

RealTime Transcriptions

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

MARIKANA

BEFORE TRIBUNAL

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE FARLAM (RETIRED) - CHAIRPERSON
MR TOKOTA SC
MS HEMRAJ SC

HELD ON

DAY 203

17 MARCH 2014

PAGES 24831 TO 25004



© REALTIME TRANSCRIPTIONS

64 10th Avenue, Highlands North, Johannesburg
P O Box 721, Highlands North, 2037
Tel: 011-440-3647 Fax: 011-440-9119 Cell: 083 273-5335
E-mail: realtime@pixie.co.za
Web Address: <http://mysite.mweb.co.za/residents/pak06278>



Page 24831

1 [PROCEEDINGS ON 17 FEBRUARY 2014]
 2 [09:14] CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya. I'm sorry, I
 3 didn't say, the Commission resumes. The Commission
 4 resumes. I'd be grateful if every person who has a cell
 5 phone will see to it that the cell phone is switched off.
 6 A cell phone going off in the middle of proceedings can be
 7 very disturbing. I just want to remind everyone present
 8 about that ruling. Mr Semenya?
 9 MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, we will have my
 10 learned colleague Baloyi give the argument on behalf of the
 11 SAPS.
 12 CHAIRPERSON: I see. Yes, yes, Ms
 13 Baloyi.
 14 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.
 15 Chairperson, we've prepared heads of argument. We've
 16 distributed these to the parties and we've also made copies
 17 for the Commissioners. Chairperson, I will not be speaking
 18 to each paragraph in the heads of argument, but will speak
 19 covering the topics that we've covered in the heads of
 20 argument.
 21 CHAIRPERSON: I think before you start,
 22 just from a housekeeping point of view just make sure that
 23 we're ready to hear the full argument from everybody. I
 24 received yesterday a set of heads which had been sent by
 25 SAPS. These are the heads from which you'll be arguing.

Page 24832

1 This morning I received heads of argument from the LRC who
 2 will argue on behalf of the Ledingwane family, from the
 3 evidence leaders, from the injured and arrested persons,
 4 the families of the three miners who were killed on the 13th
 5 of August, and the families of 33 of the 34 miners who were
 6 killed on the 16th, and also from AMCU, and I understand
 7 that the argument on behalf of those parties will be
 8 presented by Mr Mpfu and Mr Ntsebeza and possibly, it
 9 wasn't clear, counsel on behalf of AMCU as well. So those
 10 heads I've got. Those are the sets of heads I've got. Is
 11 there any other party to wishes to argue, apart from the
 12 ones I've mentioned, and if so, have they got heads that
 13 they wish to hand in? Ms Baloyi, would you please commence
 14 your argument.
 15 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.
 16 Chairperson, the orders that we seek with this application
 17 are set out in the notice of application and what we seek,
 18 what the SAPS seek, Chairperson, is rulings that would
 19 allow the witness at this stage identified as Mr X to
 20 testify in the absence of members of the public and to
 21 testify by video link, necessarily from a remote location,
 22 Chairperson.
 23 The rulings are set out in the notice and for the
 24 record, if I may read the rulings that we seek, the notice
 25 says that we seek an order that the oral evidence of Mr X

Page 24833

1 be presented in camera and by video link, that's (1).
 2 (2), That only the Commissioners, the legal
 3 representatives, and accredited media be permitted to be
 4 present in the auditorium during the evidence of Mr X.
 5 (3), The name of Mr X is to be disclosed only to
 6 the Commissioners and to the legal representatives of the
 7 injured and arrested persons in the Commission, which name
 8 shall not be disclosed by them to anyone else other than
 9 for the purpose of obtaining instructions.
 10 (4), Neither the name or any information that may
 11 reveal the identity of Mr X shall be disclosed by any
 12 person save for the purpose of obtaining instructions.
 13 (5), Members of the public wishing to listen to
 14 the evidence of Mr X will do so by listening to audio
 15 transmission of the –
 16 CHAIRPERSON: I take it that should be
 17 "may do so."
 18 MS BALOYI: May, indeed so, Chair.
 19 CHAIRPERSON: I'll amend the
 20 application accordingly –
 21 MS BALOYI: "May do so," as the
 22 Chairperson pleases.
 23 (6), Accredited members of the media reporting on
 24 the evidence may not disclose the identity of Mr X or
 25 provide any information which may lead to the disclosure of

Page 24834

1 his identity.
 2 (7), All video recordings of the evidence of Mr X
 3 must be bled or blacked out so as to not to disclose his
 4 identity in any manner.
 5 Chairperson, you would have seen from our heads
 6 of argument that in fact with respect to ruling 3 we have
 7 introduced some amendment which is that we will also
 8 disclose, make that disclosure to the representatives of
 9 AMCU, and this is in the light of the acknowledgement that
 10 Mr X does implicate, makes certain allegations that pertain
 11 to Mr Mathunjwa.
 12 CHAIRPERSON: So do you want then to
 13 amend paragraph 3 –
 14 MS BALOYI: As the Chairperson pleases.
 15 CHAIRPERSON: - by inserting the words
 16 "and AMCU" after the words "injured and arrested persons"?
 17 MS BALOYI: As the Chairperson pleases.
 18 CHAIRPERSON: Well, I don't think there
 19 can be any objection to that, so I grant the application
 20 for the amendment. Paragraph 3 now reads, "The name of Mr
 21 X is to be disclosed only to the Commissioners and to the
 22 legal representatives of the injured and arrested persons
 23 and AMCU in the Commission, which name shall not be
 24 disclosed by them to anyone else other than for the purpose
 25 of obtaining instructions."

Page 24835

1 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.
 2 Chairperson, the supporting affidavit sets out the concern
 3 that back up this application and primarily, or essentially
 4 it is that Mr X makes allegations, or will testify and make
 5 allegations that implicate certain persons. Those persons
 6 are presently the subject, some of them are subject of
 7 police investigation, pending police investigation, but
 8 also subject of pending criminal prosecution, or criminal
 9 proceedings, and there is a real concern that his
 10 testimony, or his testifying before this Commission may
 11 well expose him to harm and harm to his family.
 12 To underpin that, Chair, in the affidavit we
 13 state that in fact as things stand, Mr X is under witness
 14 protection precisely because of the concern about his
 15 safety and the safety of his family. That is essentially
 16 what underpins the application, Chairperson, and we set out
 17 in more detail in the affidavit.
 18 Now Chairperson, to the specific questions that
 19 we must address and which have been raised by the
 20 Commission, whether the Commission has the power to grant
 21 this application, and if so, where that power derives, we
 22 deal with that in our heads of argument and what we say in
 23 that regard, Chairperson, is that the Commissions Act in
 24 section 4 –
 25 CHAIRPERSON: Where are you in your heads

Page 24836

1 at the moment?
 2 MS BALOYI: At paragraph 7, Chairperson.
 3 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you.
 4 MS BALOYI: In section 4, Chairperson, of
 5 the Commissions Act what it does in its terms, it permits
 6 the exclusion of persons that the Chairperson, or that the
 7 Commission, whose presence the Commission deems not
 8 necessary or desirable when a witness testifies, when
 9 certain testimony is presented or certain submissions are
 10 made. Chairperson, our submission is that it is inherent
 11 in section 4, in the wording of section 4 that in fact
 12 certain members of the public may as the Commission is
 13 proceeding, listening to evidence may as it becomes
 14 necessary be excluded from sitting in through that
 15 evidence. That is the first source, Chairperson, of the
 16 power that we submit the Commission has to exclude persons
 17 from evidence of the witness.
 18 Chairperson, if I may for the record read section
 19 4, Chairperson, section 4 provides, the heading is "(4),
 20 Sitings to be public. All the evidence and addresses
 21 heard by a commission shall be heard in public, provided
 22 that the chairman of the commission may in his discretion
 23 exclude from the place where such evidence is to be given
 24 or such address is to be delivered any class of persons or
 25 all persons whose presence at the hearing of such evidence

Page 24837

1 or address is in his opinion not necessary or desirable."
 2 Now, Chairperson, section 4 is also backed up, or
 3 finds further support or expression in regulation 10, which
 4 provides, "Where at the time of any person presenting
 5 information to or giving evidence before the commission
 6 members of the general public are or have been excluded
 7 from attendance at the proceedings of the commission, the
 8 chairperson may on the request of such a person direct that
 9 no person shall disclose in any manner whatsoever the name
 10 or address of such person or any information likely to
 11 reveal his or her identity."
 12 Chairperson, what regulation 10 does, in fact
 13 what it does is it supports and further strengthens the
 14 power that you find in section 4, which is to preserve the
 15 identity and confidentiality of a witness that the
 16 Commission has deemed it necessary to hear his evidence in
 17 camera.
 18 Chairperson, we also make further reference in
 19 our heads of argument to regulation 19 as another source of
 20 the powers of the Commission with respect to the relief
 21 that we seek. Chairperson, at paragraph 8 of the heads of
 22 argument we make reference to regulation 19 which provides,
 23 "The Commission may determine its own procedures." In this
 24 regard, Chairperson, the submission that we make is that
 25 the question about witnesses testifying, how they testify,

Page 24838

1 in what manner they should present their evidence, it is
 2 regulated, or the Commission is empowered, it's part of the
 3 procedures of the Commission that the Commission has the
 4 power to regulate, and that's what regulation 19 does. It
 5 empowers the Commission to determine how evidence before
 6 the Commission should be present.
 7 Chairperson, to this point what we've had is
 8 we've had witnesses testifying orally by being present in
 9 the open forum, but in addition to that, Chairperson, we
 10 have considered that certain witnesses who will testify
 11 only by way of affidavit, that that decision, or that power
 12 of the Commission to determine that witnesses may well
 13 indeed present their evidence by way of affidavit is a
 14 power we submit that derives from regulation 19.
 15 Chairperson, in the –
 16 CHAIRPERSON: It appears to me that you –
 17 I mentioned at the beginning that I'd received sets of
 18 heads of argument from the various parties wishing to
 19 participate in the argument this morning, firstly from the
 20 SAPS, but thereafter from those who oppose various parts of
 21 the relief sought, and also from the evidence leaders. May
 22 I enquiry, have copies of these heads of argument been
 23 given to the representatives of the media? Because I see a
 24 number of members of the media here and if there's going to
 25 be extensive reporting on what happens today I think it

Page 24839

1 will assist the media considerably if they are given copies
 2 of the heads of argument. I don't know whether that's been
 3 that, but if it hasn't been done may I suggest that that be
 4 arranged in the course of the morning. Has it been done
 5 already, Mr Mpfu, or is it going to be done?
 6 MR MPOFU: No, Chairperson, unfortunately
 7 I think it can be done during the comfort break, because we
 8 do have extra sets, I think, all of us here.
 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, alright.
 10 MR MPOFU: Thanks, Chair.
 11 MS BALOYI: We'll do so, Chairperson.
 12 CHAIRPERSON: And I take it the evidence
 13 leaders can do the same.
 14 MS PILLAY: We will do so, Chair.
 15 CHAIRPERSON: Ja, thank you. Yes, sorry,
 16 I interrupted you. You were explaining to me that
 17 regulation 19 of the Commissions Regulations, which
 18 empowers the Commission to determine its own procedures
 19 would include a power obviously I couldn't exercise on my
 20 own –
 21 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 22 CHAIRPERSON: - but which I could
 23 exercise provided I have the consensus of my two colleagues
 24 to provide for a procedure whereby if an appropriate case
 25 is made out for it, for a witness to testify by means of an

Page 24840

1 external video, television link.
 2 MS BALOYI: Indeed so, Chair –
 3 CHAIRPERSON: That's the point you were
 4 making?
 5 MS BALOYI: That is the submission.
 6 Chairperson, in paragraph 10 of the heads of argument we
 7 set out the areas of evidence that will be covered by Mr X
 8 and we do so, Chairperson, only to illustrate the nature of
 9 the evidence that he will present to the Commission and to
 10 indicate that on the basis of this evidence, which,
 11 Chairperson, is evidence that, or allegations that are
 12 already contained in the statement of Mr X, statements of
 13 Mr X that have been submitted to the Commission. We
 14 summarise that in paragraph 10.
 15 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, while you're busy with
 16 paragraph 10, I see you're going to move on in paragraph
 17 10.1 and following to deal with the fact that Mr X is
 18 currently under witness protection.
 19 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 20 CHAIRPERSON: And you refer to the
 21 Director of Witness Protection.
 22 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 23 CHAIRPERSON: And you say in the, it is
 24 said in the replying affidavit by Mr Pretorius that, in
 25 paragraph 4.22, that the permission of the Director for

Page 24841

1 Witness Protection is required before the identity of a
 2 person under witness protection is disclosed, and you say
 3 such consent may be given in the circumstances provided in
 4 section 17 of the act.
 5 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 6 CHAIRPERSON: Then he says, "I will
 7 before the hearing of this application seek to obtain the
 8 attitude of the Director for Witness Protection to the
 9 disclosure of the name of Mr X." Now has that been done?
 10 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, that –
 11 CHAIRPERSON: Because as I understand it
 12 you can't even disclose to us who he is, or to the
 13 representatives of the injured and arrested persons and
 14 AMCU, as you seek to do –
 15 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 16 CHAIRPERSON: - unless you have his
 17 permission, as I understand it.
 18 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 19 CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct?
 20 MS BALOYI: Yes, that is correct,
 21 Chairperson. As things stand now we are in the process of
 22 procuring that consent, the written consent from the
 23 Director of Witness Protection.
 24 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, and the section 18 of
 25 that act provides that, apart from any relief that you may

Page 24842

1 seek in this application, I have to make certain orders,
 2 which are set out in section 18. You haven't incorporated
 3 those orders in the relief that you seek, but in terms of
 4 the act it's obligatory for you, as I read the act, but the
 5 section concludes by saying, by having said that I must
 6 make certain orders in relation to a person under
 7 protection, it says, "Unless the Director satisfies the
 8 presiding officer concerned that exceptional circumstances
 9 which are in the interest of justice exist why such an
 10 order should not be made" – now clearly your application is
 11 defective in the sense that firstly I'm not told what the
 12 attitude of the Director is, I'm not told whether he's
 13 going to endeavour to satisfy me to make an order such as
 14 dealt with in the last section, last portion of the
 15 section, and also it doesn't include the orders which I'm
 16 obliged to make –
 17 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 18 CHAIRPERSON: - in terms of the section.
 19 So that's a matter that receives - are not referred to in
 20 your heads of argument anywhere –
 21 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 22 CHAIRPERSON: - or in the papers to
 23 section 18 of the act, but I would be acting contrary to
 24 the terms of that act unless I complied with section 18.
 25 MS BALOYI: Yes.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24843</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: Is that not so?</p> <p>2 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, that is indeed</p> <p>3 the case. We do not deal with section 18 in the heads of</p> <p>4 argument, neither in our oral submissions.</p> <p>5 [09:34] Chairperson what we will need to do, we realise</p> <p>6 is that even before the Chairperson delivers, the</p> <p>7 Commission delivers its rulings on this issue.</p> <p>8 CHAIRPERSON: I make the ruling.</p> <p>9 MS BALOYI: Yes.</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: That's clear from the terms</p> <p>11 of the Act and the regulations.</p> <p>12 MS BALOYI: Yes.</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON: If there's going to be an</p> <p>14 empowering ruling in relation to, for example, the external</p> <p>15 video link, that involves the whole Commission.</p> <p>16 MS BALOYI: Yes.</p> <p>17 CHAIRPERSON: All three of us would be</p> <p>18 involved in that, if that's going to happen, but everything</p> <p>19 else I'm afraid is for me to decide alone. I may say that</p> <p>20 I've read, I read your heads last night and obviously</p> <p>21 studied the papers and I've also looked at some of the</p> <p>22 cases which have a bearing on the matter. There are some</p> <p>23 quite important points that arise for decision. I don't</p> <p>24 propose giving an ex tempore judgment or ruling at the end</p> <p>25 of the day.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24845</p> <p>1 happens. That's in the event of my making the order that</p> <p>2 you seek. If I don't, well, then of course that problem</p> <p>3 won't arise.</p> <p>4 MS BALOYI: Indeed so, Chair.</p> <p>5 CHAIRPERSON: Adv Hemraj points out to me</p> <p>6 that if we're only going to know what the attitude of the</p> <p>7 director is, the director clearly is an important person in</p> <p>8 relation to the kind of relief you're seeking, the other</p> <p>9 parties here who will be opposing the relief sought may</p> <p>10 well wish to say something about the attitude of the</p> <p>11 director has to communicate to me as Chairman of the</p> <p>12 Commission. So if it can be done today, it would be</p> <p>13 better. I suppose if it can't be done today, well, we'll</p> <p>14 have to either try to do something about it tomorrow or</p> <p>15 even possibly next week if that becomes necessary but</p> <p>16 clearly it's important, regard being had to the role or</p> <p>17 potential role the director would play, that all the</p> <p>18 parties get an opportunity to deal with what he has to say</p> <p>19 as well. I'm sorry to have interrupted you but that is an</p> <p>20 important point that –</p> <p>21 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON: - has to be addressed at</p> <p>23 the very beginning.</p> <p>24 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.</p> <p>25 MR MPOFU: Sorry, Chairperson, may I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24844</p> <p>1 MS BALOYI: Yes.</p> <p>2 CHAIRPERSON: As you know, we're not</p> <p>3 sitting on Wednesday and Thursday and I was proposing, if</p> <p>4 possible, to make the order next Monday after I've had an</p> <p>5 opportunity to consider the arguments that will be</p> <p>6 presented as well as the cases that have a bearing on that.</p> <p>7 So far as the Director of Witness Protection is concerned</p> <p>8 and his involvement, that will afford you the opportunity</p> <p>9 to ensure that what has to be put before me or what you</p> <p>10 wish to put before me will in fact be put before me before</p> <p>11 I'm in a position – before I'm in a position to make the</p> <p>12 ruling and in fact make the ruling. As I say, I hope to be</p> <p>13 able to make the ruling next Monday but it may be that in</p> <p>14 the course of considering the matter and reading the</p> <p>15 authorities and re-reading the argument I may find it</p> <p>16 difficult to give the ruling as soon as next Monday but</p> <p>17 I'll obviously do it as soon as I can because I understand.</p> <p>18 MS BALOYI: Yes.</p> <p>19 CHAIRPERSON: The next witness is going</p> <p>20 to be Colonel Vermaak. I understand you'd like to call Mr</p> <p>21 X. I anticipate that Colonel Vermaak will be some time in</p> <p>22 the box or at the witness table but clearly you have to be</p> <p>23 ready, not only to call Mr X when Colonel Vermaak has</p> <p>24 finished but if there are certain things that have to be</p> <p>25 put in place you'd obviously need time to ensure that that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24846</p> <p>1 enquire – I agree with the Chairperson's outline but may I</p> <p>2 enquire how, in that regime, we will accommodate our right</p> <p>3 of reply? In other words, obviously what the Chairperson</p> <p>4 is proposing will happen before the ruling is given but how</p> <p>5 are we to deal – how is the other side, so to speak, going</p> <p>6 to –</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: It depends – sorry to</p> <p>8 interrupt you, it depends what he says. Section 18 of the</p> <p>9 Act, that's the Witness Protection Act, says,</p> <p>10 "Notwithstanding any other law, the presiding officer at</p> <p>11 any proceedings" – which, by the way, include proceedings</p> <p>12 before a Commission – "in which the protected person is a</p> <p>13 party or a witness" – well, he would be a witness – "must</p> <p>14 make an order." So "Notwithstanding any other law, the</p> <p>15 presiding officer at any proceedings in which the protected</p> <p>16 person is a witness must make an order prohibiting the</p> <p>17 publication of any information, including any drawing,</p> <p>18 picture, illustration, painting, photograph" and then they</p> <p>19 go on to describe that, "pamphlet, poster or other printed</p> <p>20 matter which may disclose the place of safety or location</p> <p>21 where he or she is as being under protection or where he or</p> <p>22 she has been relocated in terms of the Act, the</p> <p>23 circumstances relating to his protection, the identity of</p> <p>24 any other protected person, the relocation or change of</p> <p>25 identity of a protected person. Unless the director has</p>

Page 24847

1 satisfied the presiding officer concerned the exceptional
 2 circumstances which are in the interests of justice exist
 3 why such an order should not be made." So his involvement
 4 is of such a nature that I would imagine that, depending on
 5 what he says, you may not consider it necessary to reply.
 6 Alternatively, if you do reply you could possibly reply in
 7 writing or, it's impossible to look with too much accuracy
 8 into the future, you may wish to address me orally on that
 9 point but these are all matters that – it's not very clear
 10 what exactly is going to happen so we can't say at this
 11 stage what facilities or opportunities will be afforded you
 12 to deal with what the director has to say.

13 MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.
 14 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, Ms Baloyi, sorry.
 15 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.

16 Chairperson, I've been alerted to the fact that not
 17 everybody in this room has a copy of the heads of argument
 18 and perhaps I should read as much as possible into the
 19 record of what is contained in the heads.

20 CHAIRPERSON: I don't think that's
 21 strictly necessary. I would imagine that the general
 22 thrust of what you have to say will be apparent. The media
 23 will, I understand, be given copies in the course of the
 24 morning but I doubt whether the other people here would
 25 want exactly to know every word that's in your heads. As

Page 24848

1 long as the general thrust is clear it should be in order.
 2 MS BALOYI: As the Chair pleases.
 3 CHAIRPERSON: You will remember Mr Mpofo
 4 indicated he thought the whole argument would be over by 11
 5 o'clock. Well, it may be an impossible target but
 6 obviously the longer we take, the less time we have for the
 7 conclusion of Major-General Naidoo's evidence.

8 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.
 9 Chairperson, I was at the point where I was pointing out
 10 that in paragraph 10 we set out in summary some of the
 11 allegations that are contained in the statement of Mr X,
 12 which we say are matters about which he will testify.
 13 Chairperson, at paragraph 11 we set out the legal framework
 14 that we say applies to a determination of an application of
 15 this nature and in that regard, Chair, we – the Chairperson
 16 will see at paragraph 11.3, at paragraph 11.3 that we set
 17 out the rights that are implicated in this application.
 18 11.3.1 The right to life as provided for in section 11 of
 19 the Constitution, 11.3.2 the right to freedom and security
 20 of the person which includes freedom from all forms of
 21 violence, whether from public or private sources, that is
 22 section 12 of the Constitution. And at 11.3.3 we speak of
 23 section 34 which provides for the right to have any dispute
 24 that can be resolved by application of law, decided in a
 25 fair public hearing.

Page 24849

1 Chairperson, the application or the relief that
 2 we seek, in particular that the witness testify in camera
 3 as contemplated in section 4, immediately implicates
 4 section 34 which is that all disputes should be resolved by
 5 public hearing –

6 CHAIRPERSON: Well, does it? The reason
 7 I ask you that is, have you got section 34 in front of you?
 8 MS BALOYI: I do.
 9 CHAIRPERSON: Will you read it to us,
 10 please?
 11 MS BALOYI: I do, Chairperson.
 12 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, will you read section
 13 34 to us please? Do you have the section?
 14 MS BALOYI: I do, Chairperson.
 15 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, would you read it
 16 please? Sorry.
 17 MS BALOYI: Section 34 reads, "Access to
 18 court. Everyone has the right to have any dispute that can
 19 be resolved by the application of law decided in a fair
 20 public hearing before a court or, where appropriate,
 21 another independent and impartial tribunal or forum."
 22 CHAIRPERSON: Well, does that apply to a
 23 Commission? The language is a bit ambiguous.
 24 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 25 CHAIRPERSON: It talks about another

Page 24850

1 forum or tribunal, this is clearly not a court.
 2 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 3 CHAIRPERSON: We don't make orders at the
 4 end although I can understand that the findings we make and
 5 the recommendations we make may involve some reputational
 6 damage to some of the people concerned, but is there
 7 authority on the question as to whether this Commission
 8 could be regarded as a forum or tribunal within the meaning
 9 of those expressions as they are used in section 34?
 10 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson, we haven't
 11 come across anything specifically that deals with the
 12 proceedings of the Commission. The reason that we are
 13 prepared to make the concession or to concede, perhaps ill-
 14 advised even, to concede that section 34 may well be
 15 implicated, Chair, it is because the terms of reference
 16 requires the Commission to make certain findings, and
 17 perhaps to pick an easy example, whether the conduct of the
 18 members of the SAPS was reasonable in the circumstances.
 19 Perhaps a second example that pertains to the strikers is
 20 whether any of their conduct in any way contributed to the
 21 events in Marikana, to what transpired in Marikana.
 22 Chairperson, this is not merely, we submit, that it will
 23 probably not be just a factual enquiry. The Commission
 24 will probably have to get into principles of law applicable
 25 to see whether certain findings are justified and in that

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24851</p> <p>1 way, Chairperson, you would be applying the law and perhaps 2 the famous example is the SAPS having, the account of the 3 SAPS in these proceedings is that its members would have 4 acted in self-defence in some of the cases. That does 5 require the Commission to look into the principles of law 6 and to come to certain conclusions on that and, 7 Chairperson, to that extent this forum does look into 8 questions or does decide issues applying principles of law. 9 Secondly, Chairperson, indeed this is not a court 10 of law but perhaps it is possible that this Commission is 11 covered by the part of section 40 – 34, rather – that says 12 another independent and impartial forum. Chairperson, it 13 may well be that this Commission is such a forum which 14 determines certain questions applying principles of law and 15 to that extent, Chairperson, it would appear that section 16 34 is relevant for purposes of this Commission. 17 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. 18 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chair. 19 Chairperson, what section 34 – rather what section 4 of the 20 Commissions Act does in its terms is to in fact say – 21 CHAIRPERSON: The reason I asked you the 22 question is this, if section 34 applies to this Commission, 23 then any statute which delegates from the entrenched right 24 created by section 34 would have to comply with the 25 limitation provisions in the Constitution and there may be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24853</p> <p>1 reference. 2 MS BALOYI: I will give the correct 3 citation, Chairperson. 4 CHAIRPERSON: Of course, there's a 5 further complication of course, that if there is a statute 6 which it is contended is unconstitutional, I would have no 7 power to declare it unconstitutional. 8 MS BALOYI: Yes. 9 CHAIRPERSON: I would have to accept, I 10 take it, that it is constitutional but obviously if the 11 Constitution applies in interpreting the statute, I would 12 obviously be obliged to accept it's constitutional but I 13 would have to interpret it in such a way, if I could, as to 14 make it constitutional and that might have a bearing on the 15 way the statutes, the ones you rely on, are to be 16 construed. That's also one of the main reasons why I ask 17 the question. 18 MS BALOYI: Yes. 19 CHAIRPERSON: I take it you would concede 20 that to be the case as well. 21 MS BALOYI: Yes, Chairperson. 22 Chairperson, we are not making the submission that there is 23 specific legislation or statute that deals with this kind 24 of application before the Commission. We're not saying 25 that it is regulated, save for what you find in section 4</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24852</p> <p>1 issues that arise in respect of that, so that that was the 2 focus, the reason why I asked you the question. 3 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chair. 4 CHAIRPERSON: You, in effect, have 5 conceded that the section of the Constitution does apply so 6 that further consequences would follow. 7 MS BALOYI: Yes. In fact, Chairperson, 8 what – on that our submission is that the provisions, the 9 statutes that in fact provide or deal with the kind of 10 relief that we are seeking in this application have not 11 been found to be unconstitutional. Perhaps a good example, 12 Chairperson, a point of reference is the Criminal Procedure 13 Act. The provisions of section 153 of the Criminal 14 Procedure Act which provides for hearings in camera and 15 section 158 which provides for testimony by way of video 16 link. Those provisions post '94 have been found to be 17 applicable, they haven't been declared unconstitutional. 18 Chairperson, a further authority in fact that we 19 do not refer to in our heads of argument is the matter of 20 DPP Transvaal v The Minister of Justice. Chairperson, it's 21 a – I'll give the Chairperson the correct citation. I 22 think it's a 2008 decision of the Constitutional Court – 23 CHAIRPERSON: It can't be the DPP 24 Transvaal if it's 2008 because the Transvaal as such had 25 ceased to exist but anyway if you can give me the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24854</p> <p>1 which – 2 CHAIRPERSON: Well, section 4 would have 3 to be interpreted, would it not? 4 MS BALOYI: Indeed so, Chair. 5 CHAIRPERSON: If possible, so as to 6 render it constitutionally valid and the same would apply 7 to regulation 10. 8 MS BALOYI: Yes. 9 CHAIRPERSON: Is that right? 10 MS BALOYI: Yes. 11 CHAIRPERSON: And also, I take it, in 12 relation to the sections in the Witness Protection Act that 13 are relevant. 14 MS BALOYI: Yes. Thank you, Chair. 15 Chairperson, perhaps the last point that I was making was, 16 in fact, where the Constitution Court has had occasion to 17 look at – 18 CHAIRPERSON: You're going to give us the 19 reference of this. 20 MS BALOYI: Yes. 21 CHAIRPERSON: This DPP of – 22 MS BALOYI: I will, Chairperson. Mr 23 Pretorius is trying to assist me. 24 CHAIRPERSON: Of somewhere in the old 25 Transvaal, apparently, versus the Minister of Justice. It</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24855</p> <p>1 may have been an earlier case that involved the DPP of 2 Transvaal and was only reported later, I don't know. 3 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, in fact I do 4 have the citation, if I may. 5 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, please give it to me. 6 MS BALOYI: Yes. It is, surprisingly it 7 is DPP Transvaal, Chairperson, v Minister of Justice & 8 Others 2009(7) BCLR 637, a decision of the Constitutional 9 Court. 10 CHAIRPERSON: Do you know if it's 11 reported in the South African Law Reports as well? 12 MS BALOYI: I beg your pardon, 13 Chairperson? 14 CHAIRPERSON: Do you know if it's 15 reported in the South African Law Reports as well? 16 MS BALOYI: Chair, I couldn't find any 17 other reference. 18 CHAIRPERSON: Well, I'd be grateful if 19 you could try to get us a copy of the judgment. 20 MS BALOYI: Yes. 21 CHAIRPERSON: Because it'll obviously be 22 necessary in fact to refer to it. 23 MS BALOYI: Chair, we'll do that. 24 CHAIRPERSON: Or it may be necessary to 25 refer to it, I don't know yet.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24857</p> <p>1 African Legal Information Institute we'll be able to find 2 the judgment - 3 MS BALOYI: Yes. 4 CHAIRPERSON: - electronically, so we 5 will get copies. Mr Ntsebeza wants to know full details, 6 he's now got them. So you can proceed. 7 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, in paragraph 8 166, insofar as it is relevant to the question that the 9 Chair just raised with me, that in paragraph 166 of that 10 judgment the Constitutional Court says that, "These 11 procedures," and this is testimony of a child in camera 12 through a mediator and by video link, the court there says 13 that, "These special procedures should not be seen as a 14 justifiable limitation on the right to a fair trial, but as 15 measures conducive to a trial that is fair to all." 16 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I see the case 17 is reported in the South African Law Reports and in the 18 South African Criminal Reports. Adv Hemraj has drawn my 19 attention to a passage in Adv du Toit's textbook on 20 Criminal Procedure where he says at page 22-30 and on to 21 22-31 that the case is reported 2009 (2) SACR 130, and 2009 22 (4) SA 222 (CC). So that should make it easier for us to 23 find the case. 24 MS BALOYI: I'm indebted to the 25 Chairperson.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24856</p> <p>1 MS BALOYI: We'll do that, Chair, but 2 Chair, perhaps to - 3 MR NTSEBEZA SC: Chair, can we get the 4 full citation? 5 CHAIRPERSON: The reference is 2009(7) 6 BCLR637 (CC). If we can give them the gate then through 7 the SAFLII website we should, or even the Constitutional 8 Court website we should be able to obtain an electronic 9 version of the judgment. 10 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chair. Perhaps, 11 Chair, for completeness to point out that in fact in this 12 matter before the Constitutional Court the court was 13 concerned with the equivalent of section 153 and 158 so far 14 as they pertain to child witnesses and child complainants 15 and the court recognised that the purpose of those 16 provisions are to protect from stress. 17 [09:54] (1), distress of testifying, but also the 18 possible harm that may be caused to them by having to 19 testify in the presence for example of the person that they 20 are accusing of wrongdoing, and Chair, the date of the 21 judgment, the matter in fact was decided on 1 April 2009. 22 It was heard on 6 November 2008. 23 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Now we've got 24 the dates; by reference to the website of the 25 Constitutional Court and also the website of the South</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24858</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: You're really indebted to 2 Adv Hemraj. 3 MS BALOYI: I am indeed, Chair. 4 CHAIRPERSON: But anyway, you say the 5 passage in the judgment which is particularly relevant for 6 us is paragraph 166? 7 MS BALOYI: 166, Chairperson. 8 Chairperson, we make the point in the heads of argument 9 that there doesn't seem to be any dispute - 10 CHAIRPERSON: You're now at paragraph? 11 MS BALOYI: Chair, if you would bear with 12 me. Chairperson, perhaps to finish off on paragraph 10 in 13 which we set out, the one thing that I should have 14 mentioned is we make the point, and I think Mr Pretorius 15 may well, in his replying affidavit makes the point that it 16 doesn't seem to be in dispute between the parties that 17 there may well be a risk to Mr X is he's required to 18 testify in an open forum. The point of difference it 19 appears is the measures that can and should be put in place 20 to secure him from any risk of harm, and Chair, we submit 21 that that is significant to take into account in 22 considering the facts in an application of this nature. 23 Chairperson, section 4 that empowers the 24 Commission to order a hearing in camera, we say that that 25 power of the Commission, or the ability of the Commission</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24859</p> <p>1 to grant that kind of relief, although we do not come 2 across authority that deals specifically with section 4 or 3 the exercise of the power under section 4, there are 4 parallels and guidelines or guidance to be drawn from the 5 decisions of our courts which have dealt with these issues, 6 and many of these decisions, they in fact are rendered in 7 the period after 1994 under the current Constitution. 8 Chairperson, we make reference to in fact a 9 decision that predates our Constitution, and here, 10 Chairperson, I'm at paragraph 12.1 of the heads of argument 11 – the decision of State versus Leepile and Others (1) 1986 12 (2) SA 333 (W), and we make the point, Chairperson, that it 13 was well argued by the esteemed counsel in that matter. 14 CHAIRPERSON: You're referring to junior 15 counsel- 16 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, the issue is 17 about balancing what are competing rights; the right of Mr 18 X to life, but also his physical safety, and the right of 19 parties who have an interest in the proceedings in this 20 Commission to participate in the proceedings of this 21 Commission, and the issue really is to strike the correct 22 balance. 23 Now Chairperson, we do not seek to withhold the 24 identity of Mr X from everybody. In the extreme cases, 25 Chairperson, I think in the Leepile matter along the way,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24861</p> <p>1 says he did. That's if he's telling the truth, because if 2 he's a total impostor and he wasn't there at all – 3 MS BALOYI: Yes. 4 CHAIRPERSON: - they won't know who he 5 is. But you presumably can't be heard to contend that I 6 must make an order on the assumption that they don't know 7 him. 8 MS BALOYI: Yes. 9 CHAIRPERSON: They must know who he is. 10 So, and in any event counsel would have had, as you concede 11 in effect by implication in prayer 3, counsel have to 12 disclose his name to their clients to get instructions. So 13 I must confess I have difficulty in understanding why his 14 name can't be disclosed to the parties who on the facts 15 before – particularly the strikers, I mean, because on the 16 facts before us they must already know who he is. 17 MS BALOYI: Yes. 18 CHAIRPERSON: But that's something that 19 you will deal with in due course, I trust. 20 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson – 21 CHAIRPERSON: Now when you've reached a 22 suitable stage I've been asked to authorise a comfort 23 break. It may be you would want to think about some of the 24 points I've put to you during the comfort break, but when 25 you – I don't want to interrupt the flow of your argument –</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24860</p> <p>1 it must be Leepile (5) where in fact there was a request 2 to, where the State requested, or required to withhold the 3 name and identity of the witnesses from even counsel and 4 the Court. This is not such a case, Chairperson. This is 5 a case where we say for his safety members of the public 6 should not have access to his identity and – 7 CHAIRPERSON: Well, you go a bit further 8 than that. What you say in paragraph 3 of the notice of 9 motion is "His name should only be disclosed to the 10 Commissioners and the legal representatives of the injured 11 and arrested persons and AMCU." So it can't be disclosed 12 to Mr Ntsebeza for example because he appears for the 13 families. 14 MS BALOYI: Yes. 15 CHAIRPERSON: It can't be disclosed to 16 the representatives of the Ledingwane family either. So 17 that seems to be unduly restrictive I would have thought, 18 prima facie. 19 MS BALOYI: Yes. 20 CHAIRPERSON: But it can't even be 21 disclosed to the parties except for the purposes of 22 obtaining instructions. Now if Mr X is telling the truth 23 and he did all the things that he says he did, then he must 24 be known to the other strikers. They must know who he is 25 because they would have seen him doing the things which he</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24862</p> <p>1 MS BALOYI: Yes. 2 CHAIRPERSON: - but when it's convenient 3 for you would you let me know and we'll take the comfort 4 break? 5 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson, perhaps 6 the note to take the comfort break would be that it is 7 indeed what we propose, that he should, his details should 8 be disclosed to those persons, we say, where it will be 9 necessary for the legal representatives to obtain 10 instructions in order to deal with the evidence of Mr X 11 insofar as it implicates parties before this Commission. 12 Chairperson, we will give further thought - 13 CHAIRPERSON: You may then have to 14 redraft the terms of prayer 3 for purposes of that. 15 MS BALOYI: Yes. 16 CHAIRPERSON: I mean you'll remember the 17 section, as far as disclosure is concerned that's governed 18 by regulation 10. 19 MS BALOYI: Yes. 20 CHAIRPERSON: And in line with the cases 21 to which you've referred me by way of analogy, quite a 22 strong language is used there. The regulation 10 itself 23 doesn't indicate the test to be applied by the Chairperson 24 if he should comply with the request that the name, 25 address, and other information of a person not be</p>

Page 24863

1 disclosed. So I would imagine that by analogy I would have
 2 to have regard to some of the cases, or tests formulated in
 3 the cases to which you've referred me, with due regard of
 4 course to the fact that this is a Commission and not a
 5 trial, but having said that, the principles will apply at
 6 least to some extent by analogy and the cases talk about
 7 things such as necessity, "strict necessity" is used in
 8 some of the cases. So I mean I can't just make the order
 9 that the names not be disclosed to the parties where the
 10 probabilities are overwhelming that the parties, certainly
 11 the striking parties know who he is. But apart from that
 12 some basis would have to be advanced to justify an order in
 13 the restricted terms you've asked for, but I'm not
 14 expecting you to give me an answer now. Perhaps we should
 15 take the comfort break now and we'll resume in quarter of
 16 an hour.

17 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.

18 CHAIRPERSON: And then perhaps some of
 19 the housekeeping matters that have been addressed up to now
 20 can have been attended to in the interim as well.

21 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chair.

22 [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]

23 [10:36] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. We
 24 have now on our desks a copy of the Constitutional Court
 25 judgment in the DPP Transvaal v The Minister of Justice and

Page 24864

1 Constitutional Development and Others, for which we wish to
 2 express our gratitude to those responsible for making it
 3 available to us. The evidence leaders, I think, are those
 4 to whom our thanks must be directed. Ms Baloyi, you were
 5 addressing us when we took the comfort break.

6 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chair.

7 CHAIRPERSON: Please proceed.

8 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, perhaps to start
 9 with the issue that the Chairperson raised and perhaps a
 10 good point to start, on the issue of the extent of the
 11 disclosure of the name of Mr X. As we've set out in the
 12 notice we, as amended, we had offered that we would
 13 disclose to the legal representatives of the injured and
 14 arrested and to the legal representatives of AMCU. In
 15 fact, Chairperson, perhaps we could make a further
 16 amendment to that prayer or that order, that part of the
 17 order, that we will make disclosure to all the legal
 18 representatives. That would be in order, such a ruling.

19 CHAIRPERSON: Well, yes, it may be that
 20 as your argument proceeds and you hear, have the benefit of
 21 inputs from your learned friends, you may want to amend
 22 your relief further. So I'd be grateful if at the end you
 23 give me a typed version of what you seek.

24 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chair.

25 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, please proceed. What

Page 24865

1 paragraph were you busy with when we adjourned?

2 MS BALOYI: Well, Chairperson, perhaps
 3 even before I go back to the paragraph, if I may address
 4 some of the questions. They are addressed in the heads of
 5 argument and I would have addressed them in the
 6 submissions, it's just that the Chairperson, you've
 7 prompted them in the engagement – which I'm not complaining
 8 about, Chairperson, I'm happy to deal with –

9 CHAIRPERSON: You must deal with it as
 10 you consider, you know, most appropriate.

11 MS BALOYI: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON: If you wish to deal with
 13 them at the appropriate point in your heads, do so. If you
 14 want to deal with them now you may do so as well. Either
 15 way I'll hear what you have to say and consider it.

16 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, I'm happy to
 17 take this approach that on the – Chairperson, you asked the
 18 question that if the name is disclosed and it's going to be
 19 disclosed for purposes of taking instructions and I
 20 understanding the question really to be about the efficacy
 21 of such an order as we ask for –

22 CHAIRPERSON: No, the main point was that
 23 if they know, if on the overwhelming probabilities the
 24 strikers already know who Mr X is –

25 MS BALOYI: Yes.

Page 24866

1 CHAIRPERSON: Because the point being if
 2 Mr X played the prominent role he says he did, if he's
 3 telling the truth in other words, then there's an
 4 overwhelming probability that they know who he is and they
 5 know what he looks like and they even know his name. So
 6 it's a little bit artificial then to say, to impose a
 7 restriction that his name can only be given to legal
 8 representatives only for the purposes of obtaining
 9 instructions and so on, whereas in fact you can imagine the
 10 strikers looking in amazement at their legal
 11 representatives if they tell them that and they say, but we
 12 know him already. Of course they mightn't admit that
 13 that's so and in fact they may be being truthful if they
 14 don't admit it but if he is correct that he did all the
 15 things he says he did, it's overwhelmingly probable they
 16 know who he is.

