

PROCEEDINGS AT JOINT MEETING

The Houses met in the Chamber of Parliament at 15:30.

Mr Speaker took the Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS, TABLINGS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS—see col 12539.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before the Secretary reads the first order of the day, I want to mention that the hon member for Rust Ter Vaal has asked me for an opportunity to make a personal explanation.

*Mr S K LOUW: Mr Speaker, on 5 June in the debate on the Environment Affairs Vote I said in my speech "Never before have I seen such a large number of vultures as in this House this afternoon", knowing that the hon members of the Official Opposition in the House of Representatives could interpret this as a reference to them. If that is the case, I request permission to withdraw these words.

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon member must withdraw them unconditionally.

*Mr S K LOUW: I withdraw them unconditionally, Mr Speaker.

POPULATION REGISTRATION ACT REPEAL BILL

(Second Reading debate)

The MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS: Mr Speaker, in his historic speech on 1 February 1991 the hon the State President announced that legislation would be introduced to Parliament during the current session to repeal the Population Registration Act of 1950. We have now reached that point in time. Since the announcement by the hon the State President much has been said to either welcome or to deplore the intended step. The reasons for these diverse reactions are to be found in the fact that this Act, like the Group Areas Act, is generally regarded as a fundamental element of the apartheid system. The repeal of this Act, which is without doubt the most important piece of legislation in the history of apartheid, is therefore absolutely

vital to the dismantling of the apartheid system. The sooner this is achieved, the sooner apartheid will be dealt a death-blow, and we have now reached that moment.

We have, during the past week, witnessed the dismantling of the Group Areas Act, the Black Land Act, the Development Trust and Land Act, the Black Communities Development Act, the deletion of racial reservations on land tenure in all other laws and drastic changes to local government legislation. We all agree that this is a major step forward and that South Africa will never be the same again as far as inter-race relations are concerned. All these steps, however, would have been in vain if race classification, as provided for by the Population Registration Act, 1950, were not repealed at the same time. This Act, which was at times referred to as the "Europeans Only Act", forms the cornerstone of apartheid and discrimination in the Republic of South Africa. Most other apartheid Acts are in fact based on race as defined by and determined in terms of the Population Registration Act.

The repeal of the Act is in fact the repeal of apartheid as practised by South Africa over a period of 43 years. The 1948 general election was won on the policy of apartheid. Political leaders at the time believed in separation of the races and the purposeful development and upliftment of the separate communities. In practice, however, the implementation of the policy did not comply with the expectations of self-determination and fair and equal development. The outcome was one of discriminatory humiliation and heartache, with members of the same family often classified in two or more different racial groups.

The problems surrounding applications for reclassification placed members of the public as well as my department in an embarrassing position, in addition to the process being time-consuming and more often causing disappointment to the applicant, whose natural association with a certain community often could not be satisfied on account of statutory stipulations. The fact that all people who were not White or Black were referred to as "Coloured" and could be classified in seven different categories further complicated the application of the Act and the task of my department.

When the hon the State President announced the intended repeal of the Population Registration Act he also said that a transitional measure would be necessary for the interim maintenance of the present constitutional dispensation. The Bill, which is a consolidation of two other proposed Bills that were withdrawn on 4 June 1991, contains such a transitional measure. In this regard I wish to refer hon members to clause 1(3) of the Bill.

In terms of the proposed transitional measure present classifications will be temporarily retained in the Population Register for purposes of the application of Acts which still rely on such classifications, especially where this is necessary to comply with the present constitutional dispensation which, as the hon the State President has undertaken, will be the subject of renegotiation between all parties striving towards a peaceful, constitutional and acceptable solution for the new South Africa.

These classifications will naturally fall away automatically when the present Republic of South Africa Constitution Act is repealed. This undertaking has been specifically included in the Population Registration Act Repeal Bill to serve as an unconditional guarantee of the Government's bona fides in this connection.

The important point which needs to be emphasised is that there will be no new classifications after this Bill has become law. The Republic of South Africa Constitution Act of 1983 and, as far as could be ascertained, the following limited number of Acts which are closely linked to the present constitutional dispensation and its essential implications, are involved in the transitional phase in terms of clause 1(3) of the Bill: The Child Care Act, Act No 74 of 1983; the Coloured Persons Education Act, Act No 47 of 1963; the Indians Education Act, Act No 61 of 1965; the Indians Advanced Technical Education Act, Act No 12 of 1968; the Social Pensions Act, Act No 37 of 1973; the General Pensions Act, Act No 29 of 1979; the Referendums Act, Act No 108 of 1983 and the Local Government Bodies Franchise Act, Act No 117 of 1984.

The Population Registration Act Repeal Bill therefore repeals the whole of the Population Registration Act of 1950 and the whole of the Population Registration Amendment Acts of 1956, 1960, 1962, 1967, 1969, 1970, 1973, 1977, 1980, 1982 and 1984, as set out in Schedule I of

the Bill, together with the repeal of specified sections of three other Acts. In terms of Schedule II a number of Acts will be amended. The Identification Act of 1986 will be amended by terminating the inclusion of a person's race or population group in the Population Register by means of a birth entry number. The Marriage Act of 1961 will no longer provide for the appointment of marriage officers for particular groups. I announced on 12 February 1991 that race was no longer to be indicated on certificates of birth, with effect from that date. Apartheid is therefore being removed, literally from the cradle to the grave.

In accordance with the Population Registration Act Repeal Bill under discussion reference to race or colour is now also being removed from the Merchant Shipping Act of 1957, the Births, Marriages and Deaths Registration Act of 1963, the Unemployment Insurance Act of 1966, the National Parks Act of 1976 and the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1941.

*Those who are opposed to the repeal of the Act have made their objections known in no uncertain terms. The objections display an obsession and a preoccupation with groups on a racial basis and in order to defend their standpoint they are invoking the Government's undertaking that it would protect the interests of minority groups.

However, the Population Registration Act has never afforded protection to groups, and particularly minority groups. The Population Registration Act forced individuals into groups on the basis of the colour of their skin regardless of their cultural values, language usage and even family ties.

The Government's assurance that groups will be protected, therefore stands regardless of the existence or otherwise of statutory group definitions. In this regard I refer hon members to the hon the State President's Opening Address on 1 February this year when he said, *inter alia*, the following in regard to an own community life (Hansard, 1991, col 13):

The ending of apartheid and the repeal of these last remaining discriminatory laws will bring us to the end of an era—an era in which it was sought to deal with the reality of a diversity of peoples and communities within the same national boundaries, by means of discriminatory coercion.

However, the removal of discrimination and coercion, which is now being completed, does not alter the reality of the existence of a variety of peoples and communities.

This is not unique to South Africa either.

Throughout the world, there are certain communities within countries and states that have maintained a specific identity. Individuals, who feel attracted to certain communities and happy and secure in them, are also allowed to do so.

In South Africa, too, a deeply-rooted desire exists among some communities for a system in which certain human needs may continue to be met in a community context—without coercion, without discrimination and without apartheid.

The Government is convinced that recognition has to be given to this reality in any new dispensation. Therefore, it remains committed to ensuring community rights for those who desire them and believes that they will have to be accommodated in the new South Africa.

The Government's points of departure in this respect are that:

People cannot be coerced into communities;

The authorities may not discriminate against certain communities in favour of others;

A community life of one's own has to be sustained by one's own inherent will and abilities and not by statutory coercion;

Community recognition has to be based on freedom of association, as it is recognised constitutionally and otherwise by various countries in the world.

Unlike the supposed protection afforded by the Population Registration Act, a new, just South Africa will form the basis of the existence, recognition and protection of groups in accordance with voluntary association.

†There are also those who, although they support the repeal of the Act, deplore the introduction of a transitional clause. These critics will no doubt be surprised to note that only a few Acts still rely on the Population Registration Act. Analysis shows that these Acts are closely linked to the essential applications of the present constitutional dispensation and are therefore subjected to the process of negotiation.

Then there are those who claim to be staunch opposers of apartheid, who thrived while apartheid was still in full cry, but who are now lamenting because of the turn of events. They will no doubt, like vultures, descend on the remains of the carcass of apartheid to justify their continued existence.

*The repeal of the Population Registration Act underscores the Government's approach that all people in South Africa are equal and must have equal opportunities, that they are co-creators and co-builders of the future and that no population group's survival and identity is dependent on absolutely watertight, legally divided separateness. The future cannot be built on separate rights and privileges of groups, but in fact on binding forces. Dividing forces instead of combining and utilising them, would be fatal. The grouping together of people and groups will henceforth occur on the basis of voluntary association, within which factors such as the economy, language and culture could, in fact, play a role.

However, whereas the economy has always been integrated, the abolition of racial classification now opens up new opportunities. Joint management of the country, joint local government, land reform and the abolition of group areas delimitation are now finally paving the way for the hon the State President, with multiparty negotiations, to reflect on the future of South Africa around the conference table.

The world is awaiting the repeal of racially discriminatory legislation and, in particular, the repeal of the Population Registration Act. In anticipation of the hon the State President's undertakings, doors are opening to South Africa ever more rapidly in Africa, Europe, the United Kingdom, the USA and the rest of the world, and South Africa is making phenomenal breakthroughs daily.

It has often been alleged that the Population Registration Act is the cornerstone of the apartheid system. Its repeal means that parents will no longer be required to furnish their population group or that of the child upon registering a birth. It also means that references to population groups will disappear from all official documents, except for a few laws, including, *inter alia*, the Constitution, for which provision has been made in the interim.

Its repeal therefore symbolises the fact that all legislation that discriminates on the basis of colour has for practical purposes finally disappeared from the Statute Book. In the final analysis its repeal does in fact symbolise, more than anything else, the change of attitude that is taking place among the inhabitants of South Africa.

I therefore want to appeal to everyone who has the future of South Africa at heart to develop those factors that bind us and to do so in a positive humanitarian spirit. The experiment of accentuating differences has failed. We also realise that we do not need laws to protect a group's identity. Our salvation lies in building a common future together and in the separate community ensuring from its own resources that what it regards as sacred, is protected.

In order to succeed in this, it is necessary for South Africa, after the repeal of this Act, which grouped people into groups in an inhumane fashion according to their colour and descent, to obtain everyone's co-operation to ensure that apartheid does not continue to survive in practice in everyday life as if it had never been abolished. We must practise what we preach.

Human dignity must be recognised and respected. This will also afford the elements of the rich diversity of our society the opportunity to get to know one another even better, to work together and to concern ourselves with eradicating radicalism and instead strengthening our economy, creating educational and employment opportunities and striving for peace and security. Through this approach we can only build a finer and stronger South Africa. It is therefore a great privilege for me to introduce the Second Reading debate of this Bill.

*Mr J H MOMBERG: Mr Speaker, I take pleasure in speaking after the hon the Minister in this historic debate today. I want to tell him that I greatly appreciate the vein of sincerity vein running through his speech. I consider it a privilege today to participate in the funeral of the mother of all apartheid laws, namely the Population Registration Act, Act 30 of 1950.

It was the Population Registration Act which permitted the Group Areas Act, the Immorality Act, the Electoral Act, the Constitution, the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act and many

more to function, because this Act classified people into colour groups.

†The heart of the Population Registration Act must be section 5(1) which reads:

Every person whose name is included in the register shall be classified by the Director-General as a white person, a coloured person or a Black, as the case may be, and every coloured person and every Black whose name is so included shall be classified by the Director-General according to the ethnic or other group to which he belongs.

When Parliament debated the Population Registration Act in 1950, General Smuts spoke in the debate on 8 March and said prophetically:

I think a law of this nature will do more harm not only here in South Africa and abroad, but generally to the conscience of many people than we realise today, and that being so, I think we should give this matter very careful thought before we pass legislation of this kind.

This was the section which determined where a person could live, have a meal, go to church, go to school, belong to a sport club, where to be buried, whom to marry, whether he could vote. This was the section that put colour into all the hated race laws, and therefore it is indeed a great joy for me to take part in this debate and say that the DP will support this Bill.

*When the original Bill, namely Act 110 of 1991, was tabled for the first time, we in the DP had serious reservations about it and proposed an amendment to clause 2 in the joint committee which was rejected by the various components, however.

The greatest problem we had with the Bill was that we believed that the transitional provision in clause 2 was clumsy and ambiguous. We believed that it could lead to incorrect interpretations.

We of the DP have no problem with the standpoint of the hon the State President, as expressed during the opening of Parliament this year when he said that the abolition of the Act would have to go hand in hand with the adoption of temporary transitional measures to uphold the Constitution and the Electoral Act.

After the joint committee had agreed to the Bill, the DP, and especially my colleague the hon member for Wynberg, kept on trying to alter the

Bill. Prof Nic Olivier helped us with the formulation of a new Bill which amalgamated Bills 110 and 117. This concept was then submitted to the hon the Minister and members of the joint committee, and my leader, the hon member for Parktown, also submitted it to the hon the State President. It is with the greatest appreciation that I can say today that both the hon the Minister and the hon the State President exhibited great understanding of the DP's objections. The new Bill is a result of that understanding. Nevertheless I believe that the hon the Minister could have given a little more credit for the role that the DP played in this regard.

