2/4/2/1/10/8

THEMES COMMITTEE

MEETING: 3/4/95
TAPES: 1

CONTENT:

1) PRINT-OUT
2) COMPUTER DISK
3) 1 TAPE
4) NOTES

Theme Committee 4 - 3 April 1995
Tape 1

NOTE

0511:
with us Thomas???

0535:
The Executive Director response ???

0740:
Is it Mr Ndlovu(?), seconded Mr Ackerman?

0796:
Who is speaker?

1957:
What do ??? comment

3360:
Who is speaker?

3851:
Who is speaker?

4154:
political artists? then

4356:
as long as ??? you mustn't say

4550:
Who is speaker??

4600:
run through our ???

5477:
??? will then ???

5762:
Who is speaker??

5890:
Who is lady speaker?? Sue who???

6320:

Who is speaker??

6423:
Who is speaker??

6600:
Who is speaker??

6641:
Who is speaker?? ??? sits on the Friday

6653:
Who is speaker??

Theme Committee 4 - 3 April 1995

Tape 1

Chairperson ... have been submitted to you. You can pick up a copy if you have left your copy at home or you have misplaced your copy, but these are not new documents. Okay, ladies and gentlemen, the first item on the agenda. You are all welcome. Thanks very much. I don't know how many times I have welcomed you today. It's now six o'clock in the evening, just past six, I don't know whether I should say "good morning" or "good evening". You're all welcome. And then the second item on the agenda is the meeting, which starts on page 3 to page 9. Any corrections from the minutes? Have you read the minutes. Page 4 of the minutes, 3.1.2. Alright, Mr Beyers was present at the meeting of the 13th. He was causing problems! Could you mark him present! (laughter) Are you with us ??? Have you noted that? Now page 4.3.1.2. I don't know what's that. The Executive Director ??? included. What's that? How do you read that? Page 4.3.1.2. Are you there? The Executive Director ??? included what? Excerpts? What's that? Oh, extracts, included extracts from the minutes of the Management Committee. OK. That's what you meant? Any correction? OK. If there is no question of clarification, somebody move? Mr Ndlovu(???), seconded Mr Ackerman(???). There are no matters arising from the minutes. They are not noted here.

??? I just want to ask a question, that's all. Whether the workshop on self-determination and Volkstaat and the constitutional amendments have now been finalised or are they still under consideration?

Chairperson

Prof.? Are you not one of those that are technical experts? We are waiting for the Volkstaat before we deal with that. Alright. And the other one? OK. Fine. No decision taken on the other one yet as well. Now I was saying to a lot of members that if you co-operate we can finish at ten o'clock, provided you co-operate. If you don't co-operate we can finish probably at 11 o'clock tonight. OK? Now the third item deals with the question of the electoral system proposed workshop. It is on page 10 of your working document. Now this workshop is proposed for 8th May and the technical advisors have already come out with the agenda. We have approved this agenda as the Core Group, but you know we have no powers. We recommend and we bring things to you for approval so the proposed agenda is in front of you. We are waiting for your approval so that the technical advisors can carry on planning for the workshop on 8th March. Mr Pahad?

Mr Pahad

Mr Chairman, I'm rather afraid that I did raise some objections in the Core Group to the proposed programme. Not that there is anything wrong with the ideas proposed. I was not convinced then, and I am not convinced now that the proposed programme is going to actually deal with the issues that we want to deal with in terms of the electoral system. I raised the issue about... I wasn't sure in my own mind and unless it can be clarified as to how input on the whole question of the 1994 election and a clerical analysis is going to help us arrive at some kind of conclusion in terms of the electoral system... I wasn't sure of that. That's the first point. The second point I made was that I had thought, unless otherwise corrected, that all of the parties here present had agreed that we should have a proportional