17 MS BALOYI: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON: So, or the vast majority I
 19 would've thought know who he is, so what's the point then
 20 in imposing an artificial restriction which is in fact,
 21 practically speaking, meaningless? That was the purpose of
 22 the question and flowing from that was, all restrictions
 23 that are imposed are in some ways derogations from the
 24 right people have to start with and the more restrictive
 25 the order is, the more the need for justification and if

Page 24867

1 the justification is, well, they mustn't know his names
 2 except for certain limited purposes, but it's
 3 overwhelmingly probable they know them anyway – well, then
 4 the basis for granting the restriction becomes weaker. So
 5 you understand my problem?
 6 MS BALOYI: I do understand.
 7 Chairperson, it is not contended that this is a perfect
 8 measure that protects a witness in perpetuity and forever.
 9 In fact, in the authorities that we rely on it is accepted
 10 that it is effective only so far but in fact the important
 11 thing about that measure of protection or to protect the
 12 witness is that it is intended to enable the witness to
 13 testify with as little concern about his safety, the safety
 14 of his family as possible and thereby - that's the theory
 15 behind it, as we understand it, Chairperson – and thereby
 16 assist the Commission because he comes to the Commission
 17 and he testifies, he's prepared to testify freely, in fact
 18 enabled to testify hopefully freely, without constraints,
 19 without any anxiety as much as possible and the remedy
 20 being not so much to protect him forever against harm
 21 because that cannot be done, but for the purposes of his
 22 testimony as he is testifying. Chairperson, the decision
 23 in S v Leepile (1) speaks to that fact that indeed it is
 24 acknowledged, in fact it is doubtful how efficient the
 25 remedy or the protection that is supposed to be given to

Page 24868

1 the witness, how efficient it is but that is not the point.
 2 The point is you give it anyway because underlying that
 3 remedy is that a witness should get the comfort of knowing
 4 that there is some protection that they have and for the
 5 purposes of them testifying at that point as they testify,
 6 they speak much more freely, less anxiously and therefore
 7 are of greater assistance in the course of –
 8 CHAIRPERSON: I understand that but if
 9 the witness, when he gives evidence, knows that most of the
 10 strikers know who he is anyway and know what he looks like
 11 and so on, then the factor for which you content won't be
 12 present because he already has the fear that these people
 13 know who I am, they know what I look like and that operates
 14 from the moment he starts giving evidence. So the argument
 15 could be on the other side – I'm not putting it because I
 16 have a fixed view on it because I haven't but I want to get
 17 the benefit of your submissions – the argument on the other
 18 side will be, if you want to impose restrictions by all
 19 means impose sensible restrictions. Impose restrictions,
 20 even if they won't be entirely successful, which have a
 21 chance of working to some extent, have a chance of reducing
 22 the risks to the witness. I understand that argument but
 23 what's the point of imposing a restriction which in fact is
 24 totally unnecessary because, it will be contended – rightly
 25 or wrongly, I don't know but I suspect it will be contended

Page 24869

1 – what's the point of imposing restrictions that the
 2 strikers mustn't know who he is, if it's overwhelmingly
 3 probable that they do know who he is, if he's telling the
 4 truth?
 5 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 6 CHAIRPERSON: That's the point you have
 7 to deal with. I'm not sure what the answer is, that's why
 8 I'm asking you the question.
 9 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson, of course
 10 with the ruling that the legal representatives will know
 11 his identity and that might include his image as well,
 12 Chairperson, we accept what is inherent in that is that the
 13 clients that Mr Mpfu, for example, represent, will get to
 14 know the name of the witness. They will probably even get
 15 to see the image of the witness because they need to be
 16 able to give proper instructions but, Chairperson, that
 17 doesn't, it's not anything that arises in the special
 18 circumstances of this case. That is a problem that is
 19 inherent in the relief that section 153, drawing reference
 20 to the Criminal Procedure Act, that in fact perhaps to
 21 bring it closer home, that is inherent in section 4 in the
 22 relief that section 4 contemplates, that he will be in
 23 camera. If he testifies in camera and his identity must be
 24 disclosed – as we concede must be, it has to be disclosed
 25 to the legal representatives of the party that he

Page 24870

1 implicates – it is inherent in that that you couldn't
 2 safeguard completely the exposure of his identity including
 3 his image, it is accepted. What we are concerned about,
 4 Chairperson, is a wide, uncontrolled distribution of his
 5 identity. Chairperson, if by way of example –
 6 CHAIRPERSON: No, but the question I put
 7 to you doesn't relate to that. It doesn't relate to
 8 excluding the public, it relates to excluding the parties.
 9 If it's correct – I don't know that it is but if it is
 10 correct that the parties already know who he is, that when
 11 the statements were given – you remember long ago Mr
 12 Semenya distributed copies of X's statement, there were
 13 certain names blanked out but I take it that the statements
 14 at that stage were already shown or the contents were
 15 communicated to the strikers, months and months ago. How
 16 likely is it that the striker, if he's telling the truth,
 17 that the strikers who heard him saying I am the person who
 18 did all these things, that the strikers wouldn't know who
 19 he is? If he's telling the truth and they were present,
 20 they would have seen him doing the things that he says he
 21 did. In other words, it's not a question of them
 22 discovering later on who he is. The problem is, do they
 23 not already know who he is?
 24 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 25 CHAIRPERSON: Anyway, that's the

Page 24871

1 question. I'm not debating it with you, I'm just asking
 2 you the question so that you can give me the answer.
 3 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, indeed, it is a
 4 shortcoming in this remedy as contemplated in section 4 and
 5 then the simple point or the only point that I'm making
 6 about it is, Chairperson, it is not proposed that this is a
 7 perfect measure by any means. It does have inherent in it
 8 the difficulty that witnesses, not only before this
 9 Commission as we speak about Mr X, but every witness that
 10 seeks, where it is sought to use similar provisions as you
 11 find them in the different legislation, where it is sought
 12 to use that, that it is inherent in that that perhaps the
 13 remedy or the protection that seeks to be given it may well
 14 be that at the end of the day it is purely academic but it
 15 is then nonetheless and to the extent that witnesses may
 16 well draw comfort from it, the Commission in this case
 17 should be inclined to grant that, notwithstanding the
 18 difficulties with its efficacy.
 19 CHAIRPERSON: Even in a criminal case the
 20 accused isn't excluded. An order is made under 153 or is
 21 it 158, the other section, the accused is normally in the
 22 courtroom, onlooker outside but the accused is there
 23 inside. The accused sees the person on the screen if
 24 that's appropriate, that's a point we can talk about later.
 25 The identity of the witness isn't disclosed from the

Page 24872

1 accused, isn't concealed or withheld from the accused. So
 2 you're in fact asking now for relief which is in fact wider
 3 than the relief that's normally granted in a criminal case.
 4 Now I know the argument may, will be that this isn't a
 5 criminal trial, this is a Commission, and I understand that
 6 and that's a factor which has got to be given appropriate
 7 weight and that's what I'm trying to find out what that
 8 weight should be.
 9 The problem with a Commission of course, like
 10 this, is it can substantial reputational damage to the
 11 parties if it makes findings which reflect adversely on
 12 them. So it's true it's not a trial, it's true that
 13 there's no order at the end of the day but because it can
 14 do reputational damage to people, findings – even findings
 15 of Commissions can be set aside on review. There was a
 16 case years ago in the Privy Council where a Commission
 17 dealing with the crashing of an aeroplane in the Antarctic
 18 was overturned by the Privy Council and there was a case in
 19 the Eastern Cape some years ago where a finding of a
 20 judicial commission was set aside in the Motion Court in
 21 Grahamstown, you may be familiar with that. So the
 22 principle of a Commission's finding being overturned on
 23 review because of, I take it because of the reputational
 24 damage that could be done to the people affected, is one
 25 that also has to be borne in mind. Anyway, I'm putting to

Page 24873

1 you, you actually – if the analogy is with a criminal
 2 trial, you're asking for relief which goes beyond even what
 3 would be acceptable in a criminal trial. It may be that
 4 you can make out justification for it but I'm just probing
 5 the point with you so that you can give me the benefit of
 6 your argument on it.
 7 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson, can we
 8 deal with those kinds of concerns in the fullness of our
 9 submissions. Chairperson, on the question of when the
 10 Chairperson exercises his discretion to grant the ruling
 11 such as we seek under section 4, with respect, Chairperson,
 12 Chairperson is correct that you have to be satisfied that
 13 it is necessary and in fact some authorities, as the
 14 Chairperson says, require that it is strictly necessary, it
 15 should be strictly necessary in the –
 16 CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you.
 17 Section 4 talks about desirable.
 18 MS BALOYI: Yes, necessary and/or
 19 desirable, Chair.
 20 CHAIRPERSON: One of the problems might
 21 be, there might be Constitutional problems in relation to
 22 that, so "desirable" would also have to be restrictively
 23 interpreted perhaps, as would "necessary" although I would
 24 think necessary is necessary. You know, there isn't really
 25 scope that something be half necessary, it's either

Page 24874

1 necessary or it isn't but desirable is a more flexible
 2 concept which might occasion difficulties in its
 3 application, particularly against the background of section
 4 34 which you concede – of the Constitution – which you
 5 concede applies.
 6 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson, with
 7 regard to the requirement of section 4 when the Chairperson
 8 can exercise his discretion, insofar as it is required to
 9 be necessary, the submission we make in that regard,
 10 Chairperson, is the nature – firstly, the Commission is
 11 required to resolve the issues or to make decisions and
 12 findings on the issues set out in the terms of reference
 13 and these include what we set out, Chairperson, in
 14 paragraph 4 of the heads of argument and, Chairperson, it
 15 is that the Commission is required to make findings, report
 16 on and make recommendations concerning the conduct of
 17 individuals and loose groupings in fermenting or otherwise
 18 promoting a situation of conflict and confrontation which
 19 may have given rise to the tragic incident, whether
 20 directly or indirectly.
 21 Now, Chairperson, the evidence of Mr X as set out
 22 in his statement which has been distributed to the
 23 Commission, we submit speaks to those issues. He speaks,
 24 Chairperson, of specific incidents, for example the
 25 incident of the killing of the two Lonmin security, he

Page 24875

1 provides information regarding that. He speaks to the
 2 killing of another person on the 13th in the morning who was
 3 attacked, he provides details of that. He speaks to the
 4 involvement and his own involvement, together with others,
 5 with the Nyanga and the services that were rendered by the
 6 Nyanga and the purposes of that. Chairperson, we will
 7 submit eventually that the involvement of the Nyanga and
 8 the explanation as given by Mr X of the reasons why he was
 9 engaged and what it is that he did or what kind of service
 10 he provided to them, does provide some answers to the
 11 questions that have been raised in this Commission and
 12 specifically the one that comes to mind, Chairperson, is
 13 the repeated question about why would the strikers have
 14 acted the way that they did. Mr X's evidence touches on
 15 that. Chairperson, that is necessary evidence that this
 16 Commission, we submit, must receive and if the Commission
 17 denies itself the opportunity to receive that information,
 18 the answer to some of these questions becomes that poorer
 19 for lack of a witness who was directly involved with some
 20 of these activities.

21 CHAIRPERSON: There would only be
 22 circumstantial evidence on those points, evidence of -

23 MS BALOYI: Indeed so, Chairperson.

24 CHAIRPERSON: - rituals being observed
 25 and photographed but the evidence would obviously fall far

Page 24876

1 short of the detail –

2 MS BALOYI: Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON: - and direct evidence which
 4 Mr X can provide.

5 MS BALOYI: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON: If what he says is true.

7 MS BALOYI: Indeed so, Chairperson.

8 Chairperson, I list these by way of, these instances by way
 9 of example to make the submission that his evidence is
 10 relevant to the questions that the Commission must decide
 11 and a failure to take into account that account or those
 12 accounts of the various instances may well not serve the
 13 interests of justice in the context of the Commission in
 14 that we will not have as complete explanations as we would
 15 otherwise gain from the evidence of this witness.

16 [10:56] CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I don't think it's
 17 contended by those who oppose the relief you seek that the
 18 evidence is not material, not evidence which, if true,
 19 would assist the Commission in answering the questions
 20 posed in the terms of reference. I don't think that's the
 21 suggestion raised. The suggestion raised is that if he is
 22 allowed to testify in circumstances where they are
 23 restricted in the exercise of their rights to test his
 24 evidence, the test will be inadequate and there'll be a
 25 greater chance of false evidence being accepted as true

Page 24877

1 because some of the factors which operate normally to
 2 enable the court to be satisfied that – the tribunal,
 3 Commission – to be satisfied that evidence is true, would
 4 be lacking and it's difficult sometimes to compensate for
 5 that. I think I'm correctly summarising the arguments that
 6 have been put up on the other side. So I don't think they
 7 say that the evidence isn't material. I don't think you
 8 even have to address me on that, quite clearly it is
 9 material and if it's true it'll obviously assist us
 10 substantially. I don't say we would be unable to come, to
 11 make findings on the secondary circumstantial evidence we
 12 have but certainly it would make it much easier. There'd
 13 be far more detail and that sort of thing, but that's not
 14 their argument. Their argument is the Commission will be
 15 handicapped in coming to the truth and their clients would
 16 be prejudiced, at least from a reputational point of view,
 17 in consequence because some of the safeguards which operate
 18 in trials to assist in the obtaining of the truth would be
 19 lacking and they will contend that the justification for
 20 removing those safeguards hasn't been shown by the SAPS,
 21 which of course if they seek the, if they want the relief
 22 they seek they must show that the removal of those
 23 safeguards will not adversely affect the outcome. I think
 24 that's a summary, in a few sentences, of their argument but
 25 they'll probably advance the argument at greater length

Page 24878

1 than I have, some of them anyway.

2 MS BALOYI: Of course, Chair, we are not
 3 – we are not proposing any measure that withholds the
 4 necessary and relevant information from the other parties,
 5 Chairperson. The evidence of Mr X will be, will continue
 6 to be publicised as it has always been. That is a relevant
 7 factor, Chairperson. So to the extent that there's
 8 concerns about ability to take instructions about whatever
 9 it is that he says, Chairperson, such concerns are easily
 10 addressed by an answer that his evidence will continue to
 11 be publicised in the same way that the Commission has been
 12 doing all along.

13 Chairperson, the other point that we make in our
 14 heads of argument at paragraph 11.7 is that –

15 CHAIRPERSON: Before you get to 11.7, I'm
 16 just looking for something in the opposing affidavit I want
 17 to put to you. You don't necessarily have to deal with it
 18 now but while it occurs to me. If you look at paragraph
 19 11.2 of the opposing affidavit, page 5 – the whole of
 20 paragraph 11 actually sets out, they say that the order
 21 sought by SAPS will breach common law principles which are
 22 established which relate to fair procedure. The first is
 23 the point about the identity but I think you've
 24 substantially altered that because the identity will not,
 25 his identity will not in fact be withheld. Their counsel

Page 24879

1 will have the information and clearly the person getting
 2 instructions –
 3 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 4 CHAIRPERSON: - their counsel will convey
 5 it to them. Of course whether that really is his identity
 6 and whether - you say he's John Smith and they say right,
 7 well, we don't know John Smith. He may not really be John
 8 Smith, he may be Peter Jones and they won't know anything
 9 about that but from a practical point of view I think we
 10 can accept, prima facie at least, that the identity problem
 11 has probably been addressed by the order that you propose.
 12 The second point they make is something you don't
 13 address at all in your argument, as far as I can see, and
 14 that's why I'd be pleased to get – not necessarily now, you
 15 understand, I'm putting problems to you as they occur so
 16 that you can answer them at your convenience. The second
 17 one is as follows. The application envisages that Mr X
 18 will not be in the same room as the cross-examiner and that
 19 the proceedings, including cross-examination, will be
 20 relayed by video feed. This will water down the power and
 21 utility of cross-examination to such an extent as to render
 22 it virtually nugatory - well, that may be an overstatement
 23 but anyway, it's a point they make – both because the
 24 witness will not be required to give his evidence and have
 25 it tested in the heightened atmosphere of a live

Page 24880

1 adversarial exchange and because judgments about the
 2 witness's demeanour, often so critical to the outcome of a
 3 case, will be difficult if not impossible to make in the
 4 circumstances. I don't know that the point about demeanour
 5 is very powerful because you could presumably see the
 6 demeanour over a video link but what about the point about
 7 the heightened atmosphere of a live adversarial exchange?
 8 And one of the points to be considered there, which you
 9 don't address at all, is that – was expressed by Wigmore in
 10 a passage quoted with approval in the first Leepile case to
 11 which you referred. It's at page 266 of the All South
 12 Africa Reports, I'm not sure where it is in the South
 13 African Law Reports but in the judgment, after quoting from
 14 what Lord Haldane said in the Scott case, the leading case
 15 on public trials in the Anglo-American system of
 16 jurisprudence, Judge Ackermann quotes, Ackermann says this
 17 – he cites what was said by Lord Loreburn in another case
 18 and he then says this, "In the present case the contingency
 19 is, of course, expressly laid down in the section under
 20 consideration, namely the likelihood that harm might result
 21 to the witness but Scott's case does support the approach
 22 that the discretion should only be exercised where this is
 23 strictly necessary for the attainment of justice" -
 24 transferring that to the facts here where it is strictly
 25 necessary for the ascertainment of the truth this

Page 24881

1 Commission is appointed to find. "It is also important, in
 2 my opinion, to consider the objects of justice which public
 3 hearings are calculated to promote and the underlying
 4 reasons therefore. Wigmore on Evidence, the Chadbourn
 5 revision 1976, volume 6 paragraph 1834 deals with these
 6 under two heads. Firstly, those reasons which make
 7 publicity of judicial proceedings a security for
 8 trustworthiness and completeness of testimony and,
 9 secondly, those which have other advantages in view.
 10 Dealing with the first head, the following is stated by the
 11 learned author" – and this is now a quotation from Wigmore
 12 – "Its operation, intending to improve" and he italicises
 13 the word "improve," "Its operation intending to improve the
 14 quality of testimony is twofold. Subjectively it produces
 15 in the witness's mind a disinclination to falsify, first by
 16 stimulating the instinctive responsibility to public
 17 opinion symbolised in the audience and ready to scorn a
 18 demonstrated liar and next, by inducing the fear of
 19 exposure of subsequent falsities through disclosure by
 20 informed persons who may chance to be present or hear of
 21 the testimony from others present."
 22 Now that second point, of course, is dealt with
 23 by the provision in the order you seek that the press
 24 should be allowed to be present, the press should be
 25 allowed to report but of course the press won't be allowed

Page 24882

1 to report who he is. So people who know that that
 2 particular person wasn't there on the day and therefore
 3 he's telling a pack of lies, assuming those are the facts,
 4 I'm not saying they are – won't be able to come forward.
 5 We know that John Smith isn't telling the truth when he
 6 says he was in Marikana on the 13th because we happened to
 7 be with him in Johannesburg on that day. That evidence of
 8 course won't be able to be forthcoming but nevertheless
 9 there will be a substantial degree of disclosure which
 10 would presumably meet most of the second point made. But
 11 what about the first point, the instinctive responsibility
 12 to public opinion symbolised in the audience and ready to
 13 scorn a demonstrated liar? And I think many of us who have
 14 been in practice for a long time can recount instances
 15 where a person was quite happy to tell a tale if there's
 16 hardly anybody in court but if there were a lot of people
 17 there that knew him and knew he wasn't telling the truth
 18 and who looked at him, he wasn't prepared to persist. That
 19 may or may not be a cogent factor in this case but it's
 20 certainly one of the safeguards, one of the things to use,
 21 Wigmore's language, which improves the quality of testimony
 22 and if you remove that safeguard, which is what you're
 23 asking to happen, then you've got to justify it because
 24 effectively the ability of the Commission to reach the
 25 truth will to some extent be minimised. It may be that

Page 24883

1 it's not a factor that operates very powerfully in this
 2 case, it may be a point that you can argue but certainly if
 3 you're taking – you know, if you have a balance, all the
 4 factors that you mentioned, the fear of the witness, the
 5 need, the risk he's exposed to, the danger that he won't
 6 come or terrible things will happen to him if he does, all
 7 those factors operate in favour of the relief you seek. On
 8 the other hand, on the other side of the scale you have got
 9 to put the diminutions that will follow from making the
 10 order you seek, the respects in which the traditional
 11 safeguards are not present and those have got to be weighed
 12 up as well because as you also said at the beginning of
 13 your argument, this is a balancing exercise but one has got
 14 – you can't balance things unless you know what's on each
 15 side, each pan of the scale. Now what do you say about
 16 that one? You don't have to tell me now, you can tell me
 17 in due course but it is a factor which obviously one has to
 18 consider.

19 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, we will deal
 20 with it later. Chairperson, I was at the point of
 21 discussing the, or making the submission that we make at
 22 paragraph 11.7 of our heads of argument and, Chairperson,
 23 the point – this is with reference to regulation 9(1) which
 24 compels a witness to answer questions. Chairperson, we
 25 make the point or we make the submission notwithstanding

Page 24884

1 being mindful of the fact that in this case we deal with a
 2 witness who is not under compulsion, has not been
 3 subpoenaed and has volunteered to testify. The point we
 4 make, Chairperson, our submission we make about it is, that
 5 doesn't take away from affording – the fact that he's
 6 volunteering to testify in this case, he is also though a
 7 compellable witness. The Commission, knowing what it knows
 8 about him, could easily elect or have elected to compel
 9 him. He would have been entitled, in that capacity, to
 10 some measure of protection to the extent to the Commission,
 11 if satisfied, if the Commission is, if the Chairperson is
 12 satisfied that in fact he does require the protection that
 13 we seek, he would have been entitled to that kind of
 14 protection. Chairperson, the submission we make about it
 15 is, the fact that he volunteers to testify in this case
 16 doesn't take away from the need to provide protection if,
 17 in the opinion of the Chairperson, it is warranted. It is
 18 such a case that requires that protection.

19 Chairperson, at paragraph 11.8 we also refer to
 20 regulation 11 which prescribes or which – indeed, which
 21 prescribed that the Commission, the Chair, the Commission
 22 may give directions about how evidence should be dealt with
 23 if such evidence which is being given may have an impact or
 24 consequences for other proceedings.

25 Chairperson, we submit that the nature of the

Page 24885

1 evidence that Mr X will give is in fact evidence that is
 2 contemplated under regulation 11. We have in the
 3 answering, in the affidavit in support of this application
 4 and we further discuss it in the heads of argument that he
 5 is assisting with the pending criminal proceedings against
 6 specified named individuals that he is implicating in his
 7 evidence. He is also assisting the police in continuing
 8 investigation arising from the events in Marikana and his
 9 testimony here may well have implications for those pending
 10 proceedings and investigations and, Chairperson, we submit
 11 that his evidence falls, is evidence as contemplated in
 12 regulation 11 which would require the Commission to direct
 13 that it be dealt with in ways that seek not to compromise
 14 those other processes that are unfolding outside the
 15 Commission.

16 Chairperson, the rulings that we seek indeed seek
 17 to achieve that which regulation 11 contemplates. It is
 18 that he will testify but we should not, the Commission
 19 should not or should assist to avoid a situation where his
 20 evidence here compromises other processes that are
 21 unfolding.

22 CHAIRPERSON: What do you mean by
 23 compromise? I'm not sure that I understand how that
 24 regulation operates here but again you don't have to answer
 25 me now but I'm a bit puzzled about that.

Page 24886

1 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, what we –
 2 perhaps an easy example is that when he does testify and he
 3 is warned to mention names, for example, specific names and
 4 give detail of what people did as per his account, it may
 5 well be that it becomes necessary for the Commission to
 6 give some direction about how that aspect of evidence
 7 should be handled, even by the SAPS, if its being tendered
 8 in this Commission in a certain manner may affect criminal
 9 proceedings, for example, later on, Chairperson.

10 Chairperson, we refer in the heads of argument to
 11 the – I've made reference, Chairperson, to Leepile, the
 12 decision in Leepile (1) both for the –

13 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, which paragraph are
 14 you at now? 12.2?

15 MS BALOYI: I'm looking at 12.1,
 16 Chairperson.

17 CHAIRPERSON: 12.1, 12.2 yes.

18 MS BALOYI: And 12.2. Chairperson, about
 19 the task that confronts the Commission when required to
 20 adjudicate the application such as what we are seeking and
 21 specifically, Chairperson, at this point I'm speaking to
 22 the in camera, the request that he should be permitted to
 23 testify in camera, that in the balancing act that is
 24 required the Commission has to determine that how best is
 25 justice to be served in the circumstances, if it to be best

Page 24887

1 served by having testimony presented in camera, that is the
 2 path that the Commission should prefer or that the
 3 Chairperson should prefer – of course with the necessarily
 4 safeguards that protect the interests of other parties and
 5 that is something which is within the power of the
 6 Commission, to impose conditions on which the testimony of
 7 this witness will be received, if it is received in camera.
 8 Chairperson, we further make those references to
 9 the authorities in 12, in paragraph 12.3 and specifically
 10 in 12.3, Chairperson, we refer to the decision in S v Ntoae
 11 and Others. It's an unreported decision in 1999 of the WLD
 12 in which the point is made with reference to section
 13 153(2)(b) of the Criminal Procedure Act –
 14 CHAIRPERSON: Ntoae - I don't know how to
 15 pronounce it, probably – is it N-T-O-A-E –
 16 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, we have
 17 struggled with the pronunciation.
 18 CHAIRPERSON: - I don't know whether Mr
 19 Ntsebeza can help us, it looks like a Sotho name.
 20 MS BALOYI: Yes, it is.
 21 CHAIRPERSON: How do you pronounce it?
 22 MS BALOYI: Well, it seems it's Ntoae but
 23 it's possible –
 24 CHAIRPERSON: Ntoae, okay. It is
 25 reported –

Page 24888

1 MS BALOYI: It must be Ntoae,
 2 Chairperson.
 3 CHAIRPERSON: It is reported, 2000(1)
 4 SACR 17.
 5 MS BALOYI: I'm indebted to the
 6 Chairperson.
 7 CHAIRPERSON: And the passage you're
 8 referring to is at page 29, I am informed by Adv Hemraj
 9 who's been doing some work on this case for me.
 10 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson, the point
 11 that is made there is –
 12 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can we just write
 13 the reference in on your heads? This is para 12.3, isn't
 14 it?
 15 [11:16] MS BALOYI: Yes, indeed Chair.
 16 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you. The
 17 passage referred to is set out in your heads.
 18 MS BALOYI: It is, Chair. And Chair, the
 19 point of it is to emphasise the purpose of a provision such
 20 as section 4. In this case that we refer to, Chair, it is
 21 in the context of the Criminal Procedure Act section
 22 153(2)(b) but it is emphasised, the purpose, and the
 23 purpose being as I've previously alluded to, Chairperson,
 24 that it is to ensure that members of the public such as Mr
 25 X become willing to come and testify, knowing that they

Page 24889

1 will be afforded the necessary protection that the law
 2 permits for them to be provided in the circumstances.
 3 Chairperson, on the question of the fairness of
 4 the process in the balancing of the scales, Chairperson,
 5 the issue on our submission arises not so much when the
 6 evidence, the witness is permitted to testify in camera
 7 because in camera he testifies in the presence of legal
 8 representatives who have ample opportunity to cross-examine
 9 him and to observe his reactions, his immediate reactions,
 10 as the Chairperson alluded to earlier on. It arises when
 11 we talk about the issue or part of the application that
 12 seeks that he presents his evidence by video link.
 13 Chairperson, we have stated the reasons why that is the
 14 preferred mode –
 15 CHAIRPERSON: In fact you concede that
 16 what I can call the first safeguard mentioned by Wigmore is
 17 removed where he gives evidence away from the chamber in
 18 which the hearing is taking place.
 19 MS BALOYI: When he testifies by video
 20 link, Chairperson.
 21 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if he gives evidence
 22 in camera –
 23 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 24 CHAIRPERSON: - that factor is also
 25 removed, of course, but a fortiori if he's testifying by

Page 24890

1 video link, it must be. The audience there who, on the
 2 passage put, know, theoretically may know that he is lying
 3 and by their very body language indicate it and the
 4 suggestion is that a witness is reluctant to tell a pack of
 5 lies in front of a whole lot of people who know he's lying.
 6 He's much happier to tell a pack of lies before an audience
 7 of people who don't know he's lying and may well be taken
 8 in by what he says.
 9 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 10 CHAIRPERSON: That's the point.
 11 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 12 CHAIRPERSON: Now, it may not be decisive
 13 but it's one of the factors that's obviously got to be
 14 borne in mind. I take it you'd concede that, would you?
 15 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, I accept that
 16 but inasmuch as the presence of the public may well have
 17 the effect of intimidating him from testifying honestly,
 18 fully and frankly, Chairperson –
 19 CHAIRPERSON: No, no, I understand that
 20 but of course the parties are the ones I'm talking about
 21 primarily. The parties know, their argument would be – I
 22 may not be correct of course, everything he says may be
 23 true but in testing it one has got to consider various
 24 possibilities and the safeguard which Wigmore mentions
 25 which is cited with approval by Judge Ackermann in the

Page 24891

1 Leepile case is the one I read you –
 2 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 3 CHAIRPERSON: And that would be removed,
 4 would it not?
 5 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, that much is
 6 conceded, that becomes the consequence of it but again,
 7 Chairperson, it is part of the burden of achieving the
 8 correct balance between serving the interests of having the
 9 witness testifying as fully, as comprehensively and as
 10 freely as possible and yet minimising as much as possible
 11 the safeguards that may be there to ensure that his
 12 evidence is true and correct. Chairperson, insofar as the
 13 evidence about video link is concerned, Chairperson, again
 14 this is – the Act, the Commissions Act doesn't deal with
 15 this at all and here we have to draw parallels from the
 16 statutes that permit.
 17 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, but the fact that the
 18 Commissions Act doesn't deal with it at all and the
 19 regulations don't deal with it at all, would give rise to
 20 an argument that I haven't got the power. It may be
 21 desirable to do it but if I haven't got the power to do it
 22 then I can't make the order.
 23 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 24 CHAIRPERSON: And if the order I – if I
 25 were to grant the relief you seek without the power, then

Page 24892

1 of course a court of review would set aside the order.
 2 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 3 CHAIRPERSON: So you've got to satisfy me
 4 that I've got the power. Now you say that I can get the
 5 power if the Commission, in other words not Chair alone but
 6 all three Commissioners are prepared to say that that
 7 procedure would be appropriate. Well, yes, the Commission
 8 would say that in an appropriate case the Commission could
 9 have that, could follow that procedure. I, of course,
 10 would still have to decide whether it was appropriate in
 11 this particular case but it may well be said that our
 12 powers to regulate procedure don't go so far as to actually
 13 confer a power on the Chairman which the statute doesn't
 14 give him and there's a lot of what we lawyers pompously
 15 call legal learning on the subject of the distinction
 16 between procedural regulations and actual powers that are
 17 exercised.
 18 So it may be that the solution that you seek to
 19 find in regulation 19 may be an unsafe way of proceeding.
 20 So the first question I've got to consider, even before I
 21 decide whether it's appropriate to exercise the power in
 22 relation to a video link, is to see whether I've got the
 23 power and, if so, what the source of the power is. Now you
 24 concede, as I – you only rely on 19, as I understand,
 25 regulation 19 – so effectively you're conceding, if I may

Page 24893

1 put it, I hope, without being terribly unfair, you're
 2 conceding that I haven't got the power but I may get the
 3 power if the Commission decides to give it to me. And that
 4 raises a further question, it's whether the Commission has
 5 got the power to give me the power. I'm not saying the
 6 answer to all those questions is necessarily against you
 7 but they're all matters I've got to consider and you've got
 8 to persuade me that the Commission has got the power to
 9 give me the power because if it hasn't got the power to
 10 give me the power then even if it purports to give me the
 11 power, it won't help.
 12 Alternatively, if there's another basis for
 13 saying I have the power, well, then I can do that also but
 14 it doesn't help to say it'll be a good thing if I do it and
 15 it would be very sensible, if Parliament didn't consider it
 16 necessary in 1947 or subsequently because the Commissions
 17 Act has been amended from time to time since then, to give
 18 the power expressly and if the President didn't give me the
 19 power in the regulations, then the power has got to come
 20 from somewhere. Anyway, and it doesn't help to tell me
 21 that it can be done in criminal cases where the power is
 22 expressly conferred because I know that.
 23 So the first question has got to be, have I got
 24 the power? Now most of the orders you seek, I haven't got
 25 the power to give and you very fairly set out the statutory

Page 24894

1 provisions that apply and one has got to add in a reference
 2 to what the Witness Protection Act says, but as far as the
 3 video link point is concerned, which we're busy with now,
 4 the first thing you've got to do is to persuade me I have
 5 the power, alternatively that the Commission has the power
 6 to give me the power and that it would be appropriate for
 7 them to do so.
 8 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson, the
 9 question, in our understanding, is about how the Commission
 10 receives evidence. The Commissions Act, Chairperson,
 11 doesn't by way of example stipulate, specifically stipulate
 12 that the Chairperson can receive evidence by way of
 13 affidavit. It doesn't have that specific stipulation. It
 14 is beyond –
 15 CHAIRPERSON: But it also doesn't say
 16 that evidence has got to be given orally.
 17 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 18 CHAIRPERSON: And be subjected to cross-
 19 examination and obviously the affidavit that comes and is
 20 read out or is otherwise made available, is part of the
 21 public hearing just as a court in a matter on motion, an
 22 application court is sitting in public even though there's
 23 no oral evidence being given –
 24 MS BALOYI: Yes.
 25 CHAIRPERSON: There are affidavits, so

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24895</p> <p>1 I'm not sure that reliance on the fact that we've received 2 affidavits necessarily helps because I would think that 3 we're sitting in public, operating in public, even in the 4 absence of oral testimony, if we rely on affidavits which 5 are available to all concerned to see if they wish. 6 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, the evidence of 7 Mr X becomes available to the public proceeding on the same 8 line, logic, Chairperson, that if it is accepted that 9 affidavits that are submitted to this Commission are 10 available to the public and therefore the evidence that is 11 contained in those affidavits is evidence in public, we're 12 not asking for any less or for anything more than that from 13 Mr X. It is purely a practical issue of location, 14 Chairperson, that we are talking about, and delivery. The 15 evidence of Mr X will be presented, will be available 16 publicly. It will be, he will do so by video link, it will 17 be capable of being followed by any member, any interested 18 member of the public, Chairperson. So to that extent it 19 falls in the same category as evidence that is presented in 20 this chamber and that is followed by members of the public. 21 It falls in the same category as the evidence that is 22 presented by way of affidavit, which affidavits are 23 available to interested members of the public. 24 So, on that score, Chairperson, that evidence is 25 available to the public. It is capable of being followed</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24897</p> <p>1 effectively observe the demeanour of a witness who is 2 testifying by video link, even with the limitations that he 3 is not in the same room. The only difference is he is not 4 in the same room as the cross-examiner, otherwise he is 5 fully visible to the cross-examiners and to members of the 6 Commission to evaluate his body language, his demeanour, 7 his stutterings, his hesitations and all of that. And that 8 therefore the fact, by itself, that he's testifying by 9 video link is not in any way, it doesn't in any way take 10 away from the fairness of those proceedings. 11 CHAIRPERSON: While we're on it, what 12 exactly is a factual necessity or desirability, depending 13 which of those is the test, for him giving evidence by 14 video link? He is not a child who's going to be overborne 15 by some battering kind of cross-examination which is more 16 fashionable elsewhere than here. He is an adult who, on 17 his own version, has behaved in the manner that one expects 18 from a hardened criminal, so why is it suggested that it's 19 necessary that he must give evidence by video link? I know 20 there are concerns for his safety. I'm not quite sure that 21 I understand them fully. I'd be grateful if you could 22 elaborate on that. 23 MS BALOYI: Yes. 24 CHAIRPERSON: It's very often a case of 25 video link if a witness is likely to be overborne by</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24896</p> <p>1 by the public. The issue about a video link, Chairperson, 2 is the practicality of the location of the witness when he 3 testifies. Any concerns about that form of presentation of 4 evidence, Chairperson, could only be about what has been 5 alluded to or what has been raised in the opposing 6 affidavit which is, we lose the power of observing the 7 demeanour of the witness because it is by video link. 8 Chairperson, those are the only concerns that 9 could be raised about it but as to the question of whether 10 this evidence is evidence that is being presented in 11 public, it is, Chairperson. In what we propose, we propose 12 nothing less than that. Chairperson, to deal with the 13 concerns about the limitations of testimony being presented 14 by video link, the concerns that arise from that, we deal 15 with that Chairperson in our heads of argument from 16 paragraph 12.4 and make reference there to the decisions in 17 S v Nisavant, one, 1973(3) SA 582 but also to S v Staggie 18 and Another 2003(1) SACR 232 (C). These dealing, 19 Chairperson - and perhaps for completeness, Chair, if I 20 could also refer to the authority that we state in 21 paragraph 12.6 which is K v Regional Magistrate NO and 22 Others 1996(1) SACR 434 (E). Chairperson, these deal with 23 the concern about the ability to assess and to evaluate the 24 demeanour of the witness and, Chairperson, what all these 25 decisions find is that in fact it is still possible to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24898</p> <p>1 powerful cross-examination in the case of children, for 2 example, or possibly a woman who's been subjected to a 3 sexual assault and there are all sorts of things that are 4 associated with the trial procedure which constitute 5 intrusions on her dignity and so forth and also can give 6 rise to distinct emotional distress. I can understand all 7 those factors but none of those, I would take it, apply 8 here when you have a man who behaved the way Mr X says he 9 behaved, who's not a child and so on. It's solely for his 10 safety but what is the compelling argument for that? 11 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson - 12 CHAIRPERSON: I mean he's an accomplice, 13 isn't he? 14 MS BALOYI: He would be, Chair. 15 CHAIRPERSON: He'd be an accomplice. So 16 what exactly are the pressing - and I deliberately use the 17 word "pressing" - what are the pressing safety and security 18 concerns which arise in his case and make it necessary or 19 desirable for us to depart from the ordinary principles? 20 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, we - the issues 21 pertain to security, his security and the practicalities, 22 the practical arrangements that would have to be made. 23 Chairperson, we have - 24 CHAIRPERSON: I take it that often exists 25 in cases where courts make orders for a trial to proceed in</p>

Page 24899

1 camera. One of the reasons is, one of the most common
2 reasons, one of the strongest reasons advanced for such
3 orders is the need to protect the witness but it's very
4 rare in an ordinary case, I'm not talking about children,
5 sexual cases and that kind of thing, it's very rare for a
6 court to have to give evidence by video link from an
7 accomplice. So obviously it would be more convenient for
8 him to give evidence from afar by video link but is it
9 necessary, is it desirable? That's what you have to show,
10 don't you?

11 MS BALOYI: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON: I'm not saying you can't, I
13 just want to understand the basis upon which the contention
14 is advanced.

15 MS BALOYI: Yes. Chairperson, one of the
16 things that we will do and perhaps we have foreshadowed it
17 in the replying affidavit of Mr Pretorius, is that we will
18 obtain certain affidavits that we will – before the
19 Commission delivers its decision in this matter,
20 alternatively before Mr X testifies – that will deal with
21 some of the issues that we haven't fully addressed and part
22 of it, Chairperson, pertained to the –

23 CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you.
24 I'm not sure that it would be a very satisfactory procedure
25 because your learned friends who oppose would obviously

Page 24900

1 want to have a say about those affidavits –

2 MS BALOYI: Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON: - and see them and deal
4 with them, possibly even file affidavits in reply, so you
5 can't just sort of augment your case as you go along and
6 just before I'm ready to give the order, give me some extra
7 material. That's not the way it works so, you know, part
8 of fairness involves giving the opponents the opportunity
9 to deal with the new material you want and you know in
10 applications you don't always get an opportunity, you're
11 not supposed to supplement your case in reply although
12 there are exceptions and this may be one of them. One
13 mustn't be unduly technical in a case which may literally
14 involve life and death, I understand that also but you
15 can't just augment your case as you go along and say, well,
16 you've ready to give judgment, if you're satisfied or need
17 to be satisfied, here's an extra affidavit. They would
18 have to deal with it. I mean if you want to augment your
19 case it may be sensible – I don't suggest it necessarily is
20 so, I'm just putting it to you to consider - for us to
21 stand the matter down to possibly next week when you can
22 then come with what effectively is your case, so your
23 learned friends can reply if they wish, but I don't think
24 it's a good idea to proceed with it on a sort of piecemeal
25 basis, argue a bit and then add an affidavit and they reply

Page 24901

1 and we have another affidavit. That's not the way, the
2 sensible, practical way to deal with a matter of this
3 moment and importance, is it?

4 [11:35] MS BALOYI: Chairperson, the point is
5 taken, if I may.

6 CHAIRPERSON: My colleague Adv Hemraj
7 wants to refer our attention to a case, which she does
8 almost in a role as a spectator but I'll allow her to
9 mention it all the same.

10 COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I think if you look
11 at S v Madlavu and Others 1978(4) SA 218 during the tea
12 break, it might assist you to answer the Chairman's last
13 question.

14 MS BALOYI: I'm indebted to the
15 Commissioner. Chairperson, I'm getting noises at the back
16 here that I should realise that it's tea break, past.

17 CHAIRPERSON: No, the matter to which you
18 now refer is one that cannot be ignored. We'll take the
19 tea adjournment.

20 [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]

21 [12:07] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Ms
22 Baloyi.

23 MS BALOYI: Thank you, Chairperson.

24 CHAIRPERSON: You were round about
25 paragraph 12.8 I think when we took the comfort break, but

Page 24902

1 you were off your heads a bit. But anyway, it does help me
2 if you more or less keep to them, but you must obviously
3 argue the matter as you think will be most appropriate and
4 most effect.

5 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, I'm not
6 complaining. Chair, on the question of the – we were
7 discussing the question of testimony by video link and the
8 Chairperson had asked the question where that power drives
9 and perhaps, Chairperson, I should start off by thanking
10 Commissioner Hemraj for the reference to Madlavu.

11 Chairperson, what we see in State versus Madlavu
12 referred to is that in that matter the Court did not draw a
13 distinction between the, from the fact that the witness
14 that sought protection was in fact an accessory.
15 Protection was still provided notwithstanding because
16 certain jurisdictional facts were present that warranted
17 that kind of protection to be provided.

18 Now, Chairperson, again because we do not have in
19 the Commissions Act specific provisions that deal with
20 authorising evidence by video link we resort to, as we said
21 in our heads, to regulation 19, but also the parallels that
22 we are drawing from comparable, from other statutes that
23 deal with the issue. Chairperson, specifically –

24 CHAIRPERSON: You must forgive me, but
25 I've got a problem with that one. The fact that there's a

Page 24903

1 statute that authorises it doesn't help me at all because
 2 here there isn't a statute that authorises it, so I don't
 3 see a parallel there. I can understand the argument based
 4 on 19. I could also understand your argument that on a
 5 proper construction of the expression "in public," someone
 6 who testifies by video link but the television set is in
 7 the court chamber and everyone in court can see it, there
 8 isn't a problem created by that. I understand that, but my
 9 difficulty is I don't see, it helps to tell me that 158 of
 10 the Criminal Procedure Act says you can do it in the case
 11 of a juvenile, therefore you can do it in the case of a
 12 commission where there's no such section as 158.

13 MS BALOYI: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON: That's my problem. So in
 15 other words I'm not saying I haven't got the power; all I'm
 16 saying is it doesn't help me –

17 MS BALOYI: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON: - to say that I have got
 19 the power because in other circumstances courts have the
 20 power because of a statutory provisions. That's the point
 21 I'm putting to you.

22 MS BALOYI: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON: You understand that?

24 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, the point really
 25 that I wanted to make, or the reference that I would make

Page 24904

1 to 158 was to the factors that get taken into account in
 2 deciding whether a witness or an accused can testify, or
 3 should testify by video link, and these, Chairperson, are
 4 questions of delay, costs, convenience and security.

5 CHAIRPERSON: They're relevant surely on
 6 the exercise of the power where the power exists.

7 MS BALOYI: Yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON: The question I asked you
 9 was have I got the power, and I said there's a lot to be
 10 said for the proposition that if I had the power, I
 11 obviously haven't heard the argument of the other side yet,
 12 but there's a lot to be said that if I had the power it
 13 might be appropriate for me to use it, but the question is
 14 have I got the power.

15 MS BALOYI: Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON: And it doesn't help to tell
 17 me that in other cases where the Court has got the power
 18 there are factors that are relevant in deciding whether it
 19 should be exercised.

20 MS BALOYI: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON: And those factors I take it
 22 could appropriately be looked at here if I had the power to
 23 decide whether I should exercise it, because they would be
 24 the common sense considerations, considerations, points
 25 that fairness would be implicit. I understand that, but it

Page 24905

1 doesn't help me on the first question. If I haven't got
 2 the power, I can't exercise it.

3 MS BALOYI: Yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON: However appropriate it
 5 might be for me to exercise it if I had it. You understand
 6 the point?