The new Bill no longer contains the problematical clause 2 and, although the population register still remains in force, the new Bill makes it crystal clear that the population register will lapse as soon as Act 110 of 1983, the Constitution, is repealed. Consequently there can be no doubt that the population register will only be maintained in respect of the Electoral Act and the Constitution.

The Bill also gets rid of hurtful colour legislation, such as contained in the amendment to section 1 of Act 57 of 1976 which lays down that a White poacher may not be arrested by a non-White game warden.

The amendment to sections 5 and 6 of the Identification Act, 1986, also terminates the entry of a person's race or population group by means of a birth entry number. From now on new births will be registered only as South Africans.

†When the NP took over the Government in 1948 they systematically introduced legalised racial discrimination, commonly known as apartheid. It must be stated in all fairness, though, that the NP did not invent discrimination; they just legalised it.

What we are doing today is to remove the last official pillar of apartheid from our society. This does not mean that there will not be a great deal of discrimination left in our society that will exist in the minds and hearts of people, but, thank God, today we bury legalised apartheid.

What is kept in place is the Electoral Act and the Republic of South Africa Constitution Act of 1983. We in the DP do not like the tricameral Parliament and own affairs, but we understand—and I hope the world community will also

understand—that these interim measures must exist for the time being. The fact that clause 1(2) states that the repeal will be total when the Republic of South Africa Constitution Act, 1983, is repealed, is also an indication that these are temporary measures. It is therefore of the utmost importance that violence be stopped so that the real negotiations, which must lead to the adoption of a new constitution, can start as quickly as possible.

*This Bill brings an end to one of the most sordid racial periods in history since the Second World War. I hope and pray that we never experience anything like this in our country again. I hope that all of us who formed part of this distasteful system have learnt the lesson that no person is better than any other person simply because the colour of his skin is white. Any discrimination is unacceptable and must be eradicated mercilessly. I hope that, as a result of the pain and heartache caused by apartheid, the new South Africa will be free of any form of discrimination.

We are rejoicing today because this Act is being repealed. Personally I find it an emotional moment to form part of the repeal process. It is good to know that one day, many years hence, one's descendants will know that one also formed part of such a process. It will help to reduce that feeling caused by one's contribution to the pain of apartheid.

†In conclusion, as we meet today to repeal this Act and, in effect, begin to liberate the people of colour in this country, I think it is fitting to dedicate the immortal words spoken by Dr Martin Luther King Jr on 28 August 1963, during the famous civil rights march in Washington, to all our oppressed brothers and sisters in our country as a message of hope that they will soon be free. He said:

Let freedom ring. And when this happens, when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, Black men and White men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: "Free at last, free at last, thank God Almighty, we're free at last."

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I wish to draw the attention of hon members to the provisions of Rule 91A which reads as follows:

A member shall as far as possible refrain from reading his speech, but may refresh his memory by referring to notes.

*This rule was adopted a year or so ago by the Rules Committees for the convenience of the House. During the past session it became increasingly clear that more than one member did not even look up from his notes. This does not apply to the hon member who has just made his speech.

I appeal to hon members to comply with this rule.

*Mr D LOCKEY: Mr Speaker, I want to react briefly to what the hon member for Simon's Town said with reference to the two Bills that have been withdrawn and replaced by the Bill before Parliament at present.

The Bill before Parliament at present, is a precise combination of the two Bills that were approved previously by the committee. The DP did not move a motion in the committee that these two Bills should be combined. The DP might perhaps have made such a suggestion subsequently, but the effect of that is merely cosmetic in the sense that the Bill before Parliament at present contains no new principle.

I should like to associate myself with the hon member for Simon's Town at this funeral oration of the mother of all apartheid legislation, the Population Registration Act, 1950. This day will be recorded in the annals of history as the day on which the South African Parliament finally and irrevocably turned its back on apartheid. I should like to examine the impact of this Act in a historical perspective, and examine the effect it had on our people and on our society, and finally at the moral impact it had and the interim measures which will now continue to exist.

One could justifiably ask oneself where apartheid started. Where did this tragic misconception start in terms of which people whose skin was of a lighter pigmentation, were superior to people whose skin were of a darker pigmentation? This colour prejudice and colour antagonism, or even a false White feeling of superiority, has existed for centuries. It can be taken back as far as 4 000 years to India, when the Aryans occupied that country and subjugated the dark-skinned population.

In the *Rigveda*, one of the oldest holy books of the Aryans, there is a prayer to the Gods to destroy the subjugated dark peoples or dasas, as they were called. This White feeling of superiority was still accepted as a norm by most Westerners as recently as the sixties of this century. It is therefore not an idea that was invented by the Afrikaners; in fact, long before the NP came to power, prominent English-speaking people and English-language newspapers were strong advocates of racial separation. I want to read a quotation from a *Rand Daily Mail* of 1904 in which we read:

The principle of discrimination between Black and White is an absolute essential principle of any successful policy for the peaceful governing of South Africa.

In 1910 the same newspaper advocated the prohibition of mixed marriages and had the following to say on this subject:

It is necessary that the White people of South Africa should do their utmost to maintain the purity of their race.

However what made racism and colour prejudice amongst Whites so much more intense in South Africa, was their fear that they would be engulfed by the Black masses. This fear led to their entrenching this colour antagonism in the Population Registration Act of 1950. After this practically every imaginable constitutional, social and even religious structure was based on this Act. What makes South Africa the enigma in the world in respect of racism, is that the greatest social engineering experiment in the field of racial discrimination took place here.

Despite the fact that such extremes were gone to to bring about racial separation and racial purity, today one finds more than 3 million people who are the result of miscegenation between Europeans or Westerners and the indigenous Africans. Nowhere in the world does one find a similar phenomenon. The existence of the so-called Coloureds is a living monument to the failure of apartheid and racial purity. I want to turn to the impact on people of colour. This legislation was the source of intense humiliation for the Coloured and Black community. Section 5 of this Act provides for seven categories into which the so-called Coloureds were divided, and I shall mention them: Cape Coloured, Malay, Griqua, Chinese, Indian, other Asiatics and other Coloureds.

This Act was responsible for the splitting up of families. Some family members fell on the privileged White side, whilst those who remained behind, had to bear the yoke, the humiliation and the pain of apartheid. This Act gave officials of the Department of Foreign Affairs the divine right to typify, classify and categorise people who were created in the image of God. It was in this process of categorisation that the lot of each individual Afrikaner would be determined in the finest detail, from the cradle to the grave. In this categorisation all so-called Whites would form a single racial group, to which every imaginable privilege would be allotted. This legislation laid the foundation for the one-sided White privilege of the last 41 years in particular.

Apartheid was no different from national socialism for Whites and more specifically for the Afrikaners, at the expense of the rest of the population. [Interjections.] The White classification was in many respects a passport to opportunities and privileges, and the classifications of people of colour were in many respects the deprivation and denial of similar privileges and opportunities.

Over the years a tragic satire developed with regard to this White feeling of superiority. I want to quote from an article by Chris Louw which appears in the most recent *Suid-Afrikaan*, entitled "Vier dae op Carnavon". He says the following:

By drie verskillende mense hoor ek die storie van 'n ou oom wat met Witmens arrogansie die NP-minister beskuldig het . . .

This is at Carnavon:

"Julle met julle apartheid! Toe ons nog toegeelaat is om ons eie Kleurlinge te teel, het ons 'n goeie volk gehad."

This is the kind of tragic satire which was the result of the entire process.

I should also like to devote attention to the moral controversy that raged around apartheid. Over the past few days apartheid has unleashed an intense moral controversy throughout the world. At the forefront of this controversy have been Christians in particular—people who realised that racial discrimination was irreconcilable with the teachings of Christianity. I want to quote from John 15:12:

My commandment is this: Love one another, just as I love you.

The greatest commandment in Christianity is that one should love one's neighbour as one's self. However, John 15:12 goes further by saying that as Christians, and people created in the image of God, we should love one another as He loved us. What is greater for the Christian than the love of God? Therefore the ideal of every believing Christian should be to strive towards this Godly love for our fellow man.

In many respects the constitutional and social order in South Africa was a distorted convulsion of a false colour antagonism that had already been rejected by the entire world on a moral basis. Apartheid, to which this Act gave the legislative foundation, is nothing but heresy. It is a tragic mistake, an aberration in the teaching of Christianity. Therefore no full-fledged, convinced Christian could ever justify the existence of this Act or other apartheid laws.

Therefore the day on which this Act is being repealed is a joyous one for us in the LPSA. It is a happy day because this Act which reduced our people to second-class citizens will now disappear from the South African Statute Book. This step represents a significant milestone in our country's history.

With this passing of this Act a further 12 Acts will remain that are based on the formulation of this particular Act. I hope that the legislation relating to education, namely the Coloured Persons Education Act, the Indians Education Act, the Indians Advanced Technical Education Act, the Educational Affairs Act (House of Assembly), and the National Education Policy Act, together with the Child Care Act and the Social Pensions Act will disappear from the Statute Book as soon as possible. These Acts will have to be abolished from the Statute Book during the transitional stage because they amount to blatant racism.

The only real transitional measures that will have to be retained until a new constitution replaces the existing one, are the National States Citizenship Act, the Referendums Act, the General Pensions Act, the Constitution itself and the Local Government Bodies Franchise Act. Fundamental changes could even take place on an interim basis as far as these Acts are concerned, with the establishment of negotiated non-racial local authorities.

We in the LPSA insisted that it should be made crystal clear precisely when these interim measures expire, and that is why at our initiative an amendment to the present Bill was introduced in the committee in clause 1(3) which provides that all these interim measures expire with the repeal of the present Republic of South Africa Constitution Act, Act 110 of 1983. Now all the political parties must take the initiative to repeal this Constitution and to replace it with a new one in order to bid farewell to apartheid once and for all.

Finally let me say that as chairman of the Joint Committee on Home Affairs, Planning and Provincial Affairs it was a special privilege together with other hon colleagues in the committee, to have been able to prepare this Act for repeal by Parliament.

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: Mr Speaker, I want to say that the CP oppose this Bill and I want to say that in opposing this Bill it will become evident that an irrevocable breach has finally come about between the introducers of this piece of legislation and the CP. We on our part shall adopt and maintain our standpoint and on the part of the Government, they will have to take what comes their way in South Africa.

*Mr J W MAREE: Are you going to move?

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: I shall not move to that hon member's White holiday resort, because he is a closet racist!

It is extremely regrettable that sufficient time was not allocated to debate this fatal Bill. The Government's tricameral system and its strategy of stealthy change are of course among the prominent causes of that. In 1950, apart from the long Second Reading debate, the Committee stage of that time and the Third Reading, the opposition had far more time initially to oppose the Bill of that time, as well as all the other relevant legislation. However, in our future struggle the CP will put the standpoints and the results and the causes of this Bill in the remotest corners of our fatherland, and that will be but the beginning of the Afrikaner people's long struggle for its survival in this Southern Land.

In a comparative analysis of the debates of 1950 and today there is virtually no difference between the two opposing standpoints. It is interesting to note that at the time the late Mr Jim Fouché said the following in that debate:

Yes, the point is that we in South Africa have definitely decided that purity of race must be maintained. What I find strange is this, that whenever we introduce legislation in which we recognise the principle of apartheid between the races we have this remarkable experience that the liberals happily join in the fight on the side of the United Party; that the Communists happily join in the fight on the side of the United Party, that the Native Representatives wholeheartedly associate themselves with the United Party in that fight . . .

Today the NP are of course the left wing of the old United Party and they are co-operating happily with the ANC and communism to abolish this legislation.

The introducers of this legislation at that time accepted the given reality of the ethnic diversity and the race groups of this Southern Land. Furthermore, they rejected the British imperial boundaries and unashamedly enshrined their identity in a Bill as well. With that they did not hesitate to establish the ethnic units of South Africa in a Bill. After all, it was one of the foundations for the policy of separate development.

The late Dr Verwoerd once said:

Die kleurbeleid binne die Unie word nog steeds misverstaan. Veral diegene wat nie uit ervaring kan meepraat nie, begryp nog steeds nie dat apartheid of aparte ontwikkeling op die besef berus dat alleen langs dié weg die swakkere teen die sterkere beskerm kan word, en die andersoortige en getalmindere teenoor die getalmeerdere veilig kan voel nie. Met ander woorde, dat botsing alleen vermy kan word indien daar soveel moontlik skeiding kom.

The opposers of the legislation at that time, as the abolitionists today, have the following common characteristics. The first is that they find ethnic identity abhorrent. It may not exist. It is an abhorrent nuisance. Maintaining that policy is a sin.

Secondly, over the past few years I have been getting the impression that breaking the Ten Commandments of the Old Testament was all right, but the liberals had laid down an eleventh commandment, which was that a person was not allowed to maintain his ethnic identity, especially not if he was a White Afrikaner.

Thirdly, the Negroid is the eternal victim. He has nothing because the Caucasian does. He is the disadvantaged because the White man has progressed.

Another similarity is that his Negrophilism is exceeded only by his abhorrence of the White man. I can mention many more characteristics. I think Freud and Jung and Adler could have had a field day with the psychopathy of this kind of White person, such as Van Zyl Slabbert's strange Oedipus complex in his book *The Last White Parliament*, Rian Malan's personal aggrandisement in his book *My Traitor's Heart*, J P du Toit's tale in his diary of how he became a national scout. In order to get closer to the NP, a psychologist would find it very interesting to make an analysis of Dr Willem de Klerk's books.

