON WEDNESDAY, 3 NOVEMBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE

The meeting adjourned at 13h00.

Present:	EE Ngobeni	XPP	(In the Chair)
	GG Zama	INM	
	S Makhuvha	Venda	
	RJ Dombo	UPF	
	Ma Netshimbupfe	TVL Traditional Leaders	

Apologies:	A Fourie	SA Government
	Q Vilankulu	IYP

1 Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed those present.

2 Substantive Issues

Statistical GGP data schedules as well as area maps indicating the watershed line were tabled.

Following debate on the various areas the following was arrived at:

- 2.1 There was general consensus amongst the members that Groblersdal be included in the Northern Transvaal Region.
- 2.2 There was general consensus that with the exception of 2.1 above, the remaining original boundaries as drawn by the Commission remain unchanged, but that these be regarded as "soft boundaries" in order to give consideration to the economic viability of the region.

3 Next Meeting

A joint meeting of the four Ad Hoc Committees will take place at 08h00 on Thursday, 4 November 1993 at the office of the Commission.

4 Closure

The meeting adjourned at 13h00.

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATIION/DELIMITATION OF SPRs BY MEMBERS OF THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSION ON REGIONAL PRETORIA HELD ON FRIDAY, 22 OCTOBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE.

Present:

AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATIION/DELIMITATION OF SPRs

NI Maritz

L. Jansen

K. de Pina/A

Pretoria/ Eastern Transvaal

1. Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed those present and outlined the brief of the Ad Hoc Committee.

2. Agenda

It was agreed to look at Pretoria in relation to the following criteria: economic viability, socio-cultural aspects, sustainability, size, and geographical coherence. It was further agreed to examine the inclusion of Pretoria in the:

2.1 Northern Transvaal

2.2 Eastern Transvaal

2.3 Pretoria as an SPR on its own

2.4 PWV

3. Inclusion of Pretoria in the Northern Transvaal

There was general consensus that Pretoria should not be included in the Northern Transvaal SPR as demarcated.

3.1 Arguments against the inclusion of Pretoria in the Northern Transvaal:

3.1.1 that Pretoria and Northern Transvaal are not a coherent entity because Pretoria could be characterised as a semi-urban region and the Northern Transvaal as a rural area;

3.1.2 that if Pretoria is included in the Northern Transvaal this would mean an increased population of over 6 million. Pretoria by itself is not economically strong enough to make the whole large area economically viable. Per capita income figures would remain relatively low.

ADDENDUM 8

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF SPRS AND MEMBERS OF THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSION ON REGIONS: PRETORIA HELD ON FRIDAY, 22 OCTOBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE.

Present:	M Manzini	ANC
	S Burger	AVU
	PA Pienaar	DP (In the Chair)
	K van Rensburg	INM
	NJ Mahlangu	IYP
	L Jacobus	SACP
	K du Plessis/A Fourie	SA Government

1. Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed those present and outlined the brief of the Ad Hoc Committee.

2. Agenda

It was agreed to look at Pretoria in relation to the following criteria: economic viability, socio-cultural aspects, institutional links, and geographical coherence. It was further agreed to examine the inclusion of Pretoria in the:

- 2.1 Northern Transvaal;
- 2.2 Eastern Transvaal;
- 2.3 Pretoria as an SPR on its own;
- 2.4 PWV.

3. Inclusion of Pretoria in the Northern Transvaal

There was general consensus that Pretoria should not be included in the Northern Transvaal SPR as demarcated:

3.1 Arguments against the inclusion of Pretoria in the Northern Transvaal:

- 3.1.1 that Pretoria and Northern Transvaal are not a coherent entity because Pretoria could be characterised as a semi-urban region and the Northern Transvaal as a rural area;
- 3.1.2 that if Pretoria is included in the Northern Transvaal this would mean an increased population of over 6 million. Pretoria by itself is not economically strong enough to make the whole large area economically viable. Per capita income figures would remain relatively low.

3.2 Following further discussion, it was suggested:

3.2.1 that the Bushveld area be demarcated as a sub region of the Northern Transvaal.

4. **Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal**

The following points were raised for the inclusion of Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal, with the exception of the African National Congress and the Inyandza National Movement.

4.1 Arguments in favour of including Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal:

- 4.1.1 that the inclusion Pretoria would improve the economic viability of the Eastern Transvaal;
- 4.1.2 that the inclusion of Pretoria fits all the criteria for the demarcation of SPRs;
- 4.1.3 that there are strong linkages, (transport, commerce, services, education) between Pretoria and the Highveld (only 40-50 kilometres distance);
- 4.1.4 that for purposes of day-to-day living some people from KwaNdebele depend entirely on Pretoria for basic services like water, electricity, banking, shopping, tertiary education and transportation subsidies;
- 4.1.5 that KwaNdebele has a functional link with the Highveld as well as to Pretoria and Pretoria cannot be seen separately from KwaNdebele;
- 4.1.6 that by separating KwaNdebele from Pretoria, the areas will become non-functional;
- 4.1.7 that there exists strong linguistic links between Pretoria and the Eastern Transvaal;
- 4.1.8 that by including Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal, an SPR could be created that matches an average regional model (for 9 regions) in terms of population, per capita income figures, and GGP;
- 4.1.9 by including Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal, four of the nine SPRs will now be fiscally independent in terms of its tax base because this SPR will become viable.

The income and tax base of the PWV was questioned due to overflow of funds from the Eastern Transvaal to the PWV

- 4.1.10 that the arguments raised in the Commission on Demarcation/Delimitation of SPRs' Report of 15 October 1993 for the exclusion of Pretoria from the Eastern Transvaal, are impractical and subjective and do not reflect all the arguments put forward, for example that the white right wing want Pretoria to be incorporated in the Eastern Transvaal in order to create a volkstaat there;
- 4.1.11 The majority of submissions on Pretoria's regional future, asked for Pretoria to be included in the Eastern Transvaal. **(See the attached addendum).**
It was noted, however, that the submissions are not fully representative of the broad community.
- 4.2 Following further debate on whether Pretoria should be included in the Eastern Transvaal, it was suggested:
 - 4.2.1 that in examining the demarcation of Pretoria the Ndebele issue cannot be ignored;
 - 4.2.2 that should Pretoria be included in the Eastern Transvaal, Lydenburg, Pilgrim's Rest and Groblersdal should be incorporated into the Northern Transvaal;
 - 4.2.3 if Pretoria is not included in the Eastern Transvaal, then a mechanism must be created to maintain linkage between the communities which are linked to the Pretoria;
- 4.3 The following questions were raised in the discussion;
 - 4.3.1 what factors bind the Highveld and the Lowveld into a coherent Eastern Transvaal region?
 - 4.3.2 how does Pretoria link up with areas such as Nelspruit, Middelburg and Witbank?
 - 4.3.3 where should the boundaries be?

Pretoria as an SPR on its own

It was noted that Pretoria as a separate SPR would be economically viable, but consideration should be given to the fact that there exists a strong link between Eastern Transvaal and Pretoria. It was further noted that there would be an increase in the number of regions if Pretoria were to be an SPR on its own, and the number of other SPRs remain unchanged.

5.1. The Committee outlined five options to consider if it was agreed that Pretoria would be an SPR on its own. These include:

5.1.1 Greater Pretoria functional region: i.e Pretoria, Wonderboom, Soshanguve, Brits, Cullinan, Bronkhorstspuit, KwaNdebele, Odi 1, Moretele 1, and Moretele 2;

5.1.2 Greater Pretoria plus some adjacent Highveld districts, i.e. Witbank, Middelburg, Delmas, which are functionally linked to Pretoria;

5.1.3 Greater Pretoria plus the adjacent Highveld plus the Bushveld (this includes the four districts of Wármbad, Waterberg, Ellissras, Thabazimbi which requests inclusion with Pretoria) (this would make it seventeen districts altogether); and

5.1.4 Greater Pretoria plus the Bushveld plus Greater Highveld, i.e Balfour, Highveld Ridge, Standerton and Bethal;

5.1.5 the Pretoria "(DC)" option; ("DC" option refers to the magisterial district)

5.2 The following arguments were raised in respect of the above scenarios i.e 5.1.1 to 5.1.5

5.2.1 That with regard to option one (5.1.1), the Ndebele issue would not be solved.

5.2.2 option two, (5.1.2) does not go far enough because the East as a region on its own is not viable;

5.2.3 as regards option three (5.1.3), the same reasons as identified in 5.2.2, are applicable; i.e the balance of the Eastern Transvaal would not be viable.

