

THESE DRAFT MINUTES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND ARE RESTRICTED TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON REGIONS, THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL. THEY ARE STILL TO BE RATIFIED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON REGIONS.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON REGIONS WITH THE TECHNICAL SUPPORT TEAM HELD AT 08H45 ON SATURDAY 17 JULY 1993 AT THE WORLD TRADE CENTRE

PRESENT: Members of the Commission
 Members of the Technical Support Team

APOLOGIES: Dr B de Villiers
 Prof J McCarthy

THE COMMISSION ON
REGIONS

REF: 1/11/ 2 / 5

1. Moment of Prayer/Meditation

Observed by all present.

2. Welcome and presence

Most members of the Commission and the Technical Support Team were present.

3. Ratification of the Agenda

The agenda was ratified:

3.1 Item 7 - Discussion of the draft report strategy for the next meeting if necessary.

3.2 Clarification of purpose and role of technical support on the day of the meeting. Item 6 - TST will present report and move to Item 7 draft report because some members of TST participate in the drafting of the report.

4. Minutes of previous meeting (on 10 July 1993)

The minutes were adopted after the following ratification were made:

4.1 Page 3: Commissioning of political experts rejected because it was felt that the expertise referred to is available in South Africa.

4.2 Page 8 paragraph 6.3.3: The people making the submission said they would rather be in a poor region rather than be dominated by a populous urban area.

4.3 Page 8 paragraph 6.3.3: It was agreed that the word Volkstaat, should be changed to the word region.

4.4 Page 17 paragraph 7.9 refer to the National Party.

5. Matters arising from the minutes

5.1 Report on hearings held on 16 July 1993

The Chairperson Prof Smit reported that the hearings started at 10:00, with a delegation led by Chief Mankuroane, followed by Mr Reuben Sive, the Intando Yesizwe Party from KwaNdebele and the Judges President from the different provinces. Prof Hanekom and the Municipality of Brandvlei did not turn up.

In the afternoon, the session started at 2 p.m. with the National Party, followed by the African National Congress, the Transkei government presented by General Holomisa, the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and General Constand Viljoen. The proceedings were concluded after 8 p.m.

The Chairperson thanked the members of the commission and the technical support team who were present.

5.2 Schedule for hearing further Evidence

5.2.1 It was suggested that hearings be organised where viewpoints of other groups were not included, during the coming week, or put in the report that clarification is needed on certain areas.

5.2.1 Visits to controversial areas were suggested to interview authentic representatives of areas like Umzimkulu where there is potential for great conflict, especially in the light that the people in the area have expressed a wish to meet with the commission.

5.2.3 Allusion to land claims like those made by General Holomisa and General Viljoen should be taken seriously.

5.2.4 A concern was raised with regard to the lack of time to visit the areas of concern to consult all groups. Therefore a provisional report should be presented.

5.2.5 The ANC and National Party have expressed that soft borders should be considered, e.g. Pongola area and leave it up to the negotiating process to appoint either this commission or new commission to investigate the matter further.

- 5.2.6 It was pointed out that it would not be practical to visit just one area of dispute because there are other areas that need attention.

6. Discussion of the Report of the Technical Support Team

- 6.1 Introduction by Dr Bax Nomvete, who chaired the meeting of the TST on 14 July.

The task of the TST was to address itself to the criteria and then present a perspective on submissions.

The following groups were asked to study the criteria from their sectorial point of view and submit their observations and suggestions to Dr Mokate, who compiled a paper on their reports.

- 6.1.1 To address the criteria the TST divided itself into the following four subgroups:

Economic issues	Prof du Pisanie Prof Tomlinson Mrs Krige Dr Buthelezi Dr Shisana
Infrastructure	Mr de Beer Mr Fowler
Geographical Coherence	Prof McCarthy Mr Pienaar
Institutional and Administrative Issues	Mr Mogoro Dr de Villiers

- 6.1.2 Synthesis of the inputs of the different groups shows that the groups of the TST are on a common wavelength concerning the criteria. Categorization of the criteria was unanimously agreed to by all the members of the TST and interpretation of the criteria showed a common understanding.

- 6.1.3 An analysis of the 116 submissions was established. Each group analyzed the submissions and considered points of agreement and of disagreements, categorized those into regional, sub-regional and local level.

