

) HSEeEMELy N

FRIDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 1994 (37 20\) 4148

when there is excessive competitiveness, but when there is healthy competition between agencies. There should be a manner in which the quality of services delivered by each of these agencies can be evaluated. I believe that healthy competition between services, like the competition between political parties, and between individuals within political parties which is constructive rather than destructive, is not a bad thing for excellent intelligence services either.

The MINISTER OF WATER AFFAIRS AND FORESTRY (on behalf of the Minister of Justice): Mr Speaker, my brother Comrade Mti elaborated on the contents of the Bill after my introduction, and I think that his intervention was important in terms of bringing to the House the details of the second measure we are introducing. There are simply a couple of points that I would like to refer to arising out of the very positive reaction from members of the House.

First of all, in relation to my friend Kobus Jordaan's intervention, let us be quite clear that the intelligence sections or departments they like to call themselves the intelligence community are not the rescuers of the Government's policy. They are not the knights in shining armour bent on doing clean or dirty work for the Government or any part of the Government, and they are not going to be the conscience of the community. These are political issues to be dealt with in the way in which political issues must be dealt with here in this House, in this Cabinet, and there is no role for the intelligence sections in the sense of meddling in what are political matters and political issues, and we have stressed that formulation and implementation of policy is the function of the Government and of Parliament, and therefore the intelligence departments cannot spy on, influence or cajole sections of our community simply because they are opposed to Government policy. Nor should they have a role in identifying who is opposed to Government policy. Their function is to defend the Constitution.

The agreement we have arrived at, and the right of peaceful change of the Constitution itself, is inherent in the nature of a democratic society. The right to change the Constitution itself is inherent in that. So the domestic intelligence service shall and the Government will see to it that it does not confine its functions to the monitoring of conflict or the potential for conflict. So the sole purpose of intelligence is to act as the

security adviser to the Government, and not, as in the past, as the political adviser to the Government. :

Therefore I will now turn to what Mr Kobus Jordaan said in relation to Mr Cassim's point. I am sorry that Mr Cassim is not here because there was a misunderstanding about the role of the Co-ordinator for Intelligence. However, again it is necessary to emphasise that the Co-ordinator for Intelligence, to use Mr Cassim's phrase, is not the gatekeeper anywhere.

There are many checks and balances in the Bill, and in practice, which will prohibit such a person becoming even a gatekeeper, left alone the introducer of policy. It must be emphasised that he or she has and we hope that the appointments will be absolutely gender-free no powers of command. He or she will only be given the responsibility to co-ordinate the activities of the intelligence community, and the following are the checks and balances. The directors-general of services have direct access to the President, which is a very important control mechanism. Secondly, the police and military intelligence structures still fall under the command of the respective heads of the department. Thirdly, the Co-ordinator for Intelligence should report the fruits of the community's efforts to the Cabinet via the Cabinet Committee for Security and Intelligence.

Therefore, we do not wish to replicate the errors of other countries in terms of creating a supremo. It is vital that there should be co-ordination, and reports on such co-ordination should be forwarded to the President and the Cabinet.

I thank the House for its forbearance and once again congratulate members of the House on the way in which they have addressed very sensitive and important issues. As Mr Mti has pointed out, we hope that this Bill becomes law before Parliament adjourns.

Debate concluded.
Decision of Question postponed.
COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS OF

PARLIAMENT ON AND INSPECTORS-
GENERAL OF INTELLIGENCE BILL

(Second Reading debate)

The MINISTER OF WATER AFFAIRS AND
FORESTRY (on behalf of the Minister of Justice): Mr Speaker, this third and final measure,

4149 i

FRIDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 1994

4150

making up the intelligence trilogy, introduces a system whereby Parliament asserts its right to monitor and oversee the intelligence services.

The basic issue here is who guards the guardians. It is not enough to say that the President's role of supervision will provide the answer. It is not enough to say that the Cabinet or its Subcommittee for Security and Intelligence will provide a high degree of supervision. Therefore, for the first time in our history we provide a pivotal aspect of the whole intelligence debate, a debate that is crucially relevant to all democracies. Accountability to Parliament is central to democracy. This is what we see in action in the measure before us.