5.2.4 if the "DC" option is agreed to, the following concerns need to be addressed:

- 5.2.5.1 what would be the boundaries?;
- 5.2.5.2 what would be the implications of this option for the Ndebele people?
- 5.2.5.3 how representative would it be of people from the city;
- 5.2.6 The points against the "DC" option include:
 - 5.2.6.1 the exclusion of areas such as Odi, KwaNdebele and Brits, Cullinan, Soshanguve, Wonderboom, and Bronkhortspruit;
 - 5.2.6.2 the SPR would be centrally controlled;
 - 5.2.6.3 Pretoria as a nodal point would be cut off from areas in the Eastern Transvaal.

6. The inclusion of Pretoria in the PWV

There was no consensus on whether Pretoria should form part of the PWV SPR.

6.1 The arguments raised against the inclusion of Pretoria in the PWV include:

- 6.1.1 that the majority of business people do not support the inclusion of Pretoria in the Witwatersrand and that they don't see themselves as being part of Pretoria;
- 6.1.2 that the majority of people residing and working in Johannesburg do not want Pretoria to be included in the Witwatersrand area;
- 6.1.3 that submissions received for the inclusion of Pretoria into the PWV SPR are based on research done in Germany, by Uwe Leonardy, and not in the particular areas concerned;
- 6.1.4 that there exists poor socio-cultural links between Pretoria and the Witwatersrand;
- 6.1.5 that the two areas, Pretoria and Witwatersrand are culturally different;
- 6.1.6 that there exists no political or administrative links between Pretoria and the Witwatersrand, merely the concept of geographical proximity;

- 6.1.7 that there is a duplication of institutional capacity as well as the institutions of civil society, between Johannesburg and Pretoria. The cities are thus not interdependent and their communities function independently over a very wide spectrum of activities;
 - 6.1.8 that there exists no historical ties linking the two areas, that Johannesburg and Pretoria do not share a common history;
 - 6.1.9 there exists no administrative precedent for Pretoria to be included in the Witwatersrand/Vaal SPR, that it could equally be included in the easterly, northerly, southerly or westerly parts of the Transvaal;
 - 6.1.10 that the people residing in the areas of Pretoria, Odi, Moretele, Laudium, Soshanguve and Eesterus do not have a PWV identity and therefore are unlikely to be included in the PWV SPR.
 - 6.1.11 that the overwhelming majority of submissions from the public on the future of Pretoria call for Pretoria to be excluded from the Witwatersrand region.
- 6.2 Arguments for the inclusion of Pretoria in the Witwatersrand/Vaal SPR include:
- 6.2.1 the two areas have different focal points, Johannesburg concentrating on finances, whereas Pretoria is focused more on government. The infrastructure of the two areas should be integrated;
 - 6.2.2 that some people commute on a daily basis between Pretoria and other parts of Witwatersrand. That there are strong economic links with the Witwatersrand. Therefore, for purposes of continuity, Pretoria should be included in the Witwatersrand/Vaal SPR;
 - 6.2.4 the idea of 'soft boundaries' should be looked at.
- 6.3 Following further discussion it was noted:
- 6.3.1 that if Pretoria should be included in the Witwatersrand/Vaal SPR, then KwaNdebele, including places such as Bronkhorstpruit should be incorporated in the East;
 - 6.3.2 that mechanisms need to be found which looks at the taxes and monies that are presently being paid to Pretoria, how the changes would affect the buying power of the people of KwaNdebele, noting that

KwaNdebele and the towns surrounding it cannot be separated from Pretoria which is their focal point in terms of basic services, buying and commuting.

7. **General**

It was agreed that Ms L Jacobus will be attending the Co-ordinating Committee meeting, assisted by Mr PA Pienaar. The meeting will be held on Monday, the 25 October 1993, at 16h00.

8. **Closure**

The meeting closed at 14h20. The members were thanked for their presence at the meeting.

9. **Next meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee will be held on the 25 October 1993 at 13h00 at the World Trade Centre.

**APPENDIX A: SUBMISSIONS OPPOSING INCLUSION OF
PRETORIA IN THE EASTERN TRANSVAAL SPR**

Submission

African Nation Congress	Oral 02/10/93
ANC Eastern Transvaal	141
National Party of SA	203
Inyandza National Movement	138
NRDAC	191
RDAC E.Tvl	144
Oosvaal, Highveld and Lowveld Regional Services Council	404
Middelburg Town Council	367
Witbank Town Council	404
Afrikaanse Sakeleier Pretoria	146
Northern Transvaal Chamber of Industries	147
Pretoria Chamber of Business	148
Kosmos Town Council	150
Kisrand Town Council	151
Marwoodburg Town Council	152
Pretoria City Council	157
Town Council of Abetsha	157
Town Council of Bronckhorstspuit	157
Hartbeespoort Town Council	157
Woodplaat Local Committee	157
Gullinan Inhabitants	157
Middelburg Afrikaanse Sakeleier	157
Witbank district inhabitants	157
King Makhosoke II of the Mdebele	173
Mdebele people and chiefs (Middelburg)	174
Chief Mhlangu of Delmas	174
Sub-chief J. Tlou of Witbank	177
Sub-chief of Middelburg	177
King Mavima II of the Mdebele	179
Pretoria Regional Services Council	143
Teacher's Federal Council	281
Department of National Education	409

**APPENDIX B: SUBMISSIONS IN FAVOUR OF INCLUSION
OF PRETORIA IN EASTERN TRANSVAAL**

Submission

Democratic Party of SA	438
Democratic Party S.Tvl	152
Democratic Party N.Tvl	461
Democratic Party E.Tvl	461
Intando Yesiswe Party	214
Afrikaner Volksunie	359
Ndebele African Chamber of Commerce (NACOC)	55
Bronkhorstspuit Chamber of Business (BCOB)	55
KwaNdebele Industrial Association (KIA)	55
Midveld Industrial Chamber (MIC)	55
Afrikaanse Sakekamer Pretoria	146
Northern Transvaal Chamber of Industries	147
Pretoria Chamber of Business	148
Kosmos Town Council	150
Midrand Town Council	151
Verwoerdburg Town Council	156
Pretoria City Council	157
Town Council of Akasia	157
Town Council of Bronkhorstspuit	157
Hartbeespoort Town Council	157
Roodeplaat Local Committee	157
Cullinan Inhabitants	211
Middelburg Afrikaanse Sakekamer	282
Witbank district inhabitants	215
King Makhosoke II of the Ndebele	375
Ndebele people and chiefs (Middelburg)	376
Chief Mahlangu of Delmas	376
Sub-chief J. Tlou of Witbank	377
Sub-chief of Middelburg	377
King Mayisha II of the Ndebele	378
Pretoria Regional Services Council	145
Teacher's Federal Council	281
Department of National Education	409

Cor ,ience (Human rights group)	192
Schalk Burger Publications and 24 individuals	255
Totiusdal inhabitants	258
Group of people in PWV	58
Mr Clark (Hazyview)	106
Evan Stones	132
Anna Rudolph (author)	315
Association of Eastern and South-Eastern Transvaal	
Local Authorities (28 town councils):	107
Amersfoort Balfour Bethal Breyten Carolina Delmas	
Devon Dulstroom Ermelo Evander Graskop	
Greylingstad Groblersdal Hendrina Komatipoort Leandra	
Lydenburg Marble Hall Middelburg Morgenzon Piet Retief	
Pongola Secunda Standerton Wakkerstroom Waterval Boven	
Witbank Witrivier	
Vereniging van Oranjewerkers	476
9. Intende Volks Party	372
10. Johannesburg African Chamber of Commerce	374
11. Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce and Industry	375
12. African Chamber of Commerce	376
13. Pretoria Regional Services Council	377
14. Pretoria Chamber of Business	378
15. Northern Transvaal Chamber of Industry	379
16. Vervoordings Town Council	380
17. Town Council of Keweenaw	381
18. Town Council of Midrand	382
19. Pretoria City Council	383
20. Town Council of Akasia	384
21. Town Council of Brookhaven	385
22. Town Council of Hartbeespoort	386
23. Woodoppleer Local Committee	387
24. SANFED	388
25. Africa Institute of South Africa	389
26. Department of National Education	390
27. Conscience (Human rights group)	391
28. Teacher's Federal Council	392
29. Schalk Burger Publications and 24 individuals	393
30. Prof. J. van der Schyff	394
31. Van Schalkwyk (Molapoort)	395
32. Kemp (Pretoria)	396
33. Mr Benningfield (individual)	397

APPENDIX C:

PARTIES/INTEREST GROUPS AGAINST THE INCLUSION OF PRETORIA IN THE WITWATERSRAND

Submission

1.	Democratic Party of SA	438
2.	Democratic Party Southern Transvaal	152
3.	Democratic Party Northern Transvaal	461
4.	Democratic Party Eastern Transvaal	461
5.	Afrikaner Volksunie	359
6.	Afrikaner Volksfront	387
7.	COSAG Groupings	399
8.	Boere Vryheidsbeweging	372
9.	Intando Yesizwe Party	214
10.	Johannesburgse Afrikaanse Sakekamer	259
11.	Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce and Industry	260
12.	Afrikaanse Sakekamer Pretoria	146
13.	Pretoria Regional Services Council	145
14.	Pretoria Chamber of Business	148
15.	Northern Transvaal Chamber of Industry	147
16.	Verwoerdburg Town Council	156
17.	Town Council of Kosmos	150
18.	Town Council of Midrand	151
19.	Pretoria City Council	157
20.	Town Council of Akasia	157
21.	Town Council of Bronkhorstspuit	157
22.	Town Council of Hartbeespoort	157
23.	Roodeplaat Local Committee	157
24.	SANFED	370
25.	Africa Institute of South Africa	277
26.	Department of National Education	229
27.	Conscience (HUMAN rights group)	192
28.	Teacher's Federal Council	281
29.	Schalk Burger Publikasies and 24 individuals	255
30.	Prof P. van der Schyff	130
31.	Van Schalkwyk (Nelspuit)	129
32.	Kemp (Pretoria)	44
33.	Mr Benningfreed (individual)	322

34.	Office of the Chief Minister, KwaNdebele	381
35.	King Mayisha II of the Ndebele	378
36.	Sub-chief of Middelburg	377
37.	King Makhosoke II of the Ndebele	375
38.	Cullinan inhabitants	211
39.	Association of Eastern and South Eastern Transvaal Town Councils, representing the following 28 town councils	107
	1. Amersfoort	
	2. Balfour	
	3. Bethal	
	4. Breyten	
	5. Carolina	
	6. Delmas	
	7. Devon	
	8. Dulstroom	
	9. Ermelo	
	10. Evander	
	11. Graskop	
	12. Greylingstad	
	13. Groblersdal	
	14. Hendrina	
	15. Komatipoort	
	16. Leandra	
	17. Lydenburg	
	18. Marble Hall	
	19. Middelburg	
	20. Morgenzon	
	21. Piet Retief	
	22. Pongola	
	23. Secunda	
	24. Standerton	
	25. Wakkerstroom	
	26. Waterval Boven	
	27. Witbank	
	28. Witrivier	
40.	Vereniging van Oranjewerkers	476
41.	Hoedspruit Steering Committee for Regional Development .	466
42.	Africa Institute of South Africa	277
43.	Witbank district inhabitants	215
44.	Middelburg Afrikaanse Sakekamer	282
45.	KwaNdebele Parliamentary Committee on Regional Demarcation Oral 29/10/93	
46.	Delegation of Ndebele Chiefs from the Highveld Districts: Middelburg, Witbank, Ogies, Nebo, Bethal, Delmas, Roosenekal, KwaNdebele Oral 29/10/93	

APPENDIX D:

Parties/Groups on the Highveld requesting inclusion with Pretoria:

Bronkhorstspuit Town Council	6
Bronkhorstspuit Chamber of Business (BCOB)	55
Ndebele African Chamber of Commerce (NACOC)	55
KwaNdebele Industrial Association (KIA)	55
Midveld Industrial Chamber (MIC)	55
Middelburg Afrikaanse Sakekamer	282
Cullinan Residents Group	211
Witbank District Residents Group	215
King Makhosoke II of the Manala (Ndebele)	375
Ndebele sub-chief of Middelburg	376
Sub-chief Elias Mahlangu of Delmas	377
Sub-chief J. Tlou of Witbank	377
King Mayisha II of the Ndundza (Ndebele)	378
Intandyo Yesizwe Party	378
Dr Chris J. van Vuuren (Anthropologist)	382

APPENDIX E:

Parties/Groups in the Bushveld area wanting to be linked to Pretoria:

Town Council of Warmbaths	124
Editor: Ellisras Nuus	274
Amandebele-Ba-Lebelo Tribal Authority (Hammanskraal)	313
Amandebele Akamgwambani Chiefs	312
Thabazimbi DOV, DLU en Sakekamer	401
Phagameng Civic Association, Nylstroom	407
Bushveld Development Forum, Oral Submission, 30 September 1993	

APPENDIX F:

SUBMISSIONS IN FAVOUR OF AN UNDIVIDED LOWVELD AREA

RIGODOB Lowveld Escarpment Bioregion	134
Hoedspruit Steering Committee for Regional Development	233
Central Savanna Bioregion	459
Council for the Environment	131

ADDENDUM 9

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF SPRS AND MEMBERS OF THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSION ON REGION: PRETORIA HELD ON MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE

Present:

M Manzini	ANC
S Burger	AVU
PA Pienaar	DP
NJ Mahlangu	IYP
L Jacobus	SACP

Apologies: Ms K van Rensburg INM

1. Agenda

- 1.1 Minutes of the previous meeting
- 1.2 Matters Arising
- 1.3 General

2. Welcome

The members of the Ad Hoc Committee were welcomed.

3. Minutes

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting of 22 October 1993 were ratified with the following amendments:

- * Item 3.2.1 to be deleted
- * Item 4 to read: " There was general agreement that Pretoria should be included in the Eastern Transvaal, except for Inyandza National Movement and African National Congress".
- * Item 4.1.3 to read: "there are strong linkages between Pretoria and the Highveld (transport, commerce, services, education) (only 40-50 kilometres distance)"

- * Item 4.1.5 should read: "that KwaNdebele has a functional link to the Highveld as well as to Pretoria and Pretoria cannot be seen separately from KwaNdebele".
- * Item 4.1.18 should read: "that by including Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal, an SPR could be created that matches an average regional model (for 9 regions) in terms of population, per capita income figures, and GGP".
- * Item 4.1.9 should read: "by including Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal, four of the nine SPRs will now be fiscally independent in terms of its tax base because this SPR will become viable".
- * Item 4.1.10 should read: "that the arguments raised in the Commission on Demarcation/Delimitation of SPRs' Report of 15 October 1993 for the exclusion of Pretoria from the Eastern Transvaal, are impractical and subjective and do not reflect all the arguments put forward, for example that the white right wing want Pretoria to be incorporated in the Eastern Transvaal in order to create a volkstaat".
- * Item 4.1.11 should read: " The majority of submissions on Pretoria's regional future, asked for Pretoria to be included in the Eastern Transvaal.
(See attached addendum).
It was noted, however, that the submissions are not fully representative of the broad community".
- * Item 4.2.2 refers: The word "Nelspruit" should read "Groblersdal".
- * Item 4.2.3 should read: "if Pretoria is not included in the Eastern Transvaal, then a mechanism must be created to maintain linkage between the communities which are linked to Pretoria".
- * Item 4.3.1 should read: "what factors bind the Highveld and the Lowveld into a coherent Eastern Transvaal region?."
- * Item 5 refers: Delete the words "There was no consensus that Pretoria should be an SPR on its own"
- * Item 5.1.4 should read: "the Pretoria "DC" option (refers to the magisterial district)."
- * Item 5.2 should read: "The following arguments were raised in respect of the above scenarios i.e 5.1.1 to 5.1.5".
- * Item 5.2.6.1 should read: " The exclusion of areas such as Odi, KwaNdebele, Brits, Cullinan, Soshanguve, Wonderboom and

Bronkhortspruit".

- * Item 5.2.6.2 should read: "The SPR would be centrally controlled".

4. Recommendation to the Co-ordinating Committee

Since no agreement on the future position of Pretoria could be reached the representatives present decided on a compromise position. All those present were in principle prepared to reach a compromise which does not reflect their original position on Pretoria's regional future. Ms K van Rensburg replied by telephone that she would also be prepared to compromise. Mr Fourie (SA Government) indicated a compromise position at the meeting of Friday, 22 October 1993.

This position is summarised as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE/ PARTY	ORIGINAL POSITION	COMPROMISE IN PRINCIPLE	COMPROMISE POSITION
PA Pienaar, DP	Pretoria in E Tvl	Yes	Pretoria SPR
S Burger, AVU	Pretoria in E Tvl	Yes	Pretoria SPR
NJ Mahlangu, IYP	Pretoria in E Tvl	Yes	Pretoria SPR
M Manzini, ANC	Pretoria in PWV	Yes	To be decided
L Jacobus, SACP	Pretoria in PWV	Yes	To be decided
K van Rensburg, INM	E Tvl without Pretoria	Yes (by telephone)	Will consider Pretoria SPR
A Fourie, SA Govt	Pretoria in PWV	Yes (meeting on 22/10/93)	Eastern half of Greater Pretoria in E Tvl

5. General

Following a short discussion, it was decided that Ms L Jacobus, assisted by Mr PA Pienaar, be mandated to report the compromise position as reflected in paragraph 3, to the Co-ordinating Committee at the meeting to be held on 25 October 1993, at 16h00 at the World Trade Centre.

6. Closure

The meeting adjourned at 15h30 after members were thanked for their presence, inputs and co-operation.

ADDENDUM 10

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION BY THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE OF THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF SPR'S: PRETORIA.