- 6.1.4 Problem areas were then discussed and observations were made. It was indicated that the report is the product of the whole group. Summary of the report and the submissions are only to assist the members of the commission, not to make final decisions for the commission.

6.2 Introduction of report by Dr Renosi Mokate

- 6.2.1 Approach was to categorize the submissions using the Development Banks model of regions as a point of departure as was done by most submissions.
- 6.2.2 Issues were categorized into regional, sub-regional and local areas. Regional issues were defined as issues where the approach is to divide the region into two. Sub-regional issues refer to proposals where within a region a subregion has to be excised/included in that particular region. An example of a local issue is Venterstad where a proposal has been made that it should be part of region C.
- 6.2.3 The four criteria were applied to areas of disagreement and to have a point of discussion specific recommendations were made based on inputs by TST.
- 6.2.4 It was decided that proposals for a volksstaat should be dealt with like other proposals applying the different criteria.

6.3 Reaction to the report

- 6.3.1 It was decided that the commission's discussion on the criteria should be discussed later and be included in the draft report.
- 6.3.2 A framework for analysis was deemed necessary to identify the issues.
- 6.3.3 An emphasis was made that the TST sees itself as support for the commission and expressed a wish to debate issues with the commission.
- 6.3.4 It was noted that 116 submissions and submissions from the political parties were considered and there was not enough time for the commission to study the report.
- 6.3.5 To come up with the final report there is need to investigate areas like the Pretoria area as was suggested when the TST began on its draft report.
- 6.3.6 A question was raised on whether the economic aspects were considered because Prof du Pisanie was not present at the meeting on 14 July. It was explained that Prof Tomlinson, who is also an

economist was present.

6.3.7 It was noted that the decisions made were on the problem areas were not unanimous but were majority opinions. Additional information to weigh submissions on problem areas was sent to Dr Mokate for distribution to all members.

6.3.8 A suggestion was made that the document be studied page by page as a basis for discussion on the criteria.

7. Fundamental issues about the criteria - Annexure D - Page 21

7.1 It was noted that the administrative regions are correct but narrow, they should be expanded to "regions as governmental units" to include the legislative aspect.

Additional facts should be faxed to Dr Mokate on 19 July 1993.

7.2 A clarification on the term economic functionality was requested. It was noted that the term is explained in detail on page 24. Suggestion that the introduction should be changed to paragraph 3.2.1.

7.3 Legislative powers not shown as was stated in the brief, constitution conferring legislative powers to the regions, suggestion that Prof Rautenbach, Mr Mokgoro and Prof Basson should assist Dr Mokate include this aspect in the document.

7.3 Regional demarcation page 22, a suggestion of additional criteria. It was noted that the word region should not be used but "SPR's" used instead as requested by the Multi-Party Forum.

7.3.1 A suggestion was made that the criteria is not sufficient, they should include criteria that would improve growth for the country.

7.3.2 The question of how to deal with racial conflict in the demarcation process. It was suggested that the commission should debate size, number and the tension between the national players and the local players, should consider potential of the area, groups that share a common interest should be considered, non-racial alliance building will be a factor on how the community grows.

7.3.3 Clarified that the report is based on the brief that was given to the commission, a discussion of the application of the criteria instead of discussing abstracts.

7.3.4 To arrive at the definition of "conflict" then the word should be

defined to suit the situation, because the word differs in different situations.

- 7.3.5 It was suggested that because of time constraints, research on all aspects of the criteria it is not possible to broaden the criteria.

7.4 Points of departure

- 7.4.1 Number of regions - it would be difficult to determine the number of regions quote from the National Party submission.
- 7.4.2 The functional approach and the issue of balance in drawing up the regions was suggested to accommodate identity with a place (sense of belonging).
- 7.4.3 Fewer regions were proposed so that the government would be more accessible to people.
- 7.4.4 It was pointed out that the commission was appointed to help the multi-party process therefore the commission's report has to show issues of disagreement, should demonstrate political sensitivity to issues e.g. conflict/peace, instead of dealing with the criteria in an academic and rational manner.
- 7.4.5 It was noted that during hearings attention was paid to the inputs of people (grassroots) level therefore this should be included in the criteria. Include the socio-cultural aspects in the criteria.
- 7.4.6 It was suggested that the report should include overriding issues. Some felt that these are already included in the definition but the difference is in the application of the criteria.
- 7.4.7 A suggestion was made that paragraphs 2,2 and 4 should be deleted from page 23 on the points of departure as they belong in a different section of document.
- 7.4.8 A question was raised at to why the TST deems it necessary not to put boundaries in heavily populated areas. The response was that if boundaries were to cut through heavily populated areas e.g. Pretoria and Johannesburg, there would be severe practical management problems.