I think that it is worthwhile looking at why parliamentary accountability is necessary. Hon members may recall that there was an all-pervasive secrecy shrouding the Central Intelligence Agency in the United States, particularly at the end of the Vietnam War. However, this whole unfortunate situation was brought to an end, at least for a period, when the American Congress created intelligence-oversight committees in 1977. Other democratic countries, partly following scandals in which the Executive was not able to control the intelligence service sufficiently, went the route of parliamentary scrutiny committees.

This is what we are doing, in broad principle, in a mould-breaking way in our country. We should ensure that our parliamentary supervision is effective and lasting. Supervision should not be something that flourishes in the first bloom of democracy or in the enthusiasm of the moment, and then becomes shopsoiled through the operation of sweetheart deals concluded in cosy little committees behind closed doors and, may I say, among consenting adults. Parliamentary supervision should not be the flavour of the month or the flavour of the period as we participate in the bloom of the democratic order.

What this Bill intends to do, is to entrench parliamentary supervision as part of the permanent supervisory mechanism over the intelligence services. In the past, we had total opaqueness and total secrecy. There should now be transparency and as much openness as is possible in circumstances with regard to intelligence matters. It is obviously not possible to conduct intelligence in the total glare of publicity. That would be a contradiction in terms.

This is how we shall proceed with regard to this Bill. The committee, consisting of members of Parliament, appointed by the President after consultation, will be chosen on the basis of proportional representation and will be a watchdog over intelligence functions. We have looked closely at experiences in other parts of the world and arrived at an answer which provides for a compact committee, but not one that is so small that it forms over-close relations with intelligence structures.

Therefore this committee will be large enough, not only to be fairly representative of the political traditions represented in this House but also large enough to scrutinise and report indepen-

dently and honestly, never becoming an apologist for the services it has to scrutinise. Among other things, it will draw attention to a very important dimension, namely that of overstepping the budget. -

It will ensure that fundamental rights enshrined in the Constitution are not contravened. It will initiate or review legislation relating to intelligence, and [want to draw attention to the fact that it will initiate legislation on intelligence. It will also, uniquely in our situation, receive complaints from the public and refer them to the appropriate structures such as the Ombudsman, the Public Protector or the Human Rights Commission. It will report to the President, the Ministers and Parliament on its activities and those of the intelligence services.

It is, therefore, necessary to understand that this committee has to be different, in its structure and its approach, to other scrutiny committees. Unlike other scrutiny committees, it has a statutory basis. It is a creature of Statute. It is therefore a different kind of structure because it has to meet our new needs.

The establishment of this committee does not violate any constitutional principle such as the separation of powers. If the Rules of Parliament have to be changed, so be it. What we are trying to do is to fashion or mould a committee that will be special and specialised because the area covered is special and specialised. The important point to remember is that the process of appointment of this committee has to be different from the appointment of other scrutiny and function committees in our Parliament.

A new concept is the introduction of inspectors-general for the various intelligence structures.

Vs
? T

e im
B SR8 LA

e
i e

pr

SE RS s,

4151 FRIDAY, 11 NOVEMBER

) 4152

The inspectors-general will have very wide access to documents, information or premises under the control of the various intelligence services, including intelligence sources and the methods used to obtain information. These powers go beyond those of the committee of members of Parliament. Hon members will see, from the Bill's provisions, the basis of appointment.

There is a point about the inspectors-general that we ought to be aware of. They will protect the integrity of the personnel of the intelligence services, because for the first time in our history the personnel will be able to appeal in terms of the constitutional, and especially the human rights, provisions in our bill of rights as protection for their services.