The Ad-Hoc Committee therefore recommends to the Negotiating Council that:

1. We accept that there has been a vast amount of work and time spent on debating and negotiating the recommendations of the Commission on the Demarcation/Delimitation of SPR's. We further **note** that there are sensitive areas, such as Pretoria, which need further discussion and consultation and that the recommended boundaries are **viewed** as "Soft Boundaries".
 - 1.1 We also **recommend** that KwaNdebele be included in the Eastern Transvaal.
2. The Negotiating Council establish a Task Group (which the successor to the Negotiating Council will continue to manage and to which it will report) which will be charged with the responsibility of:
 - 2.1 Making recommendations on what mechanisms are available to solicit further views from people in the affected areas, e.g. forums, public meetings, referendums etc.
 - 2.2 Which mechanism/s is/are most appropriate for a particular sensitive area.
 - 2.3 Facilitating the continuing further negotiations on the disputed sensitive areas.
3. Provision is made in the appropriate Schedule of the Constitution for the Transition for the content of the Schedule (i.e. the recommendations of the Commission on the Demarcation/Delimitation of Regions as per paragraph 1 above) to be amended as necessary by proclamation not later than 28 February 1994.
4. The Committee **noted** that subdivisions within the Task Group be constituted by people with a direct interest in the sensitive disputed areas.

Western Cape, Northern Cape, North West, OFS

Western Cape, Northern Cape, North West, OFS

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS, THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL. THEY ARE STILL TO BE RATIFIED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS FOR THE WESTERN CAPE, NORTHERN CAPE, NORTH WEST AND ORANGE FREE STATE.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS (WESTERN CAPE, NORTHERN CAPE, NORTH WEST AND ORANGE FREE STATE) HELD AT 9H30 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE IN KEMPTON PARK. (22/10/93)

PRESENT :

Mr J S S Phatang (Chairperson)	-	Dikwankwetla
Mr T Delport	-	South African Government
Mr R Hulley	-	Democratic Party
Mr D Lockey	-	Labour Party
Mr E Pahad	-	South African Communist Party

Ms N Sithebe-Tsotetsi (Administration)

ABSENT : Representative of the ANC

1. WELCOME

The chairperson welcomed all present and noted the absence of a representative of the ANC.

2. AGENDA

The chairperson stated that the Committee had been briefed by the Negotiating Council to discuss four of the areas which the Commission on the Demarcation/Delimitation of Regions had recommended needed further investigation. Those areas would be discussed in the following order:

2.1 Western Cape

2.2 Northern Cape

2.3 North West

2.4 Orange Free State

3. WESTERN CAPE AND NORTHERN CAPE

The Committee decided that it would be best to discuss the Western Cape and the Northern Cape simultaneously as they were linked. The chairperson asked each member of the Committee to comment on the area.

- 3.1 Mr Delpont pointed out the South African government supported the idea of the present Cape region including the Border/Kei area being subdivided into four regions because the region was too big which would make it difficult to administer from one central point. He suggested that Kuruman and Hartswater could remain the North West Region as suggested by the Commission on the Demarcation/Delimitation of Regions but Postmasburg should be in the Northern Cape Region of the map proposed by the Commission (see Addendum). He went on to say that the North West Region recommended by the Commission should be combined with the Orange Free State to form one region considering economic factors.
- 3.2 Mr Lockey suggested that the Northern Cape Region recommended by the Commission should be divided into two with Gordonia, Hay, Kenhardt, Prieska, Hopetown, Herbert, Kimberley, Barkly West and Warrenton being joined with the North West and remaining areas joined with the Western Cape Region. He stated the following as his reasons for this suggestion:
- * the region was too big for administrative purposes
 - * the region was only occupied by 2% of the South African population
 - * there is low development in the region
 - * the region did not have a centre for administrative purposes
 - * the region is poor with a Gross Geographical Product of R300 million
 - * the areas that he suggested should be in the North West Region because they received their services from Kimberley which is closer to the North West while the other areas were already receiving most of their services from Cape Town.
 - * the Northern Cape Region recommended by the Commission would not have any tertiary institutions
 - * considering the population distribution the North Cape Region would have two times the representation at SPR level which would make it difficult for the region to function viably.
- 3.3 In answer to a question about a prospective capital of the North West Region suggested by Mr Lockey, he stated that the capital would be Mmabatho/Mafikeng with Kimberley, Uppington and Klerksdorp being sub-centres.
- 3.4 Mr Hulley stated that the Democratic Party considered functionality/infrastructure, economic community of interests/cultural of interests and recognition of history when making decisions on boundaries, therefore, the Democratic Party would not support the existence of a Northern Cape Region as recommended by the Commission. He suggested that the Northern Cape Region should be combined with the Western Cape Region with some adjustments of the northern and eastern borders.

He went on to say that the Eastern Cape should be divided into two SPRs.

He suggested that the magisterial districts of Gordonia, Kenhardt, Hay, Herbert, Prieska and Hopetown should be in one region because their economies were linked to the Orange River.

- 3.5 Mr Delpont stated that historically the areas of Postmasburg, Gordonia, Hay, Herbert, Prieska, Hopetown and Kenhardt belong the Western Cape.
- 3.6 Mr Lockey's statement that the people consulted in the areas concerned wished to be included in the North West was disputed by both Mr Delpont and Mr Hulley.
- 3.7 Mr Pahad suggested that the Northern Cape should be a region on its own as suggested by the Commission.
- 3.8 Mr Hulley proposed that the Committee should accept the recommendations of the Commission in the report on page 20 (the last paragraph) and discuss the areas in the meeting of the Co-ordinating Committee with some minor border adjustments. It was pointed out that the committee was meeting in order to solve the problem therefore the Committee should discuss the issue further to reach a compromise.
- 3.9 Mr Delpont suggested that the Committee should proceed to other regions and the Northern Cape Region revisited after he had consulted with his colleagues in the Eastern Cape Committee because he could be in a position to reconsider the government's position.
- 3.10 **The Commission wished to place on record that there was substantial agreement that the Northern Cape region should not exist as a separate region and that the boundaries should be adjusted at a later stage. The South African government, however, wished to retain the Northern Cape region until further consultation.**

4. **ORANGE FREE STATE**

It was agreed by all members of the Committee that the Orange Free State region proposed by the Commission should remain the same with the inclusion of Sasolburg in the region.

The meeting was adjourned at 10h25 to allow Mr Delpont to consult members of the Eastern Cape Committee and to attend a meeting.

The meeting reconvened at 12h00.

5. **NORTHERN CAPE/NORTH WEST REGIONS**

- 5.1 Mr Hulley informed the other Committee members that after consultation with his colleagues and the review of the submissions made to the Commission, the Democratic Party would accept the districts of Gordonia, Kenhardt, Hay, Prieska, Hopetown, Herbert, Kimberley, Barkly West and Warrenton being joined with the North West region.

- 5.2 Mr Delpont pointed out that there were many submissions from municipalities in the areas mentioned by Mr Hulley that favoured being part of a separate North Cape region.
- 5.3 Mr Pahad stated that the criteria to the Committee should be mainly economic considerations, linkages and the size of the region therefore he suggested that the block of the nine magisterial districts in question should be part of the North West region.
- 5.4 A proposal was made that the block of the above-mentioned districts should be left as a "floating block" and the people in the area tested through a referendum. This suggestion was seen as not practical by other members of the Committee, who pointed out that if one area was given an opportunity of a referendum then the whole country should be given that opportunity.
- 5.5 It was suggested that for the purposes of electioneering a provisional boundary should be recommended by the Committee with the border of the North West region being Hay, Hopetown, Herbert, Kimberley Barkly West and Warrenton. It was argued that this suggestion was not practical as the economy of these areas was linked to the economy of Postmansburg.
- 5.6 A proposal that Barkly West, Warrenton and Kimberley should be excised to the North West region was not accepted by Mr Delpont who pointed out that the Commission had made a decision to have a separate Northern Cape region based on economic reasons as well as cultural background (the dominant language in the proposed Northern Cape region being Afrikaans, and in the North West the dominant language being SeTswana). Mr Lockey pointed out that the Commission's decision to have a separate Northern Cape region had not been unanimous.
- 5.7 After much debate the Committee agreed that all the Committee members should consult with their principals on Warrenton, Kimberley and Barkly West.
- 5.8 The Committee wished to place on record that four members of the Committee agreed that the areas of Barkly West, Warrenton and Kimberley should be included in the North West region. The four members would also recommend to a future boundaries commission that the people in the districts of Gordonia, Hay, Kenhardt, Prieska, Hopetown and Herbert should be given an opportunity to decide whether they wished to be in the Western Cape region or the North West region after the elections.

6. NEXT MEETING

The Committee would meet again on Monday, 25 October 1993 at 14h00.

7. CLOSURE

The meeting adjourned at 12h45.