7 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, our primary
 8 submission, or our direct submission and the question
 9 whether the Chairperson has the power is that, is our
 10 reliance on regulation 19. We say regulation 19 empowers
 11 the Commission to determine its own procedures and in our
 12 submission, Chairperson, the question of a witness
 13 testifying from a remote location by video link is an issue
 14 of procedure. It's how the evidence of that particular
 15 witness, the form in which it is going, or the means by
 16 which it is going to be presented, it is by video link,
 17 Chair, and we submit that acting under regulation 19 the
 18 Commission does have the power. Chairperson, you asked the
 19 question –

20 CHAIRPERSON: The Commission has got the
 21 power to provide that in an appropriate case the witness
 22 can testify from elsewhere, and if the Commission does
 23 that, not just the Chairman but the Commission does it,
 24 then the power would be there and then of course whether I
 25 should exercise the power would depend on questions of

Page 24906

1 appropriateness, and as you say, 158 for example would give
 2 help because it would give, by way of analogy would mention
 3 considerations that are relevant as to whether the power
 4 should be exercised. That's correct, isn't it?

5 MS BALOYI: It is correct, Chairperson.

6 CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

7 MS BALOYI: Chairperson, the factors that
 8 would favour that the Commission exercises its power and
 9 allows the evidence by video link, you've asked the
 10 question what are the reasons in this case. Chairperson,
 11 we allude in the affidavit, in the replying affidavit, to
 12 the concerns about security and that includes, Chairperson,
 13 an issue about if Mr X is required to commute on a daily
 14 basis to this location to testify, the concerns that arise
 15 from that is that it may well compromise the safety of his
 16 location, the place where he is located, the daily exposure
 17 to commute to this place. That's the one concern, or the
 18 fact or factor that favours, that we submit favours that he
 19 should be allowed to testify from a remote location.

20 Chairperson, there is the issue of costs as well
 21 that are involved should he be required to come and testify
 22 here, and again those, Chairperson, relate to securing not
 23 only him but this location and the people that are here on
 24 a daily basis. Chairperson, when I referred earlier on to
 25 an affidavit that would have to be filed or that we're

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24907</p> <p>1 working on, it is merely to set out the measures that would 2 be involved in having him being presented to this 3 Commission, and Chairperson, given the nature of that 4 affidavit, or the information that is contained in an 5 affidavit that we contemplate, or that is being prepared in 6 that regard, it is doubtful, not impossible, given that we 7 have different parties with different interests in the 8 Commission, that it is the kind of information that would 9 call, or require an answer from a qualified person because 10 what it does, Chairperson, it sets out practical steps, so 11 practical measures on a daily basis that would have to be 12 implemented to ensure that he attends here, he is safe, 13 everyone that is here is safe and secure while Mr X 14 testifies. It's that kind of affidavit, Chairperson, and 15 for that reason we do not believe that it should even be 16 necessary that we stand down because of that kind of 17 affidavit. 18 Chairperson, in addition to those kind of 19 security measures, as I've already submitted it is really 20 about whether the Commission has the power in terms of 21 regulation 19 to determine how, where, and in what form 22 evidence would be presented. Chairperson, those are our 23 submissions, if there's nothing else. 24 CHAIRPERSON: Nothing else that you wish 25 to say? You stand by what's in your written –</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24909</p> <p>1 to which the opponents would wish to answer. I don't think 2 it's satisfactory to have answers on as it were new points 3 at the end because that's not fair to the opponents. But 4 anyway, it may well be that many of the points that have 5 been the subject of consideration will be addressed in the 6 argument of the evidence leaders, so Ms Pillay, are you 7 ready to argue now? 8 MS PILLAY: I am, Chair. 9 MS BALOYI: Chairperson – 10 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, sorry, Ms Baloyi. 11 MS BALOYI: Ja, perhaps in the light of 12 the valid concern that the Chairperson expressed, perhaps I 13 should say that on a quick look it does appear that in fact 14 we have addressed all the issues that the Chairperson 15 raised and it may well be that there's nothing else, 16 there's nothing new to address. 17 CHAIRPERSON: I see. Alright, thank you, 18 then there's no reason why Ms Pillay shouldn't start and 19 why your learned friend should then address after she has 20 done. So, but perhaps we can do a bit of housekeeping 21 before we carry on. How many people are going to argue on 22 behalf of the opponents? I understand Mr Mpofu is going to 23 argue. Is that correct? And I saw Mr Ntsebeza's name on 24 the heads. Is he going to argue as well? 25 MR MPOFU: Yes, Chairperson, there will</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24908</p> <p>1 MS BALOYI: Not at this stage, Chair. 2 We'll deal with some of the issues that, Chairperson, you 3 have raised, we'll address them in reply once we've had 4 sufficient time to consider them. 5 CHAIRPERSON: Well, with respect, that's 6 not satisfactory because then your learned friends would 7 want to reply to your reply if there are material points 8 that you want to deal with. 9 MS BALOYI: Yes. 10 CHAIRPERSON: I wonder whether we 11 shouldn't proceed this way; we've received heads from the 12 evidence leaders and the evidence leaders have prepared a 13 detailed argument. It might be helpful, I think, for the 14 parties who oppose to have the benefit of hearing what the 15 evidence leaders say because in the main they support the 16 application, although they have suggestions as to how the 17 order should be varied to make it fairer and more 18 effective. 19 MR MPOFU: Yes. 20 CHAIRPERSON: So what I suggest we do now 21 is we let Ms Pillay, who's going to present the argument on 22 behalf of the evidence leaders, argue and then perhaps 23 after that, I don't know about what stage we'll be, but it 24 may well be that we could then stand down or take some kind 25 of adjournment to give the SAPS chance to deal with points</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24910</p> <p>1 be three people who are going to argue, but they'll be 2 covering different sections, so effectively it won't – 3 CHAIRPERSON: I don't think we should 4 have any repetition. 5 MR MPOFU: Yes. 6 CHAIRPERSON: So who are the three? 7 MR MPOFU: It's myself, Mr Brickhill, and 8 Mr Ntsebeza, in that order, Chairperson. 9 CHAIRPERSON: What topics are you going 10 to cover? 11 MR MPOFU: Well, I'll be covering mainly 12 the issue of the powers. 13 CHAIRPERSON: You've got written heads, 14 have you? 15 MR MPOFU: We've given you the heads, 16 Chairperson. 17 CHAIRPERSON: I see. 18 MR MPOFU: In the morning. 19 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, you're quite right. 20 MR MPOFU: Yes. 21 CHAIRPERSON: I got them. I haven't had 22 a chance to read them. 23 MR MPOFU: Yes, we'll – 24 CHAIRPERSON: You're quite right. 25 MR MPOFU: I'm dealing mainly with the</p>

Page 24911

1 question of the powers and some of the factual issues
 2 insofar as they concern my clients.
 3 CHAIRPERSON: Yes.
 4 MR MPOFU: And also countering some of
 5 the issues that the Chairperson has raised. Mr Brickhill
 6 will deal mainly with the section 34 point, a little bit of
 7 section 35, and that act, that protection –
 8 CHAIRPERSON: Witness Protection Act.
 9 MR MPOFU: The Witness Protection Act,
 10 yes, and Mr Ntsebeza will deal with the – assuming both
 11 myself and Mr Brickhill are wrong, then the issue of the
 12 discretion that the Commission has –
 13 CHAIRPERSON: Oh, I see.
 14 MR MPOFU: - as well as international –
 15 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if I have the power
 16 that I shouldn't exercise it on the facts of this case in
 17 my discretion. That's going to be the argument?
 18 MR MPOFU: Yes, because if you don't have
 19 the power, the discretion doesn't arise.
 20 CHAIRPERSON: Ja, I understand. Alright,
 21 no that seems satisfactory division of labour. Ms Pillay,
 22 you've got to deal with all the matters yourself, of
 23 course.
 24 MS PILLAY: Yes, I am, Chair. If I may
 25 kick off, Chair, with the question of the application of

Page 24912

1 the Witness Protection Act, the submissions that we make,
 2 Chair, are made on the assumption that the Director for
 3 Witness Protection will give his consent for the order that
 4 SAPS eventually seek from this Commission. Obviously the
 5 act prescribes a default position that applies should the
 6 Director not give his consent.
 7 CHAIRPERSON: I must say this, that I'm
 8 rather surprised that we haven't yet been told what the
 9 Director's attitude is because assuming the Director comes
 10 and says no then we've wasted the whole time listening to
 11 argument in respect of orders that I'm prevented by the
 12 statute from making. So I would have thought, with
 13 respect, that the SAPS would have got their ducks in a row
 14 by now. Can you help us on that, Mr Semenya?
 15 MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I think the quick
 16 answer to that is that whatever the powers the Director has
 17 will not include a power to exclude evidence from a
 18 tribunal such as we have. Now he's either going to testify
 19 voluntarily, or we'll subpoena him. On the force of a
 20 subpoena the Director cannot preclude his giving of
 21 evidence and for that reason it must be a shortcut answer
 22 to that concern, Chair. We anticipate the answer will be a
 23 yes though.
 24 CHAIRPERSON: I don't think that's right.
 25 Section 18 deals with orders relating to the identity,

Page 24913

1 disclosure and so forth of the identity of the protected
 2 person. Now clearly, presumably we can carry on but the
 3 disclosure part is quite important. The section says,
 4 "Notwithstanding any other law," I'll read the relevant
 5 bits, "Notwithstanding any other law, the presiding officer
 6 at any proceeding," which includes a commission, "in which
 7 the protected person is a witness must make an order
 8 prohibiting the publication of any information which may
 9 disclose the place of safety or location where he is or has
 10 been under protection or where he or she has been relocated
 11 in terms of the act, circumstances relating to his
 12 protection, identity of any other protected person, the
 13 place of safety or location of such person being protected,
 14 or a relocation or change of identity of a protected
 15 person, unless the Director satisfies the presiding officer
 16 concerned that exceptional circumstances which are in the
 17 interest of justice exist why such an order should not be
 18 made."
 19 So it's the Director who has to satisfy me that
 20 exceptional circumstances in the interest of justice exists
 21 why I shouldn't make an order such as the order which the
 22 statute compels me to make. Now I take it there's been
 23 contact with the Director, has there? What does the
 24 Director say? Or hasn't there been – I mean the role of
 25 the Director was foreshadowed in the replying affidavit

Page 24914

1 filed, deposed to by Mr Pretorius, and we were told in that
 2 affidavit that the necessary consents and so forth from the
 3 Director would be forthcoming. Are you not yet in a
 4 position to give me that information?
 5 MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, our reading of
 6 section 18 is the following; that that the Chair has the
 7 power that is in 18 is admitted. The only thing, there is
 8 a caveat to that which is the "unless" part of that
 9 section.
 10 CHAIRPERSON: No, with respect, it's not
 11 a power, it's an obligation. "Notwithstanding any other
 12 law the presiding officer must make an order prohibiting"
 13 certain things. So it's not, I haven't got a power to do
 14 it, I've got to do it. If I don't do it, on review the
 15 order I make will be dealt with. So it may be that it will
 16 play a subsidiary role, obviously not relevant to the main
 17 thrust of the relief which you seek, but it is something
 18 which has to be dealt with and I would have expected that
 19 information to be forthcoming now when the application is
 20 being argued.
 21 MR SEMENYA SC: I should have preferably
 22 said the power is, I mean the section is obligatory what
 23 relief the Chair can give, but to that obligation the
 24 caveat, as we read the section, only says this to us; that
 25 if the Director has exceptional circumstances why Chair

Page 24915

1 should not exercise that power, then he must say so, but I
 2 thought we're answering to a different enquiry.
 3 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. No, the only reason I
 4 raise it was in the replying affidavit there's reference to
 5 the Director and I was told that we would be told when the
 6 application was argued what his attitude was. That's
 7 really where it comes from.
 8 MR SEMENYA SC: We expect the Director to
 9 say yes, Chair. Can we argue on that provisional basis?
 10 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, you –
 11 MR SEMENYA SC: I'm told he says yes.
 12 We'll just have to put it on paper.
 13 CHAIRPERSON: I see. No, if you give me
 14 the assurance that it's on the way, that you have the, you
 15 communicated with him and you are conveying his attitude to
 16 me, all we're waiting for really is documentary proof of
 17 that, then obviously you can carry on. No problem. Ms
 18 Pillay, after that interruption, are you now going to
 19 start?
 20 MS PILLAY: I am, Chair. If I may pick
 21 up from paragraph 2.1 of our heads of argument, Chair, and
 22 just to set out the issues which the evidence leaders
 23 intend to deal with; the first is that we intend to analyse
 24 the relief sought by SAPS and we do so to answer the second
 25 issue which we want to deal with, namely the fact, whether

Page 24916

1 or not this Commission has the power to grant the
 2 individual orders sought by SAPS.
 3 We intend also, Chair, to identify the factors
 4 which are relevant to whether or not the Commission should
 5 grant the relief sought and the exercise of its discretion,
 6 and finally, Chair, we intend to make submissions on the
 7 question of appropriate relief.
 8 [12:27] To begin then, Chair, by analysing the relief
 9 sought by SAPS as paragraph 3 of our heads of argument,
 10 essentially we say that there are three categories of
 11 relief which SAPS seek. The first is the application for
 12 an in-camera hearing of the evidence of Mr X. The second
 13 is a ruling preventing the public disclosure of the
 14 identity of Mr X. The third is that he testifies via video
 15 link.
 16 Now we note in paragraph 4, Chair, that the form
 17 of the proceedings sought differs slightly from our
 18 traditional understanding of in-camera proceedings and
 19 there are two special features which we seek to draw the
 20 Commission's attention to at this stage. The first is that
 21 the application envisages that the media will be present
 22 during the testimony of Mr X, and we say that this is a
 23 significant factor which we will deal with when we address
 24 the issue of the exercise of this Commission's discretion.
 25 The second one, Chair, and which in a sense is

Page 24917

1 the fourth category of relief which we say needs to be
 2 looked at specifically in the context of the powers of this
 3 Commission to grant the relief sought by SAPS, is the
 4 application for the live audio feed of Mr X's testimony to
 5 an adjoining room.
 6 Now just to preface our argument, Chair, that is
 7 not specifically foreshadowed in either the Commissions Act
 8 or in the regulations. So it is something that the
 9 Commission will have to look at as –
 10 CHAIRPERSON: About that, the point that
 11 I'd noticed was that in the relief sought they envisage
 12 that the members of the public will hear that and they
 13 assume that the parties – from para 3 it's clear – the
 14 parties will be excluded, and the parties will only be
 15 there, if they are there at all, in their capacity as
 16 members of the public. They're not given any special
 17 rights as parties. That's correct, is it?
 18 MS PILLAY: That's our understanding as
 19 well, Chair.
 20 CHAIRPERSON: Ja.
 21 MS PILLAY: To begin, Chair, then with
 22 the first question, and that's whether this Commission has
 23 the authority to order that the testimony of Mr X be in
 24 camera, the starting point obviously is, Chair, as has
 25 already been argued, section 4 of the Commissions Act which

Page 24918

1 expressly confers the power on this Commission to order an
 2 in-camera hearing in circumstances where in the opinion of
 3 the Chairperson it is necessary or desirable.
 4 Now we say that this section, section 4 confers a
 5 wide discretion on the Commission and in fact we later on
 6 make submissions that the word "desirable" should in fact
 7 be restrictively applied, and we will give authority for
 8 that proposition.
 9 We also say, Chair, that – and just picking up on
 10 a debate that was had earlier, that it's important that
 11 this Commission adjudicate this application on the
 12 assumption that section 4 is constitutional and valid –
 13 CHAIRPERSON: I wouldn't have power to
 14 make any contrary assumption, would I?
 15 MS PILLAY: No, you wouldn't, Chair.
 16 CHAIRPERSON: If someone were to try to
 17 attack my ruling on review, the police if I go against
 18 them, or the opponents if I go in favour of the police,
 19 then different considerations might apply, but I'm not
 20 empowered to do anything other than to assume that the
 21 statute is constitutional.
 22 MS PILLAY: Well, that is not –
 23 CHAIRPERSON: And no contention is raised
 24 in the heads as far as I can see that the – of course I'm
 25 not even sure what my powers are in relation to the

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24919</p> <p>1 regulations. You know judges and magistrates even – 2 except, no, a magistrate wouldn't be able to deal with a 3 regulation that's a presidential regulation, but judges 4 have the power to decide whether a regulation ultra vires, 5 but I happen to be a judge for life, but I'm not sitting 6 here as a judge, I'm sitting here as a different kind of 7 official. So I must assume both that the section 4 of the 8 fact and the regulations are valid and constitutional. 9 MS PILLAY: That is our submission, 10 Chair. The question therefore, Chair, and having regard to 11 that point the question really is whether on the facts it's 12 been demonstrated that it is necessary, and we say that the 13 act says "or desirable," but we would advocate a 14 restrictive interpretation. We would say that the Court 15 should – 16 CHAIRPERSON: Clearly I have the power to 17 interpret – 18 MS PILLAY: Yes. 19 CHAIRPERSON: - and I can strangely 20 enough take constitutional factors into account in 21 interpreting, but all I'm prohibited from doing is striking 22 down or reading in or reading out or whatever the 23 constitutional experts do. 24 MS PILLAY: Well, the Commission would 25 have the power to adopt the section 39(2) interpretation of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24921</p> <p>1 Minister in drafting regulations to confer additional 2 powers on the Commission, that what is clear from that is 3 that the powers which eventually find themselves in the 4 regulations promulgated by the Minister are additional 5 powers to those set out in the Commissions Act. So it's an 6 additional source of power, and in that context, Chair, 7 when regulation 19 gives the Commission the power to 8 determine its own procedure, those powers are not 9 necessarily restricted to the powers set out in the 10 Commissions Act already but may go beyond that because the 11 Minister is expressly empowered to grant additional powers. 12 The power in regulation 19, Chair, is not defined 13 in the regulations. It's not circumscribed in the 14 regulations. So we will submit that it's actually a wide 15 power, indeed a procedural power, but a wide power which 16 allows the Commission to adopt procedures which best, will 17 allow the Commission to best carry out its function, namely 18 the carrying out of the investigation. 19 Now we couple with regulation 19, which is the 20 wide procedural power, Chair, we couple the power on the 21 Commission in terms of section 3(1) of the act, of the 22 Commissions Act to compel a witness to appear before it and 23 we make the argument that if this Commission has the power 24 to compel and it's also got the power to adopt its own 25 procedures, given those two express powers this Commission</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24920</p> <p>1 the legislation. 2 The second issue then, Chair, is the application 3 for a ruling prohibiting the disclosure of the identity of 4 Mr X. Once again we see an express power on the Commission 5 in the regulations to grant such an order, and that's in 6 regulation 10 which expressly states that the Chair in 7 instances where the Commission, the Chair has allowed an 8 in-camera hearing the Chair may on the request of a person 9 order that no person shall disclose in any manner 10 whatsoever the name or address of such person or any other 11 information likely to reveal his or her identity. That's 12 at paragraph 10 of the heads of argument. So clearly, 13 Chair, in relation to those two orders there's express 14 powers on this Commission to grant those orders. 15 The third category, and clearly the more tricky 16 one is the application to testify via video link. Now 17 neither the Commissions Act nor the regulations deal 18 expressly with whether or not the Chairperson or the 19 Commission has the power to authorise a witness to testify 20 via video link, and this would apply equally to what we 21 have identified as the fourth category, that the order that 22 there be a live audio feed in circumstances where the 23 Commission has granted an in-camera application. 24 We state though, Chair, that picking up from 25 section 1(b)(1) of the Commissions Act, which permits the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24922</p> <p>1 must have the implied power to take steps to protect a 2 witness by any other means, which we say includes the power 3 to enable a witness to testify by alternative means, 4 particularly where modes of alternative means have been 5 recognised in other fora, and for example section 158 of 6 the Criminal Procedure Act in a different context but 7 certain a recognised alternative form of having a witness 8 testify – 9 CHAIRPERSON: I haven't had an 10 opportunity to read your heads because I only got them this 11 morning, but you deal with, by quoting Baxter or 12 something – 13 MS PILLAY: Yes. 14 CHAIRPERSON: - circumstances in which 15 powers can be implied. You don't cite, though, what I 16 think is the leading case that's been followed by the SCA 17 many times, Middelburg Municipality versus Gertzen, 1914 18 AD, where Sir James Rose Innes said that "An authority 19 granted to a functionary in regard to any specified subject 20 'must in the absence of clear intent to the contrary be 21 taken to include such legislative powers as are reasonably 22 required to carry out the objects of the enactment, that is 23 to deal fully and effectively with the subjects assigned." 24 That is referred to amongst others in the National Lottery 25 Board case versus Brooks –</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24923</p> <p>1 MS PILLAY: Yes.</p> <p>2 CHAIRPERSON: - 2009. So that is – I</p> <p>3 mean I prefer, with respect, the formulation by Sir James</p> <p>4 Rose Innes rather than a paraphrase by an academic, but</p> <p>5 there doesn't appear to be a material difference between</p> <p>6 what Professor Baxter said and what Sir James Rose Innes</p> <p>7 said.</p> <p>8 MS PILLAY: It is in fact a trite</p> <p>9 proposition, Chair –</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: Yes.</p> <p>11 MS PILLAY: - but it's the powers which</p> <p>12 are reasonably necessary to carry out the express powers.</p> <p>13 Now we would again -</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible]</p> <p>15 MS PILLAY: We would submit that in the</p> <p>16 context where you have an express power to compel a witness</p> <p>17 to appear before the Commission, and given the fact that</p> <p>18 you've got the power to determine your own procedure, there</p> <p>19 must be –</p> <p>20 CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible]</p> <p>21 Sir James Rose Innes said it was "the powers reasonably</p> <p>22 required to carry out the object of the enactment that is</p> <p>23 to deal fully and effectively with the subject assigned."</p> <p>24 MS PILLAY: Yes.</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: Now the point would be, I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24925</p> <p>1 the heads of argument is that we have been unable to locate</p> <p>2 any specific South African cases dealing, which expressly</p> <p>3 recognise the implied power of a commission like this one</p> <p>4 to order that witnesses testify via alternative means. It</p> <p>5 might be, Chair, that one of the reasons for that is that</p> <p>6 the Criminal Procedure Act has got an express power and</p> <p>7 that the cases which had emerged from that had been based</p> <p>8 on the section 158 express power rather than an implied</p> <p>9 power to protect a witness.</p> <p>10 We do, however, point out that we've found case</p> <p>11 law in Australia where the Courts have recognised an</p> <p>12 implied power to allow witnesses to testify –</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON: Do you have copies of those</p> <p>14 judgments?</p> <p>15 MS PILLAY: We do, Chair. We can make</p> <p>16 those available.</p> <p>17 CHAIRPERSON: The New South Wales case,</p> <p>18 the John Fairfax case –</p> <p>19 MS PILLAY: Yes.</p> <p>20 CHAIRPERSON: - that presumably is the</p> <p>21 publication case that deals with –</p> <p>22 MS PILLAY: Yes, that is so.</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: Press publication case, I</p> <p>24 imagine.</p> <p>25 MS PILLAY: That is so, Chair.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24924</p> <p>1 suppose, that it could be contended anyway, and I take it</p> <p>2 you're contending that in order to deal fully and</p> <p>3 effectively with the matter in hand, to get evidence from a</p> <p>4 witness whom we've compelled to come, may be reluctant to</p> <p>5 testify because of the fear of fatal consequences if he</p> <p>6 does, that that power must be included. I take it that's</p> <p>7 the contention.</p> <p>8 MS PILLAY: That is our submission,</p> <p>9 Chair. We tie this argument, Chair, or this interpretation</p> <p>10 to section 39(2) of the Constitution to the extent that we</p> <p>11 are bound to adopt an interpretation of both the act and</p> <p>12 the regulations, an interpretation that will further the</p> <p>13 spirit, purport and objects of the Bill of Rights,</p> <p>14 including, Chair, the right to life, the right to dignity,</p> <p>15 the right to freedom and security of the person.</p> <p>16 So we would urge the Commission to adopt an</p> <p>17 interpretation to the question of whether it has the</p> <p>18 procedural power under regulation 19 or an implied power</p> <p>19 derived from regulation 19, read with section 3(1) of the</p> <p>20 act, in a manner to promote and protect the rights of</p> <p>21 witnesses who appear before it, and enable the Commission</p> <p>22 to order that witnesses testify via alternative means in</p> <p>23 circumstances where it has been shown to be necessary to do</p> <p>24 so.</p> <p>25 The argument we make at paragraph 21, Chair, of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24926</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: John Fairfax & Sons is a –</p> <p>2 MS PILLAY: Yes.</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON: - media house, I think, in</p> <p>4 Australia.</p> <p>5 MS PILLAY: Yes.</p> <p>6 CHAIRPERSON: Is that a single judge</p> <p>7 sitting in New South Wales, or the New South Wales Court of</p> <p>8 Appeal? Do you know?</p> <p>9 MS PILLAY: I think, Chair, if I'm just –</p> <p>10 that was the one case which we struggled to find, so we've</p> <p>11 had to rely on writings on that case. I think it's not a</p> <p>12 single-judge case, if I'm not mistaken.</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON: Is it not available</p> <p>14 through –</p> <p>15 MS PILLAY: We've struggled to find that</p> <p>16 particular –</p> <p>17 CHAIRPERSON: Oh, of course –</p> <p>18 MS PILLAY: We've got the others.</p> <p>19 CHAIRPERSON: It's 1986. I think a lot</p> <p>20 of the websites in this case were only established after</p> <p>21 that.</p> <p>22 MS PILLAY: Yes, but we've managed to</p> <p>23 find substantial academic writing on the case.</p> <p>24 Essentially, Chair –</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: The University of Cape Town</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24927</p> <p>1 has got a good set of Australian reports, even the State 2 one, so maybe we can get it from there. But anyway, if 3 necessary I – 4 MS PILLAY: Yes, we'll look into it, 5 Chair. 6 CHAIRPERSON: If necessary, I should be 7 there on Wednesday anyway in the library, so if the case is 8 there, but it would be nice to have a copy, you know. 9 Obviously your learned friends would – the BUSB case? 10 MS PILLAY: That we have a copy of, 11 Chair, and can make – 12 CHAIRPERSON: Which court is that? 13 MS PILLAY: I'm just looking, Chair. 14 I've got my copies of the cases. 15 CHAIRPERSON: Well, you don't have to 16 answer immediately, but there is a copy for me, is there? 17 MS PILLAY: There are, we are making 18 copies for you. 19 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, well that will be 20 helpful, thank you. 21 MS PILLAY: Essentially what we see in 22 these Australian cases, Chair, is that the Courts have 23 recognised an implied power to allow witnesses in certain 24 circumstances to testify by alternative means and the 25 implied power in the Australian cases was derived from the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24929</p> <p>1 basis for the audio feed power is exactly the same as the 2 one for the video link power. 3 Coming then, Chair, to the third issue which we 4 wanted to address, and that's the question of whether the 5 Commission should exercise its discretion in favour of 6 granting the application sought by SAPS, which is at 7 paragraph 22 of the heads of argument; the default position 8 we've dealt with already, Chair, which is in section 4, is 9 that all hearings should be in public, but there is a 10 proviso permitting the Chairperson to exclude persons where 11 it's not necessary or desirable. 12 We say in paragraph 20, Chair, and it's an 13 important principle, that it is in the public interest that 14 all hearings be public and that witnesses testify in person 15 and that this must be the default position which is 16 entrenched. 17 We refer to the Minister of Police versus Premier 18 of the Western Cape judgment where the Constitutional Court 19 recognised the important public purpose served by a 20 commission of inquiry in terms of not only educating the 21 public, but also exposing the investigation to the public, 22 and we say, and the Constitutional Court refer to the 23 Canadian case of Phillips versus Nova Scotia where it was 24 emphasised that "Open and public nature of hearings helps 25 restore the public confidence not only in the institution</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24928</p> <p>1 Court's jurisdiction to serve the administration of 2 justice. 3 Similarly, Chair, we would say that the issue on 4 the audio feed also is not dealt with expressly in either 5 the act or the regulation, but it is an order which is 6 designed to allow greater accessibility to the hearings 7 conducted in the Commission in circumstances that is an in- 8 camera – 9 CHAIRPERSON: But prima facie I haven't 10 got a problem with that. If the first part comes, if the 11 exclusion of the public from the chamber, I have power to 12 do that and if it's appropriate to do that - obviously it's 13 something I still have to be satisfied on - that order is 14 actually designed to mitigate the effects of the exclusion 15 of the public from the chamber in a way which protects the 16 identity of the witness so that his identity would not 17 become apparent to those who know him and see him on the 18 screen, members of the public. So – 19 MS PILLAY: So on a similar basis – 20 CHAIRPERSON: So prima facie there's far 21 less difficulty, shall we say, in implying that power if 22 there's power to grant the other order, but although there 23 will still be argument whether it is appropriate, but 24 that's, we in a field of vires at the moment, aren't we? 25 MS PILLAY: But we would submit the legal</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24930</p> <p>1 or the situation being investigated, but also in government 2 as a whole," and we say this is an important reason why as 3 a default position it should be that the Commission's 4 hearings be public and that witnesses be called to testify 5 in person. This is the basis on which we argue that a 6 Court should take a restrictive interpretation to the 7 desirability aspect of the power on the Commission to order 8 in-camera hearings. 9 It's important, Chair, just to emphasise that the 10 Australian cases have utilised the test of reasonably 11 necessary, that a witness can testify by alternative means 12 where it is reasonably necessary, it's been shown that it's 13 reasonably necessary to do so. So the test that we're 14 advocating in terms of the interpretation of the 15 Commissions Act and the regulations is consistent with this 16 approach, and we say on a factual basis, having regard to 17 all of the factors, which we will go through shortly, 18 Chair, that it has been shown to be reasonably necessary 19 for Mr X to testify firstly in camera, and secondly via 20 video link. 21 We just want to emphasise, Chair, that in the 22 exercise of this Commission's discretion on whether or not 23 to grant the application it's important that the 24 constitutional principles and the constitutional – that the 25 discretion be exercised to the prisms of the Constitution,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24931</p> <p>1 having regard to the rights, the competing rights of both 2 parties. 3 [12:46] The one we've already dealt with, which is in a 4 sense a corollary of the principle of open justice and why 5 it's necessary for the hearing to be public. 6 But the others, Chair, which is what we deal with 7 from paragraph 26 of our heads of argument, is the specific 8 rights which SAPS have relied on as a basis for the 9 application that they make, and the primary right which 10 SAPS have relied on is Mr X's right to life. We would 11 submit that there are other rights implicated, namely his 12 right to be free from violence, his right to bodily 13 integrity, his right to dignity. 14 The factual basis on which SAPS claim that Mr X's 15 right to life is threatened is set out in their founding 16 affidavit and replying affidavit, but before we deal 17 specifically with the factual matter, if I can just go back 18 to the case that Commissioner Hemraj referred us to 19 earlier, and that's the case of Madlavu. Now an important 20 aspect of that decision, Chair, was that the Court said 21 that in that case the Court is not restricted to looking at 22 the factual basis which a particular party relies on in 23 order to motivate an in-camera hearing, and that the Court 24 is entitled to go beyond that, having regard to its own 25 experiences and understanding of the threat that the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24933</p> <p>1 implicates individuals and individuals who on his version 2 are capable of brutal violence, that it is reasonable to 3 draw the conclusion that Mr X's life will be in danger if 4 his identity is known and if he is forced to testify in 5 person at the Commission. 6 Now we say, Chair, and we've gone quite carefully 7 through the opposing affidavit filed by the respondents to 8 this application, and we don't see anywhere where the 9 respondents assert as a matter of fact that there is no 10 threat to the life of Mr X, and we say that this is a 11 telling factor. What they do say is that there are other 12 methods of ensuring his safety before the Commission, but 13 the fact that they do not assert that he is free from any 14 threat whatsoever we say is a very telling factor, and once 15 the parties are all ad idem that in fact Mr X is under 16 threat to his person, to his life, we would submit it's 17 appropriate for this Court to err on the side of caution 18 and to take a more conservative approach to an order which 19 might ultimately result in protecting his life. 20 Just to pick up then, Chair, on an issue which 21 was raised with Ms Baloyi on behalf of SAPS on why the need 22 for a video link as opposed to Mr X testifying in person; 23 as we understand SAPS' case the need for the video link is 24 firstly to further safeguard and protect the identity of Mr 25 X. In other words there's a risk that by Mr X travelling</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24932</p> <p>1 witness may face. 2 Now this is an important dimension, we submit to 3 the question of the exercise of this Commission's 4 discretion. This Commission is free to travel beyond the 5 factual information which SAPS have placed before the 6 Commission and to draw on its own experiences, importantly 7 of how witnesses have been dealt with thus far in the 8 Commission, and it's trite that there have been a number of 9 witnesses who've not only lost their lives but who've also 10 been threatened, and that's an important feature which 11 ought to factor into the exercise of the discretion. 12 Now crucially, Chair – 13 CHAIRPERSON: Those are summarised in Mr 14 Pretorius's replying affidavit. 15 MS PILLAY: That is so, Chair, and that – 16 CHAIRPERSON: Particular one person who 17 was at the inspection in loco and was clearly going to be a 18 witness, pointed out spots at the NUM office and then I 19 think within two weeks thereafter was killed. 20 MS PILLAY: That is so, Chair. 21 CHAIRPERSON: That's a factor which 22 obviously must weigh very heavily. 23 MS PILLAY: Yes. We say, Chair, that 24 having regard to what we understand to be Mr X's version 25 and the extent to which he implicates, and directly</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24934</p> <p>1 every day to and from the hearing that his identity may in 2 fact become known, and secondly the concern for his safety 3 and the need therefore for him to testify from an 4 undisclosed location, or in the words of Mr Pretorius in 5 his founding affidavit, "a venue that is not easily 6 identifiable." 7 Now those are the two factual bases on which we 8 understand SAPS seek the order for a video link as opposed 9 to Mr X actually appearing in person and we would submit in 10 the broader balance to be struck between all of the 11 competing interests that these are not unreasonable orders 12 and we will demonstrate why we believe on balance that the 13 order introduces sufficient safeguards to protect the 14 interests of the parties who oppose the application. 15 If I may then go to that topic, which is 16 balancing the competing rights, we deal with that from 17 paragraph 31 of our heads of argument. 18 CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] 19 cases where admittedly the phrase under consideration was 20 the probability that something might happen, that was 21 paraphrased as saying that what you have regard to is 22 whether there's a risk, where there's a reasonable risk 23 that these things would happen and that I take it would be 24 the appropriate test to apply here. 25 MS PILLAY: We would submit that that</p>

Page 24935

1 would be an appropriate test. It would be akin –

2 CHAIRPERSON: That was dealt with in the

3 Leepile cases by Judge –

4 MS PILLAY: And that's the akin of what

5 we have thus far put the test as reasonably necessary for

6 the protection of his life.

7 CHAIRPERSON: In Mr du Toit's textbook at

8 page 22-32 he summaries the Madlavu case, says you don't

9 need a probability, and he makes the point that you've just

10 made, that the Court can use its own experience, and then

11 he goes on to refer to Leepile's case where it was held

12 that the requirement is not probability, but reasonable

13 possibility, and I remember in that case the word "risk"

14 was used at one stage as well, so that on your argument

15 what is required would be the reasonable possibility, or

16 the risk - not a remote risk of course, or remote

17 possibility – of harm. That's what would have to be shown.

18 MS PILLAY: We would submit –

19 CHAIRPERSON: And whether it has been

20 shown of course is a matter you'll be dealing with in due

21 course.

22 MS PILLAY: And in assessing whether

23 what's reasonable, the Court can have regard to the

24 experience of the Commission thus far and the treatment of

25 witnesses.

Page 24936

1 We summarise in paragraph 31 –

2 CHAIRPERSON: You're now moving to

3 paragraph 31. Is that right?

4 MS PILLAY: That is so, Chair. We

5 summarise in paragraph 31 the rights that have been relied

6 upon by the respondents and the right, we say the rights

7 that are being relied on, we say, Chair, doesn't take the

8 matter much further than what we've referred to as the

9 Constitutional Court dicta that require as a default

10 position to the hearings be public. But ultimately the

11 rights are not absolute and the rights are subject to

12 limitation, especially in the context of then what the

13 Court is called upon to do is to conduct a balancing

14 exercise.

15 So the real enquiry – and this is where we would

16 ask the Commission to locate the debate amongst the parties

17 – the real enquiry is around balancing all the competing

18 interests.

19 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was really concerned

20 when Ms Baloyi was arguing to make sure that we had all the

21 competing interests. As I said, if you're going to perform

22 a balancing exercise correctly you've got to make sure that

23 everything that's appropriate goes into each of the two

24 pans of the scale, otherwise your balancing exercise will

25 be inappropriately done.

Page 24937

1 MS PILLAY: We accept that that's

2 correct, Chair. Now we would say, Chair, that the primary

3 issue which weighs heavily in tipping the balance in favour

4 of the order sought by SAPS is this acceptance that there

5 is a threat to the life of Mr X and –

6 CHAIRPERSON: Don't we need – isn't that

7 putting it perhaps too high? Don't we need a reasonable

8 possibility or a substantial risk as opposed to – does it

9 have to go higher than that? It may well be of course that

10 they may argue that they have gone higher, they succeeded

11 in showing more than they have to show, but for purposes of

12 determining the test have I stated it correctly, prima

13 facie obviously subject to argument we're going to hear

14 later, we don't need a probability, we need a reasonable

15 possibility, or what one can perhaps paraphrase by calling

16 a real risk.

17 MS PILLAY: Yes. Chair, we're happy to

18 accept the test that what's required is a reasonable

19 possibility of harm, but what's telling is that none of the

20 parties argue that that possibility doesn't exist and if

21 you move from that basis, Chair, we say that the orders

22 that have been sought by SAPS have built into them

23 sufficient mechanisms and safeguards in order to ensure

24 that the balancing exercise ultimately is in favour of

25 granting the orders firstly for the testimony to be

Page 24938

1 admitted in camera, and secondly via video link.

2 The first special feature which we want to draw

3 the Court's attention to is the fact, as we've already

4 stated, that the in-camera order is a watered-down one in

5 the sense that members of the media will be present while

6 Mr X is testifying, and secondly that there will be a live

7 audio feed of his testimony to an adjoining room.

8 Now this mechanism, this special feature we would

9 submit, Chair, in a sense addresses some of the concerns

10 which have been identified by Wigmore around inclination to

11 falsify evidence, etcetera, if Mr X is aware that while he

12 is testifying that the members of the public will be

13 following his testimony via live audio feed. It's not an

14 ideal solution to that concern raised by Wigmore, but it

15 certainly goes a long way to answering some of the

16 concerns.

17 CHAIRPERSON: When you've reached an

18 appropriate stage in the argument will you tell me so we

19 can take the lunch adjournment? I'm not cutting you off

20 immediately now, but when you consider it appropriate, let

21 me know.

22 MS PILLAY: Chair, I've got a number of

23 factors to go through, so I think if it's okay with the

24 Chair we can take the break now.

25 CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the lunch

Page 24939

1 adjournment. Let's try to be back at quarter to 2. I know
 2 it's not always easy with so many people here, but I would
 3 appreciate it if we can resume at quarter to 2.
 4 [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]
 5 [13:52] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Ms
 6 Pillay?
 7 MS PILLAY: Thank you, Chair.
 8 CHAIRPERSON: During the adjournment you
 9 gave me a copy or sent me a copy of the B. USB case as
 10 well as another case, at least one other case from the High
 11 Court of Australia but I take it you'll be referring to
 12 that later, but thank you very much for sending these to
 13 me.
 14 MS PILLAY: Thank you, Chair. Chair, we
 15 pick up from paragraph 34.3 on page 14 of our heads of
 16 argument where we are still identifying the factors which
 17 we say weigh in favour in the balancing process, weigh in
 18 favour of granting the order sought by SAPS. The third
 19 factor which we identify, Chair, is that even though Mr X
 20 would be testifying via video link, the legal
 21 representatives of the parties will be able to see him and
 22 will therefore be able to observe his demeanour and his
 23 responses to questions. And we draw your attention in
 24 paragraph 34.3, Chair, to the case if S v Staggie where in
 25 the context of section 158 of the Criminal Procedure Act

Page 24940

1 the court found that the section does not infringe on the
 2 right to a fair trial and the right of an accused to have
 3 proceedings conducted in his presence but that it merely
 4 creates a different form of the testimony being presented
 5 to court, other than the actual physical presence of the
 6 witness.
 7 In addition, Chair, to these factors, the
 8 evidence leaders have introduced three further measures
 9 which we say would render the ultimate order one which the
 10 Commission should grant in exercising this balancing act.
 11 The first is that an evidence leader would be present or
 12 must be present at all times in the room with Mr X while he
 13 is testifying. Now this is obviously a precautionary
 14 measure to ensure that there is no prospect, not only of
 15 his evidence not being distorted but of claims that his
 16 evidence was distorted through interference by some SAPS
 17 personnel.
 18 The second factor introduced by the evidence
 19 leaders is that the identity of Mr X should be disclosed to
 20 all legal representatives participating in the hearing.
 21 Obviously the legal representatives will be able to see Mr
 22 X. It doesn't make any sense that they wouldn't then –
 23 CHAIRPERSON: Before you carry on, let me
 24 ask Mr Semenya a question. I don't want you to tell me
 25 where the witness will be but if I were to grant the order

Page 24941

1 that Ms Pillay suggests, that's in 35.1, would there be
 2 practical problems? Do you understand the point?
 3 Theoretically, I put this up, obviously it's a theoretical
 4 possibility, if the witness is giving evidence in New York
 5 it might be difficult to get an evidence leader there to be
 6 present but I deliberately gave an exaggerated example, but
 7 if an order were to be made in terms of 35.1 – all the
 8 other things that are necessary to persuade me to make an
 9 appropriate order – would that create problems or would it
 10 be practical to carry that out?
 11 MR SEMENYA SC: We have tendered that
 12 concession in the replying affidavit, Chair.
 13 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
 14 MS PILLAY: Thank you, Chair. The third
 15 factor introduced by the evidence leaders would be that an
 16 advance of Mr X's testimony that SAPS provide all legal
 17 representatives with the name of Mr X as well as a
 18 photograph identifying him so that the parties are able to
 19 go through photographic and video evidence in order to
 20 prepare for his cross-examination. And we say, Chair that
 21 having regard to these three additional factors and there
 22 safety mech – the safeguards that have already been
 23 introduced by SAPS, that these are important factors which
 24 weigh in favour of granting the relief sought.
 25 The section headed "appropriate relief," Mr

Page 24942

1 Chair, what we've done is introduced into the order sought
 2 by SAPS just the additional issues raised by the evidence
 3 leaders. So paragraph 2 of the new order is a new addition
 4 by the evidence leaders.
 5 In relation to paragraph 3, Chair, just a
 6 correction. We've asked that reference to accredited media
 7 representatives be removed and that the order should only
 8 read, "Legal representatives and media representatives."
 9 CHAIRPERSON: You remember at the
 10 beginning of our sessions in 2012 we had a process whereby
 11 media representatives were accredited and if there are to
 12 be restrictions one doesn't, there might well be practical
 13 problems if people arrived and said, we're from the media.
 14 So I would imagine that the accredited media, the
 15 requirement that media representatives be accredited is
 16 important. Those who were accredited, if there are any of
 17 them left, would still be able to use that accreditation.
 18 The accreditation, as far as I remember was done by the
 19 secretary of the Commission, was it not? So if there are
 20 new people who come along and want to be accredited then
 21 they must apply to him. That's if we're going to do that.
 22 I mean if I refuse the order completely, the point would
 23 fall away but otherwise you could have some person
 24 pretending to be a media representative who is just a
 25 member of the public and there might be difficulties, so I

Page 24943

1 think from a practical point of view it's probably
 2 necessary, if we're going to go that route. If we're not
 3 going to grant the order at all then this problem will fall
 4 away.