representation system. But having agreed to that, there are many problems that flow from it because there are different kinds of proportional representation. One of them is mentioned: the question of combining proportional representation with constituencies. Now, things like number 3 and if you look at number 4, electoral systems and party democracy, then you are relating it to the question of proportional representation. I mean, I did not think we were going to discuss a system such as the first part opposed system, which is, of course, also democratic. I mean, nobody would say that the first part opposed system is not democratic. So I think that this thing needs to be looked at again before we take a final decision with regard to the topic. We can agree on the date, but with regard to the topic that needs to be discussed, I want to make a proposal. I think what we need to do is to be more focused. We can't endlessly go on discussing everything that's happening in the world. More focused with regard to proportional representation. Then proportional representation with constituencies. And then to try to see how does it work in the different countries. There are different elements here. You can have a single member constituency, you can have a multi-member constituency. These are details and mechanisms on which we need information. The German system is different from the Italian which is different from the Australian. And I think if we try to have a workshop around that, which informs us about how different systems work, then we might be better placed to understand this. Therefore I want to suggest that we really try to go for 2 and 5 in a way, because I thought 5 might raise issues that people want to raise in relation to an electoral system. And then from there we can see how

else we want to go into other issues. That's my own thinking at this moment in time, but quite clearly I would still emphasise that I would not be happy if we accepted this draft proposal of programme as it stands. Thank you.

Chairperson — What do ??? comment on item 6, Mr Pahad?

Mr Pahad — I don't know how they can see regulating the electoral system in Final Constitution when they don't know what kind of electoral system you're using at the moment. I think that will come as a product of having discussions and having... If we can get consensus on an electoral system, this can then be reflected in the Constitution, but the Constitution may well just say we'll have to have regular elections based on a proportional representation system plus constituency, then your electoral act will actually regulate the entire election in terms of the mechanisms and the details and so on and so forth. But we can come back to that later. We can't discuss that until we've really discussed what kind of system we want and we might find that there is consensus on an electoral system, in which case life would be much easier.

Chairperson — There's the proposal from Mr Pahad, that we need to be more focused and not discuss a whole range of issues. He is proposing that we put in item 2 and item 5 only for this workshop. Now let's hear other views from the people. Mr Ndlovu's hand was up, then Mr Rabie.

Mr Ndlovu — Mr Chairman, I do understand what Mr Pahad is saying, but if we narrow it to two items only... I would really like to see point number 3 being taken into consideration because

point number 3 will tie up, which is what will happen in point number 3 at the end of the day. Therefore if I can just, if you don't mind, amend what he is saying, that we have 2, 3 and 5 as the focus of this workshop. And then thereafter can take it from there.

Chairperson — Mr Ndlovu says let's put in 5. Mr Rabie?

Mr Rabie — Mr Pahad, Mr Chairman, didn't explain exactly why he wouldn't like to follow or substitute some of the topics mentioned here. He has some hassle with regard to 1. But I think it will be good for us to have an independent evaluation as to how the 1994 proportional representation election went. I would agree that we should have discussions on 2 as well, then skipping 3, but 4 should also be discussed: electoral systems and party democracy. We are having the workshops to shed light on the topics that we are not au fait with because it's the first time that we have, for instance, proportional representation in this country and an electoral system, as he so rightly mentions, may be part proportional and it might be part geographically based. So, let's discuss the issue, let's clear the air, let's clear our minds with regard to that. I don't basically have an objection to dealing with this as it stands there.

Mr Pahad — Sorry, Mr Chairman. I mean, people must explain. Let us say... If you say that you are going to have a proportional representation system on its own, let's start it, as you have previously. That impacts on party democracy. If you say you're going to have a proportional representation plus a constituency based, that also impacts upon party democracy. All I was saying to you was that you can't take

this thing and artificially separate it because they are linked. You cannot discuss the system without saying: this is the impact it would have on party democracy. Now, I am saying therefore 4 would form part of 2 and it should form part of 2 in order to inform us. Not say you are going to discuss an item under 2, and then having discussed it, you are now going to say: now we're going to go on a separate route. I am not saying that, that issue is not important. All I am saying is that the issue already would come under 4 because it would have to flow from that. I was trying to say that you need to find a way in which to link the two and not separate the two. That's the point I was really making. On 3, we're discussing here an electoral system. The question of having members nominated by the executive into parliament. I don't know what it means because once you have an electoral system and you're defining an electoral system to say your National Assembly will consist – I'm not talking about the Senate because I think we should separate that because the Senate has a whole... and I'll come back to the Senate on other questions... Then it is a different matter. Now once you've defined the system, even the system you say there are possibilities for somebody to be nominated by the executive. I don't know what that means, either you get elected by the people in parliament or you don't; I don't think that anybody was suggesting actually that somehow you'll give powers to the executive to go and nominate some more people because they didn't have a majority in parliament so they're short of five/six and now the executive is going to nominate another five in order to get the majority. I would have thought nobody would find it acceptable.

