

'91-85-82 7' 42

LQA/aa; 0009! g. 02/05/1111

SPEECH BY MR F W DE KLERK, STATE PRESIDENT, BUDGET VOTE

DEBATE, 2 MAY 1991 ,

REACTION TO DIFFERENT THEMES AND MEMBERS

Mr Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for ParktOWN for his positive response to much of what the Government is doing and saying. I wish to assure him that we share his sense of urgency about getting the real negotiations off the ground. In this context the hon. member raised several issues to which I wish to respond. The first is his suggestion that the Government and I continuously leave the public in doubt about our attitude to the ANC - whether we see it as a friend or a foe; whether we are seeking to work with it or to destroy it. The simple truth, Mr Speaker, is that neither enmity nor amity is at issue here. We regard the ANC as nothing more or less than an important potential negotiating party - as one of the many negotiators, albeit an important one, that will meet around the conference table to work out a new and just constitution for our country. Discussions we have had with the ANC centred on smoothing the road to the beginning of actual constitutional negotiations.

Our commitment to the constitutional negotiating process is clear and beyond dispute. We are prepared to work with every party and organisation that shares our commitment to peaceful solutions and to the peaceful negotiation of a new constitution. Co-operation in this context, however, does not mean that one agrees with everything the ANC says or does.

We are no less aware than the hon. member for Parktown of the conflicting and contradictory signals the ANC sends out from time to time. We also understand the reasons for this.

We have serious disagreements with important aspects of ANC policy - much more so than the Democratic Party, which is quite often ambivalent towards the ANC.

In respect of certain economic and-constitutional issues, fundamental differences exist between the ANC and the Government.

Similarly, as I indicated on Monday and Tuesday, we have difficulties with the ANC's apparently ambivalent attitude to the question of violence.

As was apparent from the speech by the hon. member for Reiger Park and others,-it is not only the Government that considers the ANC and some of its members to be particularly vulnerable on this score.

I have also stated unequivocally that the Government and the National Party cannot form an alliance, or anything like a loose relationship with the ANC, as long as it has the South African Communist Party as an ally.

- 2 -

All of this does not prevent us from negotiating with the ANC on the rules of the game. On the playing field, however, you won't find the National Party on the same side of the serum as the ANC/SACP alliance.

Mr Speaker, I do not believe that it serves much purpose to handy about issues such as these in the pre-negotiating phase. In my view, the proper place for serious discussion - also of our fundamental differences which might have an impact on the constitution - is at the negotiating table.

At this stage, the emphasis is on the need to get a multi-party conference going. This brings me to the second issue raised by the hon. member, namely his plea for a facilitator or arbiter. Why should this be necessary? I have no wish to use my executive Position to manipulate the negotiating process in any way to the detriment of other parties or sections of the population. I also have no intention of being both player and referee. Furthermore, I have no intention to assume a special or privileged role for the Government at the multi-party conference.

The multi-party conference will be a conference among political parties. Through bilateral and multilateral dialogue and negotiation, a broad consensus regarding a number of issues affecting the multi-party conference, has already been established among majority parties in Parliament and the selfgoverning states.

Good progress is also being made in a working group of the Government and the ANC which is dealing with this subject. Shortly, all of the parliamentary parties will become part of this planning process when the Joint Committee on Constitutional Affairs meets.

Against this background, the Government's point of view - and we already have wide support for it - is the following:

(a) While the State President will probably have to issue the initial invitations to the Multi-Party Conference, the very first item on the agenda should be that the Conference should decide on its own chairman or a panel of chairmen.

(b) The Conference will be free to discuss and decide on its requirements, including such matters as the appointment, with regard to its own functioning. of whomever it wishes to see in whatever position.

Nonetheless, I invite the Democratic Party to make full use of the opportunity to present its views and proposals to the Joint Committee on Constitutional Affairs. which is to be convened shortly.

The hon. member and the hon. member for Sea Point also referred to the need for bridging mechanisms during the period of transition. The Government has acknowledged the need to give non-parliamentary parties and organisations 3 voice in important policy decisions taking place in the course of the normal process of government during the transitional period to a new constitution. As hon. members will recall, I raised this possibility during my address at the opening of this Parliamentary Session, and repeated it during my recent visit abroad. This led to a report in The Argus that I had raised the prospect of including in the Cabinet members of the key negotiating parties.

Although I have not made any specific statement to that effect. it is not a novel idea. Even before I became President, we had a Bill before Parliament to make it possible.