The 16 region proposal of the ANC problematic because it is difficult as to know where borders can be drawn around a metropolitan area especially where there are informal settlements in between the cities. A solution could be the consideration of including subregions instead

of the big regions e.g. the Vaal area.

7.4.9 To create a balance in the report it would be advisable to consider submission 244 by Leon Louw, who is recognised as an expert in demarcation.

7.4.10 It was argued that from an economic point of view the metropolitan areas should not be separated from the hinterlands because historically the metropolitan areas have been advantaged, by having the bulk of the wealth.

7.4.11 Health infrastructure would be denied to people in the rural areas if rural areas are separate from the metropolis.

7.4.12 It was pointed out that the apartheid city has benefited from labour from the hinterland therefore the metropolis should not be separated from rural areas.

7.4.13 A view that if the rural and the urban areas were separated then the people from the rural areas would have an opportunity to appoint their own representatives into government to take care of their needs.

7.5 Economic Functionality - Page 24

7.5.1 Suggestion that an emphasis should be placed on fiscal transfers instead of placing an emphasis on economic viability per se.

7.5.1 A section should be included in this section on what has already been agreed to at the Multi-Party Forum.

7.6 Infrastructure - Page 25

It was pointed out that the infrastructure as it stands applies to the status quo therefore the direction of flow is determined by present legislation.

7.7 Institutional and Administrative Capacity - Page 26

This criteria can only be qualitatively applied because of time constraints, and it relates fundamentally to the structure of the government. Before restructuring, rationalization and integration take place this will be difficult to measured

7.8 Geographic coherence - Page 27

General satisfaction with the phrasing.

7.9 Socio-Cultural Issues

7.9.1 The issue of historical boundaries should be included, attention should be paid to provisional boundaries and include that historical boundaries will be used. Mr Daphne asked by the chairperson to include paragraph 3.5 - historical factors.

7.9.2 Socio-cultural should not just be based on ethnicity e.g. black people do not emphasize ethnic identity, caution should be used when dealing with submission that claim a strong ethnicity for other groups. This section should include cultural, political, geographical and religious aspects amongst others. An argument was made that ethnicity is important to many groups e.g. the Zulu King and COSAG.

7.9.3 Reference to the CBM report, page 17 to include the definition therein instead of the last sentence on page 27.

7.10 Conclusion - Page 28

Accepted by all.

8. Perspective on Submissions - Annexure E

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 Submissions considered up to submission 116 and submissions from the political parties.

8.1.2 The document should be discussed in the spirit that it is factual, and may facilitate the decision of the commission.

8.1.3 It was felt that the differing views should be included in the report so that the Multi-Party Process can then negotiate with the groups concerned.

8.1.4 Guidance was given to the TST to consider all the submissions.

8.1.5 It was noted that all commission members are making their own summaries.

8.1.6 It was agreed that weight should not be placed only on the submissions as this may create bias, because some population groups did not have the ability to make submission.

8.2 Framework for Analysis

A suggestion was made that the TST be given time to consider all submissions before they give statistics on each submissions in terms of regional, sub-regional and local areas.

8.2.1 Definitions of regional, sub-regional and local as used by the TST

- 8.2.1.1 Regional issues deal with the demarcation of the region as a whole. Definition accepted.
- 8.2.1.2 Correction of this definition necessary because sub-regional issues deal with the inclusion/exclusion of bigger areas within regions.
- 8.2.1.3 The definition of local issues can be changed to state that they deal with the inclusion/exclusion of smaller locations and localities.