5 MS PILLAY: Chair, if the accreditation
 6 process is in place then obviously we would be happy with
 7 that. The next new paragraph is paragraph 4, just to
 8 create a mechanism where parties are able to get the
 9 identity and photograph of Mr X, the legal representatives
 10 are able to get the photograph and identity of Mr X to be
 11 able to go through video and photographic evidence to
 12 prepare for cross-examination. And 5 flows from 4, Chair,
 13 and there's also an additional insertion and I think that
 14 the rest of the orders are exactly as sought by SAPS.
 15 Chair, those are our submissions.

16 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms Pillay. Mr
 17 Mpopu?

18 MR MPOFU: Yes, thank you very much,
 19 Chairperson. Chairperson, it might be appropriate, having
 20 listened to my colleagues, to just get rid of some of the
 21 peripheral issues by explaining what our case is not, so
 22 that we don't waste time on that peripheral material. It
 23 is certainly not our case, Chairperson, that Mr X's
 24 evidence is not relevant or necessary for the purposes of
 25 this Commission. He, after all, purports to have been an

Page 24944

1 eye witness. We ourselves have called eye witnesses so we
 2 would be the last people to say his evidence is irrelevant
 3 but as the Chairperson correctly pointed out in an exchange
 4 with Ms Baloyi, that is not the issue in this application.

5 The other thing we are not saying is that either
 6 the Act or the regulations are unconstitutional and Mr
 7 Brickhill will deal with that in more detail but I simply
 8 want to say is that what we are saying about the
 9 Constitution is that, as Ms Pillay has put it, when you are
 10 interpreting the Act or the regulations or anything, it
 11 must be done through the prism of the Constitution because
 12 after all this Commission has been established in terms of
 13 84(2)(f) of the Constitution of the Republic. I'll come
 14 back to the question, the issue of interpretation.

15 The third thing that we are not saying is that
 16 there is no possibility of harm, however remote that
 17 possibility might be. What we are saying in that regard,
 18 and I'll address it later, is that something more than a
 19 mere possibility of harm is needed and only to that extent
 20 we can borrow from the examples of criminal law, that we're
 21 talking about a likelihood which we will argue is something
 22 higher than a mere possibility.

23 CHAIRPERSON: You say a likelihood is
 24 required?

25 MR MPOFU: A likelihood, yes. We'll say

Page 24945

1 that that test could be, could legitimately be borrowed
 2 from the criminal law example although we'll argue that the
 3 criminal law, section 58 and those kinds of sections are
 4 not directly applicable but I think the Chairperson has
 5 made that point and in fact to a certain extent what is
 6 contained in those sections assist our argument but,
 7 Chairperson, before I even go – I just want to explain that
 8 issue of the possibility in more detail.

9 CHAIRPERSON: Let's just finish your
 10 recital of what your argument is not about.

11 MR MPOFU: Is not about, yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON: Are those the three points?
 13 The first is that you don't say that X's evidence is not
 14 relevant or necessary, you don't say the Act or the
 15 regulations are unconstitutional but you say they must be
 16 interpreted through the prism of the Constitution.

17 MR MPOFU: Correct?

18 CHAIRPERSON: And you say, you don't say
 19 there's no possibility of harm but you say –

20 MR MPOFU: That's not sufficient –

21 CHAIRPERSON: - that a likelihood is
 22 required and you will submit in due course that the
 23 likelihood is –

24 MR MPOFU: Is required, yes. Well, maybe
 25 I might as well say two things in that regard, Chairperson.

Page 24946

1 We say a likelihood is required but more importantly, a
 2 causal connection between the testifying and the
 3 eventuation of that likelihood is needed. So the last, the
 4 third one has two legs, as it were. Between the act of
 5 testifying and the eventuation of the harm, in other words
 6 the testifying in ordinary court, not in camera or not by
 7 video link and all those things and the occurrence of the
 8 harm or likelihood of the harm.

9 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, I've got it.

10 MR MPOFU: Yes, thank you. And maybe,
 11 Chairperson, I can start with dealing with that issue
 12 before I even talk about the powers.

13 CHAIRPERSON: When you are referring to
 14 things that are in your heads I'd be grateful if you'd tell
 15 me.

16 MR MPOFU: Yes, yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON: It means I don't have to
 18 write it.

19 MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. No, Chairperson, I
 20 will, I will. Now at the outset, Chairperson, one has to
 21 go to the Leepile case just to make this point that I made
 22 now and as Ms Baloyi has already indicated, that case was
 23 argued by one IG Farlam SC, otherwise described earlier as
 24 eminent counsel, appropriately.

25 CHAIRPERSON: The passage in – which

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24947</p> <p>1 Leepile judgment you're referring to because I appeared in 2 them all, which judgment are you referring to, at what page 3 of the report? 4 MR MPOFU: Yes, I'm starting, 5 Chairperson, against the letter I on page 336 on this issue 6 of the connection or the causal link. It says there, "Mr 7 Farlam" – 8 CHAIRPERSON: This is Leepile (1), is it? 9 MR MPOFU: Yes, Leepile (1), 336 ja. 10 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. 11 MR MPOFU: "Mr Farlam also emphasised, 12 correctly in my view, that there must be a causal link 13 between the act of testifying and the harm to the witness 14 which is envisaged before the jurisdictional facts are 15 established" and then it talks about the discretion. Now 16 the learned judge also then says, or then the Wigmore part 17 which the Chairperson has already cited, I'll jump that and 18 then at 341 against the letter H, Chairperson, "There is no 19 evidence at all in the present case that any witness in the 20 present case has been threatened with harm or reprisal if 21 he testifies. I have thus far only heard the testimony of 22 Warrant Officer Pienaar" or whatever. "I have thus not 23 seen any witness called in court or his testimony in any 24 way affected because of the fear of reprisal. The 25 atmosphere of the case has been free of any negative</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24949</p> <p>1 unrelated and that's exactly why he's not even on Mr 2 Pretorius's list. So you know one should not jump into 3 causal link simply because of things that happen outside. 4 Then Chairperson, the third quotation which 5 supports again leg 3 of what I said, where we say that the 6 likelihood test, as it were, is – or on page 345 of the 7 Leepile case against the letter C, B, ja, 345B yes and 8 there the learned judge said, "Of course there is the 9 possibility that any witness who testifies in a case such 10 as this may come to harm. I am, however, unable to find 11 that in the present case on all the material, evidential or 12 otherwise, which I am bound to consider in this regard, 13 that there is a likelihood that harm might result to a 14 witness if he or she testifies as required by section 153. 15 On the facts of this case such a possibility or harm is too 16 remote to constitute a reasonable possibility." Now that 17 says two things, Chairperson. It says that the possibility 18 which the judge considered is there, is something lower 19 than the likelihood of harm which he required and which he 20 found to be absent. So the mere existence of the 21 possibility did not graduate to the sufficient standard of 22 likelihood. So the reason possibility and likelihood, if 23 you read that passage, seem to be the acceptable test. And 24 we will submit, Chairperson, that that standard which we 25 concur with, we agree with, has not been met by any stretch</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24948</p> <p>1 features." Now what we say about this, Chairperson, again 2 it goes to the issue of the causal link. We obviously do 3 not deny the list that was supplied and referred to by both 4 Ms Baloyi and Ms Pillay but what we are saying is that 5 there has been no evidence of any link between any harm 6 suffered by any of those people and their testifying before 7 this tribunal. In fact in the case of Mr Bongo, he never 8 even testified so there could not have been such a causal 9 link. 10 CHAIRPERSON: He did point spots out – 11 MR MPOFU: Well, Chairperson – 12 CHAIRPERSON: He did point spots out at 13 the inspection in loco. 14 MR MPOFU: Yes. 15 CHAIRPERSON: And it was indicated that 16 he would be a witness. 17 MR MPOFU: Ja, that – 18 CHAIRPERSON: So there is that. 19 MR MPOFU: True, but that doesn't provide 20 a causal link between those pointing and whatever harm he 21 may have suffered. Similarly we know, Chairperson, and a 22 good example of this is the Nyanga murder. We were told in 23 this Commission that there was a connection between that 24 and, as the Chairperson, and possible testimony. It turns 25 out that he was killed in taxi violence, completely</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24950</p> <p>1 of the imagination nor has it been shown to exist. 2 So that's the canvas, as it were, Chairperson, 3 but let's come to the real issue which is simply whether or 4 not the Commission or the Chairperson have the necessary 5 power – 6 CHAIRPERSON: You're now at paragraph 9 7 of your heads. 8 MR MPOFU: Yes, thereabouts, Chairperson. 9 If, Chairperson, the power does not – if the Commission 10 does not have the power then that's the end of the matter, 11 with respect, because it does not matter if the Commission 12 thinks that it would be a good idea or whatever, if it is 13 shackled by the absence of power the Commission cannot act 14 ultra vires nor can it violate the principle of legality. 15 Now this, Chairperson, is a very crucial point which is why 16 we're talking about the prism and all that because 17 essentially on that leg of the case the issue is simply one 18 of interpretation. One has to interpret the instruments 19 that are there as to whether they confer that power, either 20 directly or implied, as the evidence leaders would like us 21 to believe and if the power is not there then it is not 22 there. 23 [14:12] Now as everyone has said, Chairperson, the 24 starting point is obviously section 4 of the Commissions 25 Act and I'm just going to spend a few minutes demonstrating</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24951</p> <p>1 that that section does not even remotely confer the power 2 that is sought here and that we can only do by going to the 3 section itself. The heading says "Sitting to be public." 4 Well, firstly maybe I should say this, Chairperson, and I 5 don't think my learned colleagues are arguing to the 6 contrary, that the whole, the idea, the very, very notion 7 of a commission of inquiry held in secret is an oxymoron 8 and a contradiction in terms because remember, Chairperson, 9 that what sparks a Commission in the first place is the 10 fact that there's a public interest in that matter. So 11 before one even opens their mouth the mere fact, the mere 12 existence of a Commission presupposes a public interest. 13 And as I say, my colleagues I think have all said that what 14 is being contended for here is an exception to that rule 15 and – but the important thing here, Chairperson, is that in 16 so – once you accept the general rule, as it were, and the 17 genesis of any Commission and particularly this one, then 18 it means that when we are interpreting these instruments we 19 have to do so not only through the prism of the 20 Constitution but we must, insofar as they take away 21 liberties, must do so restrictively and in a manner that is 22 not against the taking away, or rather in favour of the 23 taking away of those liberties. And once again I think 24 that my colleagues concede that certain liberties would be 25 taken but they are saying that it is necessary or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24953</p> <p>1 here, whatever the personal feelings of the Chairperson or 2 of the Commissioners might have been, it was clear that the 3 Commission did not have the powers – the Commission 4 couldn't simply say, oh well, there's regulation 19 which 5 says you can dictate your own procedures and you know we'll 6 just relocate sommer to Centurion. The Chairperson 7 correctly understood the limitation of his powers and as I 8 say, whatever his feelings were, he had to go and seek from 9 the Minister the permission and that dealt with the place. 10 That then allowed the place of where the Commission is to 11 be moved from Rustenburg to Centurion. 12 Now, so there's simply no power for that to be 13 done under either some implied power which I'll talk about 14 now, or certainly not under a proper interpretation of this 15 statute. But more importantly, Chairperson, this whole 16 thing misses the whole point of section 4. Section 4, 17 Chairperson, does not – you have no power to exclude a 18 witness from this place. Section 5 deals with something 19 completely different. It is to exclude any class of 20 persons or persons whose presence at the hearing is, in 21 your opinion, not necessary or desirable. Well, let me 22 start by saying, making a big concession. We think that 23 the presence of Mr X here is necessary and desirable. So 24 he does not fall under the kind of people that you may 25 exclude because you see, Chairperson, one doesn't even need</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24952</p> <p>1 desirable. 2 So let's go then, with that background, to 3 section 4 of the Act. "All the evidence and addresses 4 heard by a Commission shall be in public," which is just a 5 repetition of the general rule, "provided that the Chairman 6 of the Commission may, in his discretion, exclude from the 7 place where such evidence is to be given or such address to 8 be delivered, any class of person or persons or all persons 9 whose presence at the hearing of such evidence or address 10 is, in his opinion, not necessary or desirable." 11 So let's start with, "from the place where such 12 evidence is to be given." Chairperson, the place where 13 evidence has to be given is here in this room. So that's a 14 crucial thing. You can't have – and the Commission or the 15 proceedings are what happens around these walls. The 16 minute you, Chairperson, allow a witness to be in New York 17 as the Chairperson, such as the example, then it means a 18 part of this Commission is taking place in New York or 19 Houghton or whatever, wherever that other place is. So the 20 place where the evidence must be heard is here and you 21 can't have a portion of the Commission occurring somewhere 22 else. 23 Now to illustrate that, Chairperson, that you do 24 not have the power to just play around, with respect, with 25 the place, when we had to move from Rustenburg to come</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24954</p> <p>1 a restrictive interpretation here because the statute is 2 very clear. You may exclude a group of people, a class of 3 persons or – so even the plural suggests that we are not 4 talking about an individual here, least of all are we 5 talking about the witness. So that power is just simply 6 not there again, for that reason alone. 7 Thirdly, thirdly Chairperson, one of the biggest 8 fallacies of this argument from the other side is again to 9 lump the parties, and Chairperson hinted to this, the 10 parties with the general public. That lumping is 11 misplaced. One cannot use in the same breath the exclusion 12 of the general public to then willy-nilly cover the parties 13 themselves and, Chairperson, you have no power to exclude 14 the parties here, even if one were to say, okay, they might 15 be excluded on the basis of necessity or desirability, 16 which is something I will address now. So quite clearly, 17 on an interpretation of the statute, the power, the 18 Commission does not have those powers. 19 Now the evidence leaders, in an apparent slip of 20 the tongue, effectively concede this point by saying that – 21 at paragraph 12 of their heads when they talk about the 22 video link issue they say, "It is, however, significant 23 that section 1(b)(1) of the Commissions Act contemplates 24 that the Minister may confer powers additional on the 25 Commission which are additional to those set out in the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24955</p> <p>1 Commissions Act.” We agree. So it would seem that at best 2 on this formulation, if the Commission were to assume such 3 powers or rather were to desire such powers, they would 4 have, the Minister would have to confer those powers just 5 as the Minister conferred the powers – the Chairperson 6 remembers there are two instances, two other examples. 7 When the Department of Justice refused to supply the 8 families with lunch money and those kinds of facilities, 9 once again the Chairperson expressed his views on it but 10 that was not sufficient. It could not have just happened 11 just because the Chairperson wished it to happen. There 12 had to be a promulgation of the regulations which was done 13 to make that possible. So the desires and wishes of the 14 Chairperson unfortunately cannot create powers that are not 15 there, or of the Commission for that matter. And even then 16 section 19 did not, the Chairperson did not, or the 17 Commission, assume that well, we'll just use section 19 to 18 order that the families must be provided with accommodation 19 and lunch. 20 The third example, Chairperson, happened more 21 recently. Again when there were all sorts of problems and 22 a crisis, to put it mildly, in the Commission on the 23 question of funding. Once again I think it was very clear, 24 the Commission very properly made its views very clear and 25 even went further than just making its views very clear,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24957</p> <p>1 think this is a matter of procedure. We think this is a 2 matter of substance but even if it was not, the maxim which 3 is quoted in paragraph 19, <i>lex specialis derogat legi</i> 4 <i>generali</i>. What it means, Chairperson, is that one cannot – 5 when the, let's call it the legal framework has made 6 specific provisions for the situation where the Chairperson 7 or the Commission may allow certain things, then there's no 8 room to rely on the general provision. In other words, if 9 it was the intention of the legislature that under the 10 rubric of procedure the Chairperson or the Commission is 11 basically at large to do whatever they want to do in order 12 to facilitate the Commission, then that would be it but the 13 minute the legislature specifies certain things and says 14 you may exclude certain people under these circumstances 15 and so on and this is what you must take into account, it 16 means that had the legislature wanted to give you this 17 power, it would have done so. So one cannot jump into the 18 – if my argument around section 4 is correct then that's 19 the end of the matter. You can't then seek refuge in 20 regulation 19 because the matter is specifically dealt 21 with, as it were. Now - and that, Chairperson, deals with 22 the issue of the implied power as well. You may, one may 23 not imply a power where there is statute or a regulation 24 that regulates that matter. 25 And ironically, that argument is defeated by the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24956</p> <p>1 went further and made attempts to obtain such funding but 2 the Commission emphasised time and again and it's all on 3 the record, that its own hands were tied in that regard 4 because it didn't have the power to simply say, well, the 5 lawyers of the injured must be paid or whatever. 6 Now, those are examples that make it very clear, 7 the difference between what one might want to happen and 8 what one is empowered by law to do. 9 Now, another misconception here, Chairperson, is 10 the misconception of the words, “were, in his opinion, not 11 necessary or desirable.” Those words are clearly linked to 12 the exclusion of the persons who are un desirable. They 13 are not to be construed to mean the Chairperson must use 14 those, that test to, for example, allow the issue of a 15 video link – actually the two things are not to do with 16 each other at all. So the test of necessity and 17 desirability, yes, is a test but it's a test not to permit 18 the derogation from the interests of justice and all the 19 general rule but to exclude people, certain people who are 20 undesirable. So those, I think, I'm afraid are what my 21 learned colleagues have misconstrued about section 4. 22 So let's quickly dispose in the same breath of 23 the subsidiary argument based on regulation 19. There, 24 Chairperson, the law is very clear. One cannot just rely 25 on a general provision like that. First of all, we don't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24958</p> <p>1 existence of section 158 of the Criminal Procedure Act that 2 my learned colleagues wanted to indirectly rely on because 3 what section 158 symbolises is that when the legislature 4 wants people to be, or witnesses as such to be, for their 5 evidence to be conducted via video link, then the 6 legislature says so. And the fact that it has not said so 7 in the case of this Commission means it did not 8 specifically want those powers to be conferred because the 9 legislature – otherwise the legislature would not have 10 bothered to pass section 158. It would have simply said, 11 well, courts will, whenever they feel like, you know, if 12 there's a child or a person in sexual offences obviously 13 they will find ways and provide for video links because the 14 presumption that the legislature doesn't just legislate for 15 the sake of legislating, it legislated that specific 16 section 158 exactly to make those powers and the absence of 17 a similar provision when it comes to commissions of inquiry 18 must imply exactly the opposite of what the evidence 19 leaders say it implies. It must imply that that power does 20 not exist. 21 Now, if then, Chairperson, broadly speaking 22 really what I've been saying is that if the Commission were 23 to grant the relief asked for, it would be acting <i>ultra</i> 24 <i>vires</i> and it would be, as the Chairperson correctly said, 25 the principle of legality says any public official or</p>

Page 24959

1 functionary can only act within the powers conferred upon
 2 that person. Otherwise the Commission would be opening
 3 itself to a court challenge and a constitutional challenge
 4 and to review the exercise of powers that it does not
 5 possess.

6 So, Chairperson, in a nutshell what these parties
 7 are asking for is not the exclusion of the persons
 8 mentioned in section 4, it's actually the exclusion of two
 9 important categories of people. They want to exclude the
 10 parties or participants and they also want to exclude Mr X
 11 who is a witness. That's really what is happening. It's
 12 not – of course the first part, that it be in camera, one
 13 can say this is excluding the public but the gist of what
 14 they're asking for here is to exclude the parties and to
 15 exclude Mr X and that, I'm afraid, is not empowered by
 16 section 4, neither does the Commission have any other
 17 subsidiary power to do such a thing.

18 Then, Chairperson, if you go to – and then in
 19 terms of the interpretation of the Act insofar as, in
 20 addition to whatever I have said, that Act must be
 21 interpreted through the prism of the Act, of the
 22 Constitution, Mr Brickhill will deal specifically with the
 23 prisms as far as section 34 and maybe section 35 is
 24 concerned.

25 [14:32] Then, Chairperson, let's deal with the issue of –

Page 24960

1 oh, just to emphasise this point, Chairperson, when the
 2 legislator wants to say something about parties and about
 3 witnesses it has shown in paragraph – I think it's
 4 paragraph 17 of Mr Brickhill's heads – no, it's not
 5 paragraph 17, probably page 17. Yes, it's paragraph 19,
 6 I'm sorry, Chairperson – rather page 19, paragraph 50,
 7 five-zero, of the LRC heads. It's just a convenient way
 8 of, I'm actually just looking for section 18 of the Witness
 9 Protection Act. I'm just using that because it's quoted
 10 there in full. It says, section 18 provides,
 11 "Notwithstanding any other law the presiding officer at any
 12 proceedings or at civil proceedings in which the protected
 13 person is a party or a witness," so this clearly shows that
 14 if the legislator wants to deal with a party or a witness
 15 it does so. It doesn't just call them a class of persons
 16 and lump them in the manner that section 4 is being
 17 squeezed to mean.

18 Then, Chairperson, if I can quickly deal with – I
 19 think on the question of the power and the absence thereof,
 20 unless if there's any other issue, those would be our
 21 submissions. On an interpretation as it is on all the
 22 things that, on the way the Commission has been handled up
 23 to now and on the reading of the text of the relevant
 24 legislation it's quite clear that the power simply does not
 25 exist.

Page 24961

1 Now maybe one should take one step back,
 2 Chairperson. One has to look at this, what is being asked
 3 for here are three things. We certainly have no quarrel
 4 with the fact that the Chairperson and the Commission have
 5 the right to declare in-camera proceedings.

6 CHAIRPERSON: The Chairman?
 7 MR MPOFU: The Chairman, yes, chairman in
 8 that case. That goes without saying, but that is not what
 9 is being asked for here. What is being asked for here are
 10 three things; one is that Mr X must testify in camera,
 11 which as I've explained now is something I'll address in
 12 another context. But let's say for now that we accept in
 13 the context of the powers that the Chairman has those
 14 powers.

15 But the second thing that is being asked for is
 16 assuming that he may testify in camera, should he be here?
 17 Here in this place? And we say the Chairperson has no
 18 power, or the Commission no powers to answer that question
 19 in the negative.

20 Then the third one that is being asked is what
 21 I've just addressed; can the parties be excluded. Once
 22 again we say the Chairman has no powers to do that. So if
 23 the application is looked at in those three constituent
 24 parts then the only power that you have is the first leg,
 25 which is should he testify in camera. Not that we are

Page 24962

1 saying that we concede that he should, but at least we are
 2 saying as far as the powers are concerned you do have those
 3 powers. The other two legs of the application you simply
 4 do not have the power.

5 So let's now then go to the issue of the harm.
 6 Even Ms Baloyi could not put it higher than that this is
 7 about the situation that Mr X may well be exposed to harm.
 8 Well, Chairperson, with respect, anybody may well be
 9 exposed to harm. It goes even further than that; Mr
 10 Phatsha, who I'm sure is here – oh, there, Mr Phatsha, if
 11 you can just lift your hand – Mr Phatsha has been sitting
 12 here right through the proceedings and Mr Phatsha, you'll
 13 remember, Chairperson, during his testimony, it's on the
 14 record that I even had to pay from my own pocket for his
 15 hotel accommodation because he was feeling unsafe, there
 16 were strange people visiting his place, and so on, but you
 17 know, he's still here, and so in his case it was more than
 18 the fact that he may well have a risk. Mr Magidiwana had
 19 the same problems. Mr Mabuyakhulu exactly, we had to do
 20 that when we were still in Rustenburg, and accommodate them
 21 for their own safety as it were.

22 So that is exactly what Judge Ackerman was
 23 dealing with, that the mere possibility cannot be
 24 sufficient, and it is only to that extent that we agree
 25 with what Ms Pillay was saying, that we don't argue with

Page 24963

1 the issue of the possibility. But that doesn't mean that
2 we concede that there's a likelihood of harm. Far from it
3 that we concede that even if such harm is there, it has
4 anything, or connected in any way with his giving of the
5 testimony in public.

6 But Chairperson, the other thing, and Mr Ntsebeza
7 will deal with the question of the discretion and under
8 what circumstances that discretion can be exercised. Mine
9 is simply to say that one has to understand the kind of
10 person we are dealing with here, and I'll deal with that
11 issue not so much on the discretion point, but insofar as
12 Mr X implicates some of the people that I represent.
13 There's already evidence by both Mr Magidiwana I think, and
14 Mr Phatsha, which refutes and challenges Mr X's testimony
15 in a few respects, admittedly not holistically.

16 So from the point of view of the people we
17 represent Mr X is a liar and he's not just an accomplice,
18 as the Commission correctly pointed out, that being
19 accomplice actually is the least of his problems. He's a
20 multiple murderer and a self-confessed habitual criminal,
21 having at least three murders under his belt himself and
22 having participated in those.

23 Now we have not been told what the deal is
24 really, so to speak. Is this habitual criminal going to be
25 charged? Has he been promised immunity? Is he exchanging

Page 24964

1 his so-called safety so that he can fry other people
2 falsely? Where is he? Is he staying in some posh hotel so
3 that he can come and lie here and perpetuate what he has
4 been saying? But more importantly, Chairperson - and this
5 is a point that the Chairperson raised in a different
6 context - going back to the issue of the causal link, if
7 indeed Mr X participated in the things that he says he
8 participated in, and if he's the only person out of those
9 hundred people who were on the 13th involved in the incident
10 of the 13th, he's the only person who has suddenly
11 disappeared in the last 18 months, then clearly the other
12 99 people know who he is.

13 Now that's the one issue. The second issue is
14 that it - so it would be impractical - and it's a point of
15 practicality - it would be impractical, or rather the
16 Commission cannot be asked to grant an order whose
17 practical effectiveness is doubtful at best, because if
18 they already know who he is then whatever precautions which
19 are there to protect his identity will just serve no
20 purpose whatsoever.

21 But let's even be kind and say they don't know
22 who he is. If they don't know who he is, well as soon as
23 Mr Semenya gives me the photo I'm going to give it to them,
24 all 300 of them, and Mr X implicates 3 000 people, so it
25 won't just be confined to the 300 who happened to be

Page 24965

1 arrested or injured. It's the whole - because he says the
2 whole crowd intended to attack the police, which is, I mean
3 apart from it just being - it's not even the version of
4 SAPS. It's so farfetched that it borders on being
5 ludicrous. But it means that all those people have a
6 right, having been accused of a nefarious intention by Mr
7 X, to refute what he says about them, all 3 000 of them are
8 entitled because their reputations and their names, it
9 means anybody, if a friend of mine or a relative of mine
10 was one of those 3 000 people sitting on that koppie, then
11 according to Mr X they were all harbouring murderous
12 intentions against the police. So all those people are
13 entitled to - and those 3 000 can tell another 3 000, who
14 will tell another 3 000, until such time that the whole
15 world knows.

16 So whether you look at it from the point of view
17 that the probability is that they already know, or even if
18 you discount that and say they will certainly know as soon
19 as it is disclosed to us as the legal representatives, then
20 it means the order really is not going to protect him, if
21 that was its intention, and from that point of view it's
22 impractical and ineffective.

23 But more than that, more than that, that reality
24 takes away the causal link because it means whatever harm
25 he may or may not suffer after his testimony will not have

Page 24966

1 been caused, or rather could not have been prevented by the
2 video link option, and so once again from that point of
3 view the order would be not only ineffective but also not
4 serve any particular purpose really.

5 I've already addressed the issue of section 19,
6 or rather regulation 19. The only thing I want to add
7 there, Chairperson, is that the hierarchy, there's a clear
8 hierarchy of statutes. Just like legislation cannot
9 supersede the Constitution, regulations also can't
10 supersede a statute, particularly the statutes that gave
11 birth to those regulations.

12 Now the next issue that I want to deal with,
13 Chairperson, is the evidence leaders' assertions. I've
14 already said that they themselves concede - inadvertently,
15 I suspect - that the powers lie with the Minister, but
16 their answer is that the Chairperson or the Commission may
17 imply certain powers. But in the body of legislative
18 material where they require you to seek this implication is
19 exactly the section that refers you back to the Minister.
20 So it's a merry-go-round which will not assist them because
21 if part of the material that you have to consider to distil
22 your implied power is a section that clearly demonstrates
23 that you do not have such a power, then clearly you cannot
24 imply it from that very same section.

25 But in any event, a power such as this is not one

1 that could be implied easily, and Mr Brickhill will show
 2 why if anything, if there's any doubt, the interpretation
 3 should be in favour of the constitutional provisions that
 4 he will cite. So there's no power, express or implied, and
 5 if there was going to be such implied power then it should
 6 have been given directly.

7 Now the evidence leaders, we would contend that
 8 their siding with SAPS on this issue is badly advised.

9 Well, firstly it doesn't add anything except just to echo
 10 what SAPS is saying, except on this point of the implied
 11 power, and they make the very same fundamental mistake, if
 12 one looks at their proposed order. Yes, there's number 7,
 13 their proposed order number 7, which is on page 17 of their
 14 heads. "Members of the public may listen to the audio
 15 transmission of the testimony of Mr X in the overflow
 16 room." That obviously makes the fundamental mistake of
 17 treating the parties as members of the public because I've
 18 no doubt when they say that they are assuming these people
 19 who are sitting here now will have to go to that overflow
 20 room, which could not have been what is contemplated.

21 These people are not members of the public within
 22 the meaning of what is contemplated. They are interested
 23 parties. They are participants, and more than that, some
 24 of them are people who are accused of all sorts of unseemly
 25 things by none other than Mr X himself. So they have a

1 right to face their accuser. They have a right to see
 2 their accuser performing and they have a right to have
 3 their accuser being cross-examined without artificial
 4 advantages that other witnesses who have to face the music
 5 here will not have. And incidentally, seeing that the
 6 evidence leaders have sided with SAPS, the fact that the
 7 evidence leaders may be with them there, not to impugn on
 8 their integrity, will be cold comfort to the litigants. To
 9 us as lawyers it might be. It might create the comfort,
 10 but for people who don't think, who think that these
 11 people's rights must be ignored, as it were,
 12 [14:51] Then I don't think that we can say to them no,
 13 now relax because a member of, someone who doesn't even
 14 believe that you are being prejudiced is sitting there.

15 So it is to that extent that we say it would have
 16 been better if the evidence leaders had not entered the
 17 fray on this one, just from the point of view of the
 18 litigants, because you know, this is reminiscent of what
 19 was in fact during the funding application when the
 20 chattering classes were telling us that the evidence
 21 leaders would represent the interests of the litigants. It
 22 would mean now that this application would not have been
 23 opposed. In fact it would have been supported.

24 So I'm afraid that it's going to be difficult for
 25 us as litigants to, or rather as legal representatives to

1 convince the clients that such prejudice as they may
 2 perceive is going to be cured merely by the measures that
 3 have been suggested.

4 Chairperson, I think I'll leave it there. The
 5 issue that really I wanted to emphasise, the issue of
 6 practicality, it has so many other ramifications, but I
 7 won't give more examples as to how impractical it is, but
 8 if need be, some of my colleagues will deal with it.

9 Suffice to say that an order that is granted which is not
 10 going to serve any purpose, in fact it would be better if
 11 it's not serving any purpose. It is serving a purpose; it
 12 is restricting the rights of participants. It is giving Mr
 13 X unfair advantages, and you know, it simply means that he
 14 would get preferential treatment unlike any other witness.

15 The last point maybe, Chairperson, is the issue
 16 of security. We say that to the extent that - SAPS is
 17 entitled to protect its witnesses, we have no quarrel with
 18 that, but to the extent that they may perceive some
 19 theoretical dangers then SAPS have got within their means
 20 the methods to meet those dangers, as it were. If Mr X, if
 21 by coming here, or rather what they can do is to provide
 22 him with security; we're not going to quarrel if he comes
 23 here with a hundred people surrounding him. That's SAPS'
 24 problem, but here he must be and he must sit in that chair
 25 and be cross-examined like everybody else.

1 We have been told that there might be logistical
 2 issues and so on. We raise that issue at paragraph 42 of
 3 our answering affidavit as specifically to say they must
 4 say what logistical problems there might be. In the reply
 5 that was not dealt with, so we should assume that that
 6 allegation falls by the wayside because maybe the
 7 Chairperson might have been sympathetic in the event that
 8 the discretion comes to the fore, which we argue it
 9 doesn't. If they were saying - let me give one last
 10 example, Chairperson, if they were saying for example by
 11 coming here to this particular venue there is this and that
 12 and that risk, then maybe they should then be asking the
 13 Chairperson or the Minister or whoever makes those
 14 decisions, that the evidence must be heard in a place that
 15 is more conducive to protecting him, and then they'll go
 16 through what we all had to go through for the relocation of
 17 the Commission to that particular place. But now that we
 18 are here it must be done here and they must provide ways of
 19 protecting him. Thank you, Chairperson. The rest of the
 20 allegations, or rather submissions are in our answering
 21 affidavit and in the heads. I didn't go through the heads
 22 sequentially. I wanted to highlight and save time. Thank
 23 you, Chairperson.

24 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Mpofu, and
 25 you timed the end of your address very conveniently. We'll

Page 24971

1 take the tea adjournment.

2 [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]

3 [15:14] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Mr

4 Brickhill, we have your heads.

5 MR BRICKHILL: Thank you, Chair, I

6 suppose –

7 CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry, I understood the

8 order to be Mr Mpofu first, Mr Brickhill second, Mr

9 Ntsebeza third, but if I'm wrong, perhaps you'll correct

10 me?

11 MR NTSEBEZA SC: No, that's the order.

12 I've reconciled myself with that kind of order. There's a

13 natural flow from what Mr Mpofu submitted to be followed by

14 him.

15 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, so I was right for

16 once. For once. Mr Brickhill?

17 MR BRICKHILL: Chairperson, that is

18 indeed the batting order. I propose to make this a

19 relatively short innings and deal principally with two

20 issues.

21 CHAIRPERSON: Are you going to retire or

22 are you going to be dismissed?

23 MR BRICKHILL: I'll leave Mr Ntsebeza to

24 score the winning runs, Chair, but Chair, I propose to deal

25 with two issues principally, the first is the principle of

Page 24972

1 open justice rooted primarily in the right of access to

2 courts and section 34, that's the first issue, principle of

3 open justice, and the second is the application of the

4 Witness Protection Act in the present context.

5 But before I approach those two issues, I have

6 two brief submissions to make by way of Gloss on the issue

7 of powers.

8 We endorse –

9 CHAIRPERSON: Are these in your heads or

10 must I write them down?

11 MR BRICKHILL: Chairperson, the first

12 point is in our heads at paragraph 10, on page 4 of our

13 heads of argument, and the second is not but it arises from

14 the debate earlier in the day and was foreshadowed by Mr

15 Mpofu.

16 Chair, both points relate primarily to the

17 question of the power to make the video link order.

18 Reliance has been placed on regulation 19 in that context,

19 which provides generally for the power of the Commission to

20 determine its own procedures.

21 The first point we make in paragraph 10 of our

22 heads of argument is by way of analogy to section 173 of

23 the Constitution, which is the inherent power of the Courts

24 to determine their own process, and we simply point to some

25 of the authorities on the limits of that power, which we

Page 24973

1 would submit is in any event a broader power, the inherent

2 power of the Courts to determine their own process, to

3 regulate their process, but that power has important

4 limitations which we say would be relevant also to an

5 interpretation of regulation 19.

6 We say at paragraph 10 of our heads of argument

7 that the Constitutional Court in Phillips has emphasised

8 that the section 173 power to regulate the process of the

9 Courts is designed to meet extraordinary procedural

10 situations and cautioned subsequently that the power itself

11 must be exercised with caution. That's in State versus

12 Pennington. And in Phillips the Constitutional Court held

13 further that this power, the section 173 power may not be

14 used to ignore or circumvent legislation that already

15 provides for a procedural issue, and in this regard we link

16 to the submissions made by my learned friend Mr Mpofu in

17 respect of section 4 of the Commissions Act, but also

18 section 18 of the Witness Protection Act, both provisions

19 contemplating in sum that evidence will be presented

20 physically in the auditorium and that witnesses will be

21 physically present, in particular in relation to section 4

22 of the Commissions Act.

23 So we make the point that the interpretation

24 sought to be attached to regulation 19 would in our

25 submission circumvent section 4 of the Commissions Act and

Page 24974

1 for that reason we would argue against such an

2 interpretation.

3 Chair, I then move to the first of the broader

4 issues – excuse me; there's one further interpretive point

5 that goes to the powers -

6 CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible]

7 second point now that's not in your heads.

8 MR BRICKHILL: This is our second point

9 that's not in the heads, Chair. Chair, the submission

10 simply is that the right of access to courts and section 34

11 indeed applies to proceedings of commissions of inquiry and

12 I'll provide those authorities shortly in dealing with the

13 content of the right, but section 34 applies to commissions

14 of inquiry. The orders sought would constitute a

15 limitation of that right and that has two consequences,

16 Chair. The first is the section 39(2) consequence that the

17 legislation must be narrowly construed to bring it within

18 the bounds of the Constitution. So where there is reliance

19 on regulation 19, section 4, or any other provision to

20 assert a power it must be interpreted narrowly as required

21 by section 39(2) of the Constitution.

22 The second consequence is the point that's

23 already been made; it's simply that the legislation must

24 exist. There must be a law of general application that

25 justifies the limitation of section 34 of the Constitution.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24975</p> <p>1 Chair, those are our only additional submissions 2 in relation to the powers issues. For the rest we endorse 3 my learned friend Mr Mpfu's submissions. 4 Chair, moving then to the principle of open 5 justice, we deal with it from page 5 of our heads of 6 argument and we say that assuming for the purposes of this 7 argument that the Commission has the power to grant all the 8 orders sought, the principle of open justice is central to 9 determining whether such orders should be granted. 10 We refer to the terms of reference and purpose of 11 the Commission, emphasising that the aim of the Commission 12 is fundamentally a truth-seeking one and that its mandate 13 is undoubtedly of great public importance. That informs 14 the application of the principle of open justice. 15 Chair, it has long been accepted that the public 16 has a vested interest even in ordinary judicial hearings, 17 in cases of much less public interest or moment. The 18 public has a general right to participate in legal 19 proceedings and we've quoted from the Constitutional 20 Court's decision in State versus Mamabolo where the Court 21 held as follows, paragraph 29, "Since time immemorial and 22 in many divergent cultures it has been accepted that the 23 business of adjudication concerns not only the immediate 24 litigants but is a matter of public concern which for its 25 credibility is done in the open where all can see." The</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24977</p> <p>1 is ordinarily in the context of court proceedings, the 2 principle of open justice has also been held to apply to 3 other bodies, including statutory bodies, and we provide 4 the example of the Refugee Appeal Board in the matter 5 involving Mr Krejcir, it's cited in our heads of argument 6 at footnote 21 as Mail & Guardian Limited versus Chipu, NO. 7 That concerned the right of the media to have access to 8 proceedings of the Refugee Appeal Board which are 9 ordinarily confidential proceedings. 10 Chair, we don't refer to it in our heads of 11 argument, but the media was also granted access to the 12 internal disciplinary proceedings in relation to prosecutor 13 Glynnis Breytenbach – 14 CHAIRPERSON: Was that a decision of a 15 Court or is that just an administrative ruling, as it were? 16 MR BRICKHILL: It was an administrative 17 ruling, as I understand it, Chair. Just one further 18 example of the expanded application of the principle of 19 open justice, beyond simply the courts. But we're here 20 dealing, Chair, with a commission of inquiry and the 21 question arose earlier whether section 34 in particular is 22 applicable to commissions of inquiry. We make the 23 submission that the right is applicable and we rely on a 24 line of authorities that have applied section 34 and 25 different aspects of that right to various commissions of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24976</p> <p>1 quote continues, but we emphasise that first sentence. 2 The principle of open justice, Chair, rests on a 3 cluster of constitutional rights, principally three rights; 4 section 34 in relation to civil proceedings, section 35 in 5 relation to criminal proceedings, and the right to freedom 6 of expression in section 16 of the Constitution. 7 In relation to section 34, the requirement of a 8 public hearing is explicit. Similarly in section 35 it's 9 required that criminal proceedings be held in public, and 10 in relation to the right to freedom of expression the right 11 has been held to include not just the right to impart ideas 12 and information, but also the right to receive ideas and 13 information, and the Court in SABC, this is the 14 Constitutional Court in SABC versus NDPP & Others held that 15 the general public is in fact the primary bearer of the 16 right to receive information and ideas. 17 So on these three constitutional rights, the 18 right of access to courts in section 34, the right to a 19 fair criminal trial in section 35, and the right to freedom 20 of expression in section 16, rests what has come to be 21 known as the principle of open justice. It's a principle 22 that enhances the pursuit of truth, an objective which we 23 submit is central to the purpose of this particular 24 Commission. 25 Chair, although the application of the principle</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24978</p> <p>1 inquiry. We cite four cases in footnote 22 on page 8 of 2 our heads of argument; Bongoza, which was a case argued by 3 former evidence leader, now Justice Madlanga, Mbebe's 4 matter, and the matters of Grundlingh and De Beer, all of 5 which concerned different aspects of the right of access to 6 courts, including the right to procedural fairness. 7 Chair, further than that the High Court has 8 specifically confirmed that section 34 of the Constitution 9 applies to this very Commission in the context of the 10 litigation in respect of State-funded legal representation 11 of the parties. That was in the part B hearing of the 12 Magidiwana matter in which Makgoka J held at paragraph 37 13 that section 34 is indeed applicable, and Chair, we 14 emphasise that his lordship Mr Justice Makgoka was dealing 15 with one of the more contentious aspects of section 34, the 16 right to free legal representation which must be located in 17 that word "fair". 18 Chair, the aspect of a public hearing is much 19 less contentious. It's clear from the text of section 34, 20 but his lordship confirmed in that matter that the right to 21 section 34 applies to commissions of inquiry. It may not 22 apply in all respects identically to its application in a 23 court, but in principle the right is applicable. 24 CHAIRPERSON: Now that case is on appeal. 25 Do we know whether it's been set down for the May term?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24979</p> <p>1 There was speculation at an earlier stage, you'll remember, 2 that the appeal might be set down for hearing in the May 3 term. 4 MR MPOFU: Yes. 5 CHAIRPERSON: Can we be informed whether 6 that – I take it the May roll has been drawn by now. 7 MR MPOFU: No, Chairperson, no, there's 8 no date which has been set down, but I think there's just 9 two aspects which I might bring to the attention of the 10 Commission, namely that the appeal does not concern the 11 facts of this matter, and so they were appealing in broad 12 principle kind of appeal, which is why we didn't oppose the 13 application. 14 CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] 15 MR MPOFU: Yes, I have mentioned that, 16 and secondly, Chairperson, well at the risk of stating the 17 obvious, that until it's appealed it's good law at the 18 moment, ja. 19 CHAIRPERSON: That's true, but the fact 20 it's on appeal might make one a bit apprehensive about 21 applying it too prematurely. But it may well be correct on 22 that point. I'm not expressing an opinion; I'm just 23 curious to know whether it was going to be dealt with soon. 24 MR MPOFU: Fair enough, Chair. 25 CHAIRPERSON: But it would seem not. Is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24981</p> <p>1 grateful. 2 MR BRICKHILL: We'll certainly do so, 3 Chair. 4 CHAIRPERSON: You obviously don't have to 5 do it today, but as soon as you can. 6 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, we therefore submit 7 that the principle of open justice and specifically its 8 civil component in section 34 of the Constitution applies 9 to the proceedings of this Commission. Chair, we make the 10 submission in paragraph 20 of our heads of argument that 11 that principle of open justice extends beyond merely 12 ensuring a public hearing, the holding of proceedings in 13 public. In the Independent Newspapers matters, which was a 14 spinoff of the litigation involving the dismissal of former 15 Head of Intelligence Billy Masetlha, the Constitutional 16 Court confirmed that the principle of open justice extends 17 to the appeal record itself, so the documents before a 18 Court. Accordingly the principle of open justice applies 19 to the evidence that is before a Court of a commission or 20 other tribunal and not merely to the idea of holding public 21 proceedings. 22 Accordingly the principle of open justice would 23 normally require that the proceedings of the Commission be 24 open to the public and that Mr X testify in person and 25 without any measure of anonymity. The question in the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24980</p> <p>1 that right, Mr Mpofo? 2 MR MPOFU: That's very correct, 3 Chairperson, yes. 4 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, in any event the 5 decision of the High Court relied upon and rests upon that 6 line of authority cited in footnote 22 of our heads of 7 argument. The contentious aspect in Magidiwana's matter is 8 whether there's a right to free legal representation. The 9 application question is we submit less contentious, given 10 that there's other authority on that issue, and in the same 11 breath, Chair, the Constitutional Court's ambivalence in 12 the part A appeal similarly related to the question whether 13 there's a right to free legal representation rather than 14 these questions of application. 15 Chair, we therefore submit that the SAPS 16 correctly concede that section 34 – 17 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before you proceed, 18 Mr Brickhill, have you got a copy of the judgment in De 19 Beer's case? I see it's, you say it's unreported. Perhaps 20 if you can perhaps – 21 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, we do have a copy 22 here. 23 CHAIRPERSON: If you have one, which you 24 must have I take it because you refer to paragraph 11 as 25 well, if you could make a copy available to me I'd be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24982</p> <p>1 present matter, Chair, is whether a departure from the 2 principle of open justice is warranted in any of these 3 respects and we had authorised in terms of the law of 4 general application the prior question of powers. 5 Chair, in the next section of our heads of 6 argument from paragraph 22 we deal briefly with the 7 reliance by the SAPS on the protection of the right to life 8 and the right to dignity and security of the person of Mr 9 X. We obviously acknowledge that these are 10 constitutionally protected rights of fundamental 11 importance. We reiterate the submission that my learned 12 friend Mr Mpofo made that the threshold here ought to be a 13 likelihood of harm. I shan't repeat those submissions, but 14 what we do say, Chair, in paragraph 24 – 15 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, you said the 16 likelihood of harm and I understood from Mr Mpofo's 17 submissions that he was referring amongst other things to 18 the Leepile case, and the wording of course that was 19 considered there is the wording in section, the same words 20 as in 153(2) of the Criminal Procedure Act, "likelihood 21 that harm might result," and that was held to mean a 22 reasonable possibility. There's a difference clearly 23 linguistically between a likelihood of harm and a 24 likelihood, in other words a likelihood that harm will 25 result and a likelihood that harm might result, and the</p>