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS (WESTERN CAPE, NORTHERN CAPE, NORTH WEST AND ORANGE FREE STATE), THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL. THEY ARE STILL TO BE RATIFIED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE HELD AT 14H00 ON MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE, KEMPTON PARK.

PRESENT: Mr JSS Phatang (Chairperson) Dikwankwetla Party
Mr T Botha African National Congress
Dr T Delpont South African Government
Mr R Hulley Democratic Party
Mr D Lockey Labour Party
Mr R Nogumla South African Communist Party

Ms N Sithebe-Tsotetsi (Administration)

APOLOGIES: Mr E Pahad South African Communist Party

1. WELCOME

The chairperson welcomed all present. The meeting was informed that Mr Pahad would not be able to attend the meeting as he had been stabbed in Johannesburg and was in serious condition at the hospital. Mr Nogumla represented the SACP in Mr Pahad's place.

The following documents were submitted:

- 1.1 Minutes of the previous meeting.
- 1.2 A submission by the Surplus People Project.

2. AGENDA

- 2.1 The North Cape Region would be discussed to see if the members of the Committee could reach a compromise.
- 2.2 A report that would be submitted to the Co-ordinating Committee.

3. DISCUSSION OF THE NORTH CAPE REGION

The chairperson invited the members of the Committee to report on their consultations with their principals and decisions that had been reached.

- 3.1 Mr Hulley reported that the Democratic Party had no problem with the Orange River being the boundary between the North West and the Western Cape.
- 3.2 Mr Lockey supported the above position and added that south border of the North West would be Gordonia, Hay and Herbert.
- 3.3 Dr Delpont stated that the submission of the Surplus People Project should be disregarded because the Committee would have to invite other submissions to be fair to other concerned people. He went on to say that the position of the South African Government had not changed since the last meeting because no progress had been made in the Eastern Cape region.
- 3.4 It was pointed out by some members of the Committee that the Surplus People Project had made the same submission to the Commission on the Demarcation/Delimitation of Regions.
- 3.5 Mr Botha reported that the position of the ANC was that the Northern Cape Region as demarcated by the Commission should be disintegrated, that the Orange River should be considered the border of the North West and Western Cape Regions. He went on to say that the ANC supported the proposal that Sasolburg should be in the Orange Free State. He also felt that the submission of the Surplus People Project should not be considered as it had no bearing on the meeting.
- 3.6 Mr Nogumla reported that the SACP supported the disintegration of the Northern Cape Region and the Orange River being the border between the North West and the Western Cape.
- 3.7 Mr Pathang, from the Dikwankwetla Party, stated that his party supported the positions of the ANC, Labour Party, DP and the SACP.
- 3.8 Mr Botha, Mr Hulley and Mr Lockey agreed that the decision made on the Northern Cape Region should be based solely on the area that the Committee had been asked to investigate and it should not be linked to a decision made on the Eastern Cape.
- 3.9 Dr Delpont stated that the South African Government's position had not changed because:

- * no single objective reason had been given to make a change (the disintegration of the Northern Cape Region) which they considered to be drastic;
- * the Orange River could not be used as a boundary because there were close economic and social links between communities on both sides of the river;
- * the Commission had done extensive investigations on the area and it had decided on having a separate Northern Cape Region. A response was made that even the Commission had been split (8 to 7) on the decision to have a separate Northern Cape Region and that this was the only area where the Commission felt it necessary to vote.

3.10 Mr Hulley said he would like it put on record that:

- * the Northern Cape Region was not desirable as a separate region because the communities of Namaqualand, Calvinia, Vredendal, Clanwilliam and Sutherland had economic ties with the Western Cape while the rest of the Northern Cape Region had a GGP of less than 1% of the country's GGP therefore the region would not be able to sustain itself as a separate region;
- * the Orange River was used as a border from Lesotho to Namibia except in the Cape area.

3.11 Mr Lockey pointed out that he had supplied reasons for the disintegration of the Northern Cape Region at the previous meeting (see minutes of 22 October, paragraph 3.2). He went on to say that the motivation of the National Party was political.

3.12 In conclusion the following five members of the Committee:

Mr Botha
Mr Hulley
Mr Lockey
Mr Nogumla
Mr Phatang

agreed to the proposal:

- * that the Northern Cape Region should be disintegrated with the Orange River as the border between the North West Region and the Western Cape Region. The areas of Gordonia, Hay and Herbert would then be the southern border of the North West Region. The decision was based on the fact that the above members believed that the Northern

Cape Region would not be economically viable on its own;

- * that Sasolburg should be in the Orange Free State.

Dr Delpont stated that the position of the South African Government had not changed from the previous meeting. He then he walked out of the meeting.

- 3.13 Mr Lockey wished it placed on record that during Dr Delpont's presence at both meetings, Dr Delpont had not made any constructive proposals but had only put forward obstructive views.

4. NEXT MEETING

No meeting was scheduled, Mr Phatang would report to the Co-ordinating Committee on the decisions reached by the Committee and the minutes of both meetings would be submitted to the Co-ordinating Committee.

5. CLOSURE

The meeting adjourned at 15h05.

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS (WESTERN CAPE, NORTHERN CAPE, NORTH-WEST AND ORANGE FREE STATE), THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL. THEY ARE STILL TO BE RATIFIED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE AD-HOC COMMITTEE HELD AT 10H15 ON TUESDAY, 02 NOVEMBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE.

Present:	Mr JSS Phatang	Dikwankwetla Party (Chairperson)
	Mr D Lockey	Labour Party
	Mr R Hulley	Democratic Party
	Dr T Delport	South African Government

1. Welcome

The Chairperson welcomed all the members present.

The following documents were submitted:

- 1.1 Draft minutes of the previous meeting - 25 October 1993

2. Agenda

The North Cape Region would be looked at to see if members of the Ad-Hoc Committee could reach a compromise.

3. Summary of discussion

- 3.1 The members of the Ad-Hoc Committee stated that their positions remain unchanged, as reflected in the minutes of 25 October 1993. (See **addendum A**)

- 3.2 The Ad-Hoc Committee identified the following areas of concern:

3.2.1 Orange Free State

It was agreed by all the members of the Committee that the Orange Free State region, as proposed by the Commission should remain the same, with the inclusion of the Sasolburg in the region.

3.2.2 Northern Cape

It was agreed that the Northern Cape region should be disintegrated with the Orange River as the border between the North West Region

and the Western Cape Region. The areas Gordonia, Hay and Herbert would then be the southern border of the North West Region. The decision was based on the fact that some members believed that Northern Cape Region would not be economically viable on its own.

The position of the South African Government had not changed and that "no single objective reason had been given to make a change (the disintegration of the Northern Cape Region) which they considered to be drastic".

4. **General**

It was suggested that members of the Ad-Hoc Committee should facilitate discussions with other Ad-Hoc Committees, for example Eastern Cape and look at proposals;

Following discussion, it was felt that it was necessary to look at the interests of the people living in the affected areas, as the decisions taken would have serious implications for people living in the areas;

Following discussion, it was suggested that the Planning Committee or the Negotiating Council should facilitate progress in the Ad-Hoc Committee and that in the final analysis the final decision remains a political one.

5. **Next meeting**

No further meetings of the Ad-Hoc Committee was scheduled and the Chairperson thanked the members for their attendance.

6. **Closure**

The meeting closed at 11h00.

ADDENDUM 14

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF PROVINCES HELD ON MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1995

CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE: DEMARCATIION/DELIMITATION OF SPRs

PRESENT : Mr A Fourie (Chairperson) - South African Government
Mr T Botha - African National Congress
Ms L. Mphahlele - South African Communist Party
Mr J S S. Mphahlele - Inkwenkwezi Party
Mr P A. Pheko - Democratic Party

Mr F de Pretz (Observer)
Ms N. Mphahlele (Secretary)

1. WELCOME

Mr Fourie accepted his nomination as the chairperson of the meeting.

2. AGENDA

2.1 Reports from the four chairpersons of the Ad-Hoc Committees.

2.2 Decision whether the Co-ordinating Committee would be ready to meet with the Negotiating Council on Wednesday, 27 October 1995.

3. REPORTS FROM THE FOUR AD-HOC COMMITTEES

3.1 Mr Botha reported on the KwaZulu/Natal, Eastern Cape and Koi areas that the Ad-Hoc Committee could not reach agreement on any of these areas.

3.1.1 Natal/KwaZulu

* The Ad-Hoc Committee could not reach consensus on a suitable final southern boundary for Natal/KwaZulu. The following compromise was suggested:

* That the current Provincial/State boundary between Natal/KwaZulu and Transkei should be retained as an interim measure. This would imply that the District of Umzimkhulu would remain with the remainder of Transkei whilst the districts of Alfred and Moses Curry would remain with Natal/KwaZulu.