Chairperson — Let met get the other views on the issue. Dr Steenkamp?

Dr Steenkamp — Mr Chairman, I think what Mr Pahad actually does know is to sort of try to pre-empt what the speakers on the various topics might say and then decides beforehand whether we like it or not and I think the whole purpose of a workshop is to listen and then this committee is in a position to decide. So, I would be unwilling to beforehand disqualify certain topics. I would indeed include number 4, for instance, and even number 3 which could lead, in this committee, to a very interesting discussion, after we have listened to the inputs. So I do not think one should fall into the trap to decide from the topics what we like and what not beforehand, and scrap the topics, in which case you may as well scrap the workshop.

Chairperson — Mr Ndlovu(?)

Mr Ndlovu — Mr Chairman, don't grumble, don't grumble. Mr Chairman, what Dr Pahad is saying. He is saying that number 3 won't fit in because we are talking about the electoral system, but in that number 3 there is Senate elected by National Assembly, the topic says that there. Therefore that is why I think it has a bearing on the election of those people. There are other parties who think that Senators must not be elected, must be appointed. There are other parties who think that Senators should be elected, directly or indirectly. Therefore it will clear our minds... I don't think there is any problem, Mr Chairman, I said if there is anything that's behind this agenda that is in front of us, I've already amended his proposal by saying that 2, 3 and 5, 4 can be combined with 2, 2 together 4, and 3 and 5 can stand as

items on the agenda of this workshop. I don't think there is any problem with that unless Dr Pahad says there is a problem, and he must say so if there is a problem.

??? Mr Chairman, can I ask the Core Committee just to consider the possibility whether it will not be more effective during the workshop to first listen to the contributions and afterwards have the questions and the discussion simultaneously.

Chairperson Mr Eglin?

Mr Eglin Chairperson, I think, you know, the subject is extremely broad. The one thing we are looking at is a system, what I call democratic election, for the lower house. And on that we are committed to common voters' roll, non-racial, an extent proportionality and all of the parties seem to be indicating that they want some constituency content to it. And I think even if we have somebody give us a talk on five or six different systems, not just how they work, but the impact on the parties. Because each system has a different impact on the political parties, it has a different impact on parliament. So I think that's a subject on its own. I am sympathetic to our also having a look at the Senate, but that is a completely different issue. It isn't the issue of how do you elect what electoral system, it is really how do you compose because you may have them nominated by the executive from each province, it's not an election process. So I am for having one on the lower house, concentrating on what I call the "popular election" and how it works, but I believe there should be a separate one on how the Senate is to be composed and how that is going to be put in place.

I wouldn't put two at one workshop because I think they are two different issues.

Chairperson — It's your proposal, Mr Eglin.

Mr Eglin — I'm assuming that if you ask somebody under 2 to talk about accountable proportional representation, it isn't just a mechanistic look at how you count the votes at the end of the day, it is also a philosophical discussion on how it affects the political parties, to the extent that electoral systems and party democracy fall under that; I think that all is relevant. But I think it should be geared at trying to find a solution within the framework of the Constitutional Principles that we have and not start having just a discourse on parliamentary democracy in general. So I would argue strongly that 2 should form the essential core of it; that, I think, brings in an international aspect; and that 4 is automatically covered by it. I don't think you have to have a separate one on 4 because it should be covered by both 2 and 5. So, I would concentrate on 2 and 5 and, in the process, ask the people to expand on the impact of that electoral system on both the political parties and on the parliament.

Chairperson — Mr Eglin supports the view suggested by Mr Pahad. Which one do we fall for now? All Mr Eglin is saying is that we take 3 out. You will have a separate workshop on 3. That's what Mr Eglin is proposing.

??? — Then I'll have no problem. If we are going to have a separate workshop for the Senators and others, then I have no problem.