Page 24983

1 words used were "likelihood that harm might result" and
 2 that was held by Mr Justice Ackerman as meaning a
 3 reasonable possibility. Now I know Mr Mpofu argued for the
 4 higher test, namely likelihood. Are you arguing the same?
 5 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, we accept that they
 6 are largely functionally equivalent to the extent that – we
 7 recognise that in Leepile's case his lordship Mr Justice
 8 Ackerman equated the likelihood of harm that might result
 9 to a reasonable possibility of harm. Chair, we submit that
 10 on that threshold too the application fails. It's more
 11 though, Chair, than a mere possibility of harm. It's
 12 something higher than that.
 13 CHAIRPERSON: He held in terms, mere
 14 possibility is not enough. Anything is possible. That's
 15 clearly not enough. So, but he interpreted the words we
 16 discussed as a reasonable possibility, and that seems to
 17 have been followed in all the subsequent cases. There were
 18 aspects in which subsequent cases didn't follow what was
 19 held in the appeal there, but wrongly so in my respectful
 20 opinion, but that's an issue that doesn't arise here.
 21 That's about the withholding of identity even from counsel
 22 and so on. So you say an application fails on the
 23 threshold of reasonable possibility also. Alright, thank
 24 you.
 25 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, in any event in the

Page 24984

1 present matter we would submit that there's a second issue
 2 that's more decisive on the question whether this
 3 threshold, whatever it may be, is crossed and that's the
 4 causation issue that my learned friend Mr Mpofu referred to
 5 earlier, the causal link.
 6 [15:34] And in this regard we would refer to the
 7 submission made earlier by my learned friend Ms Pillay on
 8 behalf of the evidence leaders, that in effect the
 9 respondents, the opposing parties in this application,
 10 failed to put up evidence to make out a case to show that
 11 Mr X's safety when travelling to and from the Commission
 12 each day and so on would be assured. In effect it was
 13 submitted that we hadn't addressed this issue and, Chair,
 14 the submission that we would make in response is that it
 15 was for the SAPS at the outset to make out a case in this
 16 regard and with respect, Chair, I would take the Commission
 17 to the founding affidavit of the SAPS, Mr Pretorius, at
 18 page 3 paragraph 9. And, Chair, this relates also to the
 19 suggestion or the debate earlier with my learned friend Ms
 20 Baloyi regarding possible or anticipated additional
 21 evidence relating to the costs and logistical challenges of
 22 transporting Mr X and assuring his safety. I'd like to
 23 read paragraph 9, it reads "I am further advised, I am
 24 advised further that the logistical requirements to secure
 25 Mr X's attendance at the Commission regarding any possible

Page 24985

1 threats to his life will be enormous. Such possible
 2 threats may also entail taking measures to protect even the
 3 Commissioners themselves. It is for this reason that
 4 caution demands that Mr X gives his evidence, firstly, in
 5 camera and, secondly, at a venue not easily identifiable."
 6 Chair, this allegation was responded to directly
 7 in the answering affidavit of the opposing parties at page
 8 16, paragraph 42. Page 16, paragraph 42, the affidavit of
 9 Ms Ketse and, Chair, it's a direct response to paragraph 9.
 10 It states, "The content of this paragraph is denied. The
 11 applicant has failed to show how or why the logistical
 12 requirements will be 'enormous.' The applicant has failed
 13 to provide any evidence as to how the Commissioners
 14 themselves will be at risk. I submit that there are less
 15 restrictive means to ensure the protection of Mr X that do
 16 not infringe on the principle of open justice, the right to
 17 a public hearing and the rights of the accused, the victims
 18 and the public more broadly."
 19 So, Chair, issue was taken with the bald
 20 allegation that there would be enormous logistical
 21 requirements and the SAPS was invited, it was invited to
 22 present the evidence. In reply, Chair, paragraph 42 of the
 23 answering affidavit received no response. There was simply
 24 no reply directly to paragraph 42. So we have the bald
 25 allegation of enormous logistical requirements, issue is

Page 24986

1 taken with that, it's pointed out that there's no evidence
 2 at all in support of the allegation and in reply, nothing.
 3 So, Chair, we submit that whatever the threshold, that
 4 issue is decisive because no causal link has been
 5 established between the act of testifying in the ordinary
 6 course and the risk, whatever it may be, to Mr X.
 7 Chair, in the next section of our heads we deal
 8 with the balance to be struck between the contesting rights
 9 and principles at play and we deal with them in relation to
 10 the three aspects of the relief sought in turn, dealing
 11 first with the exclusion of the public, then with testimony
 12 by video link and finally with the anonymity, the identity
 13 of the witness.
 14 Chair, in relation to the exclusion of the
 15 public, I shan't repeat my learned friend Mr Mpofu's
 16 submissions in relation to necessary, desirable and so on.
 17 What we do point to, Chair, in paragraph 27, relying on
 18 Leepile's case and Sexwale's case is that ultimately the
 19 court must weigh the factors in favour of an open hearing
 20 against the factors that favour excluding the public and
 21 that a key consideration in that balance would be the
 22 practical ramifications or efficacy of the proposed order
 23 when deciding whether or not to depart from this
 24 fundamental principle. We make the submission, Chair, that
 25 even assuming for the purposes of the argument that there

1 is a risk to Mr X, the measures proposed do not materially
2 reduce that risk and accordingly don't justify the
3 substantial departures from the principle of open justice
4 that are sought by the SAPS.

5 Chair, in paragraph 29 we deal with who
6 constitutes the public. This is a matter that received
7 some debate already in the course of today's proceedings.
8 My learned friend Ms Pillay made the submission that the in
9 camera order sought is watered down by the fact that the
10 excluded part, members of the public will be enabled to
11 view – well, to listen to the proceedings by audiovisual
12 link in a room outside the auditorium. We would make the
13 submission, Chair, that contrary to being, far from being
14 watered down, in fact the in camera order sought is of a
15 more extreme variety than the ordinary in camera order
16 because it seeks to exclude not just members of the public
17 but parties, an issue dealt with by –

18 CHAIRPERSON: Mr Brickhill, I don't think
19 it appropriate for – excuse me, excuse me, excuse me – I
20 don't think it appropriate for cameramen or anybody else to
21 walk between counsel and the Chair. That's not the kind of
22 behaviour we expect and if it happens again I'll have you
23 excluded from the chamber and if that means we won't sit in
24 public I'll take that on the chin. Carry on, Mr Brickhill.

25 MR BRICKHILL: I'm indebted to the Chair.

1 Chair, the point that we make is that the in camera order
2 sought is not watered down. To the contrary, it's a more
3 extreme variety. An ordinary in camera order excludes the
4 true members of the general public from a courtroom, it
5 doesn't, it would never exclude the parties in the ordinary
6 course. And that raises, Chair, a difficulty that flows
7 from the breadth of the order sought, which is how one
8 would even define the public if one were to attempt to
9 narrow the order to the true general public and permit the
10 parties to be present because clearly, Chair, the parties
11 in this Commission are not a tightly defined category of
12 persons. They include all of the victims' relatives, they
13 include also the families of slain members of Lonmin
14 security, potentially slain policemen. There's a broad
15 category of persons, Chair, who would constitute something
16 akin to a party before this Commission and of course the
17 order in its current form seeks to exclude all of them but
18 including the true general public, but we make the further
19 point that it wouldn't be reasonably practicable to draw a
20 line between the public and parties for purposes of such an
21 order.

22 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, we therefore submit
23 that it will be contrary to the principle of open justice
24 and that no case has been made out to exclude the public in
25 the manner sought in prayers 1, 2 and 5 of the Notice of

1 Application.

2 The second issue that we address, Chair, is the
3 testimony by video link in the context of the principal of
4 open justice and we refer, Chair, to the ordinary context
5 in which such evidence takes place via video link or
6 intermediary. It's commonly employed in matters involving
7 testimony by children or victims of sexual assault and,
8 Chair, in those circumstances the purpose of the mechanism
9 is to protect the child witness from the trauma associated
10 with giving oral evidence in a court. And similarly in
11 respect of victims of sexual assault, the aim is to limit
12 the public embarrassment or the humiliation and injury to
13 the complainant as well as to limit the possibility of
14 intimidation. We make the submission, Chair, that that
15 simply doesn't apply to Mr X. He doesn't fall within that
16 special category of persons who are effectively
17 complainants or victims in criminal proceedings.

18 There was some suggestion that one of the
19 purposes of the application was, in my learned friend Ms
20 Baloyi's terminology, to provide a more comfortable
21 atmosphere in which Mr X could testify. We submit that he
22 doesn't fall within the category of persons on whom the law
23 seeks to confer that more comfortable atmosphere.

24 From the founding affidavit, Chair, there appear
25 to be two main purposes behind the video link aspect of the

1 application. The first is to bolster the anonymity sought
2 to be imposed by making it impossible for members of the
3 public to recognise the face of Mr X and secondly, there's
4 a suggestion that the measure is proposed to secure the
5 safety of the Commissioners and perhaps other persons
6 present in the auditorium. In relation to the second
7 issue, Chair, our submission is that there is no factual
8 basis on the papers to require video link evidence for the
9 purpose of making the venue more secure. The security of
10 the Commission venue is already managed in accordance with
11 security protocols that will remain in place and be managed
12 appropriately as different witnesses come and go. And in
13 relation to the first issue, Chair, the purpose of
14 protecting the anonymity of Mr X, that's the issue that we
15 deal with next, separately.

16 One aspect of the relief sought is to protect his
17 identity, the identity of Mr X. We point out in paragraph
18 37 some of the facts –

19 CHAIRPERSON: Before you carry on, the
20 point in paragraph 34, I'm not sure it's quite as simple as
21 you suggest. If there is – this is obviously based on that
22 assumption which may not be correct – if there is an
23 increased risk that someone may want to take a, what one
24 can describe as a pot shot at Mr X while he's here, in the
25 process of doing that it might involve the Commissioners

Page 24991

1 and other people in the chamber being involved in the
 2 cross-fire or hit by a badly aimed bullet or something of
 3 that sort, that kind of risk of witnesses being potential
 4 victims of attacks of that kind hasn't arisen so far and I
 5 take it it's contended that if Mr X comes it will arise.
 6 So I'm not sure it's quite as simple as you make it out in
 7 34. There is surely an increased risk. It may well be
 8 that – there's lots to be said for the proposition that the
 9 security in place should be adequate enough to deal with
 10 the situation but it does seem that there is a chance of an
 11 increased risk which might eventuate in the way I've
 12 described. So I'm not sure that your paragraph 34 as it
 13 stands deals completely with that point but I must put the
 14 difficulty to you so you can amplify it if you wish.
 15 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, we don't mean to be
 16 glib about the matter of the safety of all of the people
 17 physically in the venue. The submission, Chair, is that
 18 the security of the venue is something that needs to be
 19 assured throughout the proceedings. It may be that one or
 20 other witness presents a particular risk or a heightened
 21 risk for a period of time but those are matters that
 22 require to be dealt with independently of whether or not Mr
 23 X is present in the venue and would continue to be
 24 addressed within the protocol. We certainly, though, don't
 25 mean to be glib or dismissive of the potential increased

Page 24992

1 risk when a particular witness such as Mr X is physically
 2 present.
 3 Chair, turning then to the issue of anonymity and
 4 the identity of Mr X, we summarise in paragraph 37 some of
 5 the facts that have been set out in Mr X's two statements
 6 and we make this point which was already debated at some
 7 length earlier, that in effect he must already be known in
 8 all probability and if he is not already known he will
 9 become known, his identity will become known very shortly
 10 after his evidence begins. The point therefore, Chair, is
 11 that there really is no effective purpose to be achieved by
 12 imposing any form of anonymity in relation to him.
 13 We submit in paragraph 41, Chair, that three
 14 factors are decisive in this regard. The first is that the
 15 restrictions sought to be imposed in relation to Mr X's
 16 identity constitute a substantial departure from the
 17 principle of open justice and would significantly constrain
 18 the capacity of other parties to challenge his evidence.
 19 Chair, perhaps in development of that submission I just
 20 need to address the breadth of paragraph 3 of the Notice of
 21 Motion. Ms Baloyi at the outset sought to amend paragraph
 22 3 to insert AMCU. There was also some indication that
 23 paragraph 3 of the Notice of Application would be expanded
 24 further to include at least the families –
 25 CHAIRPERSON: Well, the evidence leaders

Page 24993

1 in their proposed order, paragraph, extend it to all the
 2 legal representatives, not just limiting it to the legal
 3 representatives for the injured and arrested parties as was
 4 originally asked for by the police or the legal
 5 representative for AMCU as suggested from the bar by Ms
 6 Baloyi. So the legal representatives, sorry, the evidence
 7 leaders extended it in the way that I have read out.
 8 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, that is – that is
 9 so. The evidence leaders do propose a broader formulation.
 10 In that regard, Chair, we would simply point out potential
 11 difficulties relating to parties who fall within the terms
 12 of reference who are currently unrepresented and potential
 13 –
 14 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, which parties are
 15 unrepresented? My understanding is that all the parties –
 16 sorry, if one goes on to read 4, is what is important, para
 17 4 of the evidence leaders' formulation, "At least two weeks
 18 prior to the commencement of the testimony of Mr X, SAPS
 19 legal representative shall disclose the name of X to
 20 evidence leaders and legal representatives of all the
 21 parties, provide the evidence leaders and legal
 22 representatives of the parties with a photograph" – and
 23 then there's another one in 4(c). I'm not aware of any
 24 parties who are not represented. All the parties, as far
 25 as I know, are represented. Their legal representatives

Page 24994

1 aren't always in the chamber, of course, but as far as I
 2 understand there's no unrepresented party who appears alone
 3 or is, as it were, before us as a nominal party who doesn't
 4 take part. So every party, to my knowledge, is represented
 5 by a legal representative. So that's why, obviously
 6 subject to the other points you make, if this is an
 7 appropriate case for an order along the lines of that
 8 sought, it would – prima facie to me it would seem at least
 9 that the attempted restriction to only legal
 10 representatives of the arrested and injured parties and
 11 AMCU as being the people who could have disclosure made and
 12 so on, that clearly wouldn't be acceptable. At the very
 13 least, I'm not saying it would be so but at the very least
 14 prima facie, it commends itself to me, will be an order in
 15 the terms sought by the evidence leaders.
 16 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, the additional
 17 parties to which I refer might be more accurately referred
 18 to as potential parties, interested parties or witnesses.
 19 They would include, for example, striking mineworkers who
 20 don't fall within the category of the injured and arrested,
 21 don't constitute the parties known as the families. So
 22 there are additional, perhaps I can call them interested
 23 parties who may have relevant evidence and may have a
 24 contribution to make if they became aware of the identity
 25 of Mr X, theoretically they may come forward. If they're

Page 24995

1 not permitted to discover his identity that evidence may
 2 not come forward. I accept that that's, it's speculative,
 3 the submission but –
 4 CHAIRPERSON: It's speculative, a little
 5 bit on the remote side, isn't it because what is envisaged,
 6 as I understand it, is that if I grant the order – it's not
 7 self-evidence but if I were to grant it - that what Mr X
 8 says would be reported, I take it fairly extensively in the
 9 media and I would imagine that these potential parties you
 10 talk about would be adequately informed as to all the
 11 detail that he would give as to what happened over the
 12 relevant period. So there would obviously be potentially
 13 other matters, I suppose, that they might want to bring
 14 before us but the vast majority of the factors that would
 15 be contained in his evidence – in fact everything contained
 16 in his evidence would in fact be available. You will
 17 remember apart from the suggestion that people could be
 18 here across the passage, as it were, watching on the
 19 television screen or listening rather to the soundtrack of
 20 what's being said, of course the transcript is available on
 21 the internet. So interested parties, apart from what they
 22 could read in the press, would be able also if they had the
 23 access although I'm not sure all the people you mention
 24 would necessarily have access but a vast number of them
 25 presumably would have access to what's put up in the

Page 24996

1 transcripts. So they would actually see what has been said
 2 in written form. So I understand there still are some
 3 restrictions, I'm not suggesting there aren't but the point
 4 I think the evidence leaders are making is that such
 5 handicaps as they would be, would be substantially reduced
 6 by the proposals that are in place.
 7 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, the more decisive
 8 factor then we submit is that in any event anonymity would
 9 be ineffective because the identity will become known if
 10 it's not already known and that's the third factor that we
 11 point to in paragraph 41 of our heads. The second factor,
 12 and it's to this issue that I propose to turn now, is that
 13 Mr X is already a witness under witness protection and I'll
 14 deal now with what that, the implications of his protected
 15 status, which is the final section of our heads of
 16 argument, Chair.
 17 [15:54] CHAIRPERSON: You talk about his
 18 evidence, his identity being known. Now I indicated, I
 19 think to Ms Baloyi when she was arguing, that the
 20 probabilities are overwhelming that some, at least, of the
 21 strikers know who Mr X is, if he's telling the truth. I
 22 mean if he's talking total nonsense and he wasn't there at
 23 all then they don't know who he is but if he did the things
 24 he said he did, which you've summarised in your heads and
 25 if that's true then they will know, but of course that

Page 24997

1 doesn't mean the general public knows. On the contrary,
 2 the general public doesn't know and there are sometimes
 3 people, particularly in circumstances of excitement and
 4 tension such as we have as a background to the events at
 5 Marikana, members of the public might feel encouraged to
 6 take a pot shot at someone whom they regard as having acted
 7 inappropriately, whose identity they're not aware of. And
 8 I take it one of the factors which prompts the SAPS to
 9 bring the application is the object, hope of ensuring that
 10 the broader public don't discover who he is because the
 11 more people who know who he is, the greater the danger is.
 12 I take it that's the reasoning. Whether it's adequate to
 13 justify the relief they seek is another matter, but that
 14 seems to be what the application is about.
 15 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, we would submit
 16 that to the extent that my earlier submission was
 17 speculative, that that line of reasoning is similarly
 18 speculative and it's based on an assumption that this sort
 19 of information won't travel once it reaches the initial
 20 group of persons who would be permitted, in terms of the
 21 order, to have the identity disclosed to them and my
 22 learned friend Mr Mpofu extrapolated those numbers earlier
 23 and how this information will effectively spread. We
 24 submit that that is the likely consequence, Chair. The
 25 only possible effect that the order might have would be to

Page 24998

1 delay that spread perhaps to some degree, by a matter of
 2 days perhaps but again we're in the realm of speculation.
 3 The fundamental submission, Chair, is that the identity, if
 4 not already known, will become known as soon as Mr X begins
 5 to give the substance of his evidence.
 6 Chair, the final section of our heads deals with
 7 the Witness Protection Act and I think I should be able to
 8 deal with it before the close.
 9 CHAIRPERSON: I'd better not ask you
 10 anything more, to give you a chance of doing it before the
 11 close.
 12 MR BRICKHILL: Chair, at paragraph 42 we
 13 set out the purpose of the Witness Protection Act and we
 14 emphasise this, Chair. The purpose of the system is to
 15 protect witnesses so that they are able to give evidence in
 16 proceedings such as this Commission, notwithstanding
 17 possible risks to their safety. That's the purpose of the
 18 Act and a witness as defined would obviously include Mr X
 19 and, Chair, you pointed out earlier that the definition of
 20 proceedings similarly would include the proceedings of this
 21 Commission. A key player is the director who bears the
 22 responsibility to protect witnesses and related persons.
 23 Chair, in terms of section 12 of the Act the
 24 witness bears an obligation in terms of the statute itself
 25 but also embodied in a witness protection agreement that

1 must be concluded, to give evidence. So there is that
 2 obligation in terms of the Witness Protection Act on Mr X
 3 as a witness under protection to give evidence in these
 4 proceedings. So there's an additional layer of
 5 compellability there. I'll come in a moment though to a
 6 protection or a qualification in respect of his
 7 compellability as a witness in terms of the Act.
 8 Chair, in terms of the period of protection, my
 9 learned friend Ms Baloyi in her submissions earlier
 10 emphasised that the purpose of this application, the
 11 present application, is to protect him during the current
 12 proceedings and while he gives evidence and that protecting
 13 him for the rest of his life is a more difficult matter
 14 but, Chair, the purpose of the Witness Protection Act is
 15 indeed to protect on an indefinite bases, witnesses under
 16 protection. And that, we don't deal with this in our heads
 17 of argument, Chair, but I would refer to section 13(6) of
 18 the Witness Protection Act which deals with the duration of
 19 that protected status. I won't read the submission but the
 20 effect of it is that the protection is indefinite until it
 21 is either waived by the witness under protection or
 22 discharged by the director with the concurrence of the
 23 Minister. So we're dealing here with a scheme that should
 24 endure indefinitely, in effect until the risk has been
 25 dealt with or is assessed to have gone away, either by, in

1 the assessment of the witness him or herself or in the
 2 assessment of the director, with the Minister.
 3 Chair, we make the submission in paragraph 15
 4 that the Witness Protection Act maintains the default
 5 position in terms of the manner in which evidence is to be
 6 given by a protected person. The default position in terms
 7 of section 15 if that the person gives evidence in terms of
 8 the laws regulating such proceedings, in other words in the
 9 same way as any other witness. However, Chair, section
 10 15(2) provides a safety valve, an insurance power for
 11 presiding officers in effect to postpone proceedings where
 12 there is a witness under protection or, to consider
 13 imposing appropriate restrictions and the subsequent
 14 provisions of the Act deal with some of the restrictions in
 15 relation to disclosures concerning the witness.
 16 Section 17, Chair, which we set out in paragraph
 17 46 of our heads of argument, deals in effect with
 18 disclosures by officials in the Witness Protection Act and
 19 those related to them, persons discharging functions under
 20 the Act. And in effect it is a general prohibition on
 21 those persons discharging functions under the Witness
 22 Protection Act from making disclosures about the protected
 23 person.
 24 Section 17 is effectively mirrored in regulation
 25 3 of the Witness Protection Regulations, which those

1 regulations, Chair, were made under section 185A of the
 2 Criminal Procedure Act but were maintained in operation
 3 beyond the repeat of that provision in terms of section 24
 4 of the Witness Protection Act but regulation 3, Chair, we
 5 submit doesn't deal with disclosures for the purpose of
 6 judicial proceedings. There's an exclusion in relation to
 7 judicial proceedings. The key provision, Chair, we submit
 8 is section 18 to which my learned friend Mr Mpofo referred
 9 earlier and which was debated earlier in the proceedings.
 10 Chair, the submission that we would emphasise – I
 11 won't read the provision, it's been referred to earlier –
 12 the submission that we emphasise is that in paragraph 51.2
 13 of our heads of argument. Section 28, Chair, is concerned
 14 with information that would lead to the discovery of the
 15 whereabouts of the protected person or, we would submit,
 16 any new or assumed identity. In effect, the purpose of the
 17 provision is to prevent the discovery of a protected person
 18 and their exposure to risk as a protected person. It is
 19 not concerned, we emphasise, Chair, with any prohibition on
 20 the publication of the identity, the actual identity of the
 21 witness.
 22 Section 18 requires a presiding officer, unless
 23 the Director of Witness Protection satisfies the presiding
 24 officer that there are exceptional circumstances, to make
 25 the order set out in (i) to (iv), paragraphs (i) to (iv) of

1 section 18. Chair, those deal with the following matters –
 2 the place of safety or location where he or she is or has
 3 been under protection or where or she has been relocated in
 4 terms of this Act, (ii) the circumstances relating to his
 5 or her protection, (iii) the identity of any other
 6 protected person and the place of safety or location where
 7 such person is being protected or (iv) the relocation or
 8 change of identity of a protected person. Chair, that
 9 default order in terms of section 18 does not require the
 10 imposition of anonymity in relation to a witness in the
 11 proceedings. What it does is it puts in place a scheme to
 12 protect the person in terms of their new identity, their
 13 new location and their current whereabouts. And Chair,
 14 importantly, section 19 of the Witness Protection Act
 15 extends that protection to a protected witness by providing
 16 that such a witness cannot be compelled to answer questions
 17 in the proceedings on that very same subject matter. In
 18 other words the witness cannot be compelled to disclose who
 19 their managing official is in relation to their protected
 20 status, they cannot be compelled to disclose their
 21 whereabouts, they cannot be compelled to disclose the
 22 whereabouts of their family members. All of that is
 23 appropriate and entirely in accordance with the purpose of
 24 the statute.
 25 Chair, in conclusion we set out the basis on

Page 25003

1 which the majority of the orders sought, we submit, fall to
 2 be dismissed. We make the submission from paragraph 60
 3 that the orders sought in prayers 6 and 7 of the
 4 application are, in certain respects, over-broad and in
 5 others too narrow. In effect, Chair, our submission is
 6 that the appropriate order in these circumstances, and we
 7 indeed propose such an order, is the order mandated in
 8 terms of section 18 of the Witness Protection Act. That is
 9 the order that has been carefully designed by the
 10 legislature in the legislation specifically adopted to
 11 protect witnesses in the witness protection programme and
 12 in our submission, Chair, that, rather than the package of
 13 orders sought by the SAPS, would be the appropriate order
 14 in this matter.

15 It may further be appropriate, Chair, although
 16 this could perhaps be dealt with in the course of Mr X's
 17 testimony, to grant a ruling in respect of section 19 of
 18 the Witness Protection Act that Mr X would not be
 19 compellable, would not be required to answer questions in
 20 relation to that specific subject matter but we would close
 21 our submissions, Chair, with the emphasis that section 18
 22 is narrow, it does not extend to a prohibition on the
 23 disclosure of Mr X's identity, his actual name. Chair,
 24 those are our submissions.

25 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Brickhill.

Page 25004

1 Mr Ntsebeza, you'll be ready to argue tomorrow morning.
 2 Can you give me an indication of how long you're likely to
 3 be? I say that because, as I indicated, I won't be in a
 4 position to give a ruling as soon as the argument is over
 5 and then course there'll be a reply from the police as well
 6 but General Naidoo I think would very much like to conclude
 7 his evidence tomorrow if he can. Is that likely? How long
 8 are you likely to be?

9 MR NTSEBEZA SC: Mr Chairman, in the
 10 light of the submissions made by Mr Mpofu and Mr Brickhill,
 11 there's very little that I will be dealing with. It's
 12 going to be really – I don't think I'll be more than an
 13 hour.

14 CHAIRPERSON: I see. And then there'll
 15 be a reply from the police service, so it does seem as if
 16 Major-General Naidoo may well be able to conclude his
 17 evidence tomorrow, we'll certainly try to see that that
 18 happens. Very well, we will now adjourn until tomorrow at
 19 9 o'clock.

20 [COMMISSION ADJOURNED]



A				
<p>ability 24858:25 24878:8 24882:24 24896:23</p> <p>able 24844:13 24856:8 24857:1 24869:16 24882:4,8 24919:2 24939:21,22 24940:21 24941:18 24942:17 24943:8,10 24943:11 24995:22 24998:7,15 25004:16</p> <p>absence 24832:20 24895:4 24922:20 24950:13 24958:16 24960:19</p> <p>absent 24949:20</p> <p>absolute 24936:11</p> <p>academic 24871:14 24923:4 24926:23</p> <p>accept 24853:9,12 24869:12 24879:10 24890:15 24937:1,18 24951:16 24961:12 24983:5 24995:2</p> <p>acceptable 24873:3 24949:23 24994:12</p> <p>acceptance 24937:4</p> <p>accepted 24867:9 24870:3 24876:25 24895:8 24975:15,22</p> <p>access 24849:17 24860:6 24972:1 24974:10 24976:18 24977:7,11 24978:5 24995:23,24,25</p> <p>accessibility 24928:6</p> <p>accessory 24902:14</p> <p>accommodate 24846:2 24962:20</p> <p>accommodation 24955:18 24962:15</p> <p>accomplice 24898:12 24898:15 24899:7 24963:17,19</p> <p>account 24851:2 24858:21 24876:11 24876:11 24886:4 24904:1 24919:20 24957:15</p> <p>accounts 24876:12</p> <p>accreditation 24942:17 24942:18 24943:5</p> <p>accredited 24833:3,23 24942:6,11,14,15,16 24942:20</p> <p>accuracy 24847:7</p> <p>accurately 24994:17</p> <p>accused 24871:20,21 24871:22,23 24872:1 24872:1 24904:2 24940:2 24965:6 24967:24 24985:17</p> <p>accuser 24968:1,2,3</p> <p>accusing 24856:20</p>	<p>achieve 24885:17</p> <p>achieved 24992:11</p> <p>achieving 24891:7</p> <p>Ackerman 24962:22 24983:2,8</p> <p>Ackermann 24880:16 24880:16 24890:25</p> <p>acknowledge 24982:9</p> <p>acknowledged 24867:24</p> <p>acknowledgement 24834:9</p> <p>acted 24851:4 24875:14 24997:6</p> <p>acting 24842:23 24905:17 24958:23</p> <p>activities 24875:20</p> <p>actual 24892:16 24940:5 25001:20 25003:23</p> <p>ad 24922:18 24933:15</p> <p>add 24894:1 24900:25 24966:6 24967:9</p> <p>addition 24838:9 24907:18 24940:7 24942:3 24959:20</p> <p>additional 24921:1,4,6 24921:11 24941:21 24942:2 24943:13 24954:24,25 24975:1 24984:20 24994:16 24994:22 24999:4</p> <p>address 24835:19 24836:24 24837:1,10 24847:8 24862:25 24865:3 24877:8 24879:13 24880:9 24908:3 24909:16,19 24916:23 24920:10 24929:4 24944:18 24952:7,9 24954:16 24961:11 24970:25 24989:2 24992:20</p> <p>addressed 24845:22 24863:19 24865:4,5 24878:10 24879:11 24899:21 24909:5,14 24961:21 24966:5 24984:13 24991:24</p> <p>addresses 24836:20 24938:9 24952:3</p> <p>addressing 24864:5</p> <p>adequate 24991:9 24997:12</p> <p>adequately 24995:10</p> <p>adjoining 24917:5 24938:7</p> <p>adjourn 25004:18</p> <p>adjourned 24865:1 25004:20</p> <p>adjournment 24901:19 24908:25 24938:19 24939:1,8 24971:1</p> <p>ADJOURNS 24863:22 24901:20 24939:4 24971:2</p>	<p>adjudicate 24886:20 24918:11</p> <p>adjudication 24975:23</p> <p>administration 24928:1</p> <p>administrative 24977:15,16</p> <p>admit 24866:12,14</p> <p>admitted 24914:7 24938:1</p> <p>admittedly 24934:19 24963:15</p> <p>adopt 24919:25 24921:16,24 24924:11,16</p> <p>adopted 25003:10</p> <p>adult 24897:16</p> <p>Adv 24845:5 24857:18 24857:19 24858:2 24888:8 24901:6</p> <p>advance 24877:25 24941:16</p> <p>advanced 24863:12 24899:2,14</p> <p>advantages 24881:9 24968:4 24969:13</p> <p>adversarial 24880:1,7</p> <p>adversely 24872:11 24877:23</p> <p>advised 24850:14 24967:8 24984:23,24</p> <p>advocate 24919:13</p> <p>advocating 24930:14</p> <p>aeroplane 24872:17</p> <p>afar 24899:8</p> <p>affect 24877:23 24886:8</p> <p>affidavit 24835:2,12,17 24838:11,13 24840:24 24858:15 24878:16,19 24885:3 24894:13,19 24895:22 24896:6 24899:17 24900:17 24900:25 24901:1 24906:11,11,25 24907:4,5,14,17 24913:25 24914:2 24915:4 24931:16,16 24932:14 24933:7 24934:5 24941:12 24970:3,21 24984:17 24985:7,8,23 24989:24</p> <p>affidavits 24894:25 24895:2,4,9,11,22 24899:18 24900:1,4</p> <p>afford 24844:8</p> <p>afforded 24847:11 24889:1</p> <p>affording 24884:5</p> <p>afraid 24843:19 24956:20 24959:15 24968:24</p> <p>Africa 24880:12</p> <p>African 24855:11,15</p>	<p>24857:1,17,18 24880:13 24925:2</p> <p>ago 24870:11,15 24872:16,19</p> <p>agree 24846:1 24949:25 24955:1 24962:24</p> <p>agreement 24998:25</p> <p>aim 24975:11 24989:11</p> <p>aimed 24991:2</p> <p>akin 24935:1,4 24988:16</p> <p>alerted 24847:16</p> <p>allegation 24970:6 24985:6,20,25 24986:2</p> <p>allegations 24834:10 24835:4,5 24840:11 24848:11 24970:20</p> <p>allow 24832:19 24901:8 24921:17 24925:12 24927:23 24928:6 24952:16 24956:14 24957:7</p> <p>allowed 24876:22 24881:24,25,25 24906:19 24920:7 24953:10</p> <p>allows 24906:9 24921:16</p> <p>allude 24906:11</p> <p>alluded 24888:23 24889:10 24896:5</p> <p>alright 24839:9 24909:17 24911:20 24915:10 24927:19 24971:15 24983:23</p> <p>altered 24878:24</p> <p>alternative 24922:3,4,7 24924:22 24925:4 24927:24 24930:11</p> <p>alternatively 24847:6 24893:12 24894:5 24899:20</p> <p>amazement 24866:10</p> <p>ambiguous 24849:23</p> <p>ambivalence 24980:11</p> <p>AMCU 24832:6,9 24834:9,16,23 24841:14 24860:11 24864:14 24992:22 24993:5 24994:11</p> <p>amend 24833:19 24834:13 24864:21 24992:21</p> <p>amended 24864:12 24893:17</p> <p>amendment 24834:7 24834:20 24864:16</p> <p>ample 24889:8</p> <p>amplify 24991:14</p> <p>analogy 24862:21 24863:1,6 24873:1 24906:2 24972:22</p> <p>analyse 24915:23</p> <p>analysing 24916:8</p>	<p>and/or 24873:18</p> <p>Anglo-American 24880:15</p> <p>anonymity 24981:25 24986:12 24990:1,14 24992:3,12 24996:8 25002:10</p> <p>answer 24863:14 24869:7 24871:2 24875:18 24878:10 24879:16 24883:24 24885:24 24893:6 24901:12 24907:9 24909:1 24912:16,21 24912:22 24915:24 24927:16 24961:18 24966:16 25002:16 25003:19</p> <p>answering 24876:19 24885:3 24915:2 24938:15 24970:3,20 24985:7,23</p> <p>answers 24875:10 24909:2</p> <p>Antarctic 24872:17</p> <p>anticipate 24844:21 24912:22</p> <p>anticipated 24984:20</p> <p>anxiety 24867:19</p> <p>anxiously 24868:6</p> <p>anybody 24882:16 24962:8 24965:9 24987:20</p> <p>anyway 24852:25 24858:4 24867:3 24868:2,10 24870:25 24872:25 24878:1 24879:23 24893:20 24902:1 24909:4 24924:1 24927:2,7</p> <p>apart 24832:11 24841:25 24863:11 24965:3 24995:17,21</p> <p>apparent 24847:22 24928:17 24954:19</p> <p>apparently 24854:25</p> <p>appeal 24926:8 24977:4,8 24978:24 24979:2,10,12,20 24980:12 24981:17 24983:19</p> <p>appealed 24979:17</p> <p>appealing 24979:11</p> <p>appear 24851:15 24909:13 24921:22 24923:5,17 24924:21 24989:24</p> <p>appeared 24947:1</p> <p>appearing 24934:9</p> <p>appears 24838:16 24858:19 24860:12 24994:2</p> <p>applicable 24850:24 24852:17 24945:4 24977:22,23 24978:13,23</p>