Today I want to call the NP and the left-wing liberal establishment the Afrikaner's children of Cain, because nowhere in history since Cain has one found the kind of behaviour of a people being destroyed by its brothers in the way the NP wants to destroy the Afrikaner.

Here we are dealing with a cold-blooded

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is the implication of what the hon member is saying?

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: Mr Speaker, I am simply saying that Cain acted towards his brother in a cold-blooded manner. However, if you think it is unparliamentary, then I withdraw it.

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! Yes, I think the hon member should withdraw it.

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: Mr Speaker, I withdraw it.

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon member may proceed.

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: How are they doing it? During the 1989 election they said the following in their *Five Year Plan of Action*:

We, the National Party, commit ourselves to uphold the commitments in our Programme of Principles and our Manifesto of 1987.

The NP policy of 1987 is, in fact, the maintenance of a White community life, separate voters' rolls, White schools and everything that goes with that. Therefore I want to say that the NP won the election in a dishonourable and

dishonest way. The fruits of this dishonourable deed will haunt them until the day they die.

The purely scientific approach to and analysis of the human being in its racial, cultural and ethnic context during the past few decades has somehow been affected by a strange and somewhat odd kind of malice. It has been inspired in particular by the humanism of the past few decades and by certain theologians.

In modern science all organisms or various species are scientifically studied. There is nothing wrong if one studies the animal in the animal kingdom as a physical biological being. A very strong conservation cult has been established throughout the world. Everything must be protected. The only thing which may not be protected, however, is the White man—especially a White man in Africa or in Southern Africa. There is a mania to protect everything. However, there is a mania throughout the world to destroy the White man.

The White people who do it have some kind of guilt complex and are involved in their own aggrandisement and self-destructive urge. The Black people have seized upon this destructive urge of the White man and they are now implementing a Black imperialism in which they are using the White man's guilt feeling to acquire what belongs to him. What is the situation today? The White man feels guilty about what he has; he feels guilty about what he has built up, and the Black and non-White person are using these guilt feelings to take what belongs to the White away from him. This is disgraceful behaviour, on the one hand by giving it away and on the other by acquiring it.

I want to say very frankly that the Whites, the Afrikaners, are not going to disappear because the NP, whatever its psychological reasons may be, today wants to abolish legislation which establishes the realities of Southern Africa. The Afrikaners and the Whites will not disappear because of that. With all its propaganda and with all it does the NP will not succeed in cultivating those guilt feelings among us so that we would want to commit suicide in Southern Africa or want to destroy ourselves.

The NP, unfaithful to its own election promises, will not destroy our existence. They are welcome to abolish as many laws as they like, but the Afrikaner people and the Whites will continue to

exist in their millions in South Africa. [Interjections.] Race and ethnicity are undeniable realities and they become more undeniable if one wants to destroy them. It is interesting to see in history that the Afrikaner people became strongest at the time when the imperialism of its own people wanted to destroy it. I have found throughout South Africa a growing feeling of identity awareness among real Afrikaners and among Whites who want to identify with the Afrikaners.

It is also interesting that this legislation was introduced on the orders of and in submission to the American government. I found this very interesting article from America which has ostensibly become the melting-pot society of the world and where the majority of the population are Whites while the Blacks are in the minority. In America it has become the fashion, among some White girls in particular, to marry Black men. This magazine article said the following:

Tyne se eks maak rasse-moles

Praat van omgekeerde rassisme . . . Toe Tyne Daly (Cagney & Lacey) en haar man, Georg Stanford Brown, besluit om ná 23 jaar te skei, het Georg geëis dat hul dogter, Alyxandra (5), onder sy toesig geplaas word.

Die rede wat Georg, oorspronklik van Jamaika, daarvoor aangevoer het? Sy dogter is gekleurd en hy dus meer bevoeg om na haar om te sien.

Dis snert, sê Tyne. Toe sy en Georg die geboortsertifikaat ingevul het, het hy glad nie sulke voorbehoude gehad nie. Trouens, by ras het hulle mens ingevul en by etnisiteit het hulle burger van die wêreld geskryf.

Today I want to announce that since the NP has become ashamed of its own racial and national identity, the CP will start to create an own identity document for our people, the Afrikaner people and the White people who want to join us, which will at least indicate who and what we are. [Interjections.] We shall do it because we shall find it necessary in South Africa in future and because this hon Minister is now going to take the next step. They are not satisfied with abolishing the legislation. He and his fellow sell-outs of the White man will purposefully want to chase us from one place to another simply because we want to maintain our racial and national identity. [Interjections.]

I want to tell the hon the Minister that in recent times, after he promised the voters in 1989 that he would maintain the White man's own community life, he has done exactly the opposite. What has he done since 1989? He has taken all the measures we had on the Statute Book . . .

The MINISTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT: [Inaudible.]

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: That hon Minister should rather keep quiet. I almost want to say to him what was declared to be unparliamentary the other day. I want to tell him that since they came to power in 1989 they have done everything to destroy the White man and the Afrikaner in this country. He has taken our land away. He has taken our schools away. Now he is taking our right to be White and to be an Afrikaner away as well. [Interjections.] This hon Minister has said himself that new groups will have to be established and that it may not happen on racial grounds. That hon Minister said it.

The MINISTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT: [Inaudible.]

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: Mr Speaker, that hon Minister is saying certain things and you are allowing him to do so. You probably did not hear what he said. However, I want to tell him that his behaviour is treacherous and he is still a member of the Afrikaner Broederbond! Its chairman, Mr J P de Lange, recently said that the Broederbond would remain White. Now I should like to ask the hon the Minister something. He is now completely off balance and he achieved what he did because he was White and said that he was an Afrikaner. That is how he became a Broederbonder. He became the chancellor of a university. He achieved everything. [Interjections.] If he had been what he is now, he would never even have been able to become a member of the NP! [Interjections.]

I want to tell the hon the Minister that it is only a barbarian which does not allow a people to be itself. It is an absolute barbarian which will not allow a people to have its own fatherland. I want to tell the hon the Minister . . .

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon member may not allege that another hon member in this Chamber is a barbarian. The hon member must withdraw it.

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: Mr Speaker, I withdraw it. What I am saying is that if a person does not allow a people to be a people in its own right, he is acting like a barbarian.

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! Yes, that may be so, but I gave a ruling and the hon member must please comply with it.

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: Very well, Sir, I shall comply with it. [Interjections.]

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon member may proceed.

*The MINISTER OF HOUSING (Representatives): So you need a law to keep you White!

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: No, I do not need a law!

*The MINISTER OF HOUSING (Representatives): Of course you need a law!

*Mr H D K VAN DER MERWE: What I do want to tell the hon the Minister, however, is what we do need and we do not want to [Time expired.]

Mr P I DEVAN: Mr Chairman . . .

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon the Minister of Constitutional Development may address the Chair.

*The MINISTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Mr Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that the hon nominated member Mr H D K van der Merwe called me a barbarian when he walked past me.

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already on numerous occasions given a ruling to the effect that the Chair is not prepared to get involved in private altercations. The hon member for Cavendish may proceed. [Interjections.]

Mr P I DEVAN: Mr Speaker, in response to the hon nominated member Mr H D K van der Merwe, I wish to say that the Kingdom of God knows no foreign nation, no foreign man.

Let us assume all the Black people in this country were to turn White overnight, and the Whites were to turn Black, for nothing is impossible. This is a hypothetical question. What then? [Interjections.] I pose that question merely to show how shallow and hollow our thinking is, even to this day.

The Population Registration Act Repeal Bill seeks to repeal the Population Registration Act of 1950 and subsequent amendments. The Act is another of the country's objectionable pieces of legislation on the Statute Book. I think we should rejoice today in motivating the repeal of this Act.

Mrs S EBRAHIM: Hear, hear!

Mr P I DEVAN: The Population Registration Act entrenched the racial policy which brought this Government to its knees. Let us admit that. However, let us at the same time feel satisfied that we are outgrowing our follies and frivolities of the past. The Population Registration Act had numerous implications in the enforcement of laws. In respect of the Electoral Act it is also very important that one should be able to furnish proof of a vital fact, one's race. The determination of a person's race also implies separate residential areas, and in this regard the Group Areas Act is conspicuously relevant. How ridiculous this Act is can be gleaned from this extract from the *Instituut vir Eietydse Geskiedenis* of the University of the Orange Free State. I quote:

It seems that last year 573 "Cape Coloureds" became white, 369 "Blacks" became Cape Coloured as did 14 "Whites". Fifteen "Cape Coloureds" became Chinese as did two "Whites" while three "Whites" became Indian, 59 "Indians" became Cape Coloureds and 56 "Cape Coloureds" became Indians.

Can one beat this Black magic! [Interjections.] In 1981 a Johannesburg magistrate convicted a woman, previously thought White, for living in a White area. The magistrate said she was Coloured because she had a flat nose, wavy hair, a pale skin and high cheekbones. The conviction was set aside by the Supreme Court. The Judge's ruling was that while the woman was not obviously White, she was generally accepted as such. [Interjections.]

Today, while we are in the process of scrapping this humiliating Act, I would like to observe that there are many countries whose legislation in all respects is laudable but who are still practising colour prejudice. If we in South Africa do that merely to join the bandwagon and claim to be non-racial in practice, but continue to be hypocrites, then all of this is useless. This is one of those precious moments when the statement "freedom without responsibility" is dangerous. This statement is relevant. In my, shall I say

cursory reading, I stumbled on the following statement which I want to quote to hon members. There is much in it that can help us formulate our own credo based on this. It is an extract by Sir Alan Burns, GCMC, formally Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Gold Coast. I quote:

The present unhappy condition of affairs is, however, not entirely the fault of White races. It can be made better, as I have tried to show, by an improvement in the manners of White people. But if any material and lasting improvement is to be accomplished it must be with the co-operation of Negroes . . .

One could replace Negroes with Blacks or people of colour—

. . . who must endeavour to forget the past and credit their White neighbours with good intentions when they give evidence of such intentions. The old brooding on past injuries, the suspicious attitude to White advances and the bitter and sometimes outspoken hatred of everything White must be controlled if a true spirit of friendship and respect is to be established between the races. Above all, the Negroes must cultivate an intellectual honesty which will make them realise that all the handicaps under which their race labours are not due to the machinations of others but in a very large measure to their own shortcomings.

They must also develop that other form of honesty which will ensure that they can be trusted to do good work or hold responsible positions without the constant need of supervision, and they must build up a public opinion, and a moral courage, which will enable them to oppose the evil doers—even those of their own race—without fear or favour.

These are not my words, I quote this because I think there is much in it over which people of the various groups can ponder.

Here is another extract from *The Weekly Mail*, dated 8-14 February 1991:

Since the destruction of Nazi Germany, no society in the world has laid so much store on the racial origins of people as South Africa in the era of the Population Registration Act. The damage that was done by this arbitrary measure of human worth to the lives of such people as Sandra Laing or those dark-skinned children who never went to school because

their “White” parents had to hide them at home, can never be undone. All we can hope is that the extremity of the Government’s obsession with race has made ordinary people ultrasensitive about racism.

[Time expired.]

The DEPUTY MINISTER OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY AND TOURISM: Mr Speaker, the temptation, on an historic occasion like this, is to become overemotional and perhaps to overdramatise. Today we are closing a chapter in South Africa’s history and setting off on a new road of true nation-building.

The Population Registration Bill was introduced in this Parliament at its second reading on 8 March 1950. At that time I was only nine years old. That was 41 years ago, and over that period this Bill has predominated and has made possible much of the harmful and hurtful legislation of those four decades. It is indeed interesting to go back and read the Hansard of that debate, to identify the personalities who were involved and to analyse what they said. There was Dr Dönges, Genl Smuts, Piet van der Byl, Adv Strauss and the then youthful member for Hottentots Holland. It is therefore with some irony that I stand here today as the first speaker of the NP to second the proposal of the hon the Minister to repeal this Act.

What was said then is equally true today. I quote from Hansard of 13 March 1950, cols 2849-50, the speaker being the member for Hottentots Holland who said that the real reason for this Bill was:

. . . to serve the cause of apartheid and that it is necessary in order that the present Government can carry out its policy of racial separation . . . It means . . . the establishment of a human stud-book for the Union of South Africa.

He also referred to the phenomenon of the atavistic throwback. His words were:

You might find in the course of generations that among those classified as Europeans, you will have many dark-eyed people with black hair and very olive-coloured skins. You might find among those classified as, shall I say, non-Europeans . . . some people with fair hair and blue eyes and comparatively white skins.

Today my answer to that is: *Circumspice*—look around you.

We cannot change past history. We can only attempt to influence the future. It is perhaps necessary to repeat the epithets of the 1950 debate—that this legislation was unpopular, undesirable and unfair, that it engendered distrust and hatred and erected a boundary fence in our society. The chapter we are closing in our history ends an experiment of social engineering that endeavoured to divide God's people according to the concentration of melanine in the epidermis.

*I just want to say: Thank God, it is over, and let us pray for a new future together.