Chairperson — Then we take 2 and 5 and that 4, it is implied, will be dealt with under 2. Mr Rabie, are you happy? OK. Fine. Then we move that way, that is the decision of this committee. Thank you very much.

Mr Rabie — I misunderstood, Chairman. I have in the Core Group proposed that under 2, which is now a combination, that Professor Albert Venter also be included to address that workshop.

Chairperson — Under 2? Professor Albert Venter? OK. There's a proposal that Professor Albert Venter be a second speaker under 2. Mr Pahad?

Mr Pahad — That's right. Mr Rabie's quite right that, that proposal had been agreed. I thought what we had also said that this takes place on 8th May and if other parties do know of an expert who could make a contribution to it, then they should propose this to the Theme Committee or the Core Group, which could then consider the names. So we shouldn't say that the issue is closed with regard to who will make their inputs because, I think, what Mr Eglin said is important. It's not a question of implied, you see, it's a question of its being central to the question, this question of party democracy. Also that we want to look at different countries. People must come and explain to us how it works in Germany, what happens in other countries and so your experts would then be dependent. You can't just bring somebody who has read a book on the proportional representation system. It must be somebody then who knows the country they are talking about so that the input will be meaningful. So I am saying we agree with Mr Rabie

about Professor Venter, but we must also try to see that other experts who know specifically about certain countries who could make a meaningful contribution come to the workshop. And there is time for that. The workshop's taking place on 8th May.

Chairperson — Could I request political ??? then who have got some names they would like to suggest, to just forward those names to the Core Group members via the administration. OK? There was another submission. Mr Beyers was suggesting that when we have workshops, how about listening to all speakers and form a panel thereafter, take questions and discussions at the same time to save time? Do you agree on that one? Normally we have been allowing a speaker to talk, raise questions of clarity, and then in the end, participate. But what we have discovered, or the experience tells us that, most of the time is consumed by question time and at the end people have really no time to have inputs into the workshop and their own contributions. Could we try that? Mr Msomi?

Mr Momi — Is it possible then to request the speakers to prepare their papers well in advance, or ask to see what they are going to be presenting and see how we can consolidate questions across all the papers?

Chairperson — The problem is that with the previous workshops we had we have been preparing those workshops in a week's time and it has not been possible, but maybe with this one, because it's the 8th May and apparently we are concluding the preparations now, we could maybe request them to do so. I think it is possible to arrange it in advance. OK. Thank

you. Nkosi Ligege?

Mr Ligege — Chairperson, as long as ??? you mustn't say: I'm going away. I'll leave you with the paper.

Chairperson — OK. We'll control that. Thank you very much. Could we then move to the next item. And the next item is "Establishment of commissions". Now, will you look at item 4? Administration says it has requested all Theme Committees to advise them whether they want to appoint commissions on some other issues that we want to deal with. Now, I don't know whether... Do we really want to appoint commissions? Is there are substance that we feel we should refer to commissions? You remember we said at the beginning that maybe the only substance we can refer to a commission is the electoral system, but apparently there is no need now because we have already engaged in that whole process. I am not too sure, but have we really applied our minds as to which substance needs commissions in our Theme Committee? Can we hear your views on that?

Mr Rabie — I don't believe we need commissions.

Chairperson — You don't believe we need commissions?

??? — Mr Chairman, we brought this as a Core Group here to this meeting because we wanted to get the views of the DP on this matter because they were in favour of having commissions in the first place. Now we want to know because at this moment in time while we are dealing with this problem, tomorrow we will be dealing with traditional

authority. We have already run through our ??? therefore it will be according to us. There will be no need really to have a commission unless the DP...

Chairperson — Mr Eglin?

Mr Eglin — Chairperson, four months ago I advocated a commission on the Electoral Act because I think if we had, had three experts and given them three months or two months to go through all this and sort it all out and come to us, I think it would have been more effective. We haven't done it and we're now caught up with time and we're going to do it through a workshop. So, I think let's try the workshop route.