<p>applicant 24985:11,12 application 24832:16 24832:17 24833:20 24834:19 24835:3,16 24835:21 24841:7 24842:1,10 24848:14 24848:17,24 24849:1 24849:19 24852:10 24853:24 24858:22 24874:3 24879:17 24885:3 24886:20 24889:11 24894:22 24908:16 24911:25 24914:19 24915:6 24916:11,21 24917:4 24918:11 24920:2,16 24920:23 24929:6 24930:23 24931:9 24933:8 24934:14 24944:4 24961:23 24962:3 24968:19,22 24972:3 24974:24 24975:14 24976:25 24977:18 24978:22 24979:13 24980:9,14 24982:4 24983:10,22 24984:9 24989:1,19 24990:1 24992:23 24997:9,14 24999:10 24999:11 25003:4 applications 24900:10 applied 24862:23 24918:7 24977:24 applies 24848:14 24851:22 24853:11 24874:5 24912:5 24974:11,13 24978:9 24978:21 24981:8,18 apply 24849:22 24852:5 24854:6 24863:5 24894:1 24898:7 24918:19 24920:20 24934:24 24942:21 24977:2 24978:22 24989:15 applying 24851:1,8,14 24979:21 appointed 24881:1 appreciate 24939:3 apprehensive 24979:20 approach 24865:17 24880:21 24930:16 24933:18 24972:5 appropriate 24839:24 24849:20 24865:10 24865:13 24871:24 24872:6 24892:7,8,10 24892:21 24894:6 24902:3 24904:13 24905:4,21 24916:7 24928:12,23 24933:17 24934:24 24935:1 24936:23 24938:18,20 24941:9 24941:25 24943:19 24987:19,20 24994:7</p>	<p>25000:13 25002:23 25003:6,13,15 appropriately 24904:22 24946:24 24990:12 appropriateness 24906:1 approval 24880:10 24890:25 April 24856:21 areas 24840:7 aren't 24928:24 24994:1 24996:3 argue 24832:2,11 24883:2 24900:25 24902:3 24908:22 24909:7,21,23,24 24910:1 24915:9 24930:5 24937:10,20 24944:21 24945:2 24962:25 24970:8 24974:1 25004:1 argued 24859:13 24914:20 24915:6 24917:25 24946:23 24978:2 24983:3 arguing 24831:25 24936:20 24951:5 24983:4 24996:19 arguments 24844:5 24877:5 arisen 24991:4 arises 24869:17 24889:5,10 24972:13 arising 24885:8 arose 24977:21 arranged 24839:4 arrangements 24898:22 arrested 24832:3 24833:7 24834:16,22 24841:13 24860:11 24864:14 24965:1 24993:3 24994:10,20 arrived 24942:13 artificial 24866:6,20 24968:3 ascertainment 24880:25 aside 24872:15,20 24892:1 asked 24851:21 24852:2 24861:22 24863:13 24865:17 24902:8 24904:8 24905:18 24906:9 24942:6 24958:23 24961:2,9,9,15,20 24964:16 24993:4 24905:4,21 24916:7 24928:12,23 24933:17 24934:24 24935:1 24936:23 24938:18,20 24941:9 24941:25 24943:19 24987:19,20 24994:7</p>	<p>24980:7 24989:25 24990:16 aspects 24977:25 24978:5,15 24979:9 24983:18 24986:10 assault 24898:3 24989:7,11 assert 24933:9,13 24974:20 assertions 24966:13 assess 24896:23 assessed 24999:25 assessing 24935:22 assessment 25000:1,2 24922:23 24923:23 assist 24839:1 24854:23 24867:16 24876:19 24877:9,18 24885:19 24901:12 24945:6 24966:20 assistance 24868:7 assisting 24885:5,7 associated 24898:4 24989:9 assume 24917:13 24918:20 24919:7 24955:2,17 24970:5 assumed 25001:16 assuming 24882:3 24911:10 24912:9 24961:16 24967:18 24975:6 24986:25 assumption 24861:6 24912:2 24918:12,14 24990:22 24997:18 assurance 24915:14 assured 24984:12 24991:19 assuring 24984:22 atmosphere 24879:25 24880:7 24947:25 24989:21,23 attached 24973:24 attack 24918:17 24965:2 attacked 24875:3 attacks 24991:4 attainment 24880:23 attempt 24988:8 attempted 24994:9 attempts 24956:1 attendance 24837:7 24984:25 attended 24863:20 attends 24907:12 attention 24857:19 24901:7 24916:20 24938:3 24939:23 24979:9 attitude 24841:8 24842:12 24845:6,10 24912:9 24915:6,15 audience 24881:17 24882:12 24890:1,6 audio 24833:14</p>	<p>24917:4 24920:22 24928:4 24929:1 24938:7,13 24967:14 audiovisual 24987:11 auditorium 24833:4 24973:20 24987:12 24990:6 augment 24900:5,15,18 August 24832:5 Australia 24925:11 24926:4 24939:11 Australian 24927:1,22 24927:25 24930:10 author 24881:11 authorise 24861:22 24920:19 authorised 24982:3 authorises 24903:1,2 authorising 24902:20 authorities 24844:15 24867:9 24873:13 24887:9 24972:25 24974:12 24977:24 authority 24850:7 24852:18 24859:2 24896:20 24917:23 24918:7 24922:18 24980:6,10 available 24864:3 24894:20 24895:5,7 24895:10,15,23,25 24925:16 24926:13 24980:25 24995:16 24995:20 avoid 24885:19 aware 24938:11 24993:23 24994:24 24997:7</p>	<p>24997:18 bases 24934:7 24999:15 basically 24957:11 basis 24840:10 24863:12 24867:4 24893:12 24899:13 24900:25 24906:14 24906:24 24907:11 24915:9 24928:19 24929:1 24930:5,16 24931:8,14,22 24937:21 24954:15 24990:8 25002:25 battering 24897:15 batting 24971:18 Baxter 24922:11 24923:6 BCLR 24855:8 BCLR637 24856:6 bear 24858:11 bearer 24976:15 bearing 24843:22 24844:6 24853:14 bears 24998:21,24 Beer 24978:4 Beer's 24980:19 beg 24855:12 beginning 24838:17 24845:23 24883:12 24942:10 begins 24992:10 24998:4 behalf 24831:10 24832:2,7,9 24908:22 24909:22 24933:21 24984:8 behaved 24897:17 24898:8,9 behaviour 24987:22 believe 24907:15 24934:12 24950:21 24968:14 belt 24963:21 benefit 24864:20 24868:17 24873:5 24908:14 best 24886:24,25 24921:16,17 24955:1 24964:17 better 24845:13 24968:16 24969:10 24998:9 beyond 24873:2 24894:14 24921:10 24931:24 24932:4 24977:19 24981:11 25001:3 big 24953:22 biggest 24954:7 Bill 24924:13 Billy 24981:15 birth 24966:11 bit 24849:23 24860:7 24866:6 24885:25 24900:25 24902:1</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>24909:20 24911:6 24979:20 24995:5 bits 24913:5 blackened 24834:3 blanked 24870:13 bled 24834:3 Board 24922:25 24977:4,8 bodies 24977:3,3 bodily 24931:12 body 24890:3 24897:6 24966:17 bolster 24990:1 Bongo 24948:7 Bongoza 24978:2 borders 24965:4 borne 24872:25 24890:14 borrow 24944:20 borrowed 24945:1 bothered 24958:10 bound 24924:11 24949:12 bounds 24974:18 box 24844:22 breach 24878:21 breadth 24988:7 24992:20 break 24839:7 24861:23,24 24862:4 24862:6 24863:15 24864:5 24901:12,16 24901:25 24938:24 breath 24954:11 24956:22 24980:11 Breytenbach 24977:13 Brickhill 24910:7 24911:5,11 24944:7 24959:22 24967:1 24971:4,5,8,16,17,23 24972:11 24974:8 24977:16 24980:4,18 24980:21 24981:2,6 24983:5,25 24987:18 24987:24,25 24988:22 24991:15 24993:8 24994:16 24996:7 24997:15 24998:12 25003:25 25004:10 Brickhill's 24960:4 brief 24972:6 briefly 24982:6 bring 24869:21 24974:17 24979:9 24995:13 24997:9 broad 24979:11 24988:14 broader 24934:10 24973:1 24974:3 24993:9 24997:10 broadly 24958:21 24985:18 Brooks 24922:25 brutal 24933:2 built 24937:22</p>	<p>bullet 24991:2 burden 24891:7 BUSB 24927:9 business 24975:23 busy 24840:15 24865:1 24894:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>C 24896:18 24949:7 calculated 24881:3 call 24844:20,23 24889:16 24892:15 24907:9 24957:5 24960:15 24994:22 called 24930:4 24936:13 24944:1 24947:23 calling 24937:15 camera 24833:1 24837:17 24849:2 24852:14 24857:11 24858:24 24869:23 24869:23 24886:22 24886:23 24887:1,7 24889:6,7,22 24899:1 24917:24 24928:8 24930:19 24938:1 24946:6 24959:12 24961:10,16,25 24985:5 24987:9,14 24987:15 24988:1,3 cameramen 24987:20 Canadian 24929:23 canvas 24950:2 can't 24841:12 24852:23 24860:11 24860:15,20 24861:5 24861:14 24863:8 24905:2 24966:9 capable 24895:17,25 24933:2 capacity 24884:9 24917:15 24992:18 Cape 24872:19 24926:25 24929:18 carefully 24933:6 25003:9 carry 24909:21 24913:2 24915:17 24921:17 24922:22 24923:12,22 24940:23 24941:10 24987:24 24990:19 carrying 24921:18 cases 24843:22 24844:6 24851:4 24859:24 24862:20 24863:2,3,6 24863:8 24893:21 24898:25 24899:5 24904:17 24925:2,7 24927:14,22,25 24930:10 24934:19 24935:3 24975:17 24978:1 24983:17,18 categories 24916:10 24959:9</p>	<p>category 24895:19,21 24917:1 24920:15,21 24988:11,15 24989:16,22 24994:20 causal 24946:2 24947:6 24947:12 24948:2,8 24948:20 24949:3 24964:6 24965:24 24984:5 24986:4 causation 24984:4 caused 24856:18 24966:1 caution 24933:17 24973:11 24985:4 cautioned 24973:10 caveat 24914:8,24 CC 24856:6 24857:22 ceased 24852:25 cell 24831:4,5,6 central 24975:8 24976:23 Centurion 24953:6,11 certain 24834:10 24835:5 24836:9,9,12 24838:10 24842:1,6 24844:24 24850:16 24850:25 24851:6,14 24867:2 24870:13 24886:8 24899:18 24902:16 24914:13 24922:7 24927:23 24945:5 24951:24 24956:19 24957:7,13 24957:14 24966:17 25003:4 certainly 24863:10 24877:12 24882:20 24883:2 24938:15 24943:23 24953:14 24961:3 24965:18 24981:2 24991:24 25004:17 Chadbourn 24881:4 chairman 24836:22 24845:11 24892:13 24905:23 24952:5 24961:6,7,7,13,22 25004:9 Chairman's 24901:12 Chairperson's 24846:1 challenge 24959:3,3 24992:18 challenges 24963:14 24984:21 chamber 24889:17 24895:20 24903:7 24928:11,15 24987:23 24991:1 24994:1 chance 24868:21,21 24876:25 24881:20 24908:25 24910:22 24991:10 24998:10 change 24846:24 24913:14 25002:8</p>	<p>charged 24963:25 chattering 24968:20 child 24856:14,14 24857:11 24897:14 24898:9 24958:12 24989:9 children 24898:1 24899:4 24989:7 chin 24987:24 Chipu 24977:6 circumscribed 24921:13 circumstances 24841:3 24842:8 24846:23 24847:2 24850:18 24869:18 24876:22 24880:4 24886:25 24889:2 24903:19 24913:11,16,20 24914:25 24918:2 24920:22 24922:14 24924:23 24927:24 24928:7 24957:14 24963:8 24989:8 24997:3 25001:24 25002:4 25003:6 circumstantial 24875:22 24877:11 circumvent 24973:14 24973:25 citation 24852:21 24853:3 24855:4 24856:4 cite 24922:15 24967:4 24978:1 cited 24890:25 24947:17 24977:5 24980:6 cites 24880:17 civil 24960:12 24976:4 24981:8 claim 24931:14 claims 24940:15 class 24836:24 24952:8 24953:19 24954:2 24960:15 classes 24968:20 clear 24832:9 24843:10 24847:9 24848:1 24917:13 24921:2 24922:20 24953:2 24954:2 24955:23,24 24955:25 24956:6,24 24960:24 24966:7 24978:19 clearly 24842:10 24844:22 24845:7,16 24850:1 24877:8 24879:1 24913:2 24919:16 24920:12 24920:15 24932:17 24954:16 24956:11 24960:13 24964:11 24966:22,23 24982:22 24983:15 24988:10 24994:12</p>	<p>clients 24861:12 24869:13 24877:15 24911:2 24969:1 close 24998:8,11 25003:20 closer 24869:21 cluster 24976:3 cogent 24882:19 cold 24968:8 colleague 24831:10 24901:6 colleagues 24839:23 24943:20 24951:5,13 24951:24 24956:21 24958:2 24969:8 Colonel 24844:20,21,23 come 24850:11 24851:6 24859:1 24877:10 24882:4 24883:6 24888:25 24893:19 24900:22 24906:21 24924:4 24942:20 24944:13 24949:10 24950:3 24952:25 24964:3 24976:20 24990:12 24994:25 24995:2 24999:5 comes 24867:16 24875:12 24894:19 24912:9 24915:7 24928:10 24958:17 24969:22 24970:8 24991:5 comfort 24839:7 24861:22,24 24862:3 24862:6 24863:15 24864:5 24868:3 24871:16 24901:25 24968:8,9 comfortable 24989:20 24989:23 coming 24877:15 24929:3 24969:21 24970:11 commence 24832:13 commencement 24993:18 commends 24994:14 Commissioner 24901:10,15 24902:10 24931:18 Commissioners 24831:17 24833:2,6 24834:21 24860:10 24892:6 24953:2 24985:3,13 24990:5 24990:25 commissions 24835:23 24836:5 24839:17 24851:20 24872:15 24891:14,18 24893:16 24894:10 24902:19 24917:7,25 24920:17,25 24921:5 24921:10,22 24930:15 24950:24</p>
--	---	---	--	---

<p>24954:23 24955:1 24958:17 24973:17 24973:22,25 24974:11,13 24977:22,25 24978:21 Commission's 24872:22 24916:20 24916:24 24930:3,22 24932:3 common 24878:21 24899:1 24904:24 commonly 24989:6 communicate 24845:11 communicated 24870:15 24915:15 commute 24906:13,17 comparable 24902:22 compel 24884:8 24921:22,24 24923:16 compellability 24999:5 24999:7 compellable 24884:7 25003:19 compelled 24924:4 25002:16,18,20,21 compelling 24898:10 compels 24883:24 24913:22 compensate 24877:4 competing 24859:17 24931:1 24934:11,16 24936:17,21 complainant 24989:13 complainants 24856:14 24989:17 complaining 24865:7 24902:6 complete 24876:14 completely 24870:2 24942:22 24948:25 24953:19 24991:13 completeness 24856:11 24881:8 24896:19 complication 24853:5 complied 24842:24 comply 24851:24 24862:24 component 24981:8 comprehensively 24891:9 compromise 24885:13 24885:23 24906:15 compromises 24885:20 compulsion 24884:2 concealed 24872:1 concede 24850:13,14 24853:19 24861:10 24869:24 24874:4,5 24889:15 24890:14 24892:24 24951:24 24954:20 24962:1 24963:2,3 24966:14 24980:16 conceded 24852:5</p>	<p>24891:6 conceding 24892:25 24893:2 concept 24874:2 concern 24835:2,9,14 24867:13 24896:23 24906:17 24909:12 24911:2 24912:22 24934:2 24938:14 24975:24 24979:10 concerned 24842:8 24844:7 24847:1 24850:6 24856:13 24862:17 24870:3 24891:13 24894:3 24895:5 24913:16 24936:19 24959:24 24962:2 24977:7 24978:5 25001:13,19 concerning 24874:16 25000:15 concerns 24873:8 24878:8,9 24896:3,8 24896:13,14 24897:20 24898:18 24906:12,14 24938:9 24938:16 24975:23 concession 24850:13 24941:12 24953:22 conclude 25004:6,16 concluded 24999:1 concludes 24842:5 conclusion 24848:7 24933:3 25002:25 conclusions 24851:6 concur 24949:25 concurrence 24999:22 conditions 24887:6 conductive 24857:15 24970:15 conduct 24850:17,20 24874:16 24936:13 conducted 24928:7 24940:3 24958:5 confer 24892:13 24921:1 24950:19 24951:1 24954:24 24955:4 24989:23 conferred 24893:22 24955:5 24958:8 24959:1 confers 24918:1,4 confess 24861:13 confidence 24929:25 confidential 24977:9 confidentiality 24837:15 confined 24964:25 confirmed 24978:8,20 24981:16 conflict 24874:18 confrontation 24874:18 confronts 24886:19 connected 24963:4 connection 24946:2</p>	<p>24947:6 24948:23 consensus 24839:23 consent 24841:3,22,22 24912:3,6 concern 24914:2 consequence 24877:17 24891:6 24974:16,22 24997:24 consequences 24852:6 24884:24 24924:5 24974:15 conservative 24933:18 consider 24844:5 24847:5 24865:10,15 24881:2 24883:18 24890:23 24892:20 24893:7,15 24900:20 24908:4 24938:20 24949:12 24966:21 25000:12 considerably 24839:1 consideration 24880:20 24909:5 24934:19 24986:21 considerations 24904:24,24 24906:3 24918:19 considered 24838:10 24880:8 24949:18 24982:19 considering 24844:14 24858:22 consistent 24930:15 constituent 24961:23 constitute 24898:4 24949:16 24974:14 24988:15 24992:16 24994:21 constitutes 24987:6 Constitution 24848:19 24848:22 24851:25 24852:5 24853:11 24854:16 24859:7,9 24874:4 24924:10 24930:25 24944:9,11 24944:13 24945:16 24951:20 24959:22 24966:9 24972:23 24974:18,21,25 24976:6 24978:8 24981:8 constitutional 24852:22 24853:10 24853:12,14 24855:8 24856:7,12,25 24857:10 24863:24 24864:1 24873:21 24918:12,21 24919:8 24919:20,23 24929:18,22 24930:24,24 24936:9 24959:3 24967:3 24973:7,12 24975:19 24976:3,14,17 24980:11 24981:15 constitutionally</p>	<p>24854:6 24982:10 constrain 24992:17 constraints 24867:18 construction 24903:5 construed 24853:16 24956:13 24974:17 contact 24913:23 contained 24840:12 24847:19 24848:11 24895:11 24907:4 24945:6 24995:15,15 contemplate 24907:5 contemplated 24849:3 24871:4 24885:2,11 24967:20,22 contemplates 24869:22 24885:17 24954:23 contemplating 24973:19 contend 24861:5 24877:19 24967:7 contended 24853:6 24867:7 24868:24,25 24876:17 24924:1 24951:14 24991:5 contending 24924:2 content 24868:11 24974:13 24985:10 contention 24899:13 24918:23 24924:7 contentious 24978:15 24978:19 24980:7,9 contents 24870:14 contesting 24986:8 context 24876:13 24888:21 24917:2 24921:6 24922:6 24923:16 24936:12 24939:25 24961:12 24961:13 24964:6 24972:4,18 24977:1 24978:9 24989:3,4 contingency 24880:18 continue 24878:5,10 24991:23 continues 24976:1 continuing 24885:7 contradiction 24951:8 contrary 24842:23 24918:14 24922:20 24951:6 24987:13 24988:2,23 24997:1 contributed 24850:20 contribution 24994:24 convenience 24879:16 24904:4 convenient 24862:2 24899:7 24960:7 conveniently 24970:25 convey 24879:4 conveying 24915:15 convince 24969:1 copies 24831:16 24838:22 24839:1 24847:23 24857:5 24870:12 24925:13</p>	<p>24927:14,18 copy 24847:17 24855:19 24863:24 24927:8,10,16 24939:9,9 24980:18 24980:21,25 corollary 24931:4 correct 24841:19,20 24852:21 24853:2 24859:21 24866:14 24870:9,10 24873:12 24890:22 24891:8,12 24906:4,5 24909:23 24917:17 24937:2 24945:17 24957:18 24971:9 24979:21 24980:2 24990:22 correction 24942:6 correctly 24877:5 24936:22 24937:12 24944:3 24947:12 24953:7 24958:24 24963:18 24980:16 costs 24904:4 24906:20 24984:21 couldn't 24839:19 24855:16 24870:1 24953:4 Council 24872:16,18 counsel 24832:9 24859:13,15 24860:3 24861:10,11 24878:25 24879:4 24946:24 24983:21 24987:21 countering 24911:4 couple 24921:19,20 course 24839:4 24844:14 24845:2 24847:23 24853:4,5 24861:19 24863:4 24866:12 24868:7 24869:9 24872:9 24877:21 24878:2 24879:5 24880:19 24881:22,25 24882:8 24883:17 24887:3 24889:25 24890:20 24890:22 24892:1,9 24905:24 24911:23 24918:24 24926:17 24935:16,20,21 24937:9 24945:22 24949:8 24959:12 24982:18 24986:6 24987:7 24988:6,16 24994:1 24995:20 24996:25 25003:16 25004:5 court 24849:18,20 24850:1 24851:9 24852:22 24854:16 24855:9 24856:8,12 24856:12,15,25 24857:10,12 24860:4 24863:24 24872:20</p>
--	---	---	---	--

24877:2 24882:16 24892:1 24894:21,22 24899:6 24902:12 24903:7,7 24904:17 24919:14 24926:7 24927:12 24929:18 24929:22 24930:6 24931:20,21,23 24933:17 24935:10 24935:23 24936:9,13 24939:11 24940:1,5 24946:6 24947:23 24959:3 24973:7,12 24975:20 24976:13 24976:14 24977:1,15 24978:7,23 24980:5 24981:16,18,19 24986:19 24989:10 courtroom 24871:22 24988:4 courts 24859:5 24898:25 24903:19 24925:11 24927:22 24958:11 24972:2,23 24973:2,9 24974:10 24976:18 24977:19 24978:6 Court's 24928:1 24938:3 24975:20 24980:11 cover 24910:10 24954:12 covered 24831:19 24840:7 24851:11 covering 24831:19 24910:2,11 crashing 24872:17 create 24941:9 24943:8 24955:14 24968:9 created 24851:24 24903:8 creates 24940:4 credibility 24975:25 criminal 24835:8,8 24852:12,13 24857:18,20 24869:20 24871:19 24872:3,5 24873:1,3 24885:5 24886:8 24887:13 24888:21 24893:21 24897:18 24903:10 24922:6 24925:6 24939:25 24944:20 24945:2,3 24958:1 24963:20,24 24976:5,9,19 24982:20 24989:17 25001:2 crisis 24955:22 critical 24880:2 cross 24894:18 crossed 24984:3 cross-examination 24879:19,21 24897:15 24898:1 24941:20 24943:12	cross-examine 24889:8 cross-examined 24968:3 24969:25 cross-examiner 24879:18 24897:4 cross-examiners 24897:5 cross-fire 24991:2 crowd 24965:2 crucial 24950:15 24952:14 crucially 24932:12 cultures 24975:22 cured 24969:2 curious 24979:23 current 24859:7 24988:17 24999:11 25002:13 currently 24840:18 24993:12 cutting 24938:19	24987:5 24990:15 24991:9 24996:14 24998:8 24999:16 25000:14 25001:5 25002:1 dealing 24872:17 24881:10 24896:18 24910:25 24925:2 24935:20 24946:11 24962:23 24963:10 24974:12 24977:20 24978:14 24986:10 24999:23 25004:11 deals 24850:11 24853:23 24859:2 24881:5 24912:25 24925:21 24953:18 24957:21 24991:13 24998:6 24999:18 25000:17 dealt 24842:14 24859:5 24881:22 24884:22 24885:13 24914:15 24914:18 24928:4 24929:8 24931:3 24932:7 24935:2 24953:9 24957:20 24970:5 24979:23 24987:17 24991:22 24999:25 25003:16 death 24900:14 debate 24918:10 24936:16 24972:14 24984:19 24987:7 debated 24992:6 25001:9 debating 24871:1 decide 24843:19 24851:8 24876:10 24892:10,21 24904:23 24919:4 decided 24848:24 24849:19 24856:21 decides 24893:3 deciding 24904:2,18 24986:23 decision 24838:11 24843:23 24852:22 24855:8 24859:9,11 24867:22 24886:12 24887:10,11 24899:19 24931:20 24975:20 24977:14 24980:5 decisions 24859:5,6 24874:11 24896:16 24896:25 24970:14 decisive 24890:12 24984:2 24986:4 24992:14 24996:7 declare 24853:7 24961:5 declared 24852:17 deemed 24837:16 deems 24836:7 default 24912:5	24929:7,15 24930:3 24936:9 25000:4,6 25002:9 defeated 24957:25 defective 24842:11 define 24988:8 defined 24921:12 24988:11 24998:18 definition 24998:19 degree 24882:9 24998:1 delay 24904:4 24998:1 delegates 24851:23 deliberately 24898:16 24941:6 delivered 24836:24 24952:8 delivers 24843:6,7 24899:19 delivery 24895:14 demands 24985:4 demeanour 24880:2,4 24880:6 24896:7,24 24897:1,6 24939:22 demonstrate 24934:12 demonstrated 24881:18 24882:13 24919:12 demonstrates 24966:22 demonstrating 24950:25 denied 24985:10 denies 24875:17 deny 24948:3 depart 24898:19 24986:23 Department 24955:7 departure 24982:1 24992:16 departures 24987:3 depend 24905:25 depending 24847:4 24897:12 depends 24846:7,8 deposed 24914:1 derived 24924:19 24927:25 derives 24835:21 24838:14 derogat 24957:3 derogation 24956:18 derogations 24866:23 describe 24846:19 24990:24 described 24946:23 24991:12 designed 24928:6,14 24973:9 25003:9 desirability 24897:12 24930:7 24954:15 24956:17 desirable 24836:8 24837:1 24873:17,19 24873:22 24874:1 24891:21 24898:19 24899:9 24918:3,6	24919:13 24929:11 24952:1,10 24953:21 24953:23 24956:11 24956:12 24986:16 desire 24955:3 desires 24955:13 desks 24863:24 detail 24835:17 24876:1 24877:13 24886:4 24944:7 24945:8 24995:11 detailed 24908:13 details 24857:5 24862:7 24875:3 determination 24848:14 determine 24837:23 24838:5,12 24839:18 24886:24 24905:11 24907:21 24921:8 24923:18 24972:20 24972:24 24973:2 determines 24851:14 determining 24937:12 24975:9 development 24864:1 24992:19 dicta 24936:9 dictate 24953:5 didn't 24831:3 24893:15,18 24956:4 24970:21 24979:12 24983:18 difference 24858:18 24897:3 24923:5 24956:7 24982:22 different 24871:11 24907:7,7 24910:2 24915:2 24918:19 24919:6 24922:6 24940:4 24953:19 24964:5 24977:25 24978:5 24990:12 differs 24916:17 difficult 24844:16 24877:4 24880:3 24941:5 24968:24 24999:13 difficulties 24871:18 24874:2 24942:25 24993:11 difficulty 24861:13 24871:8 24903:9 24928:21 24988:6 24991:14 dignity 24898:5 24924:14 24931:13 24982:8 dimension 24932:2 diminutions 24883:9 direct 24837:8 24876:3 24885:12 24905:8 24985:9 directed 24864:4 direction 24886:6 directions 24884:22
--	--	---	---	---

<p>directly 24874:20 24875:19 24932:25 24945:4 24950:20 24967:6 24985:6,24 director 24840:21,25 24841:8,23 24842:7 24842:12 24844:7 24845:7,7,11,17 24846:25 24847:12 24912:2,6,9,16,20 24913:15,19,23,24,25 24914:3,25 24915:5,8 24998:21 24999:22 25000:2 25001:23 Director's 24912:9 disappeared 24964:11 discharged 24999:22 discharging 25000:19 25000:21 disciplinary 24977:12 disclose 24833:24 24834:3,8 24837:9 24841:12 24846:20 24861:12 24864:13 24913:9 24920:9 24993:19 25002:18 25002:20,21 disclosed 24833:5,8,11 24834:21,24 24841:2 24860:9,11,15,21 24861:14 24862:8 24863:1,9 24865:18 24865:19 24869:24 24869:24 24871:25 24940:19 24965:19 24997:21 disclosure 24833:25 24834:8 24841:9 24862:17 24864:11 24864:17 24881:19 24882:9 24913:1,3 24916:13 24920:3 24994:11 25003:23 disclosures 25000:15 25000:18,22 25001:5 discount 24965:18 discover 24995:1 24997:10 discovering 24870:22 discovery 25001:14,17 discretion 24836:22 24873:10 24874:8 24880:22 24911:12 24911:17,19 24916:5 24916:24 24918:5 24929:5 24930:22,25 24932:4,11 24947:15 24952:6 24963:7,8,11 24970:8 discuss 24885:4 discussed 24983:16 discussing 24883:21 24902:7 disinclination 24881:15 dismissal 24981:14 dismissed 24971:22</p>	<p>25003:2 dismissive 24991:25 dispose 24956:22 dispute 24848:23 24849:18 24858:9,16 disputes 24849:4 distil 24966:21 distinct 24898:6 distinction 24892:15 24902:13 distorted 24940:15,16 distress 24856:17 24898:6 distributed 24831:16 24870:12 24874:22 distribution 24870:4 disturbing 24831:7 divergent 24975:22 division 24911:21 documentary 24915:16 documents 24981:17 doesn't 24842:15 24858:9,16 24862:23 24869:17 24870:7,7 24884:5,16 24891:14 24891:18 24892:13 24893:14,20 24894:11,13,15 24897:9 24903:1,16 24904:16 24905:1 24911:19 24923:5 24936:7 24937:20 24940:22 24942:12 24948:19 24953:25 24958:14 24960:15 24963:1 24967:9 24968:13 24970:9 24983:20 24988:5 24989:15,15,22 24994:3 24997:1,2 25001:5 doing 24860:25 24870:20 24878:12 24888:9 24919:21 24990:25 24998:10 don't 24834:18 24839:2 24843:23 24845:2 24847:20 24850:3 24855:2,25 24861:6,25 24866:14 24868:25 24870:9 24876:16,20 24877:6 24877:7,10 24878:17 24879:7,12 24880:4,9 24883:16 24885:24 24887:14,18 24890:7 24891:19 24892:12 24899:10 24900:10 24900:19,23 24903:2 24903:9 24908:23 24909:1 24910:3 24911:18 24912:24 24914:14 24922:15 24927:15 24933:8 24935:8 24937:6,7,14 24940:24 24943:22</p>	<p>24945:13,14,18 24946:17 24951:5 24956:25 24962:25 24964:21,22 24968:10,12 24977:10 24981:4 24987:2,18,20 24991:15,24 24994:20,21 24996:23 24997:10 24999:16 25004:12 doubt 24847:24 24967:2,18 doubtful 24867:24 24907:6 24964:17 DPP 24852:20,23 24854:21 24855:1,7 24863:25 drafting 24921:1 draw 24871:16 24891:15 24902:12 24916:19 24932:6 24933:3 24938:2 24939:23 24988:19 drawing 24846:17 24869:19 24902:22 drawn 24857:18 24859:4 24979:6 drives 24902:8 du 24857:19 24935:7 ducks 24912:13 due 24861:19 24863:3 24883:17 24935:20 24945:22 duration 24999:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <p>E 24896:22 earlier 24855:1 24889:10 24906:24 24918:10 24931:19 24946:23 24972:14 24977:21 24979:1 24984:5,7,19 24992:7 24997:16,22 24998:19 24999:9 25001:9,9,11 easier 24857:22 24877:12 easily 24878:9 24884:8 24934:5 24967:1 24985:5 Eastern 24872:19 easy 24850:17 24886:2 24939:2 echo 24967:9 educating 24929:20 effect 24852:4 24861:11 24890:17 24902:4 24984:8,12 24992:7 24997:25 24999:20,24 25000:11,17,20 25001:16 25003:5 effective 24867:10 24908:18 24992:11</p>	<p>effectively 24882:24 24892:25 24897:1 24900:22 24910:2 24922:23 24923:23 24924:3 24954:20 24989:16 24997:23 25000:24 effectiveness 24964:17 effects 24928:14 efficacy 24865:20 24871:18 24986:22 efficient 24867:24 24868:1 either 24845:14 24860:16 24865:14 24873:25 24912:18 24917:7 24928:4 24944:5 24950:19 24953:13 24999:21 24999:25 elaborate 24897:22 elect 24884:8 elected 24884:8 electronic 24856:8 electronically 24857:4 embarrassment 24989:12 embodied 24998:25 emerged 24925:7 eminent 24946:24 emotional 24898:6 emphasis 25003:21 emphasise 24888:19 24930:9,21 24960:1 24969:5 24976:1 24978:14 24998:14 25001:10,12,19 emphasised 24888:22 24929:24 24947:11 24956:2 24973:7 24999:10 emphasising 24975:11 employed 24989:6 empowered 24838:2 24918:20 24921:11 24956:8 24959:15 empowering 24843:14 empowers 24838:5 24839:18 24858:23 24905:10 enable 24867:12 24877:2 24922:3 24924:21 enabled 24867:18 24987:10 enactment 24922:22 24923:22 encouraged 24997:5 endeavour 24842:13 endorse 24972:8 24975:2 endure 24999:24 engaged 24875:9 engagement 24865:7 enhances 24976:22 enormous 24985:1,12</p>	<p>24985:20,25 enquire 24846:1,2 enquiry 24838:22 24850:23 24915:2 24936:15,17 ensure 24844:9,25 24888:24 24891:11 24907:12 24937:23 24940:14 24985:15 ensuring 24933:12 24981:12 24997:9 entail 24985:2 entered 24968:16 entirely 24868:20 25002:23 entitled 24884:9,13 24931:24 24965:8,13 24969:17 entrenched 24851:23 24929:16 envisage 24917:11 envisaged 24947:14 24995:5 envisages 24879:17 24916:21 equally 24920:20 equated 24983:8 equivalent 24856:13 24983:6 err 24933:17 especially 24936:12 essentially 24835:3,15 24916:10 24926:24 24927:21 24950:17 established 24878:22 24926:20 24944:12 24947:15 24986:5 esteemed 24859:13 etcetera 24938:11 evaluate 24896:23 24897:6 event 24845:1 24861:10 24966:25 24970:7 24973:1 24980:4 24983:25 24996:8 events 24850:21 24885:8 24997:4 eventually 24875:7 24912:4 24921:3 eventuate 24991:11 eventuation 24946:3,5 everybody 24831:23 24847:17 24859:24 24969:25 evidential 24949:11 ex 24843:24 exactly 24847:10,25 24897:12 24898:16 24929:1 24943:14 24949:1 24958:16,18 24962:19,22 24966:19 exaggerated 24941:6 examination 24894:19 example 24843:14</p>
--	--	---	---	---

24850:17,19 24851:2 24852:11 24856:19 24860:12 24869:13 24870:5 24874:24 24876:9 24886:2,3,9 24894:11 24898:2 24906:1 24922:5 24941:6 24945:2 24948:22 24952:17 24955:20 24956:14 24970:10,10 24977:4 24977:18 24994:19 examples 24944:20 24955:6 24956:6 24969:7 exception 24951:14 exceptional 24842:8 24847:1 24913:16,20 24914:25 25001:24 exceptions 24900:12 exchange 24880:1,7 24944:3 exchanging 24963:25 excitement 24997:3 exclude 24836:16,23 24912:17 24929:10 24952:6 24953:17,19 24953:25 24954:2,13 24956:19 24957:14 24959:9,10,14,15 24987:16 24988:5,17 24988:24 excluded 24836:14 24837:6 24871:20 24917:14 24954:15 24961:21 24987:10 24987:23 excludes 24988:3 excluding 24870:8,8 24959:13 24986:20 exclusion 24836:6 24928:11,14 24954:11 24956:12 24959:7,8 24986:11 24986:14 25001:6 excuse 24974:4 24987:19,19,19 exercise 24839:19,23 24859:3 24874:8 24876:23 24883:13 24892:21 24904:6,23 24905:2,5,25 24911:16 24915:1 24916:5,24 24929:5 24930:22 24932:3,11 24936:14,22,24 24937:24 24959:4 exercised 24880:22 24892:17 24904:19 24906:4 24930:25 24963:8 24973:11 exercises 24873:10 24906:8 exercising 24940:10 exist 24842:9 24847:2 24852:25 24913:17	24937:20 24950:1 24958:20 24960:25 24974:24 existence 24949:20 24951:12 24958:1 exists 24898:24 24904:6 24913:20 expanded 24977:18 24992:23 expect 24915:8 24987:22 expected 24914:18 expecting 24863:14 expects 24897:17 experience 24935:10 24935:24 experiences 24931:25 24932:6 experts 24919:23 explain 24945:7 explained 24961:11 explaining 24839:16 24943:21 explanation 24875:8 explanations 24876:14 explicit 24976:8 expose 24835:11 exposed 24883:5 24962:7,9 exposing 24929:21 exposure 24870:2 24881:19 24906:16 25001:18 express 24864:2 24920:4,13 24921:25 24923:12,16 24925:6 24925:8 24967:4 expressed 24880:9 24909:12 24955:9 expressing 24979:22 expression 24837:3 24903:5 24976:6,10 24976:20 expressions 24850:9 expressly 24880:19 24893:18,22 24918:1 24920:6,18 24921:11 24925:2 24928:4 extend 24993:1 25003:22 extended 24993:7 extends 24981:11,16 25002:15 extensive 24838:25 extensively 24995:8 extent 24851:7,15 24863:6 24864:10 24868:21 24871:15 24878:7 24879:21 24882:25 24884:10 24895:18 24924:10 24932:25 24944:19 24945:5 24962:24 24968:15 24969:16 24969:18 24983:6 24997:16	external 24840:1 24843:14 extra 24839:8 24900:6 24900:17 extraordinary 24973:9 extrapolated 24997:22 extreme 24859:24 24987:15 24988:3 eye 24944:1,1 <hr/> F <hr/> face 24932:1 24968:1,4 24990:3 facie 24860:18 24879:10 24928:9,20 24937:13 24994:8,14 facilitate 24957:12 facilities 24847:11 24955:8 factor 24868:11 24872:6 24878:7 24882:19 24883:1,17 24889:24 24906:18 24916:23 24932:11 24932:21 24933:11 24933:14 24939:19 24940:18 24941:15 24996:8,10,11 factors 24877:1 24883:4,7 24890:13 24898:7 24904:1,18 24904:21 24906:7 24916:3 24919:20 24930:17 24938:23 24939:16 24940:7 24941:21,23 24986:19,20 24992:14 24995:14 24997:8 facts 24858:22 24861:14,16 24880:24 24882:3 24902:16 24911:16 24919:11 24947:14 24949:15 24979:11 24990:18 24992:5 factual 24850:23 24897:12 24911:1 24930:16 24931:14 24931:17,22 24932:5 24934:7 24990:7 failed 24984:10 24985:11,12 fails 24983:10,22 failure 24876:11 fair 24848:25 24849:19 24857:14,15 24878:22 24909:3 24940:2 24976:19 24978:17 24979:24 fairer 24908:17 Fairfax 24925:18 24926:1 fairly 24893:25 24995:8 fairness 24889:3	24897:10 24900:8 24904:25 24978:6 fall 24875:25 24942:23 24943:3 24953:24 24989:15,22 24993:11 24994:20 25003:1 fallacies 24954:8 falls 24885:11 24895:19,21 24970:6 false 24876:25 falsely 24964:2 falsify 24881:15 24938:11 falsities 24881:19 familiar 24872:21 families 24832:4,5 24860:13 24955:8,18 24988:13 24992:24 24994:21 family 24832:2 24835:11,15 24860:16 24867:14 25002:22 famous 24851:2 far 24844:7 24856:13 24862:17 24867:10 24875:25 24877:13 24879:13 24892:12 24894:2 24918:24 24928:20 24932:7 24935:5,24 24942:18 24947:21 24959:23 24962:2 24963:2 24987:13 24991:4 24993:24 24994:1 farfetched 24965:4 Farlam 24946:23 24947:7,11 fashionable 24897:16 fatal 24924:5 favour 24883:7 24906:8 24918:18 24929:5 24937:3,24 24939:17,18 24941:24 24951:22 24967:3 24986:19,20 favours 24906:18,18 fear 24868:12 24881:18 24883:4 24924:5 24947:24 feature 24932:10 24938:2,8 features 24916:19 24948:1 FEBRUARY 24831:1 feed 24879:20 24917:4 24920:22 24928:4 24929:1 24938:7,13 24958:11 24997:5 feeling 24962:15 feelings 24953:1,8 fermenting 24874:17 field 24928:24 file 24900:4 filed 24906:25 24914:1	24933:7 final 24996:15 24998:6 finally 24916:6 24986:12 find 24837:14 24844:15 24853:25 24855:16 24857:1,23 24871:11 24872:7 24881:1 24892:19 24896:25 24921:3 24926:10,15 24926:23 24949:10 24958:13 finding 24872:19,22 findings 24850:4,16,25 24872:11,14,14 24874:12,15 24877:11 finds 24837:3 finish 24858:12 24945:9 finished 24844:24 first 24836:15 24878:22 24880:10 24881:10,15 24882:11 24889:16 24892:20 24893:23 24894:4 24905:1 24915:23 24916:11 24916:20 24917:22 24928:10 24938:2 24940:11 24945:13 24951:9 24956:25 24959:12 24961:24 24971:8,25 24972:2 24972:11,21 24974:3 24974:16 24976:1 24986:11 24990:1,13 24992:14 firstly 24838:19 24842:11 24874:10 24881:6 24930:19 24933:24 24937:25 24951:4 24967:9 24985:4 five-zero 24960:7 fixed 24868:16 flexible 24874:1 flow 24861:25 24971:13 flowing 24866:22 flows 24943:12 24988:6 focus 24852:2 follow 24852:6 24883:9 24892:9 24983:18 followed 24895:17,20 24895:25 24922:16 24971:13 24983:17 following 24840:17 24881:10 24914:6 24938:13 25002:1 follows 24879:17 24975:21 footnote 24977:6 24978:1 24980:6 fora 24922:5 force 24912:19
--	---	--	--	---

forced 24933:4	24897:5,21 24899:21	24914:4,23 24915:13	24943:2,3 24950:25	24846:4 24847:10
fore 24970:8	24922:23 24923:23	24918:7 24957:16	24951:2 24963:24	24882:23 24883:6
foreshadowed	24924:2	24964:23 24969:7	24964:6,23 24965:20	24919:5 24934:20,23
24899:16 24913:25	function 24921:17	24970:9 24995:11	24967:5 24968:24	24949:3 24955:11
24917:7 24972:14	functionally 24983:6	24998:5,10,15	24969:2,10,22	24956:7
forever 24867:8,20	functionary 24922:19	24999:1,3 25004:2,4	24971:21,22	happened 24882:6
forgive 24902:24	24959:1	given 24836:23	24979:23 25004:12	24955:10,20
form 24896:3 24905:15	functions 25000:19,21	24838:23 24839:1	good 24852:11	24964:25 24995:11
24907:21 24916:16	fundamental 24967:11	24841:3 24846:4	24864:10 24893:14	happening 24959:11
24922:7 24940:4	24967:16 24982:10	24847:23 24866:7	24900:24 24927:1	happens 24838:25
24988:17 24992:12	24986:24 24998:3	24867:25 24870:11	24948:22 24950:12	24845:1 24952:15
24996:2	fundamentally	24871:13 24872:6	24979:17	24987:22 25004:18
former 24978:3	24975:12	24874:19 24875:8	governed 24862:17	happier 24890:6
24981:14	funding 24955:23	24884:23 24894:16	government 24930:1	happy 24865:8,16
forms 24848:20	24956:1 24968:19	24894:23 24907:3,6	graduate 24949:21	24882:15 24937:17
formulated 24863:2	further 24837:3,13,18	24910:15 24917:16	Grahamstown	24943:6
formulation 24923:3	24852:6,18 24853:5	24921:25 24923:17	24872:21	harbouring 24965:11
24955:2 24993:9,17	24860:7 24862:12	24952:7,12,13	grant 24834:19	hardened 24897:18
forth 24898:5 24913:1	24864:15,22 24885:4	24967:6 24980:9	24835:20 24859:1	harm 24835:11,11
24914:2	24887:8 24893:4	25000:6	24871:17 24873:10	24856:18 24858:20
forthcoming 24882:8	24924:12 24933:24	gives 24868:9 24889:17	24891:25 24916:1,5	24867:20 24880:20
24914:3,19	24936:8 24940:8	24889:21 24921:7	24917:3 24920:5,14	24935:17 24937:19
fortiori 24889:25	24955:25 24956:1	24964:23 24985:4	24921:11 24928:22	24944:16,19
forum 24838:9	24962:9 24973:13	24999:12 25000:7	24930:23 24940:10	24945:19 24946:5,8,8
24849:21 24850:1,8	24974:4 24977:17	giving 24837:5	24940:25 24943:3	24947:13,20 24948:5
24851:7,12,13	24978:7 24984:23,24	24843:24 24868:14	24958:23 24964:16	24948:20 24949:10
24858:18	24988:18 24992:24	24897:13 24900:8	24975:7 24995:6,7	24949:13,15,19
forward 24882:4	25003:15	24912:20 24941:4	25003:17	24962:5,7,9 24963:2
24994:25 24995:2	future 24847:8	24963:4 24969:12	granted 24872:3	24963:3 24965:24
found 24852:11,16		24989:10	24920:23 24922:19	24982:13,16,21,23,24
24925:10 24940:1	G	glib 24991:16,25	24969:9 24975:9	24982:25 24983:1,8,9
24949:20		Gloss 24972:6	24977:11	24983:11
founding 24931:15	gain 24876:15	Glynnis 24977:13	granting 24867:4	hasn't 24839:3
24934:5 24984:17	gate 24856:6	go 24846:19 24860:7	24929:6 24937:25	24877:20 24893:9
24989:24	general 24837:6	24865:3 24892:12	24939:18 24941:24	24913:24 24991:4
four 24978:1	24847:21 24848:1	24900:5,15 24918:17	grateful 24831:4	haven't 24842:2
fourth 24917:1	24951:16 24952:5	24918:18 24921:10	24855:18 24864:22	24899:21 24903:15
24920:21	24954:10,12	24930:17 24931:17	24897:21 24946:14	24904:11 24905:1
framework 24848:13	24956:19,25 24957:8	24931:24 24934:15	24981:1	24910:21 24912:8
24957:5	24974:24 24975:18	24937:9 24938:23	gratitude 24864:2	24914:13 24922:9
frankly 24890:18	24976:15 24982:4	24941:19 24943:2,11	great 24975:13	24928:9
fray 24968:17	24988:4,9,18 24997:1	24945:7 24946:21	greater 24868:7	head 24881:10
free 24931:12 24932:4	24997:2 25000:20	24952:2 24953:8	24876:25 24877:25	24981:15
24933:13 24947:25	25004:6	24959:18 24962:5	24928:6 24997:11	headed 24941:25
24978:16 24980:8,13	generali 24957:4	24967:19 24970:15	group 24954:2	heading 24836:19
freedom 24848:19,20	generally 24972:19	24970:16,21	24997:20	24951:3
24924:15 24976:5,10	genesis 24951:17	24990:12	groupings 24874:17	hear 24831:23
24976:19	Gertzen 24922:17	goes 24873:2 24935:11	Grundlingh 24978:4	24837:16 24864:20
freely 24867:17,18	getting 24879:1	24936:23 24938:15	Guardian 24977:6	24865:15 24881:20
24868:6 24891:10	24901:15	24948:2 24961:8	guidance 24859:4	24917:12 24937:13
friend 24909:19	gist 24959:13	24962:9 24974:5	guidelines 24859:4	heard 24836:21,21
24965:9 24973:16	give 24831:10 24844:16	24993:16		24856:22 24861:5
24975:3 24982:12	24852:21,25 24853:2	going 24831:6	H	24870:17 24904:11
24984:4,7,19	24854:18 24855:5	24838:24 24839:5	H 24947:18	24947:21 24952:4,20
24986:15 24987:8	24856:6 24862:12	24840:16 24842:13	habitual 24963:20,24	24970:14
24989:19 24997:22	24863:14 24864:23	24843:13,18	hadn't 24984:13	hearing 24836:25
24999:9 25001:8	24868:2 24869:16	24844:19 24845:6	Haldane 24880:14	24841:7 24848:25
friends 24864:21	24871:2 24873:5	24846:5 24847:10	half 24873:25	24849:5,20 24858:24
24899:25 24900:23	24879:24 24884:22	24845:18 24865:18	hand 24832:13 24883:8	24889:18 24894:21
24908:6 24927:9	24885:1 24886:4,6	24897:14 24905:15	24924:3 24962:11	24908:14 24916:12
front 24849:7 24890:5	24891:19 24892:14	24905:16 24908:21	handicapped 24877:15	24918:2 24920:8
fry 24964:1	24893:3,5,9,10,10,17	24909:21,22,24	handicaps 24996:5	24931:5,23 24934:1
full 24831:23 24856:4	24893:18,25 24894:6	24910:1,9 24911:17	handled 24886:7	24940:20 24952:9
24857:5 24960:10	24897:19 24898:5	24912:18 24915:18	24960:22	24953:20 24976:8
fullness 24873:8	24899:6,8 24900:6,6	24932:17 24936:21	hands 24956:3	24978:11,18 24979:2
fully 24890:18 24891:9	24900:16 24906:1,2	24937:13 24942:21	happen 24843:18	24981:12 24985:17
	24908:25 24912:3,6			