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND ARE RESTRICTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS, THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL. THEY ARE STILL TO BE RATIFIED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE.

ADDENDUM 14

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS HELD AT 16H00 ON MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE IN KEMPTON PARK.

PRESENT :

Mr A Fourie (Chairperson)	-	South African Government
Mr T Botha	-	African National Congress
Ms L Jacobus	-	South African Communist Party
Mr J S S Phatang	-	Dikwankwetla Party
Mr P A Pienaar	-	Democratic Party

Mr F du Preez (Administration)

Ms N Sithebe-Tsotetsi (Administration)

1. WELCOME

Mr Fourie accepted his nomination as the chairperson of the meeting.

2. AGENDA

2.1 Reports from the four chairpersons of the Ad-Hoc Committees.

2.2 Decision whether the Co-ordinating Committee would be ready to meet with the Negotiating Council on Wednesday, 27 October 1993.

3. REPORTS FROM THE FOUR AD-HOC COMMITTEES

3.1 Mr Botha reported on the KwaZulu/Natal, Eastern Cape and Kei areas that the Ad-Hoc Committee could not reach agreement on any of these areas.

3.1.1 Natal/KwaZulu

* The Ad-Hoc Committee could not reach consensus on a suitable final southern boundary for Natal/KwaZulu. The following compromise was suggested:

- That the current Provincial/State boundary between Natal/KwaZulu and Transkei should be retained as an interim measure. That would imply that the district of Umzimkhulu would remain with the remainder of Transkei whilst the magisterial districts of Alfred and Mount Curry would remain with Natal/KwaZulu.

- The following areas, North Transkei/Pondoland (comprising of the magisterial districts of Lusikisiki, Bizana, Tabankulu, Flagstaff, Mt Ayliff, Mt Frere, Mt Fletcher and Maluti), the district of Umzimkhulu and East Griqualand could petition a referendum within 18 months of the national elections to determine which SPR they wished to be permanently included in. Such a petition for a referendum must be supported by at least 20 000 signatures from residents from within that particular area. He went on to say that the members of the Ad-Hoc Committee decided to present this solution to their principals and the idea had received support from the ANC, the DP and Transkei.
- The Committee could not reach any agreement on the Eastern Cape.

3.1.2 The Northern Transvaal

Mr Fourie reported that no finalization and compromises were made in the area. However, the following options were suggested:

- * that Groblersdal be included in the Northern Transvaal Region;
- * that there should be flexibility regarding Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest if the watershed could be used as the boundary;
- * there was no consensus concerning Bushbuckridge. The suggestion that the area be included in the Northern Transvaal was supported by all present except Mr Zama from Inyandza National Movement;
- * that a compromise could be reached regarding Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest depending on how the issue of a Greater Pretoria was solved in relation to the Eastern Transvaal.

3.1.3 Pretoria

Ms Jacobus reported that there were strong arguments against Pretoria being included in the Northern Transvaal. The Intando Yesizwe Party, The Afrikaner Volksunie and the Democratic Party supported the inclusion of Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal Region. The ANC, the SACP and the South African Government supported the inclusion of Pretoria in the PWV. She went on to say that after much debate the Committee decided on finding a compromise position which was of Pretoria being a separate SPR with the following five options:

- * Greater Pretoria functional region: i.e Pretoria, Wonderboom, Soshanguve, Brits, Cullinan, Bronkhortspruit, KwaNdebele, Odi 1, Moretele 1, and Moretele 2;
- * Greater Pretoria plus some adjacent Highveld districts, i.e. Witbank, Middelburg, Delmas, which are functionally linked to Pretoria;
- * Greater Pretoria plus the adjacent Highveld, plus the Bushveld (this includes the four districts of Warmbad, Waterberg, Ellisras, Thabazimbi which requested inclusion with Pretoria), seventeen districts altogether;
- * Greater Pretoria plus the Bushveld, plus the Greater Highveld, i.e. Balfour, Highveld Ridge, Standerton and Bethal;
- * The Pretoria "(DC)" option; ("DC" option referring to the magisterial district). This option was not accepted as a practical solution.

3.1.4 Western Cape, Northern Cape, North West and the Orange Free State

- * Mr Phatang reported that the Committee had reached general agreement that the Orange Free State should remain as it had been demarcated by the Commission and Sasolburg should be included in this region.
- * Regarding the North Cape Region, five members representing the ANC, the SACP, Dikwankwetla, the DP and the Labour Party agreed that the Northern Cape Region as demarcated by the Commission should be disintegrated and that the Orange River should be used as a boundary. Therefore the magisterial districts of Gordonia, Hay, Herbert, Kimberley, Barkly West and Warrenton would be in the North West with the remainder of the districts being excised into the Western Cape. The South African Government could not agree on this compromise but indicated that its position could be revised if the Eastern Cape Region could also be considered in relation to the Western Cape/Eastern Cape border.

4. SUMMARY

After a lengthy discussion on the above reports the Co-ordinating Committee agreed that engaging in more debate would be time consuming because debating had been done in the different Ad-Hoc Committees. It was agreed that each member would consult with his/her principals, there would be bilateral discussions if necessary and a report comprising of a summary of the discussion of the meeting would be given to the Planning Committee which would then decide whether the Co-ordinating Committee was ready to report to the Negotiating Council.

The Summary is as follows:

4.1 **Eastern Cape/Kei Regions**

The Committee agreed that it appeared that there was a deadlock because two out of five participants wanted two regions in the area while three participants wanted the area joined to form one region.

4.2 **KwaZulu/Natal/East Griqualand Regions**

To reach a compromise three options were put forward by the Committee:

- 4.2.1 That the 1910 borders be reverted to.
- 4.2.2 That Umzimkhulu and Mount Curry should remain in Natal and Pondoland in Transkei.
- 4.2.3 That the magisterial districts in paragraph 4.2.2 should all be included in Natal.
- 4.2.4 That Mt Curry, Umzimkhulu and Pondoland can petition for a referendum within 18 months of the national elections to determine with which SPR they wished to be permanently included. Such petition for a referendum must be supported by at least 20 000 signatures from residents from within that area.

4.3 **Northern Transvaal and Eastern Transvaal**

- 4.3.1 The Committee proposed that Bushbuckridge should remain in the Northern Transvaal then Lydenburg and Pilgrim's Rest could remain in the Eastern Transvaal.
- 4.3.2 There was consensus that Groblersdal should be in the Northern Transvaal.
- 4.3.3 Should the Pretoria area include Wonderboom, Cullinan, Bronkhorstspuit and KwaNdebele then there would be flexibility regarding Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest being in Northern Transvaal.

4.4 **Pretoria**

The Committee wished to put on record that there appeared to be a deadlock regarding Pretoria. To solve the issue the following options were considered:

- 4.4.1 That Pretoria should be a separate SPR.
- 4.4.2 That Pretoria should be included in the PWV.
- 4.4.3 That Pretoria should be included in the Eastern Transvaal.

4.4.4 As a compromise the Committee would look at the following proposals made by the Ad-Hoc Committee on Pretoria:

- * A functional region of a greater Pretoria comprising of Pretoria, Wonderboom, Soshanguve, Brits, Cullinan, Bronkhortspruit, KwaNdebele, Odi 1, Moretele 1 and Moretele 2;
- * A greater Pretoria region joined by some Highveld districts, i.e. Witbank, Middelburg, Delmas which are already functionally linked to Pretoria.
- * A greater Pretoria region plus the adjacent Highveld and Bushveld areas including the four districts of Warmbad, Waterberg, Ellisras and Thabazimbi.
- * A greater Pretoria region plus the Bushveld and Greater Highveld areas i.e. Balfour, Highveld Ridge, Standerton and Bethal.

4.4.5 An alternative option was suggested by the Co-ordinating Committee which would be to put the border of Pretoria with the Witwatersrand at the Jukskei River and include Wonderboom, Soshanguve, Cullinan, Bronkhortspruit and KwaNdebele. The districts could then be excised into the Eastern Transvaal. Moretele 1, Odi 1, Odi 2 and Brits could be included in the Western Transvaal. This proposal was made bearing in mind the claim of Bophuthatswana on some areas in the Western Transvaal.

4.5 Western Cape, Northern Cape and Orange Free State

4.5.1 It was agreed that the Orange Free State Region would remain as demarcated by the Commission but Sasolburg would be included in the region.

4.5.2 Substantial agreement (5 out of 6 participants) (see paragraph 3.1.4 of these minutes) was reached regarding the proposal that the Orange River should be the boundary between the Western Cape and the North West Region with the magisterial districts of Gordonia, Hay and Herbert forming the southern border of the North West Region.

5. NEXT MEETING

No date was set, it would depend on the Planning Committee's decision.

6. CLOSURE

The meeting adjourned at 18h00.