8.3 Framework

Checklist to clarify that everything is covered

- 8.3.1 It was noted that Fochville would like to include Carletonville and PWV into Region H and Anglo American also want this areas included in region J.
- 8.3.2 A suggestion was made that Sasolburg should be included in the Western Transvaal.
- 8.3.3 Referring to General Holomisa and the ANC proposals made on 16 July, the chairperson suggested that they should be highlighted.
- 8.3.4 Clarification was made that the regions referred to are only used as a point of reference because they are not governmental regions.
- 8.3.5 Technical submissions should be referred to, they will be taken into account e.g. the delimitation of Kwa-Zulu, should be stated clearly in the report.

8.4 Application of Criteria

- 8.4.1 On page 36, the Northern Transvaal Political Forum, there is concern that the decision was unanimous which is in contradiction with submissions on the area.
- 8.4.2 Concern about the wording and the structure of the points was stated. It was suggested that it would be necessary to separate the application

of the criteria and the analysis/opinion.

- 8.4.3 Annexures and facts should be included to substantiate the claims made in the documents, these should be prioritised, to clarify the various proposals.
- 8.4.4 Because of the amount of work, and the time limitation factor it would be impossible to get this data, therefore, the TST should concentrate on getting data on four disputed areas.
- * 8.4.5 Profiles like GDP per capita would be needed to have a balanced opinion of the areas.
- 8.4.6 The TST is going to take the information from the meeting's discussion, and the new submissions and consider them for a draft report to be submitted to the commission on Saturday, 24 July.
- * 8.4.7 Request made for more information concerning the Pretoria area and the PWV.
- 8.4.8 Northern Transvaal disagreement about the use of the word unanimous because 10 out of 12 political parties in the area agreed.
- 8.4.9 Suggestion that a systematic way of demarcation be used beginning with regions then move to sub-regions and lastly the local area.
- 8.5.10 There was a suggestion that if there are no hard facts to make a change, then the area should be left as it is.
- 8.5.11 A concern was raised that with areas like Thabazimbi, which have extreme mineral wealth, knowledge of the regions where such areas are finally placed would be of importance.
- 8.5.12 Suggestion on the drafting of the PWV, which will be a basis for the region and a reference when considering Pretoria.
- 8.5.13 Ellisras area disagreement on the sub-regional, level therefore additional data will be supplied on economic considerations, region by region, four areas of disagreement including the PWV area.
- 8.5.14 It was suggested that discussion is necessary before request for information are made.
- 8.5.15 An observation was made that the provision of services would also influence the situation where Pretoria would be separated from the PWV, depending on whether services were the

responsibility of the public sector or the private sector.

- 8.5.16 A proposal for Pretoria to be a separate metropolis including black surrounding townships (submission 121 by Pretoria RSC). To consider this more information on income, GDP etc. would be necessary. There would be difficulty supplying this information as there are no submissions that were made to support this issue.
- 8.5.16 Proposal made for the TST to give a short presentation on the different regions and follow them with discussion with the commission.

9. Presentation by TST region by region

9.1 Northern Transvaal (Region G) highlighted by Mr De Coning

- 9.1.1 No regional disagreement.
- 9.1.2 Thabazimbi should be included in the region.
- 9.1.3 Groblersdal - Lichtenburg needs further investigation. Political parties in Gazankulu would like to see Groblersdal - Lichtenburg, Pilgrim's Rest as well as the Kruger Park be included in Region G.
- 9.1.4 Kruger Park is being managed on a national level therefore not very important to categorize it regionally.
- * 9.1.5 Region poorest in the country therefore more data needed on income, GDP etc. in order to discuss tax base etc.
- 9.1.6 Both Regions F and G are claiming part of the Kruger National Park or the whole. It was stated that the income from the Kruger Park insignificant compared to the incomes of both F and G.
- 9.1.7 Satisfaction with the way the issue of the Kruger National Park is expressed in the document.

9.2 Eastern Transvaal (Region F)

- 9.2.1 Highlighted by Mr Pienaar. He indicated that the definition of the Eastern Transvaal coincides with Region F. There are 3 Regional Services Councils in the area and the submission to the council made by these three collectively.

They are the Lowveld RSC based at Nelspruit, the Southeastern

Transvaal RSC based in Ermelo and the Highveld RSC based in Middelburg. Submission made by the three RSCs mentioned above.