Finally, it is essential that we restore public respect for our intelligence services. In a democracy, respect for the institutions of government is vital. We present this legislation in the spirit of the Constitution, in the spirit of openness, accountability and, indeed, reconciliation. It is gratifying to note that those services which, not too long ago, were on different sides in what was a guerrilla war, have now worked, in the closest possible co-operation, on this trilogy of Bills, and are now poised to serve their country and the Government of National Unity in a new and unique comradeship.

Such are the wonders of a country that startled the world by making a transition few thought possible. It is now the job of all of us in this Parliament to ensure, through the adoption of this measure, that our country remains safe for all its citizens. [Applause.]

Mr L T LANDERS: Mr Speaker, first of all we congratulate the hon the Minister on his speech. I also take this opportunity to congratulate hon Comrade Joe Nhlanhla for the manner in which he conducted the proceedings in the ad hoc committee. On a personal note I thank Mr Kobus Jordaan for his kind words and especially for persuading his party to accept the Bills in their present form.

Oversight of intelligence services is not a new

concept, as was pointed out by Comrade Kader Asmal. Examples of public accountability by intelligence services through political control can be found in the USA, Canada and Australia. Indeed, many aspects of the Canadian example are contained in our own oversight Bill. Therefore, a hawk-eyed oversight committee is an

-essential cog in the machine that provides the series of controls and checks and balances of the intelligence service.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land and it binds all legislative, executive and judicial organs of State at all levels of government. This provision in our Constitution is the basis for the democratic transformation of our society, including South Africa's intelligence services. The trilogy of Bills before this House seeks to amalgamate, integrate, restructure and transform South Africa's intelligence services such that they meet the demands and challenges of democratic accountability and allegiance to the dictates of the supreme law of the land, and in particular Chapter 3 of the Constitution, which provides for fundamental rights something

which our intelligence services had no regard for in the past.

The three Bills before this House are the culmination of a process that began at Codesa, through to the Negotiating Council at Kempton Park, where the ANC insisted that the Transitional Executive Council provide civilian control and oversight of all intelligence services in the run-up to the elections. Some of us who are here today had the privilege of serving on the TEC's Subcouncil on Intelligence. I refer in particular to Comrade Alfred Nzo, our hon Minister of Foreign Affairs, Comrade Lindiwe Sisulu, the hon Mr Fanus Schoeman of the NP, as well as myself. ; 0

Aside from ensuring that the intelligence service did not in any way destabilise the elections, one of the tasks given to the Subcouncil on Intelligence was to help draft legislation that brought together all the disparate intelligence services, namely the National Intelligence Service, the ANC's Department of Intelligence and Security, the PAC's own intelligence structure, the intelligence services of the TBVC states, and now we have heard that the IFP will be joining both bodies. That is something which we welcome.

One of the basic functions of any intelligence service and, indeed, this is provided for in the National Strategic Intelligence Bill is to gather, correlate, evaluate and analyse intelligence so that any threat or potential threat to the people of South Africa can be identified. If this basic function is not carried out effectively, our Government of National Unity will not be provided with an appropriate and effective end-product. It is imperative, therefore, that the

4153

) FRIDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 1994

4154

quality of the product provided to our President

by the intelligence services :
standard. It is of the highest

Intelligence services currently receive some R65.0 million from our Minister of Finance. In addition to this, and in terms of the Security Services Special Account Act, the services also have access to interest derived from the investment of money standing to the credit of the Security Services Special Account. It is important to note, therefore, that the quality of the product provided by our intelligence services should justify the use of such huge sums of taxpayers' money. We look to the Co-ordinator for Intelligence and the Inspectors-General of Intelligence provided for in the Bill to ensure that we receive such a quality product and value for money. We also look to the Cabinet Committee for Safety and Security to do the same. Above all else, we look to the oversight committee, that will be established in terms of the Bill before us, to ensure the same.

For too long now South Africa's intelligence and security forces have been blatantly and consciously used by the NP, brutally and cynically to suppress most, if not all, forms of opposition to the NP and its policy of apartheid. We want to say emphatically that the total-onslaught mentality must never again prevail. Never again should the intelligence services be used in conjunction with the security forces and the government to suppress democratic opposition, in the process spawning another Civil Co-operation Bureau. This bureau operated as a law unto itself and, in the words of a learned judge operated in a world in which anything, including murder, was possible and permissible.