Chairperson — OK. So there are no moments for commission at the moment unless later we might think of having a commission. Do you agree on that one? Thanks very much. The next item on the agenda is the question of submission. Now, we have completed a separate document which we would like to look at very quickly. I'll introduce the document and we'll discuss the document quickly. The Core Group decided that maybe we should approach the discussion of submission in a different way this time so we requested our technical advisers to propose a way forward as to how we are going to approach discussing the submissions which we have received. Six parties have now submitted, we got quite a number of submissions from the civil society. Now, how do we go about it, the way forward? Now, the proposals are there. If you look at number 2 there, blocks 2 and 3 can be divided into the following topics. Pardon? You didn't find the document?

Oh, it's a loose document distributed to you. On top is written "Proposal for work programme" on blocks 2 and 3. This one. It's on the table as well. Do you have that one all of you? Does everybody have it? Now all that the technical advisers are saying in this document is that it is going to be much better if we divide this block into four main topics. Now the first topic is the National Assembly, including the size of the National Assembly, the elections and their removal, their presiding officers, committees, rights and remuneration of members, powers and functions vis-à-vis the executive. And the second one is the Senate. I would suppose they would talk of composition, they left out... But I think the composition of the Senate is also vital, it should be included there, purpose and functions, powers and election of the Senate. And the third topic would be then the executive or the president, election, powers, removal and term of office. And the last one would be the cabinet, appointment and dismissal, responsibilities on individuals and collectively whatever the case may be. Now, they have divided that block into four major topics. Now, this is to enable the Theme Committee members to prepare themselves on each topic so that when we come and deliberate, we are all prepared. We just stick to that topic until we complete it. And once we have completed it, we move to the next topic. That will also allow members to prepare and knowing that next week we are going to talk about the Senate, let's prepare ourselves for that, rather than just to mix everything at one time, getting people confused. Once we have dealt with that, we deal with the president and once we have finished with that, we deal with the cabinet, and all that. What will happen, if we agree to that, is that under 3 the technical advisers are then

coming with what we call a plan of action tied up with those four topics. This plan of action, in other words, will go this way:

(a) drafting of reports by technical advisers, each drafting a report on a topic mentioned above. They are dividing themselves and each one will then draft a report according to those documents.

(i) political parties' position agreements and disagreements, e.g. will be looked at when the report has been drafted, public submissions, additional proposals, report for particular proposals etc. We'll be looking at those issues.

(b) the Theme Committee 2 meetings are scheduled. I think there is another document which is distributed for you with Theme Committee work scheduled from the 18th when we come back. We will be meeting on the 18th, we will be meeting on the 19th, and we'll be meeting on the 21st. That means that from the 18th until the 21st, that time is scheduled for the 3 A work. Parliament will not be sitting that week. Now, what are we going to be doing from the 18th until the 21st? We are starting to talk about that under (b) We are saying, first it will be the presentation of technical advisers' report on the topics and secondly, presentations by political parties on points of disagreement and thirdly, debate on points on disagreement and agreement and fourthly, discussion on public submissions. That's what we will be concentrating on.

(c) drafting reports by Theme Committee 2 on four topics. And then, what are the time frames? The technical advisers are proposing brief time frames here as to what should be happening.

(a) drafting of reports by technical advisers, starting with the National Assembly. This report could be presented by

10th April; it will be distributed; Senate by 10th April; and then President by the 18th April and Cabinet by the 18th April.

(b) Theme Committee 2 meetings ??? will then ??? will then sit on the 18th, 19th; we're not sitting on the 20th actually, according to the programme of the CA, but we are only sitting on the 21st; on the 20th we're not sitting.

(off mike comments)

Only the Core Groups? No, no, no, I think we're sitting on the 18th.

(off mike discussion)

Alright, OK, fine, fine, fine. I now see what you are talking about. What's the noise all about now? Ja, I'm going to talk about that; just hold your horses a little bit. We'll come to that. The Administration is suggesting that the Core Group should meet on the 18th and the Theme Committee meeting on the 19th, 20th and the 21st. Now, we need to take it officially there, because this is our Theme Committee. Do you want the Theme Committee to meet on the 18th? Or do you want the Core Group to meet on the 18th? We can change that. If you want the Theme Committee to meet on the 18th, we can schedule a Core Group meeting later in the week. We can schedule the Theme Committee on the 18th. The Core Group on the 18th? We stick to the proposed agenda as it is.