†I wish briefly to refer to a very unpleasant incident that occurred last night. I believe that the hon member for Eldorado Park's house was completely burnt down, and that his wife and daughter were molested. I believe those of us who believe in democracy can only regard this incident with absolute disgust. The whole purpose of democracy is to accept differing views in a peaceful way and to settle those differences through the process of the vote. I hope the barbarians that are responsible for this outrage will be brought to justice as soon as possible.

*Mr J A RABIE: Mr Speaker, I want to associate myself immediately with the previous speaker and express our sympathy towards the hon member for Eldorado Park and his family in the misfortune they suffered, and I hope that the police will bring the culprits to justice quickly.

The hon member Mr H D K van der Merwe made a great song and dance about species. I regard him as a rare specimen, that is why I will say nothing about what he said.

This afternoon I can say hallelujah, amen. It is past! It is finished, as we understand it in everyday language. The way has, in reality, been cleared for the building of a nation. This makes me feel very good, because now my uncles, who became White and who are now sitting in the CP, are now equal to me. Now they are, according to CP policy, not the only ones who are entitled to sing "The Call of South Africa".

I do not want to tell the whole story, but there is an interesting story which my grandmother told me about the baptism. I shall briefly say that this Act baptised me in the past in the name of the

Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and it said: "Mens, jou naam is Kleurling!" Now we are abolishing this Act. Now this legislation baptises me again, and says: "Kleurling, jy is mens!" This Act classified my grandmother, who brought me up, as Black. They classified my uncle as Black. I mention these two examples, because these were people who were very close to me.

They had to undergo the most inhuman and humiliating ordeals as a result of racial classification. A pencil was stuck in their hair and they had to shake their heads. If it did not fall out, they were classified as Black. They were even pricked with pins. They did say "eina", but the classifier said that the hair was still the deciding factor. He would still be merciful towards them. He would look at the half-moon on their fingernails, and then he would consider how they were to be classified. If the half-moon on their fingernails was absent, he said no, the hair and the half-moon makes them Black. But if they said "ouch" when they were pricked with a pin, the matter was settled. Then they were immediately Black.

In the process my uncle was arrested because he did not carry a pass. He was sold to farmers in Bethal where he had to dig potatoes out of the ground with his bare hands. When he ran away to the Pretoria market, I had to take him home, bedraggled and dirty.

When I was 18 years old, I discovered for the first time that my own mother had been classified as White. I discovered it when I was classified as an Indian at 18, and then I could not believe it. I went to her where she, in the common old language, was a kitchen girl and there I told her: "Ousus, gee my daardie groen kaart." For the first time both she and I realised that she was classified as White. She fainted, lights out, and I had to give her sal volatile to bring her round so that I could get the story out of her. In my foolishness I handed in her card and my Indian card and when I returned that afternoon, we were classified as Coloured on both cards.

My third brother after me is also classified as White. When he had to write matric, the principal refused to let him write because his birth certificate said that he was White. My wife is a Cape Coloured, my eldest son is Coloured, the second eldest is mixed, the third one is Coloured and the other one is other Coloured. That is what racial classification has done to us.

I shall reply in full to the lady who wrote the following rubbish to me on 20 May:

Ons neem waar op televisie dat u self by die Afrikaner wil voeg. U, meneer, sal met respek in der lewe nooit 'n Afrikaner wees nie. U mag my taal praat, maar deel van my Afrikaner-volk nooit!

I want to ask this lady what about my uncles by birth, who are sitting in the CP. Are they Afrikaners? I continue:

Soort soek soort, elkeen apart met 'n trots as volk. Word liewer 'n trotse kleurling, soos die Rehoboth-basters is, 'n trotse volk.

I do not know whether this lady knows that a "ling" is a thing, and I am not a "Kleurling". I am a South African, that is why I am so glad that this Act is going to be abolished today.

I quote further:

Dan het ek vir u respek, anders nie. U sal, as u 'n trots as kleurling het, nie ander volke wil binnedring nie.

I ask again, what about my uncles? I continue:

U sien, die huidige Regering het nie meer 'n volkstrots nie, daarom wil hulle hul heil by die kleurlinge soek en dis stories aan u op wat soos soetkoek klink.

I wonder how "soetkoek" sounds. I know what it tastes like! She concludes:

Wees trots op u volk, dan wil u nie tussen die Blankes wees nie.

That is the kind of thinking which we still find among people who say that this Act has to remain on the Statute Book.

Today there are still members of my family who are classified as Black. With the abolition of this Act they are now being made equal to me and everybody else. It is just a pity that clause 1(3) is still necessary. If people did not take so long, negotiations could have progressed further and this measure would not have been necessary.

I am of the opinion that the extra-parliamentary parties must get their act together so that negotiations can start and this measure can die a natural death. I remember how in the days of the old CRC we still struggled to have the marriage of the Muslim and Black women recognised according to their tradition. With the abolition of

this Act these marriages are recognised, as long as no other marriage has been entered into.

Mr A J LEON: Mr Speaker, we heard very eloquently from the hon member for Reigerpark exactly how this Act has *par excellence* been an example of a statute which produced humiliation and a sense of inferiority among those who were obliged to submit to an investigation of their family histories, social habits and physical appearances. Those of us who were never part of that humiliation can only sympathise and say: Thank God it is now coming to an end! I do not think we should be too squeamish today to recall that the kind of investigations which were used in terms of this Act were actually inquiries into the precise racial admixture of one's parents, the colour of the friends one kept and the extent to which one's hair, fingernails, lips and other physical features inclined one towards either the Caucasian or the Negroid. That is what we are getting rid of, and of course we welcome it.

There is an aspect of this Act and its abolition which I believe is important. With the collapse of formal apartheid as evidenced in this Bill, we are uniquely poised to take South Africa into a new, different and better culture, one based on the enforcement of rights within a climate of liberty.

Twenty years ago—it is well-remembered—the hon the Minister of Foreign Affairs said in his maiden speech that South Africa should become a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In my own maiden speech last year I argued the same point and said that we had lost a golden opportunity when we declined to heed the hon the Minister's call to acknowledge that declaration affirmatively. However, the Government today—next week in fact—can salvage this omission and endorse the declaration. In view of the historic move which South Africa is making in abolishing racial classification, I believe we should send such an affirmative signal, together with the repeal of this Act, that we will immediately become a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Quite apart from its formalistic aspects, the declaration contains a common understanding, on the part of the peoples of the world, of the inalienable and inviolable rights of all members of the human family and positively constitutes an obligation for the members of the international community to adhere to them. Therefore, as we move away from being a rights-repressive cul-

ture, let us instead become a proactive rights-enforcing culture.

There are numerous other codes and conventions, such as the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948, to which we should also become a signatory. We should immediately become a State party to the Convention Against Torture of 1984. Perhaps most importantly, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of 1965 actually necessitates our immediate attention, because this convention is based on the same premise as today's Bill, and that is that there is no justification for racial discrimination either in theory or in practice.

Article 5 of that convention obliges all State parties to undertake to prohibit and eliminate racial discrimination and to guarantee equality before the law in respect of some 25 basic rights. In my view South Africans today, with the passage of this Bill, will enjoy 24 of those 25 rights. The one outstanding right is the right to equal franchise, but since the Government and all parties inside and outside Parliament are committed to this, I believe we can still become a signatory.

The other consequence of the formal ending of apartheid in this measure is the liberation of our own politics. In South Africa, for over 70 years, liberals and radicals—the opposition left, who knew who they were largely because they knew whom they opposed—were in fact united about one thing, and that is that they opposed racialism and authoritarianism in all hues and stripes and at all levels of authority.

The NP Government and its bureaucracy not only created apartheid's evil empire, but were a very worthy target of moral wrath and demanded a united response in opposition to them. Now that apartheid is ending at the hand of the very Government which perfected it, there is an identity crisis which engulfs the opponents of the system. Today's Bill means the waning of a very specific but all-defining struggle and hopefully the surrender of an essential enemy. Some would choose to continue to submerge the differences between liberalism and socialism, for example. Others dismiss liberals as an abstraction between the forces of racism and liberation.

In our view the reality is that the period of apartheid actually proved that liberalism is the only reliable barrier between apartheid and communism, because both communism and apartheid depend on the enslavement of the conscience and the enforcement of the creed of the collective.

Equally, a system founded on collective goals, whether it is socialist on the one hand, or racist on the other, is essentially incompatible with the liberal principles premised on individual rights. Therefore "The people shall govern" could, if misapplied, simply be a code for authoritarianism by another name. It is therefore necessary for members of the broadly defined opposition, ourselves no less than any others, to re-examine our positioning in South African political life. [Time expired.]

Mr E JOOSAB: Mr Speaker, the NPP wholeheartedly supports this Bill. This is another historic day, on which the last pillar of apartheid is going. This Bill removes references to race in the Bills referred to in Schedule II. Unfortunately, reference to race is retained for the purpose of keeping the tricameral system propped up.

It is my view that while orderly government is necessary until a new constitution is agreed to, consensus could be reached to reduce apartheid within the tricameral system. I am convinced that this could happen.

In this Bill the last cornerstone of apartheid goes. With it go the pains and the sufferings and the havoc it has caused. No more will people be inferior or superior and no more will people be forced to apply for race classification changes. The business community will now be free legally to do away with the nominee system. One hon member of Parliament has stated that this Act is ungodly and immoral.

When the Population Registration Bill was being discussed in Parliament in 1950, it was attacked by none other than that great South African, Field Marshal J C Smuts, who vowed to give the Bill a rough passage, and one hon member of Parliament even accused the Nats of trying to create a super race like Hitler's planned master race. This Act did demoralise people. It not only separated different communities, but it even created chaos within families when some in the

same families were classified White whilst others were classified Coloured.

In the Cape it forced Indians to classify themselves as Coloureds in order to avoid being deprived of their businesses. An HSRC report dated 1985 notes:

The link between population registration and the establishment and maintenance of White supreme authority is surely the deepest reason why ethnicity and official protection of identity in South Africa is treated so suspiciously.

Where medical science and miracle workers failed, the Government has succeeded in changing people from White to Chinese and vice versa, from Black to Griqua and from Asian to Cape Coloured and vice versa.

The Star stated a few years ago:

In opposing the Bill in 1950, Field Marshal J C Smuts stated: "By means of this legislation you create a feeling of injustice, a feeling of unfairness, a feeling that people do not get fair play. The Coloureds will look upon this Bill as a slur on them. This is an effort to classify what is unclassifiable."

Colonel Jordan was very critical. He stated his opposition to the measure in 1950, *inter alia*, as follows:

This is an ill example set by the Nazis whom this Government emulates in every way it can.

This Act has caused the denouncement of one person by another and the setting of one person against another. Today we bury another apartheid law. We are glad that we came here to play this role.

*Mr C D DE JAGER: Mr Speaker, I would like to start by repeating what I said in one of my first speeches when I arrived in this Parliament, namely that I am not better than any other person in this House. Above all I am not better than any other person because I am White.

On how good or how bad I am, I as a person and they as people will not pass judgment, and if they do pass judgment I will not pay any attention, because as far as I am concerned, there is only one judge of how good or how bad a person is, and I am prepared to accept that judgment. For that reason it is not because the word White is written behind my name, or in a register, that I am entitled to anything better than another

person. If this Act was used for that purpose, it was used incorrectly. I say that unequivocally and I stand by it.

However, if hon members tell me today that they cannot stand me because I write White after my name as regards population registration, I say they are the racists because it does not matter what I write behind my name. It does not matter whether White, Xhosa, Zulu, Coloured or whatever is written after my name, because after all is said and done that is what I am or what they are. That is what counts! It can be written after my name and they can change the Act in any way they wish.

*Dr I ESSOP: What about all the privileges you enjoyed?

*Mr C D DE JAGER: If those privileges accrued to me because of this measure, that was wrong, but this Act does not make us the same. It can make us equals. People should be equal, whether they are Coloured, White, Black or whatever colour, but no Act or its abolition can make us the same. [Interjections.]

The Creator decided that those hon members would be Coloured and I would be White, and I have no problem with that. I am not ashamed because I am White and those hon members are Coloured. On the contrary, I am proud that I am White, and I cannot understand why they are not proud of whatever colour they may be. It may be that they are not proud because other people, by abusing an Act, discriminated against them. However, every person is entitled to his identity. If hon members were to describe me, they would describe me as White.

*Dr J J VILONEL: Joe Slovo is also White!

*Mr C D DE JAGER: They will write it after my name. Joe Slovo is also White and that will also be written after his name, in the same that it will be written after those hon members' names that they are Black or Coloured. In the same way that there is a name in which I am registered and an identity cleaves to me, that identity will cleave to a person whether he is White, Coloured or whatever colour.

I frequently heard hon members say they were Black, but when the NP was thrown open, not one of them joined a Black party. They all tried for White. By doing so they decided they wanted to hold the privileged position which they be-

lied existed on that side, and they did not want to join the people they always said they stood by.

I want to say that it does not matter how one looks at it or what one says about it. My friends on this side say it does not matter if the Act is abolished; they will continue to exist as Afrikaners, Whites or whatever. It therefore does not matter whether or not the Act is abolished, because they want to retain the same preconceptions they have now. They want to retain the same position! They do not want to be Coloured. They do not want to intermarry. They say they want to remain the Whites they are.