I am positive about the need for transitional arrangements. This should not, however, impair the orderly progress of good government and administration in terms of the existing Constitution and laws. Once again, I believe that the Multi-party Conference is the appropriate forum to discuss the best ways to achieve this at the executive and legislative levels.

I do not have a negative attitude towards the idea of a Cabinet which would include a relatively broad Spectrum of competent South Africans. If consensus proves to be attainable at a multi-party conference, this idea would merit serious consideration, provided that the principles of cabinet government under the present Constitution are not negatively affected. So far, this idea has been shot down because it was regarded as unacceptable "co-optation". The hon. Leader of the Ministers' Council in the House of Representatives emphasised this aspect. The hon. members for Sea Point, Reigerpark and several other speakers, such as the hon. member for Lenasia West, also called for the abolition or phasing out, in various ways or stages, of Own affairs.

Certain aspects of the "own affairs" concept, which it is possible to deal with administratively without constitutional amendments, are receiving attention at the moment. We are looking at rationalisation wherever this is possible, without impinging on the principle of protecting the rights of minorities.

When it comes to amending the Constitution, however, I am not prepared to initiate amendments on an ad hoc or piecemeal basis. We are too near to a multi-party conference for that. Once again I want to say that I am open to transitional arrangements, provided that they represent a broad consensus. And once again. the Multi-Party Conference is the vehicle for achieving such a consensus.

Let all of us, therefore, concentrate our energy and capabilities on expediting the Multi-Party Conference. The Government, for one, is not prepared to allow the momentum of the reform process to be sabotaged by people or parties that are merely seeking to use it for selfish motives, such as destabilising the country.

Before I move on to reply to the Conservative Party, I wish to refer to the hon. Chairman of the Ministers' Council in the House of Representatives. He dealt with a wide range of matters.

I share with him his rejection of continuously looking at South African politics in terms of colour. In the new South Africa, it will not be colour, but values, that will be the determining factor in the dividing lines of politics. It will be the task of all of us to ensure that these values find expression and are safeguarded in any new constitution we may negotiate.

I also agree with the hon. Chairman of the Ministers' Council that care will have to be taken to ensure that the money that becomes available for social upliftment from reducing oil stockpiles, is used to the maximum benefit of those most in need of it. He may rest assured that care will be taken to ensure that those funds are not taken up by the creation of unnecessary administrative machinery.

I wish to thank him and his Party, too, for their positive commitment to our envisaged endeavour to terminate the violence that has become endemic in our society.

POWER-SHARING VERSUS APARTHEID

Our country is on the threshold of a breakthrough. We are already far advanced towards the envisaged new South Africa. In spite of setbacks, we are making good progress domestically. Abroad, sanctions are crumbling; access to markets long closed to us is becoming available once more; there is the prospect, once again, of foreign investment and development capital. In spite of this, the Official Opposition in the House of Assembly sees nothing good in this positive course of developments. The Conservative Party seeks our salvation in a return to the past - if I understand them properly, at least to 1986. However, they would prefer 1966 - before Mr Vorster's outward movement and shared amenities and before Mr Botha's "Adapt or Die".

Therefore, a relevant question is: How would South Africa have looked if the Government had not taken the initiatives of 1987 to 1991. We do not have to go back further than that.

If we were to persist with the policies which the Conservative Party continues to espouse in the face of all realities, or even with the National Party's policy of 1986, we would still have been in a cul de sac.

Economically, we could only have regressed further. The fact is that our country's population grew by an annual average of 2.6% over the past decade. Against that, our economic growth rate was a mere 1.6% a year. Between 1974 and 1989, only 1,2 million employment opportunities were created in the formal sector of our economy. Against that, the supply on the labour market increased by 4,7 million people. In addition, our gross domestic product declined in this period.

We were in a dead end of growing unemployment and poverty. Our access to international markets and modern technology was shrinking systematically. Not only did capital no longer enter the country, but millions of rands fled South Africa because of the campaign of disinvestment against us. Unemployment was increasing at a fearsome rate and the whole country was becoming poorer.

Poverty and unemployment contribute to crime, social instability and violence, as the Chairman of the Ministers' Council in the House of Delegates illustrated so well in his speech.

I fully endorse the impassioned plea by the hon. Chairman of the Ministers' Council in the House of Delegates for an end to the senseless violence which is tearing our country asunder. I wish to thank him for his unqualified support for my call that we all join forces to bring it to an end. As he reiterated so eloquently, South Africa simply cannot go on like this.