- 9.2.2 The economy of the Eastern Transvaal is based on agriculture and manufacturing and some tourism. The population is two million people and the region generates 9% of the GNP of South Africa.
- 9.2.3 There are five dominant languages: Seswati, Zulu, Afrikaans, North Sotho and Ndebele.
- 9.2.4 The shortcoming in the area is the delivery of services which are rendered by Pretoria. With regard to education, Pretoria University has a campus in Witbank and the Pretoria technikon has a campus in Nelspruit.
- 9.2.6 Medical services are provided by hospitals in Pretoria. Reference was made to submission 269 by Prof Mogokong of MEDUNSA, who pointed out that the Eastern Transvaal is the only area without training facilities therefore should be catered for by Pretoria University.
- 9.2.6 Legal services have to be supplied by Johannesburg and Pretoria. There is no supreme court in the Eastern Transvaal.
- 9.2.7 In terms of economic functionality and viability there is a case for the inclusion of Pretoria in Eastern Transvaal to balance the Highveld.
- 9.2.8 It was stated that the Afrikaner Volksunie incorporates Pretoria in the Eastern Transvaal.
- 9.2.9 It was noted that based on figures from the Development Bank, then Region F has a higher GDP per capita than the PWV. It was argued that the high GDP of the area can be attributed to electricity which is generated from the area.

9.3 PWV REGION (Region H)

- 9.3.1 Highlighted by Prof de Beer.

Regions should be balanced economically to keep them stable and figures show that the PWV as a region is very wealthy, but has three distinct sub-regions namely Pretoria, the Witwatersrand and the Vaal.

- 9.3.2 Traffic figures in the Vaal triangle show that traffic flow is within the Vaal and not through the Witwatersrand. It was disputed that traffic flow cannot be used as a basis for criteria for example Johannesburg has more traffic to Durban and Cape Town.

- 9.3.3 It was noted that there are cultural differences between people in Johannesburg and the people in Pretoria. The people in Pretoria have a cultural homogeneity with people in the Eastern Transvaal, which is traditional Afrikaans speaking. The Eastern Transvaal has not developed a capital of its own because Pretoria is already fulfilling that role.
- 9.3.4 It was suggested that since both the ANC and the National Party agree on this region then their input should be seriously considered.
- 9.3.5 It was further noted that Pretoria and Johannesburg are not integrated economically, Pretoria's economy is based on the public sector, while the economy of Johannesburg is linked to the mining industry. Furthermore Pretoria and Johannesburg are competitors for investment, therefore if the PWV is left big and undivided then there might be inter-regional rivalry.
- 9.3.6 Development of the townships might be hampered if Pretoria is part of the larger PWV, because the resources of the area might be limited.
- 9.3.7 The claim that the population in the Pretoria area is culturally homogenous was disputed as it only refers to the white population, which is a minority.
- 9.3.8 A suggestion was made that division of the area might cause unnecessary uncertainty, therefore it should be left as it is, more study would be needed to justify the division.
- 9.3.9 It was noted that the Lowveld and Escarpment RSC made a submission which excludes Pretoria from Region F.
- 9.3.10 However, a proposal was by the Pretoria municipality to have Pretoria as a separate region including areas that are functionally included into Pretoria. The area are Brits on the North-west, through Odi I, Moretele I and II, KwaNdebele, Cullinan, Bronkhorstpruit, Shoshanguve and Winterveld.
- 9.3.11 The chairperson noted that this submission was never received by the commission. It was clarified that the submission referred to is 121.
- 9.3.12 Concern was raised that if the PWV is left to expand and get too big, there might be inter-regional rivalry.
- 9.3.13 It was suggested that submissions from the Eastern Transvaal who do not wish Pretoria included in the region be considered. To keep the balance the region should be left as it is. The area would need further study and the extent of consultation.

- 9.3.14 It was indicated that boundaries would be difficult to determine. The example of USA where there are boundaries in densely populated was highlighted. The case of American States was debated as there was an example of Washington DC, Virginia and Maryland which have problems with inter boundary services because the boundaries cut through densely populated areas.
- 9.3.15 Noting that the criteria states that boundaries should not be in densely populated area or cut across metropolitan areas, it was suggested that if the area was densely populated then administration would be better handled by two administrations instead of one.
- 9.3.16 PWV consortium from the transportation point of view submitted that it would be unwise to unbundle the PWV.
- 9.3.17 It was suggested that more information would be required on the economy and other examples of multi-nodal regions have to be studied.
- 9.3.18 Finally a suggestion was made that the PWV should not be divided as the consequences of such a step are unknown.