They ask what difference it makes whether or not the Act is abolished. I say what difference does it make if my White identity appears after my name. If they do not want to be . . .

Dr J J VILONEL: [Inaudible.]

*Mr C D DE JAGER: The hon member must not interrupt me if it bothers him that much! The hon member can make his speech, but he is ashamed because he is White. [Interjections.] The hon member is ashamed because he feels guilty. He was one of the legislators who sat here and enforced discrimination. The hon member has been here for ten years. I did not do that. [Interjections.]

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon member for Langlaagte must contain himself. The hon member for Bethal may proceed.

*Mr C D DE JAGER: I did not do that. The hon member was a supporter of that. He discriminated, but now he is fawning on the other people because he feels guilty.

I say identification is necessary. If the fact that I am White is part of that identification it does not matter to me, because that does not make me better than other people. I am the same person. I was created by God, in the same way they were, and I respect them for that and I hope they will respect me for that. I am proud of that. I am not ashamed because I am White, and I am not ashamed to write that after my name. Nor am I ashamed if an Act provides that I must write it after my name. I cannot understand why other people are ashamed of that, because some of them were made ashamed of that because the legislation was abused and other people were discriminated against. That is why they are ashamed today. They may have reason to be

ashamed because these government people wanted to humiliate them. However, it is not necessary to humiliate people in this way.

There were times in our history when Afrikaans was considered a kitchen language, when Afrikaners were called names and the word "boer" was a term of abuse. Today I am proud if people tell me I am a boer. I hope hon members will also one day—even if they are now jesting about this—be proud if people call them what they are, because until they find themselves and make peace with themselves and know what they are, they will never be happy.

Hon members talk about the protection of ethnic or group rights. If one wants to protect a group, one must identify it in some or other way. One cannot protect something which has not been identified. One cannot say that this is a glass and prevent it from being broken until one has identified it as a glass. It must be identified, because juridically one cannot protect something which has not been identified. [Interjections.]

*Dr J J VILONEL: We do not need an Act for that.

*Mr C D DE JAGER: That hon member must please not say too much about Acts which they need or do not need. It is true that we do not need Acts prohibiting this or that, but there are people who do need Acts. The fact is that there are people who do not find it necessary to obey the Ten Commandments which state that one must not kill another person, but unfortunately there are other people who need such an Act. We are therefore not only introducing Acts for those hon sanctimonious NP members. We are introducing them for the general public. To their own way of thinking those hon members are so good that they do not need an Act, but unfortunately there are other people who do need Acts. This has been proved too. Please do not ask me to mention examples, because this will hurt you as members of the Government. [Interjections.]

I want to tell hon members of the House of Representatives they will be winners. Those of them who are going to stand by their people will win. They need not run over to join other population groups to help them. If they stand by their people, they will win. In the same way that the Afrikaner leaders stood by the Afrikaners and won, they will win if they stand by their people, because it is their duty to do so. In the

first place they are responsible to their people and their family, their siblings, their nation. If hon members stand by them, they cannot lose, and they will be happy and they will share the future with us as neighbours.

***Mr F J VAN DEVENTER:** Mr Speaker, I am standing here to tell you that I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in the debate on the repeal of this Act today. [Interjections.] I am grateful because for the first time there is a very clear illustration in this House of the fear of the narrowminded that they will not be able to maintain themselves within a situation in which they are not protected by laws. I am grateful that I can look the world in the eyes as a White Afrikaner. I am not ashamed of that, and no person can take that away from me or change it. [Interjections.] I am grateful that I can look the world in the eyes and tell the world that I am a White Afrikaner without needing a symbol in a book to indicate it.

If what the hon member for Bethal said was correct, namely that if this Act discriminated, it was wrong and those things should have been averted, I want to ask him the following. This Act has its tentacles in many laws, which are basically blatantly discriminatory, and he knows that. Is he in favour of the abolition of those laws if this Act is retained? Is he in favour of that?

***Mr C D DE JAGER:** We can debate that!

***Mr F J VAN DEVENTER:** Now the hon member is silent.

***Mr C D DE JAGER:** I am not silent! We can debate that!

***Mr F J VAN DEVENTER:** The hon member is silent because he knows in his heart of hearts that the CP wants to use this Act as a vehicle to make discrimination part of the South African future. [Interjections.]

We cannot live with that. The hon member Mr H D K van der Merwe, with his customary threats which were slung at us here, put forward the standpoint that the right of the White man and the Afrikaner to be White and an Afrikaner, was being taken away. May the good Lord ensure that the day never comes when I will be so weak and have so little belief in my own value and social values that I have to look for laws to protect those social values. [Interjections.] The day the Afrikaner walks that road, the day the

Afrikaner heads in that direction, he is approaching his end. [Interjections.]

I should like to take this opportunity to look at what the repeal of this Act will mean for the future of South Africa. My race and ethnic context is not dependent on a symbol or a figure. I am what I am and I am proud of it. I am not apologising for that. [Interjections.] What I want to say today is that this Act, and the enforcement of this by other laws in South Africa, reserved opportunities for a specific group in South Africa. [Interjections.] That is wrong, and the hon member for Bethal conceded that that was wrong. For the first time I and millions of South Africans will experience what it is like to say that I am an Afrikaner or a Zulu or a Xhosa by choice. That is a choice which one can exercise with pride because one wants to and can be.

Equally true is the "belong to" syndrome, and that is why the question of what one may or may not do is being rejected today. In the Statute Book of the Republic of South Africa there will no longer be protection for reserved privileges or the withholding of them because one is what one is. The country and its opportunities are open to everyone. As South Africans we can grasp those opportunities and do more with them than in the past, because our legs need not buckle under the burden of frustration which was part of our lives for so long.

We are forcing a gap for the recognition of human dignity. This Act which we are repealing today, and which has its tentacles in so many other laws on the South African Statute Book, by implication has—or so it is experienced by millions of South Africans—an inferiority connotation with which the NP as well as the bodies which have to enforce it can no longer live.

Secondly, it gave South Africans a choice of either accepting the prescriptions of the law and in so doing being party to discrimination against themselves, or of contravening the law and running the risk of falling foul of the law. The fact that we saw very little of the latter type of resistance, is proof of our people's desire and striving to live as decent, disciplined and law-abiding citizens.

This gives me a tremendous amount of hope for the future. If people are able to show self-discipline despite a feeling that their human dignity is being affected, as we have seen in

South Africa, I am convinced that the opportunities which are now opening up will be grasped with the same discipline and dedication.

In the times in which we are living, it cannot and should not be the role of the State to attach people to certain things or groups against their will. Human dignity implies a right to make one's own decisions regarding who one wants to associate with. The colour of a person's skin or the language which one learned as a child, should not determine the quality of one's humanity.

In the South Africa of the future each one of us will be able to live, work and achieve according to our own merits. Whether we like it or not, it is not the job of the legislature to manipulate the talents and skills of people or to destroy them by means of discriminatory laws. Let a message go out from this Parliament to all our people, since the restrictions on our human dignity have been removed, to work together towards dedicating our best strengths to the development of our country. Unless we do that, we will be negating the most important first opportunity which the new dispensation is offering us.

The repeal of this Act is the basis of the recovery of each individual's self-respect. When the new constitution of South Africa is drawn up, there will be no provisions which exclude any person from full and equal citizenship rights. Within the limits of what will be negotiated, the participation of every citizen of South Africa in the political, economic and social life will be subject to the same freedoms, but also to the same restrictions.

Full and equal freedom within the parameters of the constitution and the law, will be the guidelines in terms of which each one of us can regulate his or her life. There is no other way in which we can meet the future.

The negative elements among us will indicate the emergence of ethnic groupings in the world today. However, this is happening despite the fact that no laws exist which prescribe it.

In the South Africa of the future things will be no different. Ethnicity will not disappear, but it will grow out of the minds of self-respecting people. South Africa has room and opportunities for all its children. At the end of the day we have a joint responsibility as South Africans to build the future of our country together.

My prayer is that we will receive the mercy to respect one another for what we are because we want it to be that way, and then to use that as the foundation on which to build a future—a future free of humiliation, free of suspicion, but a future full of opportunity which is available to each one of us as fully-fledged and proud citizens of the Republic of South Africa.

Let us work and live with a sense of commitment in this country beneath the Southern Cross.

Let us make it a bastion of freedom, peace and prosperity, and a shining light for our children.

Let us make South Africa a winner in the recognition of the human dignity of the divinely created beings which were placed here to determine this country's future.

Mr C M GEORGE: Mr Chairman, like the previous speaker I deem it a privilege to take part in this debate.

The Population Registration Act of 1950 was one of the first pieces of legislation introduced by the NP Government. It was the culmination of a process that started in the latter half of the 19th century. The lie that Whites were superior had been told so often that it had become the basis of Government strategy and policy. The process is now about to reverse itself. Although the last official pillar of apartheid has gone, the eradication of apartheid from the heart remains the challenge for the future.

The recent newspaper cartoon which showed the hon the State President pulling down the walls of an apartheid building bears some comment. Whilst the Biblical figure, Samson, died in his attempt, the hon the State President will probably not suffer the same fate—politically speaking, that is—because his effort was a piecemeal one. He did not try to pull it all down in one heap.

The repeal of the Population Registration Act will finally destroy the foundations of apartheid. All that remains of the old system is the rubble. It might take as long as 10 years to finally remove the apartheid rubble. We must not delude ourselves. The scars of hardship and suffering will be evident for some time. It is in this light that Mrs Emily Davids of Bellville is quoted by the *Cape Times* as having said:

With apartheid dead the Government allows R3 739 per White school child per annum,

R2 615 per Indian child, R1 983 per Coloured child and R764 per Black child. One wonders how it would have happened if apartheid was still alive.

The Population Registration Act so denigrated people of colour that they were denied citizenship rights in the land of their birth, whilst foreigners were able to acquire full citizenship.

The repeal of the Population Registration Act is certainly going to leave many members in a political vacuum. The reasons for their political existence no longer exist. There is no legal apartheid left to fight.

In deciding future political allegiances, one must decide whether it is the individual leader or the particular party's policy one is supporting. For sensible people both aspects are important. It is important for the party's underlying principles and its stated objectives to be backed by hard evidence. The other aspect is strong, co-ordinated leadership dedicated to the party cause and good order, as opposed to chaos. When these two aspects are present, that is good party cause and good leadership, membership is bound to swell. When one or both of these aspects are absent or not obviously apparent, membership decreases because of a lack of confidence amongst party members.

In the very fluid current situation which we find ourselves in, we are poised to witness many political alignments and realignments as the aspects of party cause and good leadership are considered and reconsidered. The cause of a non-racial South Africa in which all South Africans are afforded total equality of opportunity, backed by the protection of the law, seems to be the common denominator among the majority of political organisations and parties. The choice therefore is not the name of the party, no matter how stigmatised it might be, for a name can, after all, be changed.

The deciding factor is therefore going to be leadership style and commitment. A third factor may well be the possession or control of the machinery to back up promises. Of late we have seen the oppressor become the apparent enlightened liberator. We have witnessed the NP's hijacking of the revolution. We have seen it steer the course of the revolution. We have seen it take the initiative. The time has now come to decide. The repeal of the Population Registration Act has made this legitimately possible.

God would want to use people in all parties, because all have fallen and have been found lacking. We all need to be reconciled. It does not matter where one aligns oneself, as long as one allows God to use one as an instrument of his peace.

Mr C A WYNGAARD: [Inaudible.]

Mr C M GEORGE: Better than that perhaps! The condemnation must stop. Accommodation must prevail.

Despite the talk that we are all going to be South Africans, I should just like to remind hon members that we must never ever be ashamed of our parentage. Yes, we are human beings, South Africans, but we must remember not to be ashamed of our parents.

The talk of a broad democratic alliance bears some comment. Some call it a Christian democratic alliance. I see it as a means whereby the status quo can be maintained. After all, most of the present-day parties were established because of apartheid. Therefore, with the repeal of this Act, these parties should say to themselves that they have done a good job and are therefore free to go home because the enemy has been destroyed.

Mr R M BURROWS: Mr Chairman, yes, it is a historic occasion today and I think that as a historian I should like to steep myself—and I recommend that the hon members of the NP and the CP, in particular, steep themselves—in the debate of 1950 when this measure was first proposed. [Interjections.] Let us look at the words that were then used by the NP, words that are now vile, words like “Kaffir” and “coolie-shopkeeper”.

Let us quote from column 3107 of 16 March 1950:

I do not propose . . .

This is the Native Representative for the Western Cape speaking—

. . . to comment upon the squalid torrent of racialism and the ugly anti-Semitism which has been uttered in this House by the hon member for Vereeniging. Mr Speaker, we who sit in this corner of the House hear that only too often from a large number of members in our vicinity, who have the minds of Himmler, the tongues of Goebbels and the destined fate of

Hitler. In no other country is racial tension more sharply drawn nor more nakedly acute than South Africa.

He carried on later in column 3110:

Mr Speaker, what we hear from the Government benches is not racial pride, but racial arrogance, a glorification of themselves and a self-exaltation. They are not the true patriots in the country . . . No Coloured man in this country can be proud to be such a Coloured man as this Government wants to make him. The same applies to the Africans.

Finally in that debate the following point was made by way of a quote from Shakespeare:

In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt,
But, being season'd with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil?