ADDENDUM 15

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND ARE RESTRICTED TO THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS, THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL. THEY ARE STILL TO BE RATIFIED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF REGIONS HELD AT 16H50 ON TUESDAY, 2 NOVEMBER 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE IN KEMPTON PARK.

PRESENT	:	Mr A Fourie (Chairperson)	South African Government
		Mr T Botha	African National Congress
		Ms L Jacobus	South African Communist Party
		Mr J S S Phatang	Dikwankwetla Party
		Mr F du Preez	Administration
MINUTES	:	Ms N Sithebe-Tsotetsi	Administration

1. AGENDA

The Chairperson explained that the Planning Committee had decided that the Ad-Hoc Committees on the various problem areas should meet again to reach compromises. The purpose of the meeting was for members of the Co-ordinating Committee to report on the meetings that were held in the morning of the day of the meeting.

2. REPORTS

2.1 KwaZulu/Natal, Kei and Eastern Cape

Mr Botha reported that there was no change in the proposals the Ad-Hoc Committee made as contained in the minutes of 25 October, paragraph 3.1.

2.2 Northern Transvaal

Mr Fourie reported that the positions of the members of the Ad-Hoc Committee had not changed, however there was a possibility of a compromise being reached. The following conclusions were drawn from the meeting:

- * There was general consensus amongst the members that Groblersdal should be included in the Northern Transvaal Region.

- * The Kruger National Park was not discussed as it was felt that the issue would be dealt with by a separate committee.
- * It was felt that should agreement be reached on the question of Pretoria and KwaNdebele in relation to the Eastern Transvaal, this could affect the Committee's decision on Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest.
- * The Committee felt that a compromise could be reached on the question on Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest, viz a vis Bushbuckridge. There was flexibility regarding Lydenburg and Pilgrims Rest if the consideration could be given to dividing the magisterial district boundaries on the watershed boundary.
- * The issue of economic viability of the area would also be considered as recommended by the Commission.

Mr Fourie went on to say he would be providing a map to the Ad-Hoc Committee for their meeting on 3 November, which outlines the watershed boundary. He would also provide the Committee with GGP figures per district for the area.

2.3 Pretoria/Eastern Transvaal

Ms Jacobus reported that the members of the Committee had reverted to their initial positions regarding the areas. The ANC and the SACP would like Pretoria to remain in the PWV Region. The AVU and the South African Government would like Pretoria to be included in the Eastern Transvaal. Because no solution had been reached the Ad-Hoc Committee had drafted some recommendations for the Planning Committee (see Addendum). Ms Jacobus was asked what was meant by "soft boundaries" and she replied that the term in the context in which it was used meant boundaries that still had to be finalized.

2.4 Western Cape/Northern Cape/North West/Orange Free State

It was reported by Mr Phatang that no changes had occurred since the meeting of the Committee on 25 October.

- * The Committee had confirmed that Sasolburg would be included in the Orange Free State Region.
- * A suggestion had been made that all the Ad-Hoc Committees should meet as there were decisions that were linked, for instance decisions made on the Western Cape/Northern Cape and Eastern Cape areas

could be linked to reach a compromise.

5. NEXT MEETING

The meeting of all the Ad-Hoc Committees would be on **Thursday, 4 November, at 8h00**. The purpose of this meeting would be to reduce the number of problems areas before the Committee makes recommendations to the Planning Committee and the Negotiating Council.

The recommendations submitted by Ms Jacobus would also be discussed at the meeting.

6. CLOSURE

The meeting adjourned at 17h30.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF SPR'S: PRETORIA.

The Ad Hoc Committee therefore recommends to the Negotiating Council that:

- 1.0 We accept that there has been a vast amount of work and time spent on debating and negotiating the recommendations of the Commission on the Delimitation/Demarcation of SPR's. We further **note** that there are sensitive areas, such as Pretoria, which need further discussion and consultation and that the recommended boundaries are **viewed** as "Soft Boundaries".

It is therefore **recommended** that the Negotiating Council **notes** the recommendations of the Planning Committee which should be contained in a Schedule of the Constitution for the Transition, subject to paragraph 3.3 below.

- 1.1 We also **recommend** that KwaNdebele be included in the Eastern Transvaal.
- 2.0 The Negotiating Council establish a Task Group (which the successor to the Negotiating will continue to manage and to which it will report) which will be charged with the responsibility of :
- 2.1 Making recommendations on what mechanisms are available to solicit further views from people in the affected areas, eg. forums, public meetings, referendum etc.
- 2.2 Which mechanism/s is/are most appropriate for a particular sensitive area.
- 2.3 facilitating the continuing further negotiations on the disputed sensitive areas.
- 3.0 Provision is made in the appropriate Schedule of the Constitution for the Transition for the content of the Schedule (ie. the recommendations of the Commission on the Delimitation/Demarcation of Regions as per 1.0 above) to be amended as necessary by proclamation not later than 28 February 1994.
- 4.0 The Committee **noted** that subdivisions within the Task Group be constituted by people with a direct interest in the sensitive disputed areas.

DRAFT DISCUSSION DOCUMENT**REPORT TO THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL BY THE AD-HOC COMMITTEES ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF SPRs****ADDENDA - MINUTES OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEES****AD-HOC COMMITTEE: KWAZULU-NATAL/EASTERN CAPE-KEI**

- Addendum 1: 22 October 1993
- Addendum 2: 25 October 1993
- Addendum 3: 2 November 1993
- Addendum 4: 3 November 1993

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: NORTHERN TRANSVAAL

- Addendum 5: 22 October 1993
- Addendum 6: 2 November 1993
- Addendum 7: 3 November 1993

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: PRETORIA

- Addendum 8: 22 October 1993
- Addendum 9: 25 October 1993
- Addendum 10: 2 November 1993

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: WESTERN CAPE/NORTHERN CAPE/NORTH WEST/OFS

- Addendum 11: 22 October 1993
- Addendum 12: 25 October 1993
- Addendum 13: 2 November 1993

CO - ORDINATING COMMITTEE

- Addendum 14: 25 October 1993
- Addendum 15: 2 November 1993

1. KWAZULU-NATAL/EASTERN CAPE KEI**1.1 Recommendation:**

"After lengthy discussion and due to the fact that the Ad-Hoc Committee could not reach consensus on a suitable final southern boundary from Natal/KwaZulu the following compromise was decided on:

- 1.1 That the current Provincial/State boundary between Natal/KwaZulu and Transkei should be retained as an interim measure. That would imply that the district of Umzimkulu would remain with the remainder of Transkei whilst the magisterial districts of Alfred and Mount Curry would remain with Natal/KwaZulu.

1.2 Any one of the following areas, namely:

- 1.2.1 North Transkei/Pondoland (comprising the magisterial districts of Lusikisiki, Bizana, Tabankulu, Flagstaff, Mt Ayliff, Mt Frere, Mt Fletcher and Maluti);
- 1.2.2 District of Umzimkulu, and
- 1.2.3 East Griqualand

could petition a referendum within 18 months of the national election to determine with which SPR they wished to be permanently included. Such petition for a referendum must be supported by at least 20 000 signatures from residents from within that particular area.

- 1.3 The result of the referendum should not be subject to any special entrenched constitutional provisions for future alterations to SPR boundaries, but a decision would be taken on a simple majority for each area.

On the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the SPR of Natal/KwaZulu, the Ad-Hoc Committee concurred with the recommendations of the Commission. (*see addendum 4*).

1.2

Unresolved matters:

- "2.1 On the issue of whether the Eastern Cape and Border/Kei should constitute a single or two separate SPRs the Ad-Hoc Committee was deadlocked.
 - 2.1.1 The Democratic Party, National Party and the Pan Africanist Congress support two separate regions, whilst the African National Congress, Transkei Government and the Cape Traditional Leaders support a single region. No agreement was reached on this matter.
 - 2.1.2 The Committee agreed to a request of the Democratic Party to include as addenda motivations in support of either a single or two separate SPR's in a preferable initial dispensation, given that the issue might have to be reconsidered in the future.
 - 2.1.3 The Committee agreed that further consultation with the people from the region is necessary and that the will of the people should be tested in this regard. The Committee therefore requests the Planning Committee to make recommendations on a way forward" (*see addendum 4*).

2. NORTHERN TRANSVAAL

2.1 **Recommendation:**

Groblersdal should be included in the Northern Transvaal (*see addendum 7, paragraph 2.1*):.

There was general consensus that with the exception of 2.1 (Groblersdal), the remaining original boundaries as drawn by the Commission remain unchanged, but that these be regarded as "soft boundaries" in order to give consideration to the economic viability of the region."