Politically and constitutionally, things were not much better either. The policy of separate development was failing, visibly and tangibly. The realities of our society obliged us to realise that absolute self-determination was not achievable in a heterogeneous country such as ours. Our demographic and geographic convulsion, as well as socioeconomic realities, made it impossible.

The best efforts of outstanding leaders and managers over almost four decades, demonstrated beyond dispute that policies of ethnic and territorial separation could not provide our country with a viable solution. More than half of South Africa's Black population lives and works permanently outside the TBVC countries and the six self-governing territories. There is hardly a magisterial district in the country in which Black people are not in the majority. Above all of this, none of the self-governing territories is interested in any way in independence. Even the TBVC countries are reconsidering it to an increasing extent.

Contrary to the suggestion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, it is not the Government that is persuading them to

"31-85-82 17:45 P. 7

do so in any way whatsoever. They are doing it of their own accord for reasons of their own. which include the persisting absence of international recognition and, in the case of three of them, growing doubts about their political and economic viability.

The end result is that millions of South African citizens do not yet enjoy the rights citizenship normally brings with it. And if we were to revert to 1986, they would have no prospect whatsoever of ever achieving them.

This too, could not go on — because it is evidently unjust; in conflict with the Christian values to which we profess to aspire; contrary to internationally acceptable norms: and a certain recipe for revolt, revolution and civil war.

All of this is conceded by the hon. member for Overvaal and the team that assisted him in compiling his muchvaunted document. a document that stands as an indictment of the Conservative Party's stagnation.

Those, Mr Speaker, are the realities of the matter. They are realities which the hon. Leader of the Opposition and other members of the Conservative Party will have to accept as well, however difficult it may be for them to do.

That is something no-one can escape. For that reason, power-sharing is the only viable solution for our country.

That is why we are on the road to a new South Africa. That is why we are seeking to achieve it through peaceful negotiation. Naturally, there still are obstacles to overcome. of course it is extremely difficult to build a nation with the diversity of our society. Of course we shall experience setbacks from time to time. Naturally we shall have to deal with a measure of instability which inevitably always accompanies deep-going changes. However, the fact is that it is a hard job. By contrast, the Conservative Party model cannot work at all.

The basis of the policy of power-sharing enjoys majority support among the total population. The concept of racial separation merely enjoys the support of about 30% of the white population.

The problem with the Conservative Party is its conviction that power cannot be shared successfully in a heterogeneous society. According to it, one can only dominate or be dominated. That is why it comes to the over-simplified conclusion that power-sharing has to lead to Black domination in our circumstances and that that, inevitably, has to lead to ANC domination.

The conviction that race and numbers are the only decisive factors in a heterogeneous society is a fallacy. I am convinced that a dispensation that will simply permit the

replacement of one form of domination by another, is unacceptable to every party in this Parliament. To my knowledge, it is unacceptable also to numerous important parties and organisations not represented here.

There is majority in this country that rejects typical majority domination. That is why the National Party and the other parties which have the same goals, offer hope for the future - hope for peace, hope for reconciliation, hope for community security, hope for progress, hope for international trade, hope for foreign investment, employment opportunities and economic growth. The signs that these hopes will not be disappointed are already there for all to see. especially in the international field. There is no alternative.

The negative aspects on which the hon. Leader of the Opposition and other Conservative Party spokesmen tend to harp, are not symptoms of the new South Africa. They are symptoms of the old South Africa, with its discrimination and racial tension. It takes a long time to turn around a large ship like South Africa. The socio-economic backlogs we are enduring, are not new phenomena. Unemployment. urbanisation and poverty are nothing new. Violence did not erupt suddenly after February the 2nd last year. There were incidents of it in the fifties, in the sixties, in 1976 and in 1986 when the state of emergency was imposed nationwide. Terrorism and Black-on-Black violence were endemic long before there was any talk of a new South Africa. They occurred before the banning of the ANC. during it and thereafter.

What we are experiencing today, and what the Conservative Party is putting forward as proof of the failure of Government policy. is indeed still the aftermath of our heritage of apartheid and separate development.

As I pointed out on Monday, there is a long-established culture of violence in our country. Its causes are complex - they are political, ethnic, economic and social. If we had not begun to do something about them, we would be hurtling down an irreversible slide over the abyss. That, Mr Speaker, is the only future the Conservative Party has to offer our country and all its people.