. . . In religion,
What damned error, but some sober brow
Will bless it, and approve it with a text,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament?

This Bill, 41 years gone, dies, but we must remember that for the 41 years people opposed it. People of all races, people of many parties, fought tooth and nail against it. They fought against the racial slurs that we are still hearing in this House from the CP, because the key aspect of this Act was to emphasise blood and colour. It was, if you like, the incarnation of what Adolf Hitler stood for—the purity of race. Here we are ending it. We are in an end-phase of that Nazi dream. The hon member for Bethal said this Act was not racial, but what was the effect of this Act? It brought job reservation, the Immorality Act, the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, pass laws and everything else this country has been condemned for. It depersonalised individuals, stripped them of their individuality and made them Coloureds, Indians or Whites, not individuals in this country.

Now that this Act goes, what remains? The population register remains until the Constitution is repealed, and own affairs remain. The DP has strenuously opposed own affairs since the introduction of the Constitution. I note with interest that own affairs Bills are not included in the list of remaining measures which have racial provisions. For example, the National Education Policy Act, No 39 of 1967, defines “compulsory education” as meaning “the described period during which a white person of the prescribed age limits shall receive education.” According to

that Act “education” means “instruction, teaching and training provided to White persons.” These laws are racial. They are racial in the extreme and must go.

We need to ask how the NP is going to face a South Africa in which one of the few groupings of people who will have to make racial decisions will be school principals, in which children arriving at their schools will be turned away because of the colour of their skin. Have they actually thought through how those school principals are going to act as policemen when they ask a parent for a book of life and the parent says he does not have one? Is the principal going to turn the child away?

We need to address the issue of racial welfare payments and racial pensions. We need to address Sections 14 and 16 of the Republic of South Africa Constitution Act and we need to look at Schedule 1 of that Act. The hon the Minister may make the suggestion that Schedule 1 can be pared away, that we can cut from that schedule the various areas on which there is already agreement that they are not own affairs matters—matters such as health, agriculture, water affairs and forestry. They are not own affairs and never have been. We can move to the amalgamation of Ministries.

Essentially this Bill restores or begins to restore the equal rights of individual human beings. As a result of 41 years of this legislation and its appendices we have billions of rands to spend on backlogs. However, the passing of this law signals one thing. It signals hope for South Africa. [Interjections.]

Mr L C ABRAHAM: Mr Chairman, I would be a hypocrite if I did not concede to the hon member for Pinetown that during the 41 years of its application the Population Registration Act brought misery, hurt, humiliation and black comedy as people sought to change colour. Such madness as trying for White, with its direct spin-offs on future prospects, is best relegated to the scrapheap of this country's history, which is best forgotten.

Today we are performing part of the burial process. Let us be perfectly honest and candid with each other today. Since its introduction the Population Registration Act has scarred the lives and consciences of millions of South Africans. It

was incompatible with the concept of human rights.

*We do not need laws to maintain the right to exist. I also want to agree with the hon member for Houghton about human rights. The idea of human rights is inextricably linked to equality before the law. If people are officially classified on the basis of their race, sex or standing and they enjoy lesser rights than others, officially or unofficially, human rights are being violated. This, more than any other factor, made South Africa the polecat of the world for many years. Thank heaven this situation is also changing today.

The Population Registration Act in fact be regarded as one of the untenable heritages of the old apartheid. We are now going to get away from it. The NP fully realises that in the new South Africa there is no room for acts like the Population Registration Act, and that the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act cannot serve as building-blocks for the future of the new South Africa.

†The NP has been realistic enough to conclude that rights, freedoms and privileges can only be retained by individuals and groups to the extent that the same is accorded to others. We have witnessed a momentous June during which the apartheid edifice has started to crumble to dust. We have seen the falling away of compulsory segregation of residential areas and racial classification. In the process the political formations are rearranging themselves. The Government has set about restoring freedom of association as a cornerstone of a new South Africa. It rightly concludes that race classification is totally unacceptable, totally inflexible and undoubtedly discriminatory. The NP rightly concludes that this Act is quite out of step with the dynamics of the new South Africa.

*The statutory classification of people based on race or colour, without a free choice, is morally unacceptable.

†Let us also be realistic enough today to concede that, in spite of the repeal of this Act, some informal race identification may remain in the new South Africa, as it does elsewhere in the world for cultural or other reasons. However, there is simply no place for statutory classification in this country. Let us say to each other that race classification and reclassification was a

monstrosity, and that the annual lists of reclassification were a woeful commentary on South Africa's past. But let us also say that the repeal of the Population Registration Act and Group Areas Act by the Government of the day is a sure sign that we are moving to a non-racial, multi-party democracy, with guarantees that we will have security of person and property, enjoying economic freedom and the benefits of an independent judiciary.

*Now is the time to promote a sound and common South Africanism. Let us give the wounds of the past time to heal while we are building the new South Africa. Let us forget about the bitterness, even though the wound still hurts. Let us reach out to one another. Let us dream—not only with our minds, but also with our hearts—of a better South Africa in which our children will be able to feel safe, a country where one can just be a person, just a South African.

I want to conclude with the words of P J Cillie. He said we only really love South Africa when we not only love it for what it is, for what we can get from it as regards beauty, wealth and pleasure, but when we really love it for what it still could be and what it should be: a land worthy of the footsteps of the Lord. [Time expired.]

*Mr W A BOTHA: Mr Chairman, the Population Registration Act, which the NP Government of today wants to abolish here, is the most important Act ever placed on the Statute Book by any government in South Africa. Not only is it the most important Act, but it is also one of the very best Acts ever placed on our Statute Book. This was done by the former genuine NP. This Act forms the cornerstone of separate development—the only policy, a fact that has been demonstrated all over the world, that works in a situation such as South Africa's; the only policy which, worldwide, has brought peace and stability in a situation such as South Africa's.

This party, which now wants to repeal this important and essential Act, is not a national party, but an extremely liberal party which is committing political fraud in the name of the former honest NP. The Population Registration Act which is under discussion here today also forms the cornerstone on which many other good Acts, that have recently been repealed by this Parliament, were built. I am referring to the Group Areas Act and the so-called Land Acts of 1913 and 1936, which were repealed last week.

Other good and essential laws which were based on the principle of the Population Registration Act, were the prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, section 16 of the Immorality Act and the Prohibition of Political Interference Act, which were all repealed by this liberal Government under the pressure exerted by the enemies of the Whites of South Africa.

I say this Act under discussion is a good and very essential Act. This Act and other Acts, referred to in clauses 1 and 2, that have either been repealed or are being amended, identified peoples. I want to make it very clear here today that this Act under discussion does not discriminate because it identifies peoples. This Act does not imply that a person is inferior because that person is a Coloured or an Asian, and is therefore a member of a different people or race. Nor does it imply that if a person is White, and speaks Afrikaans or English, one is superior to other peoples who are not White. These Acts simply identify a person as a member of a certain race and people.

If the NP had placed these Acts on the Table today with a view to eliminating certain shortcomings in them and in that way improving the Acts, we would have had no objection to it. Unfortunately the purpose of this debate is, however, to repeal these good and essential Acts because the NP has now become ashamed of being White, and has become a mixed party.

In the classification of persons under this Act certain criteria are used. The first, and most certainly the most important aspect which determines a person's classification is his descent. If a person's parents were Indians, it is surely logical that one will also be an Indian and one ought to be proud of that fact, as we in the CP are proud of our Afrikanerdom. Furthermore it is an accomplished fact that a person's descent also brings certain characteristics into prominence in one, such as one's skin colour. Once again, one's skin colour does not make a person good or bad. There are other factors, which have nothing to do with this Act, which determine whether a person is a good or a bad person.

I say that this Act under discussion is a good and essential law. Without this law there would have been no question of the legal protection of minority groups or peoples, particularly not in the new South Africa. The Population Registration Act, and the Acts relating to it, were

responsible for smaller peoples in this fine country of ours being able to survive and not disappear, as has happened elsewhere in Africa. This Act gave the Afrikaner people the opportunity to survive in this country as a White people and to ensure that Christian civilisation could flourish here.

Without this Act, which identified the Whites, it would not have been possible for the Afrikaners to live in peace alongside other peoples, also to the benefit of those other peoples. If this Act had not been placed on the Statute Book in 1950, there would probably not have been any Coloureds or Indians in this country today. This Act and the other Acts under discussion here identified the Coloureds as a people and afforded them protection.

This is the reason why they were able to live in their own residential areas, under the Group Areas Act in peace, without being overwhelmed or trampled into the ground by other peoples. This enabled these communities to maintain their own schools as Coloured and Indian communities, their own schools with their own standards without being crowded out by Black people, as is happening at present and which is jeopardising the education of their children. [Interjections.]

*The CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE (Assembly): Order!

*Mr W A BOTHA: Mr Chairman, these Acts under discussion here ensured that the Coloured and the Indian child was able to continue with its studies, while chaos and anarchy prevailed in Black education.

I do not want to frighten people, but if I were a Coloured or an Indian today and I loved my people, I would have opposed the deletion of the Population Registration Act with might and main, because it is in fact their people who will suffer the most under the abolition of this Act. These peoples have no future in South Africa without this Act.

The abolition of the Acts will have far-reaching implications for the quality of our continued existence in South Africa.

In the political sphere it will mean national suicide.

The NP calls this power-sharing.

The CP calls it Black domination, or worse still, communistic Black domination.

If the Population Registration Act is deleted and one considers Southern Africa to be a unitarian state, as the new NP does, then Black domination, with all the other things that go with it, is the fate that awaits one. In fact, I understand that the hon the Deputy Minister of Agriculture issued a warning to the farmers in Humansdorp that a future Black government was inevitable and that we should be careful . . .

*The CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE (Assembly): Order! The hon member must discuss the Bill a little more specifically, because he is tending to digress from it. The hon member may proceed.

*Mr W A BOTHA: Mr Chairman, I am coming to the Bill now.

He issued a warning to the farmers telling them that a future Black government would not be as tolerant of the Whites as the Whites were at present of the Blacks. I want to warn the Coloureds and Indians today that a Black government will not tolerate them at all.

The abolition of this Act will contribute to a situation in which the Whites lose political control in the RSA. If that happens, the Whites also lose control over the Police and the Defence Force, and then the guarantees given to the Whites, the Coloureds and the Indians, are not worth the paper on which they are written. The proposed deletion of this Act is yet another concession and a further abdication to the ANC-SACP alliance.

The deletion of this good Act is essential for the implementation of the constitutional model of the Broederbond, to which the hon member for Wonderboom referred in this Chamber earlier this week. If one examines very carefully, one actually needs a magnifying glass, this possible constitutional model of theirs, one sees that it is stated in very small print on page 6 under the heading "Groepe": "Groepe gebaseer op ras dus nie moontlik nie".

This constitutional model to which I am referring is acceptable in virtually every respect to the NP, DP and ANC-SACP alliance. As I have already stated, the Population Registration Act stands in the way of the implementation of this model.

The abolition of this Act has further implications for our homes for the aged, schools and universities; in fact, for every facet of our national economy. The standard of education in our schools is being jeopardised with the deletion of this Act because schools in the new South Africa, without this Act, will of necessity be integrated.

The abolition of the Act under discussion has further serious implications for our security forces. This aspect must not be regarded lightly. It will affect compulsory military service profoundly. Our Defence Force, which has up to now been known for its excellent activities to counteract communism and terrorism, will certainly become a military force consisting of communists and terrorists in the hands of an ANC-SACP government which, as the NP warned in its *Key Issues* of 6 September 1989, will help to deprive us of our religious freedom.

I want to conclude by demonstrating the arrogance of the NP. Clause 1(3) of the Bill reads:

The population register as compiled in terms of the Identification Act, 1986, and as it exists at the commencement of this Act shall remain in force and of effect until the repeal of the Republic of South Africa Constitution Act, 1983 (Act No 110 of 1983).

The NP simply accepts, without further ado that the voters are going to give them a mandate for the new South Africa when they keep their promise of a referendum or an election. I say this is arrogance and the NP is going to get the surprise of their lives.

This Act cannot be supported by anyone who loves his country or his people. The 41 members of the CP therefore cannot support this Bill.

*Mr C L DE JAGER: Mr Speaker, I feel very sorry for the hon member for Uitenhage. He is a prophet of doom who wants to build the future of our country on conflict mechanisms. I am convinced that it is men such as he who finally extinguished the ray of light of the Koos document.

*Mr S C JACOBS: Mr Speaker, is the hon member prepared to reply to a question?

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon member prepared to reply to a question?

*Mr C L DE JAGER: Mr Speaker, my time is limited.

*Mr SPEAKER: Order! The hon member is not prepared to reply to a question.

*Mr C L DE JAGER: Mr Speaker, the Whites in Southern Africa have been afraid of engulfment since early in their history owing to large numbers of Blacks. That is why a policy of regional division and racial division was established in this country as early as the 17th and 18th century. The Anglo-Boer War, the First World War, the poor White problem and the Second World War overrode the fulfilment of this policy.