(off mike comments)

Mr Rabie — Mr Chairman?

Chairperson — Yes, Mr Rabie, let me hear.

Mr Rabie — The Core Group has already planned its work in advance. What will be the purpose of the Core Group meeting on the

18th? I would propose that the Theme Committee meets on the 18th, that's the Tuesday.

Chairperson Thank you.

(off mike comments)

The 19th? We're meeting? No, no, only the Theme Committee meets on Wednesday.

??? So we meet on the 18th as well as the 19th?

Chairperson Yes, we meet right through that whole week. That's the proposal; we'll do a good stitch of work that way. Sue?

Ms Sue I would suggest that the Core Group if they've got anything to do meet on the 18th, then we meet on the 19th.

Chairperson The Core Group has got nothing to do on the 18th! Let's hear, Peter.

Mr Hendrickse Yes, Mr Chairperson, I would like to support that, that we meet on the 19th, but that we meet the full day on the 19th, the morning and the afternoon, that's two sessions. This will also assist many of us from out of town to get back to Cape Town on the Tuesday because it being Easter Weekend and the old thing, of course, it is very difficult to get place.

Chairperson Mr Eglin? Please be quiet. Mr Eglin?

Mr Eglin I want to take the timetable in conjunction with the documents that are going to be distributed. I don't believe that documents distributed over the Easter weekend are

going to serve any purpose, quite frankly. We will come back on the 18th and I think the 18th should be used for us to look at the various documents that are available. I don't think we will look at things distributed to our homes over Easter weekend. Honestly. And I don't think we can deal with all four of these subjects in one week, in four successive days. So I think we should look at the 19th; the 18th looking at the documents, then the 19th deciding how far can we take it, perhaps on the 19th and the 20th. We're not due to meet on the 21st by the way. Not according to the schedule. We're only supposed to meet on the 19th and the 20th.

Mr Rabie — Dis die spesifieke rede waarom die Core Group ook nie kan sit nie.[1]

Mr Eglin — This latest annexure... This schedule says that we meet as a Core Group on the 18th, as a Theme Committee on the 19th, as a Theme Committee on the 20th, and as a Core Group on the 21st.

Chairperson — OK, OK. I am now informed that some have documents with a missing page. Mr Eglin has a document with a missing page.

(uproar)

You don't have it? OK. I'm sorry. The schedule is that, Mr Eglin... Let me go through quickly. ...is that on the 18th a proposal from Administration that the Core Groups are meeting. And then on the 20th we are meeting as a Theme Committee. On the 21st we are meeting as a Theme

---

[1] It is for this specific reason that the Core Group also cannot meet.

Committee. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Let's go back to the 19th. the 19th we are meeting as a Theme Committee, the 20th as a Theme Committee and the 21st as a Theme Committee. And then the 21st Core Group again. Alright. So what we need to do... Let me ...

(uproar)

Can you give me a chance, please? Let us do this. Shhh. Can I then propose that we give people the chance to arrive on the 18th, get into their offices, look at the documents, have their own different caucuses if they wish to caucus, whatever the case may be, and then on the 19th the Theme Committee sits, and that on the 20th the Theme Committee sits, and that on the 21st the Core Group doesn't sit and the Theme Committee sits. Would you agree to that one? Let me repeat: on the 18th the Core Group sits, no I'm sorry, we allow the people to come in. The Core Group can decide whether it wants to meet on the 18th or not, leave it to them, they will decide, but we allow them then not to come in on the 18th, do their work in the offices, whatever they want to do. And that we meet on the 19th, the 20th and the 21st as a Theme Committee. Peter? OK. The proposal from Mr Hendrickse is that we meet the whole day on the 19th. What's the problem, ???

???

Well, you see, Mr Chairman, if we are going to meet on Wednesday the 19th and on Thursday and then we are missing on Friday, there will be no need for us to meet the whole day on Wednesday because we can use these three days. The problem, Mr Chairman, is that then we will be discussing a thing that we know. There will be no need for the people to exhaust themselves if they are coming back the second day to do their point.