9.4 Natal/KwaZulu (Region E)

The problem area in this region is the Umzimkhulu area

- 9.4.1 It was indicated that the area is functionally linked to Natal.
- 9.4.2 Farming markets are linked to Pietermaritzburg and Durban they would be disadvantaged if there were not part of Natal.
- 9.4.3 Clarification was requested on the submission by legal advisers of Durban, that the Durban metropolitan area be a separate region. It was suggested to find out information whether this is supported by the council or if it is a document of the legal advisers.
- 9.4.4 A question was raised regarding the Southern boundary. It was noted that there were the provincial boundaries to the South as established in 1977, or East Griqualand, and Transkei submitted that the 1910 map should be maintained. The actual situation of the 1910 boundary as regards to Port Shepstone was raised.
- 9.4.5 Chairman will promised to get a report by Justice Steyn on historical boundaries.

9.4.6 Proposal made that the matter be considered even if a dotted line is drawn.

9.5 Orange Free State (Region C)

9.5.1 Observation was made that the general tendency is that it should remain as it is.

9.5.2 It was noted that there are other submissions that it should be part of B and J.

9.5.3 TST proposed the combination of B and J but the southern boundaries of A and B remain unresolved.

9.5.4 It was indicated that economic viability, minimization of inconvenience of the population, and cost of government for the combined region should be considered. An analysis of the 6 self governing states, costs like buildings, salaries indicate that to have a combined region B and J the it would cost R1,4 billion. Furthermore, any of the proposals put forward would be economically viable.

9.5.5 Language distribution in regions B and J, are Afrikaans and Tswana, in region C the language is South Sotho and Afrikaans. Combining regions C B and J would pose problems when it comes to language

9.5.6 There are no functional ties between J and C.

9.5.7 The proposal to coombine the regions was made by the Qwaqwa commission and Satswa and the National Party has endorsed it. But it was noted that the this system is on its way out, so its validity is debatable.

9.5.8 It was suggested that submission 244 on page 6 and should be studied before a decision is made.

9.5.9 It was noted that a proposal of inclusion of C to B and J was made by the National Party at a late stage therefore people in B and J have had no time to react.

9.5.10 Municipalities in the northern Cape for example Venterstad would like to be in OFS. A proposal was made that region C should remain intact, and Regions B and J should be joined.

9.6 Northern Cape and Bophuthatswana (Region B)

9.6.1 It was stated that consensus was reached by people Mid region for a

Northwest Cape on the area but no consultation with Saldanah Bay was made at all. This area should be consulted before final decision.

9.6.2 Therefore, recommendation of the TST cannot be accepted.

9.7. Eastern Cape/ Border/ Ciskei/ Transkei (Region D)

9.7.1. There was disagreement whether it should be one or two regions. The major issue would be the fusion of Border-Kei as one region inclusive of Mount Currie and Umzimkhulu. Because Border-Kei is not economically viable, if the region is left alone then it would be one of the two poorest regions in the country.

9.7.2 It was suggested that separating Border-Kei can make it viable, if it receives government support.

9.7.3 Fusion with eastern Cape might drain resources of the eastern Cape region

9.7.4 The TST proposed that to create a balance, one regional structure would help develop the area and have the capacity to attract investment into the area.

9.7.5 It was discussed that the Border-Kei area has been functionally separate historically, Port Elizabeth and East London have been historically in competition with each other. Combining two ports in one region would not be economically wise.

9.7.6 It was noted that in the Transkei services come from East London and not Umtata or Ciskei.

9.7.7 In the Cape Midlands they feel(as seen from submissions) that they should be separate from Border-Kei because money that was put in the homelands and they had to fend for themselves to develop.

9.7.8 It was stated that economically the population of the Cape Midlands is 6.5 million. The GDP of Port Elizabeth-Midlands generates 5.8 billion and Border-Kei about 4.4 billion. Relating this to GDP per capita then in the Cape Midlands it is R2 900,00 and R953,00 for Border-Kei. Merging the two area per capita GDP would be R1 571,00. Joining the two would make the whole area impoverished.

9.7.9 It was also indicated that the level of urbanization in Port Elizabeth and Cape Midlands is 81% and the Border Kei it is 18%.