CONTINUING VIOLENCE

Numerous hon. members reverted to the theme of continuing violence I had raised in my opening speech.

Once again the Conservative Party stood out like a sore thumb. While every party supported the Government's initiatives to fight violence and bring it to an end, the Conservative Party condemned them as weakness.

'91-85-32 17: 47 P. 9

By implication, they are calling for a strong-arm approach.
Something like:

Declare a state of emergency once more.

Arrest thousands and imprison them Without trial.

Re-ban organisations that have been unbanned.

Clamp down on the press.

In short - revert to 1986.

What would happen then? For a while we might well return to an apparent period of calm. Then it would begin all over again; but this time with greater violence than ever.

The international community would descend on South Africa with wrath to isolate her.

Terrorism would hold sway once more, with bombs in our streets and supermarkets - this time with widespread international support.

Instead of fighting among warring factions, the purpose of violence would become, once again, the overthrow of all authority and government.

National Service would have to be doubled again, if not extended even further.

We Would be painting ourselves back into the corner into which we had been painted ourselves in 1986. We would be back on the road to inevitable and total revolution.

That the Government is not prepared to countenance - strong action. certainly, even stronger than at present; but then only if circumstances fully justify it.

If the current initiatives do not achieve the desired effect and if the conference on violence does not produce new, viable initiatives. then the Government will not shy away from far-reaching measures. We will not allow the country to sink into chaos. We will not submit to blackmail either. Nor will we tolerate private armies or armed militias.

However, such steps will continue to be directed against crime and at maintaining order and stability. The suppression of the right of any party to state its case democratically in an orderly manner, is not acceptable to the Government. That phase is irrevocably a thing of the past.

In that spirit we committed ourselves in the Pretoria Minute to the revision of our security legislation.

True to this undertaking to revise security legislation to bring it into line with the dynamic situation developing in South Africa, and to strip it of provisions that may have an inhibiting effect on participation in normal political activities, the Government has decided to divest the Internal Security Act, 1982, of those stipulations which provide for the restriction or preventive detention of persons; the maintenance of a consolidated list of names, including those of office-bearers, officials, members or active supporters of prohibited organisations and the names of people convicted of certain misdemeanours in terms of this legislation; prohibition on publications; restrictions on the registration of newspapers; disqualifications for membership of Parliament or for accession to certain legal professions; restrictions on the publication of the statements and writings of certain persons; as well as the misdemeanour of furthering communism. In addition, the provisions in respect of declaring organisations illegal and detaining persons for questioning will be amended drastically.

The current provisions in respect of intimidation appear to be inadequate and steps will, therefore, be taken simultaneously to strengthen the existing provisions. The necessary legislation will be submitted and elucidated by the Minister of Justice and of Corrective Services in the course of the next few days.

Taking into account these and previous announcements, the current situation in respect of violence and of combatting it, therefore, is as follows:

t The Police, supported by the Defence Force, will continue to deal with the problem firmly and impartially. Special actions will be launched from time to time as well.

' Strengthening the Police Force in respect of manpower and equipment is being continued and treated as a high priority.

' The entire community will be involved in a strategy against violence, with a view to which a conference is to be held on May the 24th and 25th, 1991.

t A Standing Commission is to be established under the chairmanship of a judge or senior jurist to investigate complaints of violence and to advise the Government.

h Insofar as social conditions contribute to violence, special programmes will be launched to promote the creation of employment and to deal with adverse social circumstances. Thousands of millions of rand will be spent on this.

I A special fund for aid to victims of violence is being established.

_ 10 _

' Control of dangerous weapons is being intensified.

' The upgrading as well as the conversion of hostels according to needs is receiving urgent attention.

' Just SeCurity Legislation is being maintained, but is being divested of those elements which impinge on the democratic process.

t The process of reconciliation and negotiation will be continued on every level through bilateral as well as multiaparty talks.

Call it a Ten-Point Plan if you wish. The fact is that a comprehensive plan of action is in operation or in the course of being implemented. It is a fair plan and a positive plan. However, these measures can succeed only-if we obtain the co-operation of the public and of every leader. Once again. I reiterate my call to everybody to give it.

That brings me to the ANC. The Government is under no illusion about the participation of the ANC in a conference on violence and intimidation being important to enabling the peace process to succeed in full. However, from recent statements by the ANC it does not seem likely that the organisation will take part in the conference.