Chairperson — Another thing is, I have no problem with people meeting for the whole day. Will the smaller parties be accommodated because all Theme Committees are sitting then?

??? — I request protection from the chair! From Mr Steenkamp! I don't know what the question is all about.

Chairperson — He is saying we will be here, all of us, so we can meet the whole day. That is what he is saying. Mr Olifant?

Mr Olifant — Mr Chairman, I just want to say that I'm just afraid that... I mean I am quite in favour of us meeting more often because if you can see what is happening here... It's mostly the Core Group people who participate in these meetings, which is very dangerous. It is disempowering us because every time when we find a problem we say: Let the Core Group deal with it. And that's the problem because at the end of the day we are going to sit here like little puppies and just go along with agreements on what is happening in the Core Groups and that's a problem. I am quite in favour of meeting longer so that it can empower us as well.

Chairperson — OK. Is there any counter motion? Mr Ndlovu. Only one counter motion.

Mr Rabie — I don't counter.

Chairperson — You don't counter. The majority agrees, we can meet the whole day on the 19th, starting at 10 and ending up, when? At 5? OK, fine. Thank you. Agreed? Inkosi Ligege?

Mr Ligege — This one on Friday. It's a little bit difficult on Fridays that

we can all be here.

Mr Rabie — What is wrong? Why?

Mr Ligege — The wrongness you know very well.

??? — No, Mr Chairman, I don't. If we're going to work the whole day on Wednesday, I don't know why the people don't want to work on Friday. I don't. Why we don't start at 9,00 and finish at 5,00 on Friday.

(all talking together)

Chairperson — No dialogue. We have closed that matter. We are meeting on the 19th for the whole day.

??? — ??? sits on the Friday during the morning or...

??? — What time are we sitting on Friday?

Chairperson — OK. OK. That was for the Core Group. Why can't we sit at 9 o'clock on Friday? Let's sit at 9 o'clock until we decide to finish, maybe at 1,00, whatever the case may be. OK. Let's say we sit at 9 o'clock, we'll see when we finish, but we can take it up to 1,00. OK. Thank you very much. The time for the 19th. We are sitting at what time? 10,00 until 5,00. And then on the 20th. We're sitting from 2 o'clock to 6 o'clock. And then on the 21st we are sitting at 9 o'clock until 1 o'clock. The 20th, 2,00 to 6,00. If you want it in the morning, we can arrange it, but there are other Theme Committees meeting in the morning. There's a caucus in the morning, yes, of a different political party. Mr Pahad?

Mr Pahad — I think we need to look at the proposal of the work

programmes for blocks 2 and 3 because the way it is put, I have a problem. You see, the drafting of reports by technical advisers, so they will give us something on the Senate by the 10th April, but on what are the technical experts going to base their reports? Where? There is nothing here which says when the party submissions are to be in. You are already today on, whatever the date is today, the 3rd April. Now, it seems to me that it is not logically possible. We have agreed to these dates. For technical experts to suck a report from their thumbs, without submissions from political parties. The first problem we have got to solve now is when should the political parties make their submissions to the technical experts? That's the first problem we have to solve. If we say by the end of the week, fine. I don't have a problem with that, but I think we need to establish that date. And then we can move, you see, because at the moment some of the submissions are rather general in terms of the National Assembly, just speaking from what the ANC wants, some are specific. But specifically in relation to the Senate... Those of you who read newspapers, might have actually read that the ANC had its own national conference over the last weekend in which some very important, at least for us, issues were discussed and from which a number of very important proposals, again for us, emanated. Now, when we make that submission, which we will, and we can make it by the end of the week because we've discussed in conference, it would be a good thing if the parties had a little bit more time to give consideration to it. So, what I am really raising is two things. One is: when do the political parties... Let's set a deadline for the political parties to make a submission so that the technical experts can actually make a report.

Two: to say that the technical experts should make their submissions on the basis of the report that they already have in existence. All I am saying, Mr Ndlovu, is that we, from the ANC, have not made any submissions with regard to the Senate as yet. I don't know to what extent the IFP has made submissions with regard to what should be the composition, role, functions of the Senate and I am specifically speaking about the Senate, which does create a problem.