2.2 **Unresolved matters:**

"There was reluctance to enter into debate on the Kruger National Park as it was felt that a decision on this area would be better dealt with by a seperate committee" (*see addendum 6, paragraph 2.2*)

3. PRETORIA

3.1 **Recommendation:**

"The Ad Hoc Committee therefore recommends to the Negotiating Council that: (*see addendum 10*)

1. We accept that there has been a vast amount of work and time spent on debating the recommendations of the Commission on the Delimitation/Demarcation of SPRs. We further note that there are sensitive areas, such as Pretoria, which need further discussion and consultation and that the recommended boundaries as viewed as "Soft Boundaries".
 - 1.1 We also recommend that KwaNdebele be included in the Eastern Transvaal.
 2. The Negotiating Council establish a Task Group (which the successor to the Negotiating Council will continue to manage and to which it will report) which will be charged with the responsibility of:
 - 2.1 Making recommendations on what mechanisms are available to solict further views from people in the affected areas, eg. forums, public meetings, referenum etc.
 - 2.2 Which mechanism/s is/are most appropriate for a particular sensitive area.
 - 2.3 Facilitating the continuing further negotiations on the disputed sensitive areas.

3. Provision is made in the appropriate Schedule of the Constitution for the Transition for the content of the Schedule (ie. the recommendations of the Commission on the Delimitation/Demarcation of Regions as per 1 above) to be amended as necessary by proclamation not later than 28 February 1994.
4. The Committee noted that subdivisions within the Task Group be constituted by people with a direct interest in the sensitive disputed areas."

3.2 Unresolved matters:

"Ms Jacobus reported that the members of the Committee had reverted to their initial positions regarding the areas. The ANC and the SACP would like Pretoria to remain in the PWV region. The AVU and the South African Government would like Pretoria to be included in the Eastern Transvaal" (see addendum 15 paragraph 3.2.1).

4. WESTERN CAPE/ NORTHERN CAPE/ NORTH WEST/ OFS

4.1 Recommendation:

The Orange Free State Region, as proposed by the by the Commission on the demarcation/ delimitation of SPRs should remain the same, with the inclusion of Sasolburg (see addendum 13, paragraph 3.2.1).

4.2 Unresolved matters:

Paragraph 3.2.1 of the minutes (see addendum).:

"It was agreed that the Northern Cape region should be disintegrated with the Orange River as the border between the North West Region and the Western Cape Region. The areas Gordonia, Hay and Herbert would then be the southern border of the North West Region. The decision was based on the fact that some members believed that the Northern Cape Region would not be economically viable on its own."

"The position of the South African Government had not changed and that 'no sigle objective reason had been given to make a change (the disintegration of the Northern Cape Region) which they considered to be drastic" (see addendum 13, paragraph 3.2.2).

DRAFT DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

REPORT TO THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL BY THE AD-HOC COMMITTEES ON THE DEMARCATION/DELIMITATION OF SPRs**ADDENDA - MINUTES OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEES****AD-HOC COMMITTEE: KWAZULU-NATAL/EASTERN CAPE-KEI**

- Addendum 1: 22 October 1993
Addendum 2: 25 October 1993
Addendum 3: 2 November 1993
Addendum 4: 3 November 1993

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: NORTHERN TRANSVAAL

- Addendum 5: 22 October 1993
Addendum 6: 2 November 1993
Addendum 7: 3 November 1993

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: PRETORIA

- Addendum 8: 22 October 1993
Addendum 9: 25 October 1993
Addendum 10: 2 November 1993

AD-HOC COMMITTEE: WESTERN CAPE/NORTHERN CAPE/NORTH WEST/OFS

- Addendum 11: 22 October 1993
Addendum 12: 25 October 1993
Addendum 13: 2 November 1993

CO - ORDINATING COMMITTEE

- Addendum 14: 25 October 1993
Addendum 15: 2 November 1993

1. KWAZULU-NATAL/EASTERN CAPE KEI**1.1 Recommendation:**

"After lengthy discussion and due to the fact that the Ad-Hoc Committee could not reach consensus on a suitable final southern boundary from Natal/KwaZulu the following compromise was decided on:

- 1.1 That the current Provincial/State boundary between Natal/KwaZulu and Transkei should be retained as an interim measure. That would imply that the district of Umzimkulu would remain with the remainder of Transkei whilst the magisterial districts of Alfred and Mount Curry would remain with Natal/KwaZulu.

1.2 Any one of the following areas, namely:

- 1.2.1 North Transkei/Pondoland (comprising the magisterial districts of Lusikisiki, Bizana, Tabankulu, Flagstaff, Mt Ayliff, Mt Frere, Mt Fletcher and Maluti);
- 1.2.2 District of Umzimkulu, and
- 1.2.3 East Griqualand

could petition a referendum within 18 months of the national election to determine with which SPR they wished to be permanently included. Such petition for a referendum must be supported by at least 20 000 signatures from residents from within that particular area.

- 1.3 The result of the referendum should not be subject to any special entrenched constitutional provisions for future alterations to SPR boundaries, but a decision would be taken on a simple majority for each area.

On the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the SPR of Natal/KwaZulu, the Ad-Hoc Committee concurred with the recommendations of the Commission. (*see addendum 4*).

1.2

Unresolved matters:

- "2.1 On the issue of whether the Eastern Cape and Border/Kei should constitute a single or two separate SPRs the Ad-Hoc Committee was deadlocked.
- 2.1.1 The Democratic Party, National Party and the Pan Africanist Congress support two separate regions, whilst the African National Congress, Transkei Government and the Cape Traditional Leaders support a single region. No agreement was reached on this matter.
- 2.1.2 The Committee agreed to a request of the Democratic Party to include as addenda motivations in support of either a single or two separate SPR's in a preferable initial dispensation, given that the issue might have to be reconsidered in the future.
- 2.1.3 The Committee agreed that further consultation with the people from the region is necessary and that the will of the people should be tested in this regard. The Committee therefore requests the Planning Committee to make recommendations on a way forward" (*see addendum 4*).

2. NORTHERN TRANSVAAL

2.1 **Recommendation:**

Groblersdal should be included in the Northern Transvaal (*see addendum 7, paragraph 2.1*):.

There was general consensus that with the exception of 2.1 (Groblersdal), the remaining original boundaries as drawn by the Commission remain unchanged, but that these be regarded as "soft boundaries" in order to give consideration to the economic viability of the region."

2.2 **Unresolved matters:**

"There was reluctance to enter into debate on the Kruger National Park as it was felt that a decision on this area would be better dealt with by a separate committee" (*see addendum 6, paragraph 2.2*)

3. PRETORIA

3.1 **Recommendation:**

"The Ad Hoc Committee therefore recommends to the Negotiating Council that: (*see addendum 10*)

1. We accept that there has been a vast amount of work and time spent on debating the recommendations of the Commission on the Delimitation/Demarcation of SPRs. We further note that there are sensitive areas, such as Pretoria, which need further discussion and consultation and that the recommended boundaries as viewed as "Soft Boundaries".
 - 1.1 We also recommend that KwaNdebele be included in the Eastern Transvaal.
2. The Negotiating Council establish a Task Group (which the successor to the Negotiating Council will continue to manage and to which it will report) which will be charged with the responsibility of:
 - 2.1 Making recommendations on what mechanisms are available to solicit further views from people in the affected areas, eg. forums, public meetings, referendum etc.
 - 2.2 Which mechanism/s is/are most appropriate for a particular sensitive area.
 - 2.3 Facilitating the continuing further negotiations on the disputed sensitive areas.

3. Provision is made in the appropriate Schedule of the Constitution for the Transition for the content of the Schedule (ie. the recommendations of the Commission on the Delimitation/Demarcation of Regions as per 1 above) to be amended as necessary by proclamation not later than 28 February 1994.
4. The Committee noted that subdivisions within the Task Group be constituted by people with a direct interest in the sensitive disputed areas."

3.2

Unresolved matters:

"Ms Jacobus reported that the members of the Committee had reverted to their initial positions regarding the areas. The ANC and the SACP would like Pretoria to remain in the PWV region. The AVU and the South African Government would like Pretoria to be included in the Eastern Transvaal" *(see addendum 15 paragraph 3.2.1).*

4.

WESTERN CAPE/ NORTHERN CAPE/ NORTH WEST/ OFS

4.1

Recommendation:

The Orange Free State Region, as proposed by the by the Commission on the demarcation/ delimitation of SPRs should remain the same, with the inclusion of Sasolburg *(see addendum 13, paragraph 3.2.1).*

4.2

Unresolved matters:

Paragraph 3.2.1 of the minutes (see addendum).:

"It was agreed that the Northern Cape region should be disintegrated with the Orange River as the border between the North West Region and the Western Cape Region. The areas Gordonia, Hay and Herbert would then be the southern border of the North West Region. The decision was based on the fact that some members believed that the Northern Cape Region would not be economically viable on its own."

"The position of the South African Government had not changed and that 'no sigle objective reason had been given to make a change (the disintegration of the Northern Cape Region) which they considered to be drastic" *(see addendum 13, paragraph 3.2.2).*