Never again should the security forces, underpinned by our intelligence services, spawn the likes of Eddie Webb, Ferdi Barnard, Eugene de Kock, Chappies Kloppe, Brood van Heerden or Brian Mitchell. Never again should a message emanate from a State Security Council calling for the permanent removal from society of a Matthew Goniwe, Fort Calata, Sparrow Mkonte or Sicelo Mhlawuli. Never again should residents of our townships or our commuters be subjected to campaigns of third force terror or brain violence by agents provocateurs.

We welcome and look forward to the intelligence glasnost, and the positive intelligence revolution that this trilogy of Bills will provide

The future is now in our hands. [Applause.] ;

Mr J A JORDAAN: M Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the eloquent way in which the hon the Minister introduced these Bills. However, there is a proverb in English. The saying says the road to hell is paved with good intentions. I have listened to him espousing the atrocities of the NP government, vis-à-vis the intelligence community. We have just heard this from the hon member Mr Landers so well. I can agree with quite a lot that has been said. I can actually speak from personal experience.

However, at the same time, we have to look at the type of people we are integrating. We heard only one side of the story this morning. Let us also look at the Douglas Commission report. What does it say on page 50? .

Today a few in the ANC believe that Thami Zulu really was a spy, but blame his death on

the excessive zeal of the ANC in security matters. Very

It shocked many that in 1989, five years after the Angolan mutiny, the security department could act with such impunity as to hound to death a very senior official without having to give an account of its actions.

*It continues on page 52:

This demonstrates to me that the ANC/SACP permitted, indeed, encouraged, its security arm to operate above the law without any requirement of accountability whatsoever.

Lower down on the same page one reads the following: i -

A totalitarian regime such as this knows no rules of law.

I am a Natalian, and I can therefore elaborate on the IFP. They are all going to be components of the intelligence community. In this light, and if we consider where we came from, it is critical that parliamentary supervision must exist in the true sense of the word. We must strike a balance between supervision and transparency on the one hand and secrecy on the other.

Where this is in any way possible, however the emphasis will have to be placed on supervision and transparency, while secrecy should be limited to the absolute minimum necessary.

The original purpose of this Bill was to establish a parliamentary committee on intelligence. According to the White Paper its purpose was to

FRIDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 1994

have been *â\200\230to create a joint standing committee for Parliamentâ\200\235. The legislation which finally came before us, however, made provision for a committee consisting of members of Parliament which are appointed by the State President, in consultation with the leaders of the political partics which are represented in the Govern-ment of National Unity. :

What that in fact means is that the Government of National Unity would be policed by its own people, if one wants to use this term. We have proposed amendments. There is now the exten-sion that minority partics may also scrve on the committee.

We have decided to support this Bill at this stage as an interim measure. We believe that section 58 of the Constitution must be used to amend the Rules of Parliament in such a way that we can truly have a parliamentary committee and parliamentary supervision. We cannot afford to have an intermingling of the legislative authority and the exccutive authorityâ\200\224as we find to a great extent in this legislationâ\200\224in any form whatsoever.

In view of the present situation in South Africa, in view of the history of the three parties which are involved in the Government of National Unity and which make use of intelligence to promote their expediency, their short-term objectives and so on, we believe that strong consideration should be given to the possibility of the Chairman of the Committee being chosen from a party which is not part of the Govern-ment of National Unity. We want the Minister

to consider this and convey it to the hon State President.

I repeat again that we support this Bill as an interim measure. On the other hand we must also make a final comment on the inspectors-general. As the original Bill read, the inspectors-general were to be appointed by the State President. We have succeeded in ensuring that the appointment of the inspcctors-general should bÃ© done in the same way as that of the Public Protector whose appointment takes place in terms of section 110 of the Constitution. This committee can play a critical role in that.