9.7.10 Administration of the combined districts would be cumbersome as the Cape Midlands has 27 districts and Border-kei has 53.

- 9.7.11 The identification of place, historically culture points, point to two distinct areas.
- 9.7.12 It was pointed out that the disparities of the two regions were caused by apartheid, that the national interests of South Africa should be considered instead.
- 9.7.13 When considering the flow of services in the area of education, they flow right across the region.
- 9.7.14 The notion that joining of the regions would impoverish the regions was questioned given that there would be fiscal transfers to pay for the services from the central government.
- 9.7.15 It was stated that services in the area indicate a clear disparity in the delivery services and not just in the availability of services. The capacity of the region to deliver services was questioned.
- 9.7.16 The 4 or 5 magisterial districts bordering the OFS were to be in the Cape because historically and culturally they have always been included in the Eastern Cape.
- 9.7.17 It was noted that it is difficult to measure the sense of identity for some population groups because of tampering by influx laws.
- 9.7.18 An observation was made that dividing the people in the Eastern Cape would be artificial, as can be substantiated by the people in the area. It was suggested that one region of the Eastern Cape can have subregion centres.
- 9.7.19 It was questioned why the black areas should be seen as a drain to the economy. They have supported the labour of the more affluent areas.
- 9.7.20 A note was made that creating regions makes them political entities. Therefore separating the Border-Kei would not guarantee the region development assistance if the government of the time is not sympathetic to it.
- 9.7.21 A question of whether the Kei area has the capacity to translate the fiscal flows into projects was raised. Caution should be exercised to avoid a welfare state if Border-Kei is separated from Eastern-Cape.
- 9.7.22 A suggestion was made that areas of dispute especially Transkei should be visited.

9.7.23

The chairperson pointed out that the visit would not be the right thing to do. Some commission members expressed a wish to visit the area of Umzimkhulu. A note was placed on record by Prof Muthien that it is a sad state of affairs that when a community asks to be heard, they are denied the opportunity considering that the commission has promised to look into all possibilities. It was concluded that Chief Ncamashe, Prof Muthien, Ms Gwagwa, Mr Daphne and Ms Govinden would visit the area.

10. **Draft Report**

- 10.1 It was noted that the draft report was being passed to Commission members on the drafting team who are:
Mr Daphne
Prof Rautenbach
Prof Muthien

TST members on the drafting team are:
Mr Mokgoro
Dr de Villiers
Prof McCarthy

- 10.2 The members of the commission on the drafting committee were reminded to attend the TST meeting on Thursday, 22 July 1993 so that they can agree on their final drafting report that will be submitted to the commission on Saturday, 24 July 1993.
- 10.3 It was noted that the draft report is just a draft, it is a guideline for the whole commission so that at the end of the month a final report will be available for the Multi-Party Process.
- 10.4 The Chairperson reiterated that maps were being prepared by the GSI and would be distributed by the week of 19 July.

11. **Written submission received**
Item already discussed.

12. It was ruled that all submissions received before 22 July should be considered by the TST and any later submissions will be considered by the commission.

13. **Agenda for the Technical Support Team meeting and the drafting committee of the commission**

The following draft agenda was agreed to by all present:

Date : Thursday, 22 July

Time : Beginning at 8H30

Issues to be discussed

- 11.1 International experience - paper to be presented by the following at the meeting:

Dr de Villiers
Mr Mokgoro
Dr Mokate

- 11.2 Revision of documents

Documents that have been discussed and the additional submissions to be discussed by the four committees namely:

Economic	Prof du Pisanie Prof Tomlinson
----------	-----------------------------------

Institutional and Administrative issues	Prof de Villiers Mr Mokgoro
---	--------------------------------

Geographical coherence	Prof McCarthy Mr Pienaar
---------------------------	-----------------------------

Socio-economic and demographic issues	Dr Buthelezi Dr Shisana
--	----------------------------

After discussion they will prepare their inputs to the document, before Tuesday 20 July, then various inputs will be put into a document by Dr Mokate, Dr de Villiers and Mr de Coning which will reflect all the observations and comments which have been made including additional information from the submissions.

Mr Daphne, Prof Muthien and Prof Rautenbach will attend the meeting.

TST consider all submission they receive before Thursday.

15. Closure