<p>24986:19 hearings 24852:14 24881:3 24928:6 24929:9,14,24 24930:4,8 24936:10 24975:16 heavily 24932:22 24937:3 heightened 24879:25 24880:7 24991:20 held 24935:11 24951:7 24973:12 24975:21 24976:9,11,14 24977:2 24978:12 24982:21 24983:2,13 24983:19 help 24887:19 24893:11,14,20 24902:1 24903:1,16 24904:16 24905:1 24906:2 24912:14 helpful 24908:13 24927:20 helps 24895:2 24903:9 24929:24 Hemraj 24845:5 24857:18 24858:2 24888:8 24901:6,10 24902:10 24931:18 hen 24943:6 here's 24900:17 hesitations 24897:7 He'd 24898:15 he's 24842:12 24857:6 24858:17 24861:1,2 24866:2 24867:17 24869:3 24870:16,19 24879:6 24882:3 24883:5 24884:5 24889:25 24890:5,6,7 24897:8 24898:12 24912:18 24949:1 24962:17 24963:17 24963:19 24964:8,10 24990:24 24996:21 24996:22 hierarchy 24966:7,8 high 24937:7 24939:10 24978:7 24980:5 higher 24937:9,10 24944:22 24962:6 24983:4,12 highlight 24970:22 hinted 24954:9 hit 24991:2 holding 24981:12,20 holistically 24963:15 home 24869:21 honestly 24890:17 hope 24844:12 24893:1 24997:9 hopefully 24867:18 hotel 24962:15 24964:2 Houghton 24952:19 hour 24863:16 25004:13</p>	<p>house 24926:3 housekeeping 24831:22 24863:19 24909:20 humiliation 24989:12 hundred 24964:9 24969:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>idea 24900:24 24950:12 24951:6 24981:20 ideal 24938:14 ideas 24976:11,12,16 idem 24933:15 identically 24978:22 identifiable 24934:6 24985:5 identified 24832:19 24920:21 24938:10 identify 24916:3 24939:19 identifying 24939:16 24941:18 identity 24833:11,24 24834:1,4 24837:11 24837:15 24841:1 24846:23,25 24859:24 24860:3,6 24869:11,23 24870:2 24870:5 24871:25 24878:23,24,25 24879:5,10 24912:25 24913:1,12,14 24916:14 24920:3,11 24928:16,16 24933:4 24933:24 24934:1 24940:19 24943:9,10 24964:19 24983:21 24986:12 24990:17 24990:17 24992:4,9 24992:16 24994:24 24995:1 24996:9,18 24997:7,21 24998:3 25001:16,20,20 25002:5,8,12 25003:23 IG 24946:23 ignore 24973:14 ignored 24901:18 24968:11 ii 25002:4 iii 25002:5 ill 24850:13 illustrate 24840:8 24952:23 illustration 24846:18 image 24869:11,15 24870:3 imagination 24950:1 imagine 24847:4,21 24863:1 24866:9 24925:24 24942:14 24995:9 immediate 24889:9 24975:23 immediately 24849:3</p>	<p>24927:16 24938:20 immemorial 24975:21 immunity 24963:25 impact 24884:23 impact 24976:11 impartial 24849:21 24851:12 implemented 24907:12 implicate 24834:10 24835:5 implicated 24848:17 24850:15 24931:11 implicates 24849:3 24862:11 24870:1 24932:25 24933:1 24963:12 24964:24 implicating 24885:6 implication 24861:11 24966:18 implications 24885:9 24996:14 implicit 24904:25 implied 24922:1,15 24924:18 24925:3,8 24925:12 24927:23 24927:25 24950:20 24953:13 24957:22 24966:22 24967:1,4,5 24967:10 implies 24958:19 imply 24957:23 24958:18,19 24966:17,24 implying 24928:21 importance 24901:3 24975:13 24982:11 important 24843:23 24845:7,16,20 24867:10 24881:1 24913:3 24918:10 24929:13,19 24930:2 24930:9,23 24931:19 24932:2,10 24941:23 24942:16 24951:15 24959:9 24973:3 24993:16 importantly 24932:6 24946:1 24953:15 24964:4 25002:14 impose 24866:6 24868:18,19,19 24887:6 imposed 24866:23 24990:2 24992:15 imposing 24866:20 24868:23 24869:1 24992:12 25000:13 imposition 25002:10 impossible 24847:7 24848:5 24880:3 24907:6 24990:2 impostor 24861:2 impractical 24964:14 24964:15 24965:22 24969:7 improve 24881:12,13</p>	<p>24881:13 improves 24882:21 impugn 24968:7 inadequate 24876:24 inadvertently 24966:14 inappropriately 24936:25 24997:7 inasmuch 24890:16 inaudible 24923:14,20 24934:18 24974:6 24979:14 incident 24874:19,25 24964:9 incidentally 24968:5 incidents 24874:24 inclination 24938:10 inclined 24871:17 include 24839:19 24842:15 24846:11 24869:11 24874:13 24912:17 24922:21 24976:11 24988:12 24988:13 24992:24 24994:19 24998:18 24998:20 included 24924:6 includes 24848:20 24906:12 24913:6 24922:2 including 24846:17 24870:2 24879:19 24924:14 24977:3 24978:6 24988:18 incorporated 24842:2 increased 24990:23 24991:7,11,25 indebted 24857:24 24858:1 24888:5 24901:14 24987:25 indefinite 24999:15,20 indefinitely 24999:24 independent 24849:21 24851:12 24981:13 independently 24991:22 indicate 24840:10 24862:23 24890:3 indicated 24848:4 24946:22 24948:15 24996:18 25004:3 indication 24992:22 25004:2 indirectly 24874:20 24958:2 individual 24916:2 24954:4 individuals 24874:17 24885:6 24933:1,1 inducing 24881:18 ineffective 24965:22 24966:3 24996:9 information 24833:10 24833:25 24837:5,10 24846:17 24857:1 24862:25 24875:1,17 24878:4 24879:1</p>	<p>24907:4,8 24913:8 24914:4,19 24920:11 24932:5 24976:12,13 24976:16 24997:19 24997:23 25001:14 informed 24881:20 24888:8 24979:5 24995:10 informs 24975:13 infringe 24940:1 24985:16 inherent 24836:10 24869:12,19,21 24870:1 24871:7,12 24972:23 24973:1 initial 24997:19 injured 24832:3 24833:7 24834:16,22 24841:13 24860:10 24864:13 24956:5 24965:1 24993:3 24994:10,20 injury 24989:12 Innes 24922:18 24923:4,6,21 innings 24971:19 inputs 24864:21 inquiry 24929:20 24951:7 24958:17 24974:11,14 24977:20,22 24978:1 24978:21 insert 24992:22 inserting 24834:15 insertion 24943:13 inside 24871:23 insofar 24857:8 24862:11 24874:8 24891:12 24911:2 24951:20 24959:19 24963:11 inspection 24932:17 24948:13 instances 24876:8,12 24882:14 24920:7 24955:6 instinctive 24881:16 24882:11 Institute 24857:1 institution 24929:25 instructions 24833:9 24833:12 24834:25 24860:22 24861:12 24862:10 24865:19 24866:9 24869:16 24878:8 24879:2 instruments 24950:18 24951:18 insurance 25000:10 integrity 24931:13 24968:8 Intelligence 24981:15 intend 24915:23,23 24916:3,6 intended 24867:12 24965:2</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>intending 24881:12,13 intent 24922:20 intention 24957:9 24965:6,21 intentions 24965:12 interest 24842:9 24859:19 24913:17 24913:20 24929:13 24951:10,12 24975:16,17 interested 24895:17,23 24967:22 24994:18 24994:22 24995:21 interests 24847:2 24876:13 24887:4 24891:8 24907:7 24934:11,14 24936:18,21 24956:18 24968:21 interference 24940:16 interim 24863:20 intermediary 24989:6 internal 24977:12 international 24911:14 internet 24995:21 interpret 24853:13 24919:17 24950:18 interpretation 24919:14,25 24924:9 24924:11,12,17 24930:6,14 24944:14 24950:18 24953:14 24954:1,17 24959:19 24960:21 24967:2 24973:5,23 24974:2 interpreted 24854:3 24873:23 24945:16 24959:21 24974:20 24983:15 interpreting 24853:11 24919:21 24944:10 24951:18 interpretive 24974:4 interrupt 24846:8 24861:25 24873:16 24899:23 interrupted 24839:16 24845:19 interruption 24915:18 intimidating 24890:17 intimidation 24989:14 introduced 24834:7 24940:8,18 24941:15 24941:23 24942:1 introduces 24934:13 intrusions 24898:5 investigated 24930:1 investigation 24835:7,7 24885:8 24921:18 24929:21 investigations 24885:10 invited 24985:21,21 involve 24850:5 24900:14 24990:25 involved 24843:18</p>	<p>24855:1 24875:19 24906:21 24907:2 24964:9 24991:1 involvement 24844:8 24847:3 24875:4,4,7 involves 24843:15 24900:8 involving 24977:5 24981:14 24989:6 in-camera 24916:12,18 24918:2 24920:8,23 24930:8 24931:23 24938:4 24961:5 ironically 24957:25 irrelevant 24944:2 isn't 24903:2,8 24906:4 24937:6 issue 24843:7 24859:16 24859:21 24864:9,10 24889:5,11 24895:13 24896:1 24902:23 24905:13 24906:13 24906:20 24910:12 24911:11 24915:25 24916:24 24920:2 24928:3 24929:3 24933:20 24937:3 24944:4,14 24945:8 24946:11 24947:5 24948:2 24950:3,17 24954:22 24956:14 24957:22 24959:25 24960:20 24962:5 24963:1,11 24964:6 24964:13,13 24966:5 24966:12 24967:8 24969:5,5,15 24970:2 24972:2,6 24973:15 24980:10 24983:20 24984:1,4,13 24985:19,25 24986:4 24987:17 24989:2 24990:7,13,14 24992:3 24996:12 issues 24851:8 24852:1 24859:5 24874:11,12 24874:23 24898:20 24899:21 24908:2 24909:14 24911:1,5 24915:22 24942:2 24943:21 24970:2 24971:20,25 24972:5 24974:4 24975:2 italicises 24881:12 it'll 24855:21 24877:9 24893:14 iv 25001:25,25 25002:7 I'd 24831:4 24838:17 24855:18 24917:11 24980:25 I'll 24833:19 24865:15 24910:11 24913:4 24961:11 24963:10 24969:4 24971:23 24974:12 I'm 24831:2 24842:11</p>	<p>24842:12,15 24857:24 24859:10 24863:13 24902:5 24903:15,15,21 24910:25 24912:7,11 24915:11 24918:19 24918:24 24919:5,6 24919:21 24926:9,12 24927:13 24938:19 24960:6,8,9 24962:10 24964:23 24968:24 24971:7,9 24979:22 24979:22 I've 24832:10,10,12 24861:22,24 24902:25 24907:19 24914:14 24927:14 24938:22 24961:11 24961:21 24966:5,13 24967:17 24971:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <p>J 24978:12 ja 24839:15 24906:6 24909:11 24911:20 24917:20 24947:9 24948:17 24949:7 24979:18 James 24922:18 24923:3,6,21 Johannesburg 24882:7 John 24879:6,7,7 24882:5 24925:18 24926:1 Jones 24879:8 judge 24880:16 24890:25 24919:5,6 24926:6 24935:3 24947:16 24949:8,18 24962:22 judges 24919:1,3 judgment 24843:24 24855:19 24856:9,21 24857:2,10 24858:5 24863:25 24880:13 24900:16 24929:18 24947:1,2 24980:18 judgments 24880:1 24925:14 judicial 24872:20 24881:7 24975:16 25001:6,7 jump 24947:17 24949:2 24957:17 junior 24859:14 jurisdiction 24928:1 jurisdictional 24902:16 24947:14 jurisprudence 24880:16 justice 24842:9 24847:2 24852:20 24854:25 24855:7 24863:25 24876:13 24880:23 24881:2 24886:25 24913:17</p>	<p>24913:20 24928:2 24931:4 24955:7 24956:18 24972:1,3 24975:5,8,14 24976:2 24976:21 24977:2,19 24978:3,14 24981:7 24981:11,16,18,22 24982:2 24983:2,7 24985:16 24987:3 24988:23 24989:4 24992:17 justifiable 24857:14 justification 24866:25 24867:1 24873:4 24877:19 justified 24850:25 justifies 24974:25 justify 24863:12 24882:23 24987:2 24997:13 juvenile 24903:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <p>K 24896:21 keep 24902:2 Ketse 24985:9 key 24986:21 24998:21 25001:7 kick 24911:25 killed 24832:4,6 24932:19 24948:25 killing 24874:25 24875:2 kind 24845:8 24852:9 24853:23 24859:1 24875:9 24884:13 24897:15 24899:5 24902:17 24907:8,14 24907:16,18 24908:24 24919:6 24953:24 24963:9 24964:21 24971:12 24979:12 24987:21 24991:3,4 kinds 24873:8 24945:3 24955:8 knew 24882:17,17 knowing 24868:3 24884:7 24888:25 knowledge 24994:4 known 24860:24 24933:4 24934:2 24976:21 24992:7,8,9 24992:9 24994:21 24996:9,10,18 24998:4,4 knows 24868:9 24884:7 24965:15 24997:1 koppie 24965:10 Krejcir 24977:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p>labour 24911:21 lack 24875:19 lacking 24877:4,19 laid 24880:19</p>	<p>language 24849:23 24862:22 24882:21 24890:3 24897:6 large 24957:11 largely 24983:6 law 24846:10,14 24848:24 24849:19 24850:24 24851:1,5,8 24851:10,14 24855:11,15 24857:17 24878:21 24880:13 24889:1 24913:4,5 24914:12 24925:11 24944:20 24945:2,3 24956:8,24 24960:11 24974:24 24979:17 24982:3 24989:22 laws 25000:8 lawyers 24892:14 24956:5 24968:9 layer 24999:4 lead 24833:25 25001:14 leader 24940:11 24941:5 24978:3 leaders 24832:3 24838:21 24839:13 24864:3 24908:12,12 24908:15,22 24909:6 24915:22 24940:8,19 24941:15 24942:3,4 24950:20 24954:19 24958:19 24966:13 24967:7 24968:6,7,16 24968:21 24984:8 24992:25 24993:7,9 24993:17,20,21 24994:15 24996:4 leading 24880:14 24922:16 learned 24831:10 24864:21 24881:11 24899:25 24900:23 24908:6 24909:19 24927:9 24947:16 24949:8 24951:5 24956:21 24958:2 24973:16 24975:3 24982:11 24984:4,7 24984:19 24986:15 24987:8 24989:19 24997:22 24999:9 25001:8 learning 24892:15 leave 24969:4 24971:23 Ledingwane 24832:2 24860:16 Leepile 24859:11,25 24860:1 24867:23 24880:10 24886:11 24886:12 24891:1 24935:3 24946:21 24947:1,8,9 24949:7 24982:18 Leepile's 24935:11</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<p>24983:7 24986:18 left 24942:17 leg 24949:5 24950:17 24961:24 legal 24833:2,6 24834:22 24848:13 24857:1 24860:10 24862:9 24864:13,14 24864:17 24866:7,10 24869:10,25 24889:7 24892:15 24928:25 24939:20 24940:20 24940:21 24941:16 24942:8 24943:9 24957:5 24965:19 24968:25 24975:18 24978:10,16 24980:8 24980:13 24993:2,2,4 24993:6,19,20,21,25 24994:5,9 legality 24950:14 24958:25 legi 24957:3 legislate 24958:14 legislated 24958:15 legislating 24958:15 legislation 24853:23 24871:11 24920:1 24960:24 24966:8 24973:14 24974:17 24974:23 25003:10 legislative 24922:21 24966:17 legislator 24960:2,14 legislature 24957:9,13 24957:16 24958:3,6,9 24958:9,14 25003:10 legitimately 24945:1 legs 24946:4 24962:3 length 24877:25 24992:7 letter 24947:5,18 24949:7 let's 24939:1 24945:9 24950:3 24952:2,11 24956:22 24957:5 24959:25 24961:12 24962:5 24964:21 lex 24957:3 liar 24881:18 24882:13 24963:17 liberties 24951:21,23 24951:24 library 24927:7 lie 24964:3 24966:15 lies 24882:3 24890:5,6 life 24848:18 24859:18 24880:7 24900:14 24919:5 24924:14 24931:10,15 24933:3 24933:10,16,19 24935:6 24937:5 24982:7 24985:1 24999:13 lift 24962:11 light 24834:9 24909:11</p>	<p>25004:10 likelihood 24880:20 24944:21,23,25 24945:21,23 24946:1 24946:3,8 24949:6,13 24949:19,22,22 24963:2 24982:13,16 24982:20,23,24,24,25 24983:1,4,8 limit 24989:11,13 limitation 24851:25 24857:14 24936:12 24953:7 24974:15,25 limitations 24896:13 24897:2 24973:4 limited 24867:2 24977:6 limiting 24993:2 limits 24972:25 line 24862:20 24895:8 24977:24 24980:6 24988:20 24997:17 lines 24994:7 linguistically 24982:23 link 24832:21 24833:1 24840:1 24843:15 24852:16 24857:12 24880:6 24889:12,20 24890:1 24891:13 24892:22 24894:3 24895:16 24896:1,7 24896:14 24897:2,9 24897:14,19,25 24899:6,8 24902:7,20 24903:6 24904:3 24905:13,16 24906:9 24916:15 24920:16 24920:20 24929:2 24930:20 24933:22 24933:23 24934:8 24938:1 24939:20 24946:7 24947:6,12 24948:2,5,9,20 24949:3 24954:22 24956:15 24958:5 24964:6 24965:24 24966:2 24972:17 24973:15 24984:5 24986:4,12 24987:12 24989:3,5,25 24990:8 linked 24956:11 links 24958:13 list 24876:8 24948:3 24949:2 listen 24833:13 24967:14 24987:11 listened 24943:20 listening 24833:14 24836:13 24912:10 24995:19 literally 24900:13 litigants 24968:8,18,21 24968:25 24975:24 litigation 24978:10 24981:14 little 24866:6 24867:13</p>	<p>24911:6 24995:4 25004:11 live 24879:25 24917:4 24920:22 24938:6,13 lives 24932:9 locate 24925:1 24936:16 located 24906:16 24978:16 location 24832:21 24846:20 24895:13 24896:2 24905:13 24906:14,16,19,23 24913:9,13 24934:4 25002:2,6,13 loco 24932:17 24948:13 logic 24895:8 logistical 24970:1,4 24984:21,24 24985:11,20,25 long 24848:1 24870:11 24882:14 24938:15 24975:15 25004:2,7 longer 24848:6 Lonmin 24874:25 24988:13 look 24847:7 24851:5,7 24854:17 24868:13 24878:18 24901:10 24909:13 24917:9 24927:4 24961:2 24965:16 looked 24843:21 24882:18 24904:22 24917:2 24961:23 looking 24866:10 24878:16 24886:15 24927:13 24931:21 24960:8 looks 24866:5 24868:10 24887:19 24967:12 loose 24874:17 Lord 24880:14,17 lordship 24978:14,20 24983:7 Loreburn 24880:17 lose 24896:6 lost 24932:9 lot 24882:16 24890:5 24892:14 24904:9,12 24926:19 lots 24991:8 Lottery 24922:24 lower 24949:18 LRC 24832:1 24960:7 ludicrous 24965:5 lump 24954:9 24960:16 lumping 24954:10 lunch 24938:19,25 24955:8,19 lying 24890:2,5,7</p>	<p>Madlavu 24901:11 24902:10,11 24931:19 24935:8 Magidiwana 24962:18 24963:13 24978:12 Magidiwana's 24980:7 magistrate 24896:21 24919:2 magistrates 24919:1 Mail 24977:6 main 24853:16 24865:22 24908:15 24914:16 24989:25 maintained 25001:2 maintains 25000:4 majority 24866:18 24995:14 25003:1 Major-General 24848:7 25004:16 Makgoka 24978:12,14 making 24840:4 24845:1 24853:22 24854:15 24864:2 24871:5 24883:9,21 24912:12 24927:17 24953:22 24955:25 24990:2,9 24996:4 25000:22 Mamabolo 24975:20 man 24898:8 managed 24926:22 24990:10,11 managing 25002:19 mandate 24975:12 mandated 25003:7 manner 24834:4 24837:9 24838:1 24886:8 24897:17 24920:9 24924:20 24951:21 24960:16 24988:25 25000:5 Marikana 24850:21,21 24882:6 24885:8 24997:5 Masetlha 24981:15 material 24876:18 24877:7,9 24900:7,9 24908:7 24923:5 24943:22 24949:11 24966:18,21 materially 24987:1 Mathunjwa 24834:11 matter 24842:19 24843:22 24844:14 24846:20 24852:19 24856:12,21 24859:13,25 24894:21 24899:19 24900:21 24901:2,17 24902:3,12 24924:3 24931:17 24933:9 24935:20 24936:8 24950:10,11 24951:10 24955:15 24957:1,2,19,20,24 24975:24 24977:4</p>	<p>24978:4,12,20 24979:11 24980:7 24982:1 24984:1 24987:6 24991:16 24997:13 24998:1 24999:13 25002:17 25003:14,20 matters 24847:9 24848:12 24863:19 24893:7 24911:22 24978:4 24981:13 24989:6 24991:21 24995:13 25002:1 maxim 24957:2 Mbebe's 24978:3 mean 24861:15 24862:16 24863:8 24885:22 24898:12 24900:18 24913:24 24914:22 24923:3 24942:22 24956:13 24960:17 24963:1 24965:2 24968:22 24982:21 24991:15 24991:25 24996:22 24997:1 meaning 24850:8 24967:22 24983:2 meaningless 24866:21 means 24839:25 24868:19 24871:7 24905:15 24922:2,3,4 24924:22 24925:4 24927:24 24930:11 24946:17 24951:18 24952:17 24957:4,16 24958:7 24965:5,9,20 24965:24 24969:13 24969:19 24985:15 24987:23 measure 24867:8,11 24871:7 24878:3 24884:10 24940:14 24981:25 24990:4 measures 24857:15 24858:19 24907:1,11 24907:19 24940:8 24969:2 24985:2 24987:1 mech 24941:22 mechanism 24938:8 24943:8 24989:8 mechanisms 24937:23 media 24833:3,23 24838:23,24 24839:1 24847:22 24916:21 24926:3 24938:5 24942:6,8,11,13,14 24942:15,24 24977:7 24977:11 24995:9 mediator 24857:12 meet 24882:10 24969:20 24973:9 member 24895:17,18 24942:25 24968:13 members 24832:20</p>
M				
<p>Mabuyakhulu 24962:19 Madlanga 24978:3</p>				

24833:13,23 24836:12 24837:6 24838:24 24850:18 24851:3 24860:5 24888:24 24895:20 24895:23 24897:5 24917:12,16 24928:18 24938:5,12 24967:14,17,21 24987:10,16 24988:4 24988:13 24990:2 24997:5 25002:22 mention 24886:3 24901:9 24906:2 24995:23 mentioned 24832:12 24838:17 24858:14 24883:4 24889:16 24959:8 24979:15 mentions 24890:24 mere 24944:19,22 24949:20 24951:11 24951:11 24962:23 24983:11,13 merely 24850:22 24907:1 24940:3 24969:2 24981:11,20 merry-go-round 24966:20 met 24949:25 methods 24933:12 24969:20 Microphone 24923:14 24923:20 24934:18 24974:6 24979:14 Middelburg 24922:17 middle 24831:6 mightn't 24866:12 mildly 24955:22 mind 24872:25 24875:12 24881:15 24890:14 mindful 24884:1 mine 24963:8 24965:9 24965:9 miners 24832:4,5 mineworkers 24994:19 minimised 24882:25 minimising 24891:10 Minister 24852:20 24854:25 24855:7 24863:25 24921:1,4 24921:11 24929:17 24953:9 24954:24 24955:4,5 24966:15 24966:19 24970:13 24999:23 25000:2 minute 24952:16 24957:13 minutes 24950:25 mirrored 25000:24 misconception 24956:9 24956:10 misconstrued 24956:21 misplaced 24954:11 misses 24953:16	mistake 24967:11,16 mistaken 24926:12 mitigate 24928:14 mode 24889:14 modes 24922:4 moment 24836:1 24868:14 24901:3 24928:24 24975:17 24979:18 24999:5 Monday 24844:4,13,16 money 24955:8 months 24870:15,15 24964:11 morning 24832:1 24838:19 24839:4 24847:24 24875:2 24910:18 24922:11 25004:1 motion 24860:9 24872:20 24894:21 24992:21 motivate 24931:23 mouth 24951:11 move 24840:16 24937:21 24952:25 24974:3 moved 24953:11 moving 24936:2 24975:4 Mpofu 24832:8 24839:5,6,10 24845:25 24847:13 24848:3 24869:13 24908:19 24909:22 24909:25 24910:5,7 24910:11,15,18,20,23 24910:25 24911:4,9 24911:14,18 24943:17,18 24944:25 24945:11 24945:17,20,24 24946:10,16,19 24947:4,9,11 24948:11,14,17,19 24950:8 24961:7 24970:24 24971:8,13 24972:15 24973:16 24979:4,7,15,24 24980:1,2 24982:12 24983:3 24984:4 24997:22 25001:8 25004:10 Mpofu's 24975:3 24982:16 24986:15 multiple 24963:20 Municipality 24922:17 murder 24948:22 murderer 24963:20 murderous 24965:11 murders 24963:21 music 24968:4 mustn't 24867:1 24869:2 24900:13	Naidoo's 24848:7 name 24833:5,7,10 24834:20,23 24837:9 24841:9 24860:3,9 24861:12,14 24862:24 24864:11 24865:18 24866:5,7 24869:14 24887:19 24909:23 24920:10 24941:17 24993:19 25003:23 named 24885:6 names 24863:9 24867:1 24870:13 24886:3,3 24965:8 narrow 24988:9 25003:5,22 narrowly 24974:17,20 National 24922:24 natural 24971:13 nature 24840:8 24847:4 24848:15 24858:22 24874:10 24884:25 24907:3 24929:24 NDPP 24976:14 necessarily 24832:21 24878:17 24879:14 24887:3 24893:6 24895:2 24900:19 24921:9 24995:24 necessary 24836:8,14 24837:1,16 24845:15 24847:5,21 24855:22 24855:24 24862:9 24873:13,14,15,18,23 24873:24,24,25 24874:1,9 24875:15 24878:4 24880:23,25 24886:5 24889:1 24893:16 24897:19 24898:18 24899:9 24907:16 24914:2 24918:3 24919:12 24923:12 24924:23 24927:3,6 24929:11 24930:11,12,13,18 24931:5 24935:5 24941:8 24943:2,24 24945:14 24950:4 24951:25 24952:10 24953:21,23 24956:11 24986:16 necessity 24863:7,7 24897:12 24954:15 24956:16 need 24843:5 24844:25 24866:25 24869:15 24883:5 24884:16 24899:3 24900:16 24933:21,23 24934:3 24935:9 24937:6,7,14 24937:14 24953:25 24969:8 24992:20 needed 24944:19 24946:3	needs 24917:1 24991:18 nefarious 24965:6 negative 24947:25 24961:19 neither 24833:10 24843:4 24920:17 24959:16 never 24948:7 24988:5 nevertheless 24882:8 new 24900:9 24909:2 24909:16 24925:17 24926:7,7 24941:4 24942:3,3,20 24943:7 24952:16,18 25001:16 25002:12 25002:13 Newspapers 24981:13 nice 24927:8 night 24843:20 Nisavant 24896:17 noises 24901:15 nominal 24994:3 nonsense 24996:22 normally 24871:21 24872:3 24877:1 24981:23 note 24862:6 24916:16 notice 24832:17,23,24 24860:8 24864:12 24988:25 24992:20 24992:23 noticed 24917:11 notion 24951:6 notwithstanding 24846:10,14 24871:17 24883:25 24902:15 24913:4,5 24914:11 24960:11 24998:16 Nova 24929:23 November 24856:22 Ntoae 24887:10,14,22 24887:24 24888:1 Ntsebeza 24832:8 24856:3 24857:5 24860:12 24887:19 24910:8 24911:10 24963:6 24971:9,11 24971:23 25004:1,9 Ntsebeza's 24909:23 nugatory 24879:22 NUM 24932:18 number 24838:24 24932:8 24938:22 24967:12,13 24995:24 numbers 24997:22 nutshell 24959:6 Nyanga 24875:5,6,7 24948:22 N-T-O-A-E 24887:15	objection 24834:19 objective 24976:22 objects 24881:2 24922:22 24924:13 obligation 24914:11,23 24998:24 24999:2 obligatory 24842:4 24914:22 obliged 24842:16 24853:12 observe 24889:9 24897:1 24939:22 observed 24875:24 observing 24896:6 obtain 24841:7 24856:8 24862:9 24899:18 24956:1 obtaining 24833:9,12 24834:25 24860:22 24866:8 24877:18 obvious 24979:17 obviously 24839:19 24843:20 24844:17 24844:25 24846:3 24848:6 24853:10,12 24855:21 24875:25 24877:9 24883:17 24890:13 24894:19 24899:7,25 24902:2 24904:11 24912:4 24914:16 24915:17 24917:24 24927:9 24928:12 24932:22 24937:13 24940:13 24940:21 24941:3 24943:6 24948:2 24950:24 24958:12 24967:16 24981:4 24982:9 24990:21 24994:5 24995:12 24998:18 occasion 24854:16 24874:2 occur 24879:15 occurrence 24946:7 occurring 24952:21 occurs 24878:18 offences 24958:12 offered 24864:12 office 24932:18 officer 24842:8 24846:10,15 24847:1 24913:5,15 24914:12 24947:22 24960:11 25001:22,24 officers 25000:11 official 24919:7 24958:25 25002:19 officials 25000:18 oh 24911:13 24926:17 24953:4 24960:1 24962:10 okay 24887:24 24938:23 24954:14 old 24854:24 once 24908:3 24920:4
	N		O	
	Naidoo 25004:6,16		object 24923:22 24997:9	

24933:14 24951:16 24951:23 24955:9,23 24961:21 24966:2 24971:16,16 24997:19 ones 24832:12 24853:15 24890:20 onlooker 24871:22 open 24838:9 24858:18 24929:24 24931:4 24972:1,3 24975:4,8 24975:14,25 24976:2 24976:21 24977:2,19 24981:7,11,16,18,22 24981:24 24982:2 24985:16 24986:19 24987:3 24988:23 24989:4 24992:17 opening 24959:2 opens 24951:11 operate 24877:1,17 24883:7 operates 24868:13 24883:1 24885:24 operating 24895:3 operation 24881:12,13 25001:2 opinion 24837:1 24881:2,17 24882:12 24884:17 24918:2 24952:10 24953:21 24956:10 24979:22 24983:20 opponents 24900:8 24909:1,3,22 24918:18 opportunities 24847:11 opportunity 24844:5,8 24845:18 24875:17 24889:8 24900:8,10 24922:10 oppose 24838:20 24876:17 24899:25 24908:14 24934:14 24979:12 opposed 24933:22 24934:8 24937:8 24968:23 opposing 24845:9 24878:16,19 24896:5 24933:7 24984:9 24985:7 opposite 24958:18 option 24966:2 oral 24832:25 24843:4 24894:23 24895:4 24989:10 orally 24838:8 24847:8 24894:16 orders 24832:16 24842:1,3,6,15 24850:3 24893:24 24898:25 24899:3 24912:11,25 24916:2 24920:13,14 24934:11 24937:21	24937:25 24943:14 24974:14 24975:8,9 25003:1,3,13 ordinarily 24977:1,9 ordinary 24898:19 24899:4 24946:6 24975:16 24986:5 24987:15 24988:3,5 24989:4 originally 24993:4 ought 24932:11 24982:12 outcome 24877:23 24880:2 outline 24846:1 outset 24946:20 24984:15 24992:21 outside 24871:22 24885:14 24949:3 24987:12 overborne 24897:14,25 overflow 24967:15,19 overstatement 24879:22 overturned 24872:18 24872:22 overwhelming 24863:10 24865:23 24866:4 24996:20 overwhelmingly 24866:15 24867:3 24869:2 over-broad 25003:4 oxymoron 24951:7 o'clock 24848:5 25004:19	pardon 24855:12 Parliament 24893:15 part 24838:2 24851:11 24864:16 24889:11 24891:7 24894:20 24899:21 24900:7 24913:3 24914:8 24928:10 24947:16 24952:18 24959:12 24966:21 24978:11 24980:12 24987:10 24994:4 participants 24959:10 24967:23 24969:12 participate 24838:19 24859:20 24975:18 participated 24963:22 24964:7,8 participating 24940:20 particular 24849:2 24882:2 24892:11 24905:14 24926:16 24931:22 24932:16 24966:4 24970:11,17 24973:21 24976:23 24977:21 24991:20 24992:1 particularly 24858:5 24861:15 24874:3 24922:4 24951:17 24966:10 24997:3 parties 24831:16 24832:7 24838:18 24845:9,18 24858:16 24859:19 24860:21 24861:14 24862:11 24863:9,10,11 24870:8,10 24872:11 24878:4 24887:4 24890:20,21 24907:7 24908:14 24917:13 24917:14,14,17 24931:2 24933:15 24934:14 24936:16 24937:20 24939:21 24941:18 24943:8 24954:9,10,12,14 24959:6,10,14 24960:2 24961:21 24967:17,23 24978:11 24984:9 24985:7 24987:17 24988:5,10,10,20 24992:18 24993:3,11 24993:14,15,21,22,24 24993:24 24994:10 24994:17,18,18,21,23 24995:9,21 parts 24838:20 24961:24 party 24832:11 24846:13 24869:25 24931:22 24960:13 24960:14 24988:16 24994:2,3,4 pass 24958:10	passage 24857:19 24858:5 24880:10 24888:7,17 24890:2 24946:25 24949:23 24995:18 path 24887:2 pay 24962:14 pending 24835:7,8 24885:5,9 Pennington 24973:12 people 24847:24 24850:6 24866:24 24868:12 24872:14 24872:24 24882:1,16 24886:4 24890:5,7 24906:23 24909:21 24910:1 24939:2 24942:13,20 24944:2 24948:6 24953:24 24954:2 24956:19,19 24957:14 24958:4 24959:9 24962:16 24963:12,16 24964:1 24964:9,12,24 24965:5,10,12 24967:18,21,24 24968:10 24969:23 24991:1,16 24994:11 24995:17,23 24997:3 24997:11 people's 24968:11 perceive 24969:2,18 perfect 24867:7 24871:7 perform 24936:21 performing 24968:2 period 24859:7 24991:21 24995:12 24999:8 peripheral 24943:21,22 permission 24840:25 24841:17 24953:9 permit 24891:16 24956:17 24988:9 permits 24836:5 24889:2 24920:25 permitted 24833:3 24886:22 24889:6 24995:1 24997:20 permitting 24929:10 perpetuate 24964:3 perpetuity 24867:8 persist 24882:18 person 24831:4 24833:12 24837:4,8,9 24837:10 24841:2 24842:6 24845:7 24846:12,16,24,25 24848:20 24856:19 24862:25 24870:17 24871:23 24875:2 24879:1 24882:2,15 24907:9 24913:2,7,12 24913:13,15 24920:8 24920:9,10 24924:15 24929:14 24930:5	24932:16 24933:5,16 24933:22 24934:9 24942:23 24952:8 24958:12 24959:2 24960:13 24963:10 24964:8,10 24981:24 24982:8 25000:6,7,23 25001:15,17,18 25002:6,7,8,12 personal 24953:1 personnel 24940:17 persons 24832:3 24833:7 24834:16,22 24835:5,5 24836:6,16 24836:24,25 24841:13 24860:11 24862:8 24881:20 24929:10 24952:8,8 24953:20,20 24954:3 24956:12 24959:7 24960:15 24988:12 24988:15 24989:16 24989:22 24990:5 24997:20 24998:22 25000:19,21 persuade 24893:8 24894:4 24941:8 pertain 24834:10 24856:14 24898:21 pertained 24899:22 pertains 24850:19 Peter 24879:8 Phatsha 24962:10,10 24962:11,12 24963:14 Phillips 24929:23 24973:7,12 phone 24831:5,5,6 photo 24964:23 photograph 24846:18 24941:18 24943:9,10 24993:22 photographed 24875:25 photographic 24941:19 24943:11 phrase 24934:19 physical 24859:18 24940:5 physically 24973:20,21 24991:17 24992:1 pick 24850:17 24915:20 24933:20 24939:15 picking 24918:9 24920:24 picture 24846:18 piecemeal 24900:24 Pienaar 24947:22 Pillay 24839:14 24908:21 24909:6,8 24909:18 24911:21 24911:24 24915:18 24915:20 24917:18 24917:21 24918:15 24918:22 24919:9,18
---	---	---	---	---

<p>24919:24 24922:13 24923:1,8,11,15,24 24924:8 24925:15,19 24925:22,25 24926:2 24926:5,9,15,18,22 24927:4,10,13,17,21 24928:19,25 24932:15,20,23 24934:25 24935:4,18 24935:22 24936:4 24937:1,17 24938:22 24939:6,7,14 24941:1 24941:14 24943:5,16 24944:9 24948:4 24962:25 24984:7 24987:8 place 24836:23 24844:25 24846:20 24858:19 24889:18 24906:16,17 24913:9 24913:13 24943:6 24951:9 24952:7,11 24952:12,18,19,20,25 24953:9,10,18 24961:17 24962:16 24970:14,17 24989:5 24990:11 24991:9 24996:6 25002:2,6,11 placed 24932:5 24972:18 play 24845:17 24914:16 24952:24 24986:9 played 24866:2 player 24998:21 please 24832:13 24849:10,13,16 24855:5 24864:7,25 pleased 24879:14 pleases 24833:22 24834:14,17 24848:2 plural 24954:3 pocket 24962:14 pointed 24932:18 24944:3 24963:18 24986:1 24998:19 pointing 24848:9 24948:20 points 24843:23 24845:5 24861:24 24875:22 24880:8 24904:24 24908:7,25 24909:2,4 24945:12 24972:16 24994:6 police 24835:7,7 24885:7 24918:17,18 24929:17 24965:2,12 24993:4 25004:5,15 policemen 24988:14 pompously 24892:14 poorer 24875:18 portion 24842:14 24952:21 posed 24876:20 posh 24964:2 position 24844:11,11</p>	<p>24912:5 24914:4 24929:7,15 24930:3 24936:10 25000:5,6 25004:4 possess 24959:5 possibilities 24890:24 possibility 24935:13,15 24935:17 24937:8,15 24937:19,20 24941:4 24944:16,17,19,22 24945:8,19 24949:9 24949:15,16,17,21,22 24962:23 24963:1 24982:22 24983:3,9 24983:11,14,16,23 24989:13 possible 24844:4 24847:18 24851:10 24854:5 24856:18 24867:14,19 24887:23 24891:10 24891:10 24896:25 24948:24 24955:13 24983:14 24984:20 24984:25 24985:1 24997:25 24998:17 possibly 24832:8 24845:15 24847:6 24898:2 24900:4,21 post 24852:16 poster 24846:19 postpone 25000:11 pot 24990:24 24997:6 potential 24845:17 24991:3,25 24993:10 24993:12 24994:18 24995:9 potentially 24988:14 24995:12 powerful 24880:5 24898:1 powerfully 24883:1 powers 24837:20 24892:12,16 24910:12 24911:1 24912:16 24917:2 24918:25 24920:14 24921:2,3,5,8,9,11,25 24922:15,21 24923:11,12,21 24946:12 24953:3,7 24954:18,24 24955:3 24955:3,4,5,14 24958:8,16 24959:1,4 24961:13,14,18,22 24962:2,3 24966:15 24966:17 24972:7 24974:5 24975:2 24982:4 practicable 24988:19 practical 24879:9 24895:13 24898:22 24901:2 24907:10,11 24941:2,10 24942:12 24943:1 24964:17 24986:22</p>	<p>practicalities 24898:21 practicality 24896:2 24964:15 24969:6 practically 24866:21 practice 24882:14 prayer 24861:11 24862:14 24864:16 prayers 24988:25 25003:3 precautionary 24940:13 precautions 24964:18 precisely 24835:14 preclude 24912:20 predates 24859:9 preface 24917:6 prefer 24887:2,3 24923:3 preferably 24914:21 preferential 24969:14 preferred 24889:14 prejudice 24969:1 prejudiced 24877:16 24968:14 prematurely 24979:21 Premier 24929:17 prepare 24941:20 24943:12 prepared 24831:15 24850:13 24867:17 24882:18 24892:6 24907:5 24908:12 prescribed 24884:21 prescribes 24884:20 24912:5 presence 24836:7,25 24856:19 24889:7 24890:16 24940:3,5 24952:9 24953:20,23 present 24831:7 24833:4 24838:1,6,8 24838:13 24840:9 24868:12 24870:19 24880:18 24881:20 24881:21,24 24883:11 24902:16 24908:21 24916:21 24938:5 24940:11,12 24941:6 24947:19,20 24949:11 24972:4 24973:21 24982:1 24984:1 24985:22 24988:10 24990:6 24991:23 24992:2 24999:11 presentation 24896:3 presented 24832:8 24833:1 24836:9 24844:6 24887:1 24895:15,19,22 24896:10,13 24905:16 24907:2,22 24940:4 24973:19 presenting 24837:4 presently 24835:6 presents 24889:12</p>	<p>24991:20 preserve 24837:14 President 24893:18 presidential 24919:3 presiding 24842:8 24846:10,15 24847:1 24913:5,15 24914:12 24960:11 25000:11 25001:22,23 press 24881:23,24,25 24925:23 24995:22 pressing 24898:16,17 24898:17 presumably 24861:5 24880:5 24882:10 24913:2 24925:20 24995:25 presumption 24958:14 presupposes 24951:12 pretending 24942:24 Pretorius 24840:24 24854:23 24858:14 24899:17 24914:1 24934:4 24984:17 Pretorius's 24932:14 24949:2 prevent 25001:17 prevented 24912:11 24966:1 preventing 24916:13 previously 24888:23 prima 24860:18 24879:10 24928:9,20 24937:12 24994:8,14 primarily 24835:3 24890:21 24972:1,16 primary 24905:7 24931:9 24937:2 24976:15 principal 24977:2 24989:3 principally 24971:19 24971:25 24976:3 principle 24872:22 24929:13 24931:4 24950:14 24958:25 24971:25 24972:2 24975:4,8,14 24976:2 24976:21,21,25 24977:18 24978:23 24979:12 24981:7,11 24981:16,18,22 24982:2 24985:16 24986:24 24987:3 24988:23 24992:17 principles 24850:24 24851:5,8,14 24863:5 24878:21 24898:19 24930:24 24986:9 printed 24846:19 prior 24982:4 24993:18 prism 24944:11 24945:16 24950:16 24951:19 24959:21 prisms 24930:25 24959:23</p>	<p>private 24848:21 Privy 24872:16,18 probabilities 24863:10 24865:23 24996:20 probability 24866:4 24934:20 24935:9,12 24937:14 24965:17 24992:8 probable 24866:15 24867:3 24869:3 probably 24850:23,24 24869:14 24877:25 24879:11 24887:15 24943:1 24960:5 probing 24873:4 problem 24845:2 24867:5 24869:18 24870:22 24872:9 24879:10 24902:25 24903:8,14 24915:17 24928:10 24943:3 24969:24 problems 24873:20,21 24879:15 24941:2,9 24942:13 24955:21 24962:19 24963:19 24970:4 procedural 24892:16 24921:15,20 24924:18 24973:9,15 24978:6 procedure 24839:24 24852:12,14 24857:20 24869:20 24878:22 24887:13 24888:21 24892:7,9 24892:12 24898:4 24899:24 24903:10 24905:14 24921:8 24922:6 24923:18 24925:6 24939:25 24957:1,10 24958:1 24982:20 25001:2 procedures 24837:23 24838:3 24839:18 24857:11,13 24905:11 24921:16 24921:25 24953:5 24972:20 proceed 24857:6 24864:7,25 24898:25 24900:24 24908:11 24980:17 proceeding 24836:13 24892:19 24895:7 24913:6 proceedings 24831:1,6 24835:9 24837:7 24846:11,11,15 24850:12 24851:3 24859:19,20 24879:19 24881:7 24884:24 24885:5,10 24886:9 24897:10 24916:17,18 24940:3 24952:15 24960:12</p>
---	---	---	---	---