The fact that 75% of the members of Parlia-mentâ\200\224the National Assembly, the Senate and the Constitutional Assemblyâ\200\224must approve the appointment of those inspectors-general at a

joint sitting, is truly a step forward. I think this is an outstanding improvement on the origind Bill. -

I say again, we support this legislation with hesitation. We believe that it should be a interim measure only. We also believe that the Rules of Parliament must be changed in future to make provision for the uniqueness of intelligence.

Mr M A MNCWANGO: Mr Speaker, hon members, the IFP welcomes the Committee of members of Parliament and Inspectors-general of on Intelligence Bill. This is indeed an extremely important development in the restructuring of the intelligence organisation.

One cannot dispute the central role which intelligence organisations play in the stability of our country. However, it is still very fresh in our minds how the apartheid regime misused the intelligence structures to propagate and maintain their apartheid doctrine. Some of us have been victims of the abuse of the intelligence organisations.

One remembers the role of the securocrats with whom Mr P W Botha, who surrounded himself. Many South Africans expected him to announce far-reaching changes in his Rubicon speech. Instead, he decided to dither and mill around at the political crossroads while the country was burning. It is said that it was the intelligence community which influenced him to change his mind.

It is important that intelligence organisations should be transparent and accountable to this Parliament, whose members were elected by the people. I am therefore very pleased that this Bill provides for that. It should be avoided at all costs that the intelligence service becomes a supercabinet, as was the case during the era of Mr P W Botha. The democracy which we are in the process of establishing in this country, is anchored in the tenets of human rights. It would therefore be a sad story if the intelligence services are allowed to interfere with the human rights of the people of this country.

The role of intelligence is to ensure the security of the State and that of the people of this country. Any undue interference in the political process by the intelligence organisation is bound to take the country a step back and frustrate any endeavours in regard to nation-building and reconciliation.

4157 Fl\1}AY, 11 NOVEMBER 1994

4158

We all know how the intelligence organisations of this country have discredited themselves

among the citizens, because of their past activities. It is, therefore, an important development that this Bill seeks to establish a parliamentary committee that will control the activities of the organisation and ensure that Parliament is kept informed at all times. This will make the intelligence organisation accountable to the people and thereby enhance the confidence of the people.

Finally, I wish to repeat that the intelligence organisation should not be allowed to interfere with the political process this country is going through. Furthermore, the ruling party should resist any temptation to use this national asset to bolster its party-political image by running errands against its opponents. Intelligence organisations should always uphold the sanctity of the Constitution.

The MINISTER OF WATER AFFAIRS AND FORESTRY (on behalf of the Minister of Justice): Mr Speaker, I thank the members of the House for their interventions on this Bill. I shall begin by referring to Luwellyn Landers's very important intervention concerning the experience of other countries. We are shaping this to meet our needs.

I shall therefore respond to all members's speeches except for Kobus Jordaan's conclusion. I shall not respond to his personal and very grudging response to this Bill. I shall not respond to the spirit in which it appears the DP is the repository of virtue, the ultimate test of what is good in our country. I shall not respond, therefore, in the spirit that implies that everybody else's hands are soiled, but not the hands of the DP. â

I shall respond to the DP's own role over the past 20 years in relation, for example, to the attacks on Lesotho, Mozambique and Angola, where under the philosophy of the time there was no demurral from the DP to the hot-pursuit activities resulting such grievous loss of lives. I shall not, in the same way, respond to the DP's support for the forced militarisation of thousands of White youths in the national service system, in respect of which the DP did not object to the cream of the White youth becoming the army of occupation in the townships. I will not raise that. [Applause.] I do not think it is consistent with the approach we have adopted in this debate.