When the NP came to power in 1948, it took upon itself the task of carrying out regional and racial division. Among legislation agreed to was the Population Registration Act of 1950. On the grounds of race, this Act laid down the status of the individual in important phases of his life, for example in connection with land-ownership, the franchise, marriage, residential area and so on. The aim of the legislation was to give substance to the concept of vertical liberation of all ethnic groups, each in its own territory, which later found greater substance in the thinking of Dr Verwoerd. Racial domination was never the final objective.

When the Act which is now being repealed was agreed to, however, various other forces were at work in the world. The struggle between the Allied Forces and Nazi Germany—the latter pursuing a strong racial policy—had just been concluded. This struggle resulted in the United Nations coming forward with their Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Without our intending it, the Population Registration Act gave rise to the creation of the so-called anti-apartheid industry, with India in the vanguard, supported by the majority of members of the UN. [Interjections.]

On the introduction of the beautiful declaration of human rights of the United Nations, Africa and at the same time South Africa became the playing field for the ideological struggle between America and Russia. Russia was a master in the exploitation of inequality between Black and White in establishing a series of one-party dictatorships in Black Africa which are now looking over their shoulder to see what is happening in South Africa.

The enormous power build-up which took place to the north of us compelled us to reflect and gave rise to Mr P W Botha's speech in 1979 at

Uppington when he spelt out that we should differentiate between principle and policy. The principle was to maintain civilised norms. It was Mr Botha's clear and logical standpoint, however, that, when a person found that one had to adapt the policy to maintain the principle, one had to adapt the policy. To my mind this was the actual start of change in the NP policy to ensure the survival of the Whites in Southern Africa. [Interjections.]

That is why one finds that, since 1985, the Population Registration Act has systematically been losing relevance in the following aspects. Section 16 of the Immorality Act was repealed in 1985. The Prohibition of Political Interference Act was repealed in 1985. The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act was repealed in 1990 and the Group Areas Act has been repealed in the course of this year.

It is incontrovertibly true that the the Population Registration Act is the pillar on which the tricameral Parliament rests. That is why the maintenance of the population register, as contained in the proviso in this Bill, is of importance. The current Constitution can only be repealed when an agreement has been reached on a new constitution. Meanwhile the tricameral Parliament is doing good work.

Owing to general egalitarian views which prevail worldwide under the leadership of America, South Africa is now faced with the reality of establishing a multiparty democracy in this country. Now that America has become the only player of format in Africa, the hon the State President's speech of 2 February last year was perfect and could not be improved upon in timing to reach settlements in the interests of the people of South Africa without Russian interference.

The repeal of the Population Registration Act is calculated to remove conflict among people by removing the inherently hurtful result of the Act from our society. The repeal of the Act will make the Afrikaner a free man and will unlock the White's capacity for innovation. The repeal of the Act will release the power of ethnicity in South Africa, a power which will create a true multiparty democracy in South Africa under the leadership of the NP and the hon the State President. I agree with the preamble to the Koos document that South Africa is a fundamentally

changing country for the realisation of self-determination of the White nation.

The NP believes that the self-determination of the White nation can best be guaranteed by the introduction of a free and democratic political system in South Africa according to the following guidelines. All the people of our country must participate in full at all levels of government on the basis of general adult franchise. The government of the country must be based at all times on the consent of all its subjects. All people must be equal in the eyes of the law and have equal rights regardless of race, colour, sex or belief. The rights of all individuals and minorities must be defined on a non-racial basis in the constitution and there must be a constitutional guarantee for a justiciable bill of rights. There must be freedom of speech within the generally accepted bounds of responsibility. Freedom of movement and association for all must be guaranteed.

Today damning evidence was given on the Population Registration Act as well as damning evidence on apartheid. This side of the House is overjoyed that this country was governed well by them in spite of apartheid so that they are able to bury apartheid today.

Mr N SINGH: Mr Speaker, the hon member for Uitenhage, being a member of the privileged White class, has not been exposed to the humiliation and the indignity of the effects of the Population Registration Act on people of colour. I believe that had he suffered as we have, he would wish that he were not classified Indian or Coloured. To us, Solidarity, the Bill before this House is the final nail in the coffin of apartheid and I consider myself privileged to be sharing in this historic moment.

That it has taken us some 40 years to repeal this obnoxious law is an indictment of the ruling White class. However, I must hasten to add that it is also an indication that the majority of Whites are prepared to break with the shameful past. The challenge before us is to cross the racial divide that this law perpetuated. For this to happen, we need more than the mere repeal of obnoxious legislation. What we need is a change of heart and a commitment to translate the intention underlying this Bill into reality.

I know from personal experience of a child who was taken away from her Black mother because the child was fathered by a White. Nowhere in

the world has government the right to intervene in such personal and intimate areas as family and interpersonal relationships. To separate a child from the natural mother merely on account of a bureaucratic decision meant a tyranny of the law that could never be defended. The ideology of race was driven by an impulse of aggrandisement. This became an instrument to preserve and extend the position of the dominant White group. Through racial and economic stratification it was believed that the minority would be able to create a colour line which would not only demarcate the division between the races, but at the same time demarcate the division between privilege and dominance on the one side and exploitation on the other.

Every walk of human life was soon affected by the Population Registration Act. People in the privileged White community began to believe in the great myth that races could be clinically separated and that cities would all turn White and that such a status quo could be maintained militarily for an indefinite period. Internal and external pressure and the inability of Government to reverse the flow from rural areas into urban areas showed, however, that the dream of White cities was going to remain a dream.

The limited White labour reserve was incapable of providing the requirements of industry on the one hand and those of the Armed Forces on the other. Logistically it was not possible to maintain a situation which only increasing force could sustain. The logistics and the enormous costs, both in monetary terms and in terms of international condemnation, made the Government recognise that it was no longer possible to move people about and that social engineering was an impossible dream. It was this reality which caused the doctrinaire politics of a decade ago to fall into disrepute.

It has been known for a long time that White labour saw in the colour bar an opportunity to protect themselves against competition and cheap labour. White labour was at the forefront of the move to defend the colour bar and to extend its scope. It provided an opportunity for Whites to corner for themselves the best positions available, and until very recently skilled positions on the mines and in industry were reserved, by statutory means, for Whites only.

In a remarkable film shot by the BBC, which in my view provides a definitive commentary on

South Africa's political history, the point is made that South Africa's politics for the past 30 years was inextricably linked with the interests of White labour and the reaction this elicited from Black labour. That struggle between White labour and Black labour will not end with the passage of this Bill.

This Bill merely signals that the playing field is being made a little more even. The in-built advantages enjoyed by Whites over the past 30 years will continue to load the dice in their favour for years to come. Prejudices and ingrained habits will not be removed by legislation alone, and while the law will no longer recognise race as a factor, the truth is that race will continue to bedevil our interpersonal relationships for the foreseeable future. All we are doing is giving recognition to the fact that it was immoral to have statutory provisions interfering with one's basic rights as a human being.

The law that was so intrusive and which poked its ugly nose into the most intimate aspects of a person's life is now dislocated and is no more. In the march of civilisation, race has come up against race. This has led to clashes and has also led to a fusion of ideas and thoughts which has given an impetus to civilisation. We in South Africa have an opportunity, for the first time, to be relieved of the burden of being herded into racial camps from which we could not depart without serious consequences. Whether it was a simple thing like going to a hotel or a cinema, or playing in a game of soccer or cricket, one had to be mindful of race and what had been laid down in the Population Registration Act.

It was so intrusive and so obstructive, and those who enforced it were so vindictive, that in the past few years people began to rise up here and all over the world to block the entry of Whites to trade, sport and all the other things necessary for any community to exist in the modern world. It would be difficult to quantify the hurt and the harm that this piece of legislation caused. It must qualify as being the single most pernicious tool in the armoury of apartheid, and now that it goes in its entirety it frees this country of a moral burden that weighed it down so much that it went down on its knees. [Time expired.]

Mr R V CARLISLE: Mr Speaker, let me say at once that there has been comment that changes to this Act were artificial or whatever. I just want to say that there were two Bills and now there is

one. There was a clause which the hon the Minister described as ambivalent and now it is no more, and that is a tribute to my party, because the changes did not happen in the committee.

As we move to the twilight of this parliamentary day, so do we also move to the twilight of apartheid. I believe that this is not a time for recrimination. I believe it is actually a time for celebration, not because the journey is over, but because the journey can now begin. This Bill marks the point of no return. There are new dangers which threaten, new tyrannies, mob rule, communism and violence, but the old danger is gone forever.

It is time to celebrate. It is time to celebrate that mighty chorus that sang out in protest against racial domination. It is time to pay tribute to those who opposed, to the iron men of liberalism, Paton and Hofmeyr, Hoernlé and Oppenheimer, to Albert Luthuli, the man of peace who died in banishment, to Nelson Mandela, who may yet be a man of destiny and who spent his best years in a prison cell and to Steven Bantu Biko, the apostle of self-reliance, who died naked and alone.

It is a time for tribute to some forgotten heroes—to Ossie Newton Thompson and Catherine Taylor and Japie Basson, the silver fox who snapped at the heels of apartheid while he dodged the lethal kicks of its archapostle, Verwoerd. It is a time to pay tribute to some new heroes, who spoke up in the NP caucus and prepared the way for change, people like Nothnagel and Wynand Malan, Sam de Beer and Leon Wessels and indeed, to be fair, to the hon the State President who promised the death of statutory apartheid and has now delivered it.

Whilst this Bill marks the consummation of one part of everything that the DP and its predecessors have worked for, it is only one part. It is one half, because it is also time to begin the reconstruction. There is a long and dark night that lies ahead for all of us, a night of fear and of confusion, and indeed of violence, but the dawn will come, as it has for a thousand years, and if we have done our work we have nothing to fear from the new day. For us in the DP it is a very special time of celebration. It is a time when we can say it was all worthwhile as we cast our minds back to the sudden shock of battle in 10 general elections and referendums, and countless by-elections, when we knew defeat so much more

often than victory, and when in the first 130 elections that the old Progressive Party fought, it won but 3. One notes that it is worthwhile to stick to one's guns through all the years of being called Communists, sell-outs, traitors and pinkos and worse.

It is a time to celebrate those in the party who set their face against racism and injustice and never wavered. I am referring to people like Suzman, Eglin, De Beer and Andrew and so many others. It is a time to honour the memory of those of our colleagues who, had they lived and seen this day, would have known justification. One thinks of Savage and Steytler and Van der Merwe. I think particularly today of one friend, James Rennie, who was my colleague, and indeed a colleague of many hon members, in the President's Council. At his funeral a tribute was paid which I think sums up the struggle of my party of which I am so proud. It sums up a philosophy, and I will quote it to hon members:

One who never turned his back, but marched breast forward, never doubted that clouds would break, never dreamed, though right were worsted, that wrong would triumph, held that we fall only to rise, are baffled only to fight better, that we sleep only to wake.

As that philosophy sustained my party in the first great struggle, so will it sustain them in the second.

Mr W L WHYTE: Mr Speaker, I feel honoured to address this gathering today. One is tempted to preface one's remarks today with words normally used in obituaries. The only difference is that whereas words about sad and solemn occasions are marked in an obituary, the remarks from this podium are ones expressing exultation and joy. Today we come to bear witness to the total demise and abolition of all laws that made a distinction between persons belonging to different races or population groups, namely the Population Registration Act of 1950. I do not intend going into the details of the dehumanising and denigrating decisions which were taken in the name of this Act. Greater minds have addressed themselves, sometimes in tear-jerking, emotionally charged debates, to the pernicious nature of the Population Registration Act.

Neither do I intend to dwell too long on laying the blame at the door of this Act, the current political climate of violence and intimidation and

also the untenable school system, amongst others. However, some of these sentiments must be repeated, if not for emphasis, then for the edification and enlightenment of those closed minds and bigots who still choose not to acknowledge the injustices and pain caused by this Act.

This was an Act which, to people of colour, was indeed a suppurating ulcer, a blemish and blight on the Statute Book of this country. It was an Act that, because of its very nature, sparked off fierce, controversial and highly emotional debates. It was an Act which made victims of people of colour by denying them the opportunities to progress educationally and therefore to the full development of their potential and talents.

This was an Act which placed an arbitrary and racial shackle on the economic and social mobility of the people classified as non-White. This was a deliberate plan to maintain and ensure an abundant supply of cheap labour so that the Whites could maintain their privileged status.

The entire world has recognised the association between penury, pestilence and ill health. It was therefore a deplorable situation that this state of affairs was tolerated, indeed perpetrated, and governed by a racist and separatist philosophy which resulted in gross inequalities of resources, based solely on skin colour, with regard to health care.

This was an Act in terms of which, because of racial classification, people were moved like dumb animals to places which could only be described as wastelands of misery. This was the Act which saw bulldozers moved in to uproot settled communities, all because some White official, safely ensconced in his plush office and leafy suburb, saw people of colour as inferior, or even worse, as subhuman, merely pawns to be moved around to make the racial chequerboard more presentable. Yes, such was the intrusive nature of these Acts. They cast their dark shadow across the whole spectrum of the non-White society. They ensured the continued harassment of the people classified as non-White.

I sincerely believe that the imminent repeal of these Acts is not merely a reaction to the anticipation of the inevitable and impending changes. It is not a desperate act of one who reacts because he sees the sands of time running

out, nor is it the weak-kneed reaction to outside pressure. The mere fact that these once repulsive Acts are now under consideration for immediate repeal is, I feel, a strong response to genuineness and a willingness to reform. In the final analysis no one, neither the oppressor nor the oppressed, emerged with any degree of credit from this sordid mess.