Merely as a result of this fact, however, the Government cannot abandon its sincere endeavour towards dealing with the state of violence. Consequently, the Government will proceed with the conference and, for the purpose, will promote the principle of inclusive participation as far as this is possible. The door to participation by the ANC remains wide open and I shall welcome it if their ultimate decision is positive. Such a decision will entail neither a victory nor a defeat for anybody.

As I have confirmed already on several occasions, the Government is committed to the negotiating process and the institution of a democratic constitution for South Africa. In view of the ANC's ultimatum for May the 9th and its opposition to the Government's preposed conference on violence, the Government's response is the following:

- _ the negotiating process has to retain its momentum and the ANC Ought to fulfil a constructive role in it;
- the ANC's present footwork in respect of the negotiating process notwithstanding, it remains a party central to the process and cannot escape the demands of the circumstances it has helped to create itself;
- _ the latest demands made by the ANC embody precisely the sort of matter that belong on the agenda of the Conference on Violence and Intimidation.

I am not without understanding for the problems of the ANC. The general impression is that the organisation will be ready to join the negotiating process and participate in a multi-party conference only after its National Conference in the vicinity of July this year. Although the ANC is, therefore, being granted time until July 1991 to do so, the Government has to express its concern about the tendency towards radicalisation within that organisation. The Government's general aim remains to give pace and momentum to the negotiating process and to ensure that the process of furthering democracy in the Republic of South Africa continues unabated. No-one can expect the Government to wait for the ANC before the restatement of peace may begin. For that reason, this matter will already enjoy absolute priority before July 1991, with or without the ANC.

I find some of the latest utterances of the ANC to be really unfair and removed from reality. It is being said, for example, that the Government is being unnecessarily bureaucratic about releases and indemnities. That simply is not true. The procedures we are applying are part of an agreement reached with the ANC and are not being imposed unilaterally. The same applies to the demand that "all prisoners" have to be released. Once again we are applying guidelines as agreed upon, and which clearly make provision for borderline cases. Mr Mandela's statement (according to this morning's Cape Times) is equally unfair. According to it he said:

"We have not heard Mr De Klerk say he is putting an end to the violence, he is now going to release all the political prisoners and we can bring home all the exiles. We are waiting for productive responses now".

After my speeches of this week, it is an extremely unfair statement. Instead of listening to others, Mr Mandela should read what I am saying.

Several speakers, among them the Leader of the Democratic Party and the hon. members for Reiger Park and Durban Central, proposed a broadly-representative monitoring body for violence and policing. The purpose, apparently, is to investigate, in particular, the relentless allegations of police involvement or dereliction.

Parties that propose this are welcome to place it on the table at the coming conference. However, I do not think it will be found to have much viability. My main motivation for this statement is as follows:

(1) The Standing Commission on Violence and Intimidation will be able to meet this need. Great care will be taken to ensure that its composition will enjoy general credibility.

(2) The clumsier such a monitoring body is, the less effective it will be. And to be representative of all or most parties it will, of necessity, have to be clumsy.

(3) The Government bears the ultimate responsibility for law and order and is nominated by Parliament. Steps to give a voice to extra-parliamentary groups during a transitional period should not occur on an ad hoc basis and should be the result of multi-party negotiation. To the hon. Leader of the Democratic Party and the hon. member for Seapoint, I wish to say in addition that the Police Force is exposed to enormous demands and tension. Its members deserve the sympathy and appreciation of all of us. Naturally, they also make mistakes. And of course the Police, like any other professional group, has its weak links. When mistakes come to the fore and whenever instructions concerning operations and impartiality are disregarded, action is taken. Do hon. members realise that there are policemen among those whose release from prison I have refused because of the seriousness of their crimes? Whenever crimes are committed, prosecution ensues. Strict disciplinary action is taken quite frequently.

It is to be hoped that the envisaged Commission of Enquiry into Violence and Intimidation will constitute an effective mechanism to evaluate complaints in future.

If a real need arises, before the institution of the Standing Commission, for an objective investigation of specific recent events, or of events that may occur in the weeks ahead, I will consider it with an open mind.

However, I wish to caution against over-emphasising the negative, which invariably represents the exception to the rule in any event. I have no doubt that the Police and the Defence Force generally act correctly over all in extremely difficult circumstances.

On behalf of the Government, I wish to thank them for their sacrifice, their loyalty, hard work and good sense in the face of extreme provocation. The same applies to the Ministers of Law and Order and of Defence and the top-level structures that support them.