What we should remember is that there has been an attempt to acknowledge what went wrong, not through the unsubstantiated, uncorroborated, unilateral animated versions of the Bennett Committee. However, with regard to the Motsu-nyane Commission, many of us played a role in identifying the pathology, the pathology that can

occur as a result of actual resistance to an immoral system. It is the pathology of gllardlgnsguarding the integrity of the leadership against hit squads committed to destroying the leadership as reflected on this side of the House, who lived in penury, in hardship, in Lpsaka, in Zambia, in Angola and in Mozambique, \yllo were murdered in Paris and clsewhere in Africa. These were the guardians who looked after their integrity.

It is we who, carried out an investigation of our pathology. I would ask the DP to look at their record in relation to the issues that I referred to earlier.

It was we who, in the Transitional Exccoglivc Council in September, 1992, collectively accepted responsibility for our acts. Therefore we have nothing to be ashamed of. All I can say is that the opening of the books should take place comprehensively and not on a selective basis.

I think that this is part of the process of grappling with our past. We have to grapple with it, not in a self-righteous sort of way, but genuincly come to grips with the pathology that sl_ruck us in resistance and in operation, in upholding and in resistance. There were pathologies that .took place. I acknowledge that on behalt of the majority party. However, there must be no equation with the permanent state of virtue reflected in the hon member Kobus Jordaanâ\200\231s intervention.

I conclude by saying that to get out of the

~situation reflected in the investigation by the

partics that took part in our contlict, there must be an adequate control system. This system must also reflect the need tor adequate representation. Once again, however, I question th!s approach which states that the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

There are many people who have taken part in this debate who subscribe to the very principles I articulated in introducing each of the three Bills. These people are not craven and cpwurdly, conceding to every power structurc. There are

S SO AT -

4159

FRIDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 1994

4160

people of integrity and courage in all parts of the House.

What we must have, is a structure that will allow people of integrity to take part in this extraordinary and now historic process. That does not mean that it is only people of courage who can be the chairpersons of these committees, or only those who come from outside the Government of National Unity, because it implies that no participant in the Government of National Unity has even a modicum of integrity, courage and independence.

I reflected on this matter and commend to the hon member Kobus Jordaan the role of the chairpersons of the select committees we have. They are a pain to the Ministers, because they raise the most impertinent issuesâ\200\224occasionally embarrassing issues that may go, in fact, against the policy of the Government of National Unity and its components. But there is no lack of courage among the chairpersons of the select committees already in existence. Therefore this myth that independence only comes from people who are not in the Government of National Unity must be removed. [Applause.]

The most important issue is what powers we give to this committee. Its success or failure will depend on what powers we give it. We are giving more powers to this committee, as the hon member Luwellyn Landers has shown, than similar committees have in other parts of the world. That is why we opt not to subscribe to yet another myth which suggests that simply because we elect the Inspector-General through Parliament on a 75 % majority, we will necessarily get a better person to be the Inspector-General. My own experience has been that if one puts the qualifying factor too high, what one gets is the person who represents the lowest common denominator.

The idea therefore is that there is pressure upon the Presidentâ\200\224such is his cravenness, such is his apology to his own forces and to his own partyâ\200\224to appoint someone entirely acceptable to the majority party. This is also a myth. A large arithmetical requirement often results in scavenging on the floor to get someone acceptable to all parties. We on our side do not want the Inspector-General to reflect the lowest common denominator. We want an inspector-general who recognises how intelligence structures operate, who recognises the capacity of the intelligence forces to commit harm and danger,

not only to the community, but also to their own members. We want someone who will be fearless, courageous and strong.

However, I must tell Mr Kobus Jordaan that because one needs a 75 % majority in Parliament to appoint him or her, one will not necessarily meet these requirements, although we

accept the amendment that was introduced. On

this basis, therefore, we have to be clear about the nature of the debate. The Government of National Unity has commended this Bill to the House, and we accept the intervention in that particular spirit, but we are venturing effectively into the unknown. We must recognise that it is the style of the committee that will establish its role. It is the approach of the committee that will meet the expectations of this House and of those who have been involved in this exercise for the past six months.

Debate concluded.

Decision of Question postponed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will now suspend business for five minutes during which time the bells will be rung. We require a quorum of 200 members to vote on the three Bills, unless

Bills.

