

ECCO

CONFERENCE AND
LANGUAGE SERVICES

The TECHNIHIRE group of Companies
(Registration No. 86/03905/06)

1102 Heerengracht Centre
Adderley Street
Cape Town
South Africa
Tel.: 27-21-254590
e-mail: bboile@aztec.co.za

P.O. Box 6550
Roggebaai
8012

Fax: 27-21-4191613

THEME COMMITTEE	CC - SUBC.
DATE OF MEETING	27/02/96
NUMBER OF TAPES	?
CONTENT OF ENVELOPE	CORRECTIONS
1) PRINT OUT	MADE BY
2) NOTES	TRANSCRIBER
3) TAPES	PLS. AMEND
4) COMPUTER DISK	ACCORDINGLY

2/21/11/10/8

CC Subcommittee - 27 February 1996

On page 75 and page 78 I typed Tshibani??? (and queried the name in the notes). This was typed before I had the list of members attending. From this list I have ascertained that it should be Mr ~~Chibane~~. I don't know if you want to hand in the two amended sheets. It's probably already been amended by them.

Chabane!

recognise the right of self-determination, but not in the language included in the last ??? where it says "freely to exercise... ..the Constitutional Principle marries the concept of this schedule and the recognition of the right of South African people as a whole to self-determination should not be construed as precluding within that framework the said rights of people". So, it's a balance between what I call collective determination of the nation and the cultural determination of particular communities. My problem is this: Haven't you gone too far in wanting to incorporate the concept of a formal state or province in this document at this stage where the only area in which there seems to be substantial agreement is the need for a very effective protection of cultural, linguistic and religious rights.

Chairperson

Thank you. Mr ~~Chibane~~. *Chabane*

Chabane
Mr ~~Chibane~~

Yes, Mr Chairperson, probably some of the questions might not be very well received given the fact that the members of the Council have already indicated that they are not politicians, but nevertheless I would still say that they are dealing with political issues in trying to determine their report which they actually put before us. Firstly, Mr Chairperson, I would like to understand ??? proposal of the tenth province. What type of relationship would there be between that province and the national government given the nature of the province? Because other provinces... what type of relationship would there be between that province and the national government? Number 2, how would you then say the concept or the cultural concept is proposed? It will then have to reflect themselves at national level ???

speakers in this country, come to a proposal as far as cultural self-determination is concerned, will they then reply favourably to such a proposal? Because I think that's what's implied in their questions also to the Volkstaat Council.

Chairperson He is not asking the Volkstaat members.

Mr Beyers You can answer it at a later stage if you like, Mr Chairman.

Chairperson No, I don't have to answer any questions fortunately! You are asking the majority party now?

Mr Beyers And other parties that represent Afrikaners.

Chairperson OK. Dr Pahad?

Dr Pahad I have been covered both by Mr Eglin and by Mr Chibane but I want to come back to the question that was posed by Professor du Toit which I don't think had been adequately answered. This is the relationship between a claimed objective, impartial research and the conclusion or recommendations which are totally one-sided with respect to a Volkstaat and to me there is serious contradiction because involved in this thing throughout this whole documentation, through the interim report, is the notion of language. But it seems to me the Volkstaat Council's starting point and end point is that this language belongs to white Afrikaners, which is wrong. So, I don't know if their impartial research whether they went to brown and black Afrikaans-speaking people and said to them: Do you want a Volkstaat for whites who share the same