We all now accept that the hurt and humiliation is now water under the bridge. We are all aware that the people who were discriminated against because of race, gradually become accustomed to the situation. As they moved from one purposeless day to another, the hurt and heartache became blurred and they became inured to the inevitability of their plight.

However, while the repeal of these Acts will ensure justice and dignity, and while it will lend credence to the fact that we are all one in South Africa, the hurt, humiliation and dehumanisation caused by these Acts will always remain not far from the surface of consciousness of the people of colour.

One does not wish to be pessimistic about the future, nor does one wish to appear to be harbouring feelings of resentment about past wrongs, real or perceived, but it must be categorically stated that the mere repeal of these Acts and/or the declaration of future good intentions will not easily expunge the hurt suffered from the memories of people of colour.

Nevertheless, despite all that has been said, we welcome the abolition, the repeal of these Acts of discrimination based on colour. We give our staunch support to the intentions and provisions of this Bill. In adopting these profound and irreversible changes towards the eradication and elimination of all racially restrictive laws, we are indeed heading for a normal society which can then be readmitted to the international world.

*Mr P H DE LA REY: Mr Speaker, the aim of this Bill is to remove all references to race from the Statute Book. The Bill therefore forms part of the package of laws that has recently been piloted through Parliament, all of which—so it is said—will result in apartheid being abolished in its entirety. To tell the truth, the Population Registration Act was the basis and foundation of all the other Acts, including the Constitution.

The hon the Minister has apparently gone through every law of the land with a fine-tooth

comb in order to ensure that no reference to Blacks, Coloureds or Asians remained anywhere. It is now even being provided that marriage officers for specific population groups are to be abolished.

The Government has once again yielded to the demands of the ANC, the SACP and the American government. They view this as a means of establishing a Black government in South Africa. These laws are being abolished because it is hoped that the differences between population groups can thereby be eradicated. The Government and the ANC are making a great mistake if they think that this will eradicate all racial differences.

They should take another look at the USA, where a great deal of trouble was taken to establish absolute equality. We still recall how drastic steps were taken there to integrate schools. But it is now becoming clear that this was a total failure, and apparently there is a gradual return to the old system.

I suspect that once the Black peoples begin to realise what this Bill entails, they will also be unhappy about its contents. After all, we know that Black peoples like the Zulus, Xhosas, Tswanas and others are proud of their descent and nationhood, and they will not wish to forfeit their ethnic background.

Now that these laws have been and are being abolished, the ANC and the SACP are once again dissatisfied and, as always happens, they say this is not enough. Now they are coming along with new demands, and the Government surely realises by this time that these people will accept nothing less than total capitulation. When will this Government realise that this kowtowing and capitulation is regarded by our people as the ultimate humiliation?

The White voters are proud of their race and descent, and they can no longer bear the fact that they have a government that is continually kowtowing to the ANC and the Americans and conceding to all these senseless demands. The voters are not only upset, but they are rebellious and are seeking ways to protect their rights and interests. These people do not want a Black government and will employ every means at their disposal to fight this.

However, the Government has another objective by way of this Bill. They believe that they

will achieve their objective through the passing of these laws, viz to destroy the Afrikaner people. That is what they want, because they are afraid of the powerful drive by the Afrikaners and other Whites. The Government is living in a dream-world. The abolition of these Acts is unleashing a powerful wave of nationalism, and they will not halt it.

I said that the Americans were spurring the Government on to abolish the Act, and they are doing so because they believe that a Black government will be established and they hope that this will give them access to the mineral wealth and other assets of South Africa. They also think that the eradication of the Afrikaner people is the right step in the realisation of a world government and a world state. This is another idle dream.

The mere fact that racial differences are now being removed from our Statute Book will not suddenly cause the differences between races to disappear. The existence of races in South Africa is a reality that cannot be conjured away. What we read in the newspaper last week was very interesting. The hon member for Oudtshoorn has established a Black branch of the NP. We are also forever hearing that the NP has established a Coloured branch. It seems as if the NP cannot ignore racial differences, particularly when they continue to give preferential treatment to Blacks in preference to Whites.

This evening I should like to address a word or two to the young NP backbenchers. Those hon members have never had to fight for their right of existence. They have so far lived off the prosperity that prevailed in the country until a while ago and which was achieved by the old NP, prior to the former State President, Mr P W Botha, and the present hon State President. For this reason they are not prepared to fight the battle that lies ahead of them, too. It is clear from their attitude in this House that they are apparently not even contemplating the dangers of the future. They think they can laugh everything off.

They probably also realise that it will no longer be possible for the overwhelming majority of them to be MPs in the new South Africa. I now want to ask them whether they are prepared for this disaster that lies in store for the country and for them as well.

*Mr J A JOOSTE: Mr Speaker, the hon member for Maraisburg will excuse me if I do not follow on what he said. I think that what he said here this afternoon has been repeated in this House so often and there has been so much reaction to it that it is really not worth my while going into it any further. [Interjections.]

I should rather like to link up with what the hon member for Durbanville said, namely that it was a privilege for him to be participating in this debate. The Act under discussion here determines what a group is. The Act's description of a group is based on race and colour. Having made that statement, one asks oneself at once what South Africa looks like?

I see South Africa as follows: Let us look at the streets of Cape Town, Durban, Pretoria, Bloemfontein and the streets of our small towns. [Interjections.] We will then see what the South Africa which we are dealing with looks like. We are seeing more and more of what South Africa looks like. Like its inhabitants, and in that regard I see . . .

*Mr C B SCHOEMAN: What do you see in the streets?

*Mr J A JOOSTE: Mr Speaker, I see that the people of South Africa are making constant progress in terms of their quality of life.

*Mr C B SCHOEMAN: Oh!

*Mr J A JOOSTE: People who were clothed in rags years ago, are properly dressed today. People are holding their heads high and have dignity. That is the South Africa I see. The repeal of the Population Registration Act endorses the approach of the Government that all people in South Africa are equal and must have equal opportunities. South Africa no longer has second-class citizens. South Africa is just like a home which no longer has second-class children. South Africa can no longer afford to have second- and third-class citizens.

What does the new South Africa look like? The other evening, Sunday evening, when we were watching the religious programme on television, they showed the Comrades Marathon on which the discussion was based. There we saw how the athletes ran up and down hills and how they co-operated and accepted the great challenge together to run this murderous marathon, how they suffered together, helped and carried one

another, supported one another, helped one another to some water, wet one another's heads and encouraged one another. I say that is what the new South Africa looks like.

But what does the new South Africa of the CP look like? The new South Africa of Sasolburg does not resemble the new South Africa of Wonderboom. The hon member for Sasolburg said in Bloemfontein in the debate of the Extended Public Committee on Provincial Affairs that he was not going to give up anything. I think the hon member for Kuruman supports him. Their new South Africa looks like the South Africa we know. The hon member for Wonderboom spoke about negotiation here yesterday. The hon member for Overvaal agrees with him. Let us build a smaller South Africa and negotiate about joint matters, things we have in common, says the hon member. Many CP supporters say that negotiation is capitulation. The hon member for Sasolburg also said so. Nevertheless there are many CP supporters who say that we will have to negotiate, because there are common issues between our people and the citizens of the same country which must be addressed.

Another matter which I would like to deal with briefly this afternoon is that of symbols. This matter is raised every now and again in this House. The hon member for Sasolburg spoke about national symbols in the Extended Public Committee on Provincial Affairs—the flag and the national anthem. He said that these must remain just as they are, Union Jack and everything. The hon members for Wonderboom and Overvaal say that we will at least have to change our flag by implication.

If this country changes, the flag will also have to change, particularly if the Free State is not part of the new country, the Free State's flag will no longer have a place in a new CP flag. What about the Union Jack? What about the colours of our country—orange, blue and white, which happen to be the colours of the NP as well? Surely the Conservative Party cannot keep that as well. [Interjections.] What about our beautiful national anthem, that anthem "The Call of South Africa" which we made such a group anthem that our fellow citizens were never prepared to recognise and respect it? As early as the seventies, school children turned their back on South Africa's national anthem, which was written only for Afrikaners. [Interjections.] It is still only written for Afrikaners.

*An HON MEMBER: Are you going to change it?

*Mr J A JOOSTE: A CP Member of Parliament, the hon member for Losberg, says that it is scandalous that a mixed choir should sing "The Call of South Africa". He says that it is scandalous that people dare broadcast it on television. He says that it is scandalous. There is no more definite way of destroying our precious "Call" than such remarks. There is no better way of doing that. For the reason I want to make an appeal to all our fellow South Africans today: Make this anthem your anthem as well. Make "The Call of South Africa" your anthem. Let us share this beautiful anthem. I can share "The Call" with fellow South Africans. I am prepared to change our Afrikaans lyrics in order to share the anthem with fellow South Africans and to make it a dignified anthem for everyone, an anthem which we use to celebrate our country jointly. We all celebrate South Africa when we say:

Ring out from our blue heavens, from our deep seas breaking round;
Over everlasting mountains where the echoing cracks resound;
From our planes where creaking wagons cut their trails into the earth—
Calls the spirit of our Country, of the land that gave us birth.
At thy call we shall not falter, firm and steadfast we shall stand.
At thy will to live or perish, O South Africa, dear land.

[Interjections.] The fact that we are repealing this Population Registration Act today gives our fellow citizens the opportunity to share this beautiful national anthem with us. For the hon members of the CP who are sitting there making interjections, I say that they should think about what they are saying. They should think again about what they are doing. They must think about how they incite people and humiliate them. They must think again about what they are doing to South Africa.

*Mr C A WYNGAARD: Mr Speaker, it is a memorable moment for me to be a part of this House and the debate in which this legislation is being abolished. If we persevere and do it in a positive spirit, a wonderful and bright future awaits us. The Bill which is being discussed today, makes provision for the removal of all racially based measures which are regarded by all South Africans as symbols of apartheid. The repeal of the Population Registration Act is a

milestone in the demolishing of statutory racial discrimination.

The removal of racial prejudice and discrimination however, requires more than just the abolition of a discriminatory measure. It requires a drastic change in attitude of the entire population of South Africa—a mutual understanding and sound and positive attitudes. In this respect the repeal of the Population Registration Act and all other racially based legislation which is being buried here today after more than four decades of implementation, is important because it reflects that change of attitudes.

This abolition or burial confirms that rigid group definitions simply do not work. Let us be honest—this repeal of the Acts will not remove ethnic differences; as a matter of fact, the repeal symbolises the inherent power of the various communities in South Africa.

*HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

*Mr C A WYNGAARD: It is a power which does not need statutory support. Therefore I am satisfied that the repeal of the Act will remove the final stumbling block on the way to a new South Africa, free of discriminatory coercion.

On 8 March 1950 the former Minister of the Interior introduced the Population Registration Act in Parliament. According to Hansard, col 2519 he said:

We cannot expect any Government to enforce the existing laws, which provide for a certain amount of discrimination, if we withhold the machinery necessary for the application of that form of discrimination.

Today, after 41 years, that machinery, of which group definitions and classification measures are the chief components, is finally on the point of being dismantled. It is truly an historic opportunity, not only because we are purging the Statute Book of a measure which caused a great deal of pain and humiliation over the years, but also because we are giving the death blow to an ideology which made South Africa the polecat of the world.

If one reads Hansard of 8, 13, 15 and 16 March 1950 there is no doubt that the Act, and specifically the provision for racial classification, was seen as one of the keystones of the system of apartheid. Speaker after speaker on the side of

the government emphasised it: the Act must protect the Whites, the Act is the crux of apartheid. But no-one could have stated it more bluntly than the later Minister, J J Serfontein, according to Hansard of 15 March 1959, col 2958:

The White man is master in South Africa and the White man from the very nature of his origin, from the very nature of his birth, and from the very nature of his guardianship, will remain master in South Africa to the end.

*An HON MEMBER: The CP still wants that today!

*Mr C A WYNGAARD: That is right. The Act regulated two aspects, namely population registration and population classification. I want to point out that at that stage a person's race affected his personal status in important aspects, even determined. It determined, for example who was allowed to possess land, who could vote, who could marry whom, where one was allowed to live, and where one was allowed to buy one's liquor.

Today we can rejoice and drink a toast to the assurance which the hon the State President gave during his opening speech that the Acts would be removed during this session. South Africans are longing for a new dispensation in which the rich diversity of our country can flourish without any oppressing or discriminatory measures. However, there is a small minority who still regard group identification and classification as essential to the protection of communities in South Africa. We are aware of the fact that there are countries throughout the world in which certain communities have a specific identity and maintain it without statutory protection.

Throughout the world there is a new awareness of ethnicity, not due to Acts which protect ethnic groups, in spite of the fact that such legislation does not exist. The formation of groups is a dynamic process and the powers inherent in that process cannot be suppressed in the long run by rigid group boundaries.

Finally, community acknowledgement must be based on freedom of association, which is acknowledged constitutionally and otherwise in various countries in the world. We are looking forward to a new dispensation in which the rich diversity in our country will be governed without oppressive measures.

Debate interrupted.

The Joint Meeting adjourned at 18:26.