Business suspended at 11:55 and resumed at 12:04.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We now come to the decisions on the three Intelligence Bills. In order to assist hon members I will ask the Secretary to read the Order of the Day on which we have to decide.

INTELLIGENCE SERVICES BILL
(Decision of Question on Second Reading)
Question put and agreed to.
Bill read a second time.
NATIONAL STRATEGIC INTELLIGENCE
BILL
(Decision of Question on Second Reading)
Question put and agreed to.
Bill read a second time.
COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS OF

PARLIAMENT ON AND INSPECTORS-
GENERAL OF INTELLIGENCE BILL

(Decision of Question on Second Reading)
Question put and agreed to.
Bill read a second time.

)
4161

FRIDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 1994

4162

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! While hon members are here, I would like to inform them that we only have one more item to deal with today and that is the next item on the Order Paper. We would like them to remain because we will be voting on that Bill as well.

WATER LAWS RATIONALISATION AND AMENDMENT BILL

(Second Reading debate)

The MINISTER OF WATER AFFAIRS AND FORESTRY: Mr Speaker, thank you for your appeal to hon members of this House to remain while we are dealing with this very important measure. It is not a water nationalisation Bill, but a water rationalisation Bill.

Today is an auspicious moment in our water history. We are debating the Government of National Unity's first amendment to the water legislation to set in motion the crucial water supplies and sanitation part of the Reconstruction and Development Programme. Hon members should not be fooled by the somewhat unexciting title and they must not allow themselves to be confused or even intimidated by the legal terminology.

What we have here today is indeed a milestone in our water legislation, an innovative and creative approach to bringing water and sanitation to all our communities in our country, something which, as we saw in the Budget debate, is a mammoth task in a country in which literally millions are without the essentials for a decent, - dignified life.

Gone are the days when Government sat in a white ivory tower on high and determined who should get water, where and how. What the House is considering today is a process whereby the community will be part of a central development. They will, in fact, form part of the planning team, the design criteria and, most importantly, they will actually control the management process of schemes built for their needs as they perceive them.

The Government of National Unity has committed itself to ensuring that all households eventually will have a clean and safe water supply of 20 to 30 litres per head per day, and an adequate and safe sanitation facility. The word 'eventually' means in years and not decades. Plans to implement the water and sanitation policy of the

no RDP.

RDP are well on their way, but in order to give effect to these plans the legislative framework must first be put into place to enable all the different actors and role-players to perform their essential functions. That is why this proposed legislation, however technical it may appear, is so important and why its adoption is so urgent.

Before I deal with the contents of the Bill, I wish to thank the chairperson and members of the select committee, who have actively and enthusiastically participated in discussion on the Bill. I have been informed that the members are unanimous in their support and this confirms my belief that, for the first time in our history, we are achieving a consensus on the direction of our policy towards meeting the most basic of all human needs.

The serious need for water supply, especially in rural areas, is perhaps best reflected in the decision of the select committee to propose an amendment to the Bill, specifically mentioning rural water supply in clause 5(b). Even though this proposed amendment is only of a technical nature, I believe it gives further and specific assurance to rural people who have been deprived of dependable water supplies that we recognise their plight and that we are committed to doing something about it.

I come to the water supply part of this Bill. The present Water Act of 1956 has vested sufficient powers in the Minister to implement the water supply aspects of the RDP. My Department of Water Affairs and Forestry has accordingly already started planning and implementing the RDP's water supply aspects. Similarly, there exist throughout the country water boards, which are also willing and able to play an important role in bringing water to all communities. These boards have provided a water supply service for many years and their existing structures and experience will be of great help in the coming years.

I must, however, sound a word of caution. It is impossible to supply water to everyone immediately. We must, therefore, determine priorities * to go ahead in an orderly way, without making false promises, so as to achieve our goals as

soon as possible in the RDP's water security for all far the

long term. Water supply is, therefore, one of the pillars of the RDP. Without water there can be

+ i) Puadala