<p>24960:12 24961:5 24962:12 24974:11 24975:19 24976:4,5,9 24977:1,8,9,12 24981:9,12,21,23 24987:7,11 24989:17 24991:19 24998:16 24998:20,20 24999:4 24999:12 25000:8,11 25001:6,7,9 25002:11 25002:17</p> <p>proceeds 24864:20 process 24841:21 24889:4 24939:17 24942:10 24943:6 24972:24 24973:2,3,8 24990:25</p> <p>processes 24885:14,20 procuring 24841:22 produces 24881:14 Professor 24923:6 programme 25003:11 prohibited 24919:21 prohibiting 24846:16 24913:8 24914:12 24920:3 prohibition 25000:20 25001:19 25003:22 prominent 24866:2 promised 24963:25 promote 24881:3 24924:20 promoting 24874:18 prompted 24865:7 prompts 24997:8 promulgated 24921:4 promulgation 24955:12 pronounce 24887:15 24887:21 pronunciation 24887:17 proof 24915:16 proper 24869:16 24903:5 24953:14 properly 24955:24 proposals 24996:6 propose 24843:24 24862:7 24879:11 24896:11,11 24971:18,24 24993:9 24996:12 25003:7 proposed 24871:6 24967:12,13 24986:22 24987:1 24990:4 24993:1 proposing 24844:3 24846:4 24878:3 proposition 24904:10 24918:8 24923:9 24991:8 prosecution 24835:8 prosecutor 24977:12 prospect 24940:14 protect 24856:16 24867:11,20 24887:4</p>	<p>24899:3 24922:1 24924:20 24925:9 24933:24 24934:13 24964:19 24965:20 24969:17 24985:2 24989:9 24990:16 24998:15,22 24999:11,15 25002:12 25003:11 protected 24846:12,15 24846:24,25 24913:1 24913:7,12,13,14 24960:12 24982:10 24996:14 24999:19 25000:6,22 25001:15 25001:17,18 25002:6 25002:7,8,15,19 protecting 24933:19 24970:15,19 24990:14 24999:12 protection 24835:14 24840:18,21 24841:1 24841:2,8,23 24842:7 24844:7 24846:9,21 24846:23 24854:12 24867:11,25 24868:4 24871:13 24884:10 24884:12,14,16,18 24889:1 24894:2 24902:14,15,17 24911:7,8,9 24912:1 24912:3 24913:10,12 24935:6 24960:9 24972:4 24973:18 24982:7 24985:15 24996:13 24998:7,13 24998:25 24999:2,3,6 24999:8,14,16,18,20 24999:21 25000:4,12 25000:18,22,25 25001:4,23 25002:3,5 25002:14,15 25003:8 25003:11,18 protects 24867:8 24928:15 protocol 24991:24 protocols 24990:11 provide 24833:25 24839:24 24852:9 24875:10 24876:4 24884:16 24905:21 24941:16 24948:19 24958:13 24969:21 24970:18 24974:12 24977:3 24985:13 24989:20 24993:21 provided 24836:21 24839:23 24841:3 24848:18 24875:10 24889:2 24902:15,17 24952:5 24955:18 provides 24836:19 24837:4,22 24841:25 24848:23 24852:14 24852:15 24875:1,3 24960:10 24972:19</p>	<p>24973:15 25000:10 providing 25002:15 provision 24881:23 24888:19 24956:25 24957:8 24958:17 24974:19 25001:3,7 25001:11,17 provisional 24915:9 provisions 24851:25 24852:8,13,16 24856:16 24871:10 24894:1 24902:19 24903:20 24957:6 24967:3 24973:18 25000:14 proviso 24929:10 publication 24846:17 24913:8 24925:21,23 25001:20 publicised 24878:6,11 publicity 24881:7 publicly 24895:16 purely 24871:14 24895:13 purport 24924:13 purports 24893:10 24943:25 purpose 24833:9,12 24834:24 24856:15 24866:21 24888:19 24888:22,23 24929:19 24964:20 24966:4 24969:10,11 24969:11 24975:10 24976:23 24989:8 24990:9,13 24992:11 24998:13,14,17 24999:10,14 25001:5 25001:16 25002:23 purposes 24851:16 24860:21 24862:14 24865:19 24866:8 24867:2,21 24868:5 24875:6 24937:11 24943:24 24975:6 24986:25 24988:20 24989:19,25 pursuit 24976:22 put 24844:9,10,10,25 24858:19 24861:24 24870:6 24877:6 24878:17 24883:9 24890:2 24893:1 24915:12 24935:5 24941:3 24944:9 24955:22 24962:6 24984:10 24991:13 24995:25 puts 25002:11 putting 24868:15 24872:25 24879:15 24900:20 24903:21 24937:7 puzzled 24885:25</p>	<p>qualification 24999:6 qualified 24907:9 quality 24881:14 24882:21 quarrel 24961:3 24969:17,22 quarter 24863:15 24939:1,3 question 24837:25 24850:7 24851:22 24852:2 24853:17 24857:8 24865:18,20 24866:22 24869:8 24870:6,21 24871:1,2 24873:9 24875:13 24889:3 24892:20 24893:4,23 24894:9 24896:9 24901:13 24902:6,7,8 24904:8 24904:13 24905:1,8 24905:12,19 24906:10 24911:1,25 24916:7 24917:22 24919:10,11 24924:17 24929:4 24932:3 24940:24 24944:14 24955:23 24960:19 24961:18 24963:7 24972:17 24977:21 24980:9,12 24981:25 24982:4 24984:2 questions 24835:18 24851:8,14 24865:4 24875:11,18 24876:10,19 24883:24 24893:6 24904:4 24905:25 24939:23 24980:14 25002:16 25003:19 quick 24909:13 24912:15 quickly 24956:22 24960:18 quite 24843:23 24862:21 24877:8 24882:15 24897:20 24910:19,24 24913:3 24933:6 24954:16 24960:24 24990:20 24991:6 quotation 24881:11 24949:4 quote 24976:1 quoted 24880:10 24957:3 24960:9 24975:19 quotes 24880:16 quoting 24880:13 24922:11</p>	<p>24876:21 24896:5,9 24908:3 24909:15 24911:5 24918:23 24933:21 24938:14 24942:2 24964:5 raises 24893:4 24988:6 ramifications 24969:6 24986:22 rare 24899:4,5 reach 24882:24 reached 24861:21 24938:17 reaches 24997:19 reactions 24889:9,9 read 24832:24 24836:18 24842:4 24843:20,20 24847:18 24849:9,12 24849:15 24891:1 24894:20 24910:22 24913:4 24914:24 24922:10 24924:19 24942:8 24949:23 24984:23 24993:7,16 24995:22 24999:19 25001:11 reading 24844:14 24914:5 24919:22,22 24960:23 reads 24834:20 24849:17 24984:23 ready 24831:23 24844:23 24881:17 24882:12 24900:6,16 24909:7 25004:1 real 24835:9 24936:15 24936:17 24937:16 24950:3 realise 24843:5 24901:16 reality 24965:23 really 24858:1 24859:21 24865:20 24873:24 24879:5,7 24903:24 24907:19 24915:7,16 24919:11 24936:19 24958:22 24959:11 24963:24 24965:20 24966:4 24969:5 24992:11 25004:12 realm 24998:2 reason 24849:6 24850:12 24851:21 24852:2 24907:15 24909:18 24912:21 24915:3 24930:2 24949:22 24954:6 24974:1 24985:3 reasonable 24850:18 24933:2 24934:22 24935:12,15,23 24937:7,14,18 24949:16 24982:22 24983:3,9,16,23 reasonably 24922:21</p>
Q				R
Q				R

<p>24923:12,21 24930:10,12,13,18 24935:5 24988:19 reasoning 24997:12,17 reasons 24853:16 24875:8 24881:4,6 24889:13 24899:1,2,2 24906:10 24925:5 receive 24875:16,17 24894:12 24976:12 24976:16 received 24831:24 24832:1 24838:17 24887:7,7 24895:1 24908:11 24985:23 24987:6 receives 24842:19 24894:10 recital 24945:10 recognise 24925:3 24983:7 24990:3 recognised 24856:15 24922:5,7 24925:11 24927:23 24929:19 recommendations 24850:5 24874:16 reconciled 24971:12 record 24832:24 24836:18 24847:19 24956:3 24962:14 24981:17 recordings 24834:2 recount 24882:14 redraft 24862:14 reduce 24987:2 reduced 24996:5 reducing 24868:21 refer 24840:20 24852:19 24855:22 24855:25 24884:19 24886:10 24887:10 24888:20 24896:20 24901:7,18 24929:17 24929:22 24935:11 24975:10 24977:10 24980:24 24984:6 24989:4 24994:17 24999:17 reference 24837:18,22 24850:15 24852:12 24853:1 24854:19 24855:17 24856:5,24 24859:8 24869:19 24874:12 24876:20 24883:23 24886:11 24887:12 24888:13 24894:1 24896:16 24902:10 24903:25 24915:4 24942:6 24975:10 24993:12 references 24887:8 referred 24842:19 24862:21 24863:3 24880:11 24888:17 24902:12 24906:24 24922:24 24931:18</p>	<p>24936:8 24948:3 24984:4 24994:17 25001:8,11 referring 24859:14 24888:8 24939:11 24946:13 24947:1,2 24982:17 refers 24966:19 reflect 24872:11 refuge 24957:19 Refugee 24977:4,8 refuse 24942:22 refused 24955:7 refute 24965:7 refutes 24963:14 regard 24835:23 24837:24 24845:16 24848:15 24863:2,3 24874:7,9 24907:6 24919:10 24922:19 24930:16 24931:1,24 24932:24 24934:21 24935:23 24941:21 24944:17 24945:25 24949:12 24956:3 24973:15 24984:6,16 24992:14 24993:10 24997:6 regarded 24850:8 regarding 24875:1 24984:20,25 regime 24846:2 Regional 24896:21 regulate 24838:4 24892:12 24973:3,8 regulated 24838:2 24853:25 regulates 24957:24 regulating 25000:8 regulation 24837:3,12 24837:19,22 24838:4 24838:14 24839:17 24854:7 24862:18,22 24883:23 24884:20 24885:2,12,17,24 24892:19,25 24902:21 24905:10 24905:10,17 24907:21 24919:3,3,4 24920:6 24921:7,12 24921:19 24924:18 24924:19 24928:5 24953:4 24956:23 24957:20,23 24966:6 24972:18 24973:5,24 24974:19 25000:24 25001:4 regulations 24839:17 24843:11 24891:19 24892:16 24893:19 24917:8 24919:1,8 24920:5,17 24921:1,4 24921:13,14 24924:12 24930:15 24944:6,10 24945:15 24955:12 24966:9,11</p>	<p>25000:25 25001:1 reiterate 24982:11 relate 24870:7,7 24878:22 24906:22 24972:16 related 24980:12 24998:22 25000:19 relates 24870:8 24984:18 relating 24846:23 24912:25 24913:11 24984:21 24993:11 25002:4 relation 24842:6 24843:14 24845:8 24854:12 24873:21 24892:22 24918:25 24920:13 24942:5 24973:21 24975:2 24976:4,5,7,10 24977:12 24986:9,14 24986:16 24990:6,13 24992:12,15 25000:15 25001:6 25002:10,19 25003:20 relative 24965:9 relatively 24971:19 relatives 24988:12 relax 24968:13 relayed 24879:20 relevant 24851:16 24854:13 24857:8 24858:5 24876:10 24878:4,6 24904:5,18 24906:3 24913:4 24914:16 24916:4 24943:24 24945:14 24960:23 24973:4 24994:23 24995:12 reliance 24895:1 24905:10 24972:18 24974:18 24982:7 relied 24931:8,10 24936:5,7 24980:5 relief 24837:20 24838:21 24841:25 24842:3 24845:8,9 24849:1 24852:10 24859:1 24864:22 24869:19,22 24872:2 24872:3 24873:2 24876:17 24877:21 24883:7 24891:25 24914:17,23 24915:24 24916:5,7,8 24916:11 24917:1,3 24917:11 24941:24 24941:25 24958:23 24986:10 24990:16 24997:13 relies 24931:22 relocate 24953:6 relocated 24846:22 24913:10 25002:3 relocation 24846:24</p>	<p>24913:14 24970:16 25002:7 reluctant 24890:4 24924:4 rely 24853:15 24867:9 24892:24 24895:4 24926:11 24956:24 24957:8 24958:2 24977:23 relying 24986:17 remain 24990:11 remedy 24867:19,25 24868:3 24871:4,13 remember 24848:3 24862:16 24870:11 24935:13 24942:9,18 24951:8 24962:13 24979:1 24995:17 remembers 24955:6 remind 24831:7 reminiscent 24968:18 remote 24832:21 24905:13 24906:19 24935:16,16 24944:16 24949:16 24995:5 remotely 24951:1 removal 24877:22 remove 24882:22 removed 24889:17,25 24891:3 24942:7 removing 24877:20 render 24854:6 24879:21 24940:9 rendered 24859:6 24875:5 repeat 24982:13 24986:15 25001:3 repeated 24875:13 repetition 24910:4 24952:5 reply 24846:3 24847:5 24847:6,6 24900:4,11 24900:23,25 24908:3 24908:7,7 24970:4 24985:22,24 24986:2 25004:5,15 replying 24840:24 24858:15 24899:17 24906:11 24913:25 24915:4 24931:16 24932:14 24941:12 report 24874:15 24881:25 24882:1 24947:3 reported 24855:2,11,15 24857:17,21 24887:25 24888:3 24995:8 reporting 24833:23 24838:25 reports 24855:11,15 24857:17,18 24880:12,13 24927:1 represent 24869:13 24963:12,17</p>	<p>24968:21 representation 24978:10,16 24980:8 24980:13 representative 24942:24 24993:5,19 24994:5 representatives 24833:3,6 24834:8,22 24838:23 24841:13 24860:10,16 24862:9 24864:13,14,18 24866:8,11 24869:10 24869:25 24889:8 24939:21 24940:20 24940:21 24941:17 24942:7,8,8,11,15 24943:9 24965:19 24968:25 24993:2,3,6 24993:20,22,25 24994:10 represented 24993:24 24993:25 24994:4 reprisal 24947:20,24 Republic 24944:13 reputational 24850:5 24872:10,14,23 24877:16 reputations 24965:8 request 24837:8 24860:1 24862:24 24886:22 24920:8 requested 24860:2 require 24851:5 24873:14 24884:12 24885:12 24907:9 24936:9 24966:18 24981:23 24990:8 24991:22 25002:9 required 24841:1 24858:17 24860:2 24874:8,11,15 24879:24 24886:19 24886:24 24906:13 24906:21 24922:22 24923:22 24935:15 24937:18 24944:24 24945:22,24 24946:1 24949:14,19 24974:20 24976:9 25003:19 requirement 24874:7 24935:12 24942:15 24976:7 requirements 24984:24 24985:12,21,25 requires 24850:16 24884:18 25001:22 resolve 24874:11 resolved 24848:24 24849:4,19 resort 24902:20 respect 24834:6 24837:20 24852:1 24873:11 24908:5 24912:11,13</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p>24914:10 24923:3 24950:11 24952:24 24962:8 24973:17 24978:10 24984:16 24989:11 24999:6 25003:17 respectful 24983:19 respects 24883:10 24963:15 24978:22 24982:3 25003:4 responded 24985:6 respondents 24933:7,9 24936:6 24984:9 response 24984:14 24985:9,23 responses 24939:23 responsibility 24881:16 24882:11 24998:22 responsible 24864:2 rest 24943:14 24970:19 24975:2 24999:13 restore 24929:25 restricted 24863:13 24876:23 24921:9 24931:21 restricting 24969:12 restriction 24866:7,20 24867:4 24868:23 24994:9 restrictions 24866:22 24868:18,19,19 24869:1 24942:12 24992:15 24996:3 25000:13,14 restrictive 24860:17 24866:24 24919:14 24930:6 24954:1 24985:15 restrictively 24873:22 24918:7 24951:21 rests 24976:2,20 24980:5 result 24880:20 24933:19 24949:13 24982:21,25,25 24983:1,8 resume 24863:15 24939:3 resumes 24831:3,4 24863:22,23 24901:20,21 24939:4 24939:5 24971:2,3 retire 24971:21 reveal 24833:11 24837:11 24920:11 review 24872:15,23 24892:1 24914:14 24918:17 24959:4 revision 24881:5 re-reading 24844:15 rid 24943:20 right 24846:2 24848:18 24848:19,23 24849:18 24851:23 24854:9 24857:14 24859:17,18</p>	<p>24866:24 24879:6 24910:19,24 24912:24 24924:14 24924:14,15 24931:9 24931:10,12,12,13,15 24936:3,6 24940:2,2 24961:5 24962:12 24965:6 24968:1,1,2 24971:15 24972:1 24974:10,13,15 24975:18 24976:5,10 24976:10,11,12,16,18 24976:18,19 24977:7 24977:23,25 24978:5 24978:6,16,20,23 24980:1,8,13 24982:7 24982:8 24985:16 rightly 24868:24 rights 24848:17 24859:17 24876:23 24917:17 24924:13 24924:20 24931:1,1,8 24931:11 24934:16 24936:5,6,11,11 24968:11 24969:12 24976:3,3,17 24982:10 24985:17 24986:8 rise 24874:19 24891:19 24898:6 risk 24858:17,20 24883:5 24933:25 24934:22,22 24935:13,16,16 24937:8,16 24962:18 24970:12 24979:16 24985:14 24986:6 24987:1,2 24990:23 24991:3,7,11,20,21 24992:1 24999:24 25001:18 risks 24868:22 24998:17 rituals 24875:24 role 24845:16,17 24866:2 24901:8 24913:24 24914:16 roll 24979:6 room 24847:17 24879:18 24897:3,4 24917:5 24938:7 24940:12 24952:13 24957:8 24967:16,20 24987:12 rooted 24972:1 Rose 24922:18 24923:4 24923:6,21 round 24901:24 route 24943:2 row 24912:13 rubric 24957:10 rule 24951:14,16 24952:5 24956:19 ruling 24831:8 24834:6 24843:8,14,24 24844:12,12,13,16</p>	<p>24846:4 24864:18 24869:10 24873:10 24916:13 24918:17 24920:3 24977:15,17 25003:17 25004:4 rulings 24832:18,23,24 24843:7 24885:16 runs 24971:24 Rustenburg 24952:25 24953:11 24962:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <p>S 24867:23 24887:10 24896:17,17 24901:11 24939:24 SA 24857:22 24859:12 24896:17 24901:11 SABC 24976:13,14 SACR 24857:21 24888:4 24896:18,22 safe 24907:12,13 safeguard 24870:2 24882:22 24889:16 24890:24 24933:24 safeguards 24877:17 24877:20,23 24882:20 24883:11 24887:4 24891:11 24934:13 24937:23 24941:22 safety 24835:15,15 24846:20 24859:18 24860:5 24867:13,13 24897:20 24898:10 24898:17 24906:15 24913:9,13 24933:12 24934:2 24941:22 24962:21 24964:1 24984:11,22 24990:5 24991:16 24998:17 25000:10 25002:2,6 SAFLII 24856:7 sake 24958:15 SAPS 24831:11,25 24832:18 24838:20 24850:18 24851:2,3 24877:20 24878:21 24886:7 24908:25 24912:4,13 24915:24 24916:2,9,11 24917:3 24929:6 24931:8,10 24931:14 24932:5 24933:21,23 24934:8 24937:4,22 24939:18 24940:16 24941:16 24941:23 24942:2 24943:14 24965:4 24967:8,10 24968:6 24969:16,19,23 24980:15 24982:7 24984:15,17 24985:21 24987:4 24993:18 24997:8 25003:13 satisfactory 24899:24 24908:6 24909:2</p>	<p>24911:21 satisfied 24847:1 24873:12 24877:2,3 24884:11,12 24900:16,17 24928:13 satisfies 24842:7 24913:15 25001:23 satisfy 24842:13 24892:3 24913:19 save 24833:12 24853:25 24970:22 saw 24909:23 saying 24842:5 24853:24 24870:17 24882:4 24893:5,13 24899:12 24903:15 24903:16 24934:21 24944:5,8,15,17 24948:4 24951:25 24953:22 24954:20 24958:22 24961:8 24962:1,2,25 24964:4 24967:10 24970:9,10 24994:13 says 24832:25 24841:6 24842:7 24846:8,9 24847:5 24851:11 24857:10,12,20 24860:23 24861:1 24866:2,15 24870:20 24873:14 24876:6 24878:9 24880:16,18 24882:6 24890:8,22 24894:2 24898:8 24903:10 24912:10 24913:3 24914:24 24915:11 24919:13 24935:8 24947:6,16 24949:17,17 24951:3 24953:5 24957:13 24958:6,25 24960:10 24964:7 24965:1,7 24995:8 SC 24831:9 24856:3 24912:15 24914:5,21 24915:8,11 24941:11 24946:23 24971:11 25004:9 SCA 24922:16 scale 24883:8,15 24936:24 scales 24889:4 scheme 24999:23 25002:11 scope 24873:25 score 24895:24 24971:24 scorn 24881:17 24882:13 Scotia 24929:23 Scott 24880:14 Scott's 24880:21 screen 24871:23 24928:18 24995:19 second 24850:19</p>	<p>24879:12,16 24881:22 24882:10 24915:24 24916:12 24916:25 24920:2 24940:18 24961:15 24964:13 24971:8 24972:3,13 24974:7,8 24974:22 24984:1 24989:2 24990:6 24996:11 secondary 24877:11 secondly 24851:9 24881:9 24930:19 24934:2 24938:1,6 24979:16 24985:5 24990:3 secret 24951:7 secretary 24942:19 sections 24854:12 24910:2 24945:3,6 secure 24858:20 24907:13 24984:24 24990:4,9 securing 24906:22 security 24848:19 24874:25 24881:7 24898:17,21,21 24904:4 24906:12 24907:19 24924:15 24969:16,22 24982:8 24988:14 24990:9,11 24991:9,18 see 24831:5,12 24838:23 24840:16 24848:16 24850:25 24857:16 24869:15 24879:13 24880:5 24892:22 24895:5 24900:3 24902:11 24903:3,7,9 24909:17 24910:17 24911:13 24915:13 24918:24 24920:4 24927:21 24928:17 24933:8 24939:21 24940:21 24953:25 24968:1 24975:25 24980:19 24996:1 25004:14,17 seeing 24968:5 seek 24832:16,17,18,24 24832:25 24837:21 24841:7,14 24842:1,3 24845:2 24849:2 24859:23 24864:23 24873:11 24876:17 24877:21,22 24881:23 24883:7,10 24884:13 24885:13 24885:16,16 24891:25 24892:18 24893:24 24912:4 24914:17 24916:11 24916:19 24934:8 24953:8 24957:19 24966:18 24997:13 seeking 24845:8</p>
---	--	--	---	---

<p>24852:10 24886:20 seeks 24871:10,13 24889:12 24987:16 24988:17 24989:23 seen 24834:5 24857:13 24860:25 24870:20 24947:23 sees 24871:23 self-confessed 24963:20 self-defence 24851:4 self-evidence 24995:7 Semenya 24831:2,8,9 24870:12 24912:14 24912:15 24914:5,21 24915:8,11 24940:24 24941:11 24964:23 sending 24939:12 sense 24842:11 24904:24 24916:25 24931:4 24938:5,9 24940:22 sensible 24868:19 24893:15 24900:19 24901:2 sent 24831:24 24939:9 sentence 24976:1 sentences 24877:24 separately 24990:15 sequentially 24970:22 serve 24876:12 24928:1 24964:19 24966:4 24969:10 served 24886:25 24887:1 24929:19 service 24875:9 25004:15 services 24875:5 serving 24891:8 24969:11,11 sessions 24942:10 set 24831:24 24832:17 24832:23 24835:16 24840:7 24842:2 24848:10,13,16 24858:13 24864:11 24872:15,20 24874:12,13,21 24888:17 24892:1 24893:25 24903:6 24907:1 24915:22 24921:5,9 24927:1 24931:15 24954:25 24978:25 24979:2,8 24992:5 24998:13 25000:16 25001:25 25002:25 sets 24832:10 24835:2 24838:17 24839:8 24878:20 24907:10 sexual 24898:3 24899:5 24958:12 24989:7,11 Sexwale's 24986:18 shackled 24950:13 shan't 24982:13 24986:15</p>	<p>short 24876:1 24971:19 shortcoming 24871:4 shortcut 24912:21 shortly 24930:17 24974:12 24992:9 shot 24990:24 24997:6 shouldn't 24908:11 24909:18 24911:16 24913:21 show 24877:22 24899:9 24937:11 24967:1 24984:10 24985:11 showing 24937:11 shown 24870:14 24877:20 24924:23 24930:12,18 24935:17,20 24950:1 24960:3 shows 24960:13 side 24846:5 24868:15 24868:18 24877:6 24883:8,15 24904:11 24933:17 24954:8 24995:5 sided 24968:6 siding 24967:8 significant 24858:21 24916:23 24954:22 significantly 24992:17 similar 24871:10 24928:19 24958:17 similarly 24928:3 24948:21 24976:8 24980:12 24989:10 24997:17 24998:20 simple 24871:5 24990:20 24991:6 simply 24944:7 24949:3 24950:3,17 24953:4,12 24954:5 24956:4 24958:10 24960:24 24962:3 24963:9 24969:13 24972:24 24974:10 24974:23 24977:19 24985:23 24989:15 24993:10 single 24926:6 single-judge 24926:12 Sir 24922:18 24923:3,6 24923:21 sit 24969:24 24987:23 sitting 24836:14 24844:3 24894:22 24895:3 24919:5,6 24926:7 24951:3 24962:11 24965:10 24967:19 24968:14 Sittings 24836:20 situation 24874:18 24885:19 24930:1 24957:6 24962:7 24991:10 situations 24973:10 slain 24988:13,14 slightly 24916:17</p>	<p>slip 24954:19 Smith 24879:6,7,8 24882:5 solely 24898:9 solution 24892:18 24938:14 sommer 24953:6 Sons 24926:1 soon 24844:16,17 24964:22 24965:18 24979:23 24981:5 24998:4 25004:4 sorry 24831:2 24839:15 24845:19 24845:25 24846:7 24847:14 24849:15 24849:16 24873:16 24886:13 24888:12 24899:23 24909:10 24960:6 24971:7 24980:17 24982:15 24993:6,14,16 sort 24877:13 24900:5 24900:24 24991:3 24997:18 sorts 24898:3 24955:21 24967:24 Sotho 24887:19 sought 24838:21 24845:9 24871:10,11 24878:21 24902:14 24915:24 24916:2,5,9 24916:17 24917:3,11 24929:6 24937:4,22 24939:18 24941:22 24942:1 24943:14 24951:2 24973:24 24974:14 24975:8 24986:10 24987:4,9 24987:14 24988:2,7 24988:25 24990:1,16 24992:15,21 24994:8 24994:15 25003:1,3 25003:13 soundtrack 24995:19 source 24836:15 24837:19 24892:23 24921:6 sources 24848:21 South 24855:11,15 24856:25 24857:17 24857:18 24880:11 24880:12 24925:2,17 24926:7,7 so-called 24964:1 sparks 24951:9 speak 24831:18 24846:5 24848:22 24868:6 24871:9 24963:24 speaking 24831:17 24866:21 24886:21 24958:21 speaks 24867:23 24874:23,23 24875:1 24875:3</p>	<p>special 24857:13 24869:17 24916:19 24917:16 24938:2,8 24989:16 specialis 24957:3 specific 24835:18 24853:23 24874:24 24886:3 24894:13 24902:19 24925:2 24931:7 24957:6 24958:15 25003:20 specifically 24850:11 24859:2 24875:12 24886:21 24887:9 24894:11 24902:23 24917:2,7 24931:17 24957:20 24958:8 24959:22 24970:3 24978:8 24981:7 25003:10 specified 24885:6 24922:19 specifies 24957:13 spectator 24901:8 speculation 24979:1 24998:2 speculative 24995:2,4 24997:17,18 spend 24950:25 spinoff 24981:14 spirit 24924:13 spots 24932:18 24948:10,12 spread 24997:23 24998:1 squeezed 24960:17 stage 24832:19 24847:11 24861:22 24870:14 24908:1,23 24916:20 24935:14 24938:18 24979:1 Staggie 24896:17 24939:24 stand 24835:13 24841:21 24900:21 24907:16,25 24908:24 standard 24949:21,24 stands 24991:13 start 24831:21 24864:8 24864:10 24866:24 24902:9 24909:18 24915:19 24946:11 24952:11 24953:22 starting 24917:24 24947:4 24950:24 starts 24868:14 state 24835:13 24859:11 24860:2 24896:20 24902:11 24920:24 24927:1 24973:11 24975:20 stated 24881:10 24889:13 24937:12 24938:4 statement 24840:12</p>	<p>24848:11 24870:12 24874:22 statements 24840:12 24870:11,13 24992:5 states 24920:6 24985:10 State-funded 24978:10 stating 24979:16 status 24996:15 24999:19 25002:20 statute 24851:23 24853:5,11,23 24892:13 24903:1,2 24912:12 24913:22 24918:21 24953:15 24954:1,17 24957:23 24966:10 24998:24 25002:24 statutes 24852:9 24853:15 24891:16 24902:22 24966:8,10 statutory 24893:25 24903:20 24977:3 staying 24964:2 step 24961:1 steps 24907:10 24922:1 stimulating 24881:16 stipulate 24894:11,11 stipulation 24894:13 strange 24962:16 strangely 24919:19 strengthens 24837:13 stress 24856:16 stretch 24949:25 strict 24863:7 strictly 24847:21 24873:14,15 24880:23,24 strike 24859:21 striker 24870:16 strikers 24850:19 24860:24 24861:15 24865:24 24866:10 24868:10 24869:2 24870:15,17,18 24875:13 24996:21 striking 24863:11 24919:21 24994:19 strong 24862:22 strongest 24899:2 struck 24934:10 24986:8 struggled 24887:17 24926:10,15 studied 24843:21 stutterings 24897:7 subject 24835:6,6,8 24892:15 24909:5 24922:19 24923:23 24936:11 24937:13 24994:6 25002:17 25003:20 subjected 24894:18 24898:2 Subjectively 24881:14 subjects 24922:23</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>submission 24836:10 24837:24 24840:5 24852:8 24853:22 24874:9 24876:9 24883:21,25 24884:4 24884:14 24889:5 24905:8,8,12 24919:9 24924:8 24973:25 24974:9 24977:23 24981:10 24982:11 24984:7,14 24986:24 24987:8,13 24989:14 24990:7 24991:17 24992:19 24995:3 24997:16 24998:3 24999:19 25000:3 25001:10,12 25003:2 25003:5,12 submissions 24836:9 24843:4 24865:6 24868:17 24873:9 24907:23 24912:1 24916:6 24918:6 24943:15 24960:21 24970:20 24972:6 24973:16 24975:1,3 24982:13,17 24986:16 24999:9 25003:21,24 25004:10 submit 24836:16 24838:14 24850:22 24858:20 24874:23 24875:7,16 24884:25 24885:10 24905:17 24906:18 24921:14 24923:15 24928:25 24931:11 24932:2 24933:16 24934:9,25 24935:18 24938:9 24945:22 24949:24 24973:1 24976:23 24980:9,15 24981:6 24983:9 24984:1 24985:14 24986:3 24988:22 24989:21 24992:13 24996:8 24997:15,24 25001:5 25001:7,15 25003:1 submitted 24840:13 24895:9 24907:19 24971:13 24984:13 subpoena 24912:19,20 subpoenaed 24884:3 subsequent 24881:19 24983:17,18 25000:13 subsequently 24893:16 24973:10 subsidiary 24914:16 24956:23 24959:17 substance 24957:2 24998:5 substantial 24872:10 24882:9 24926:23 24937:8 24987:3</p>	<p>24992:16 substantially 24877:10 24878:24 24996:5 succeeded 24937:10 successful 24868:20 suddenly 24964:10 suffer 24965:25 suffered 24948:6,21 Suffice 24969:9 sufficient 24908:4 24934:13 24937:23 24945:20 24949:21 24955:10 24962:24 suggest 24839:3 24900:19 24908:20 24990:21 suggested 24897:18 24969:3 24993:5 suggesting 24996:3 suggestion 24876:21,21 24890:4 24984:19 24989:18 24990:4 24995:17 suggestions 24908:16 suggests 24941:1 24954:3 suitable 24861:22 sum 24973:19 summaries 24935:8 summarise 24840:14 24936:1,5 24992:4 summarised 24932:13 24996:24 summarising 24877:5 summary 24848:10 24877:24 supersede 24966:9,10 supplement 24900:11 supplied 24948:3 supply 24955:7 support 24837:3 24880:21 24885:3 24908:15 24986:2 supported 24968:23 supporting 24835:2 supports 24837:13 24949:5 suppose 24845:13 24924:1 24971:6 24995:13 supposed 24867:25 24900:11 sure 24831:22 24869:7 24880:12 24885:23 24895:1 24897:20 24899:24 24918:25 24936:20,22 24962:10 24990:20 24991:6,12 24995:23 surely 24904:5 24991:7 surprised 24912:8 surprisingly 24855:6 surrounding 24969:23 suspect 24868:25 24966:15 switched 24831:5</p>	<p>symbolised 24881:17 24882:12 symbolises 24958:3 sympathetic 24970:7 system 24880:15 24998:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>table 24844:22 take 24833:16 24839:12 24848:6 24853:10,19 24854:11 24858:21 24862:3,6 24863:15 24865:17 24870:13 24872:23 24876:11 24878:8 24884:5,16 24890:14 24897:9 24898:7,24 24901:18 24904:21 24908:24 24913:22 24919:20 24922:1 24924:1,6 24930:6 24933:18 24934:23 24936:7 24938:19,24,25 24939:11 24951:20 24957:15 24961:1 24971:1 24979:6 24980:24 24984:16 24987:24 24990:23 24991:5 24994:4 24995:8 24997:6,8,12 taken 24890:7 24901:5 24904:1 24922:21 24951:25 24985:19 24986:1 takes 24965:24 24989:5 tale 24882:15 talk 24863:6 24871:24 24889:11 24946:12 24953:13 24954:21 24995:10 24996:17 talking 24890:20 24895:14 24899:4 24944:21 24950:16 24954:4,5 24996:22 talks 24849:25 24873:17 24947:15 target 24848:5 task 24886:19 taxi 24948:25 tea 24901:11,16,19 24971:1 technical 24900:13 television 24840:1 24903:6 24995:19 tell 24866:11 24882:15 24883:16,16 24890:4 24890:6 24893:20 24903:9 24904:16 24938:18 24940:24 24946:14 24965:13 24965:14 telling 24860:22 24861:1 24866:3 24869:3 24870:16,19</p>	<p>24882:3,5,17 24933:11,14 24937:19 24968:20 24996:21 tempore 24843:24 tendered 24886:7 24941:11 tension 24997:4 term 24978:25 24979:3 terminology 24989:20 terms 24836:5 24842:3 24842:18,24 24843:10 24846:22 24850:15 24851:20 24862:14 24863:13 24874:12 24876:20 24907:20 24913:11 24921:21 24929:20 24930:14 24941:7 24944:12 24951:8 24959:19 24975:10 24982:3 24983:13 24993:11 24994:15 24997:20 24998:23 24998:24 24999:2,7,8 25000:5,6,7 25001:3 25002:4,9,12 25003:8 terrible 24883:6 terribly 24893:1 test 24862:23 24876:23 24876:24 24897:13 24930:10,13 24934:24 24935:1,5 24937:12,18 24945:1 24949:6,23 24956:14 24956:16,17,17 24983:4 tested 24879:25 testified 24948:8 testifies 24836:8 24867:17 24869:23 24889:7,19 24896:3 24899:20 24903:6 24907:14 24916:14 24947:21 24949:9,14 testify 24832:20,21 24835:4 24837:25 24838:10 24839:25 24848:12 24849:2 24856:19 24858:18 24867:13,17,18 24868:5 24876:22 24884:3,6,15 24885:18 24886:2,23 24888:25 24889:6 24904:2,3 24905:22 24906:14,19,21 24912:18 24920:16 24920:19 24922:3,8 24924:5,22 24925:4 24925:12 24927:24 24929:14 24930:4,11 24930:19 24933:4 24934:3 24961:10,16 24961:25 24981:24 24989:21</p>	<p>testifying 24835:10 24837:25 24838:8 24856:17 24867:22 24868:5 24889:25 24890:17 24891:9 24897:2,8 24905:13 24933:22 24938:6,12 24939:20 24940:13 24946:2,5,6 24947:13 24948:6 24986:5 testimony 24835:10 24836:9 24852:15 24857:11 24867:22 24881:8,14,21 24882:21 24885:9 24887:1,6 24895:4 24896:13 24902:7 24916:22 24917:4,23 24937:25 24938:7,13 24940:4 24941:16 24947:21,23 24948:24 24962:13 24963:5,14 24965:25 24967:15 24986:11 24989:3,7 24993:18 25003:17 testing 24890:23 tests 24863:2 text 24960:23 24978:19 textbook 24857:19 24935:7 thank 24831:14 24832:15 24835:1 24836:3 24839:15 24845:21,24 24847:13,15 24848:8 24851:17,18 24852:3 24854:14 24856:10 24856:23 24857:16 24863:17,21 24864:6 24864:24 24888:16 24901:23 24909:17 24927:20 24939:7,12 24939:14 24941:13 24941:14 24943:16 24943:18 24946:9,10 24947:10 24970:19 24970:22,24 24971:5 24983:23 25003:25 thanking 24902:9 thanks 24839:10 24864:4 theoretical 24941:3 24969:19 theoretically 24890:2 24941:3 24994:25 theory 24867:14 thereabouts 24950:8 thereof 24960:19 There'd 24877:12 there'll 24876:24 25004:5,14 there's 24838:24 24843:13 24853:4 24866:3 24872:13 24878:7 24882:15</p>
---	--	--	---	--

<p>24892:14 24893:12 24894:22 24902:25 24903:12 24904:9,12 24907:23 24909:15 24909:16,18 24913:22 24915:4 24920:13 24928:20 24928:22 24933:25 24934:22,22 24943:13 24945:19 24951:10 24953:4,12 24957:7 24958:12 24960:20 24963:2,13 24966:7 24967:2,4,12 24971:12 24974:4 24979:7,8 24980:8,10 24980:13 24982:22 24984:1 24986:1 24988:14 24990:3 24991:8 24993:23 24994:2 24999:4 25001:6 25004:11 they'll 24877:25 24910:1 24970:15 they're 24893:7 24904:5 24917:16 24959:14 24994:25 24997:7 thing 24858:13 24867:11 24877:13 24893:14 24894:4 24899:5 24914:7 24944:5,15 24951:15 24952:14 24953:16 24959:17 24961:15 24963:6 24966:6 things 24835:13 24841:21 24844:24 24860:23,25 24863:7 24866:15 24870:18 24870:20 24882:20 24883:6,14 24898:3 24899:16 24914:13 24934:23 24941:8 24945:25 24946:7,14 24949:3,17 24956:15 24957:7,13 24960:22 24961:3,10 24964:7 24967:25 24982:17 24996:23 think 24831:21 24834:18 24838:25 24839:7,8 24847:20 24852:22 24858:14 24859:25 24861:23 24864:3 24873:24 24876:16,20 24877:5 24877:6,7,23 24878:23 24879:9 24882:13 24895:2 24900:23 24901:10 24901:25 24902:3 24908:13 24909:1 24910:3 24912:15,24 24922:16 24926:3,9 24926:11,19</p>	<p>24932:19 24938:23 24943:1,13 24945:4 24951:5,13,23 24953:22 24955:23 24956:20 24957:1,1 24960:3,19 24963:13 24968:10,10,12 24969:4 24979:8 24987:18,20 24996:4 24996:19 24998:7 25004:6,12 thinks 24950:12 third 24916:14 24920:15 24929:3 24939:18 24941:14 24944:15 24946:4 24949:4 24955:20 24961:20 24971:9 24996:10 thirdly 24954:7,7 thought 24848:4 24860:17 24862:12 24866:19 24912:12 24915:2 threat 24931:25 24933:10,14,16 24937:5 threatened 24931:15 24932:10 24947:20 threats 24985:1,2 three 24832:4 24843:17 24892:6 24910:1,6 24916:10 24940:8 24941:21 24945:12 24961:3,10,23 24963:21 24976:3,17 24986:10 24992:13 threshold 24982:12 24983:10,23 24984:3 24986:3 thrust 24847:22 24848:1 24914:17 Thursday 24844:3 tie 24924:9 tied 24956:3 tightly 24988:11 time 24837:4 24844:21 24844:25 24848:6 24882:14 24893:17 24893:17 24908:4 24912:10 24943:22 24956:2 24965:14 24970:22 24975:21 24991:21 timed 24970:25 times 24922:17 24940:12 tipping 24937:3 today 24838:25 24845:12,13 24981:5 today's 24987:7 Toit's 24857:19 24935:7 told 24842:11,12 24912:8 24914:1 24915:5,5,11</p>	<p>24948:22 24963:23 24970:1 tomorrow 24845:14 25004:1,7,17,18 tongue 24954:20 topic 24934:15 topics 24831:19 24910:9 total 24861:2 24996:22 totally 24868:24 touches 24875:14 Town 24926:25 traditional 24883:10 24916:18 tragic 24874:19 transcript 24995:20 transcripts 24996:1 transferring 24880:24 transmission 24833:15 24967:15 transpired 24850:21 transporting 24984:22 Transvaal 24852:20,24 24852:24 24854:25 24855:2,7 24863:25 trauma 24989:9 travel 24932:4 24997:19 travelling 24933:25 24984:11 treating 24967:17 treatment 24935:24 24969:14 trial 24857:14,15 24863:5 24872:5,12 24873:2,3 24898:4,25 24940:2 24976:19 trials 24877:18 24880:15 tribunal 24849:21 24850:1,8 24877:2 24912:18 24948:7 24981:20 tricky 24920:15 trite 24923:8 24932:8 true 24872:12,12 24876:6,18,25 24877:3,9 24890:23 24891:12 24948:19 24979:19 24988:4,9 24988:18 24996:25 trust 24861:19 trustworthiness 24881:8 truth 24860:22 24861:1 24866:3 24869:4 24870:16,19 24877:15,18 24880:25 24882:5,17 24882:25 24976:22 24996:21 truthful 24866:13 truth-seeking 24975:12 try 24845:14 24855:19 24918:16 24939:1 25004:17</p>	<p>trying 24854:23 24872:7 turn 24986:10 24996:12 turning 24992:