They, and those whom they lead, have a thankless task, because they make news only when things go wrong. In these times in which every street in every township is a powder-keg because of internal tensions in Black ranks, the country and Parliament cannot expect miracles of them.

We wish them well.

The hon. Leader of the Democratic Party also enquired about protection for a certain Sipho Madlala, a key witness in the investigation of the death of Headman Maphumulo.

The existing provisions to protect witnesses are contained in the Internal Security Act, 1982 and section 185 of the Criminal Procedure Act, 1977. The latter section provides for the Attorney-General to submit before a judge, by means of affidavit, any such information as may be required to support an application for an order that the person concerned be detained pending the relevant proceedings.

This provision may be used only if the Attorney-General is of the opinion that such a person is likely to give evidence on behalf of the State in criminal proceedings and if -

(a) he is furthermore of opinion that the personal safety of the person is in danger or that he may abscond or that he may be interfered with or that he may be intimidated: or

(b) he deems it to be in the interests of such a person or of the administration of justice, that he be detained in custody.

Prior to the Attorney-General approaching a court of law as set out above, he may himself order that such a person be detained. However, such an order cannot endure for longer than 72 hours.

It is clear from the aforementioned that people seeking protection for the witness will have to submit sufficient and reliable information to the Attorney-General to enable him to conclude that -

(a) the person to be protected is likely to give evidence on behalf of the State; and

(b) is in need of protection.

Although he is in constant contact with various persons who have interested themselves in this case, the Attorney-General informs us that the above possibility has not yet been canvassed. It is further pointed out that the gentleman seeking protection is, on the face value of the allegations, also a likely co-accused. If the Attorney-General is to forego a prosecution against him and accept him as a witness, the initiative lies with those who advise this particular gentleman. They will, therefore, be acting in the interest of their client if they were to seek co-operation with Mr Roberts, the Deputy Attorney-General.

In order to expedite the matter, however! the Deputy Attorney-General, Mr Roberts, suggests the following alternative to which he gives preference:

(a) That he will meet the person professing to have committed the offence in the presence of lawyers nominated by him and the Police under circumstances in which it will be possible to guarantee the safety of the person for the duration of the interrogation;

(b) that the Deputy Attorney-General himself take charge of the interrogation in Chambers; or

(c) that satisfactory arrangements be made for the safety of the alleged offender after the interrogation.

I sincerely hope that use will be made of this co-operative attitude on the part of the Attorney-General. We wish to get to the truth as much as anybody else.

Mr Speaker, I have dealt extensively with security matters. However, we dare not allow the negative to predominate. There were positive developments in the security field as well. In the first place, we have succeeded in reaching an understanding with the ANC on the suspension of the so-called armed struggle.

It is an understanding which still is fragile, but which has, certainly, saved the lives of many South Africans, Black and White. This understanding, which is currently still being clarified further and finalised at working group level, also meant that the leadership of the ANC came into conflict with certain hotheads within the organisation. However, no-one can doubt that it was in South Africa's interests at the end of the day. It is on this road that we can and must continue. Secondly, the political competition and conflict existing between the ANC and Inkatha notwithstanding, these two organisations took the praiseworthy step of concluding a peace agreement. In that case, too, both Mr Mandela and Dr Buthelezi had to endure certain criticisms from among their own ranks, but they had the courage of their conviction to persist with it. Nevertheless, South Africa now expects both of these leaders and their followers to fulfil the letter and the spirit of the agreement.

In the third place, we have also reached the situation, finally, in which the leaders of the self-governing territories, the ANC, most of the other political parties and the Government are able to discuss matters soberly without questioning one another's individual and/or collective right of existence or political relevance. If this process continues, we should soon be able to reach a situation in which co-operation in terms of common interests, rather than confrontation and intolerance, will be the order of the day.

In the fourth place, real change has been instituted to bring the South African governmental order largely into line with those values and principles which obtain throughout the democratic world.ⁱ As I have indicated already, large numbers of people who were detained because of politically-related convictions, have been released - on both sides of the political spectrum. Now it is the ANC, with its penal camps and detainees in some of Our neighbouring states, which deserves our criticism and that of the rest of the world. People who went into exile abroad because of the political conflict of the past and the laws which obtained in those circumstances, are returning home. The apartheid system and the international isolation and punitive measures which coincided with it, are already almost completely relegated to the past.

Thus the foundation have been laid for the successful termination of violence and a constructive beginning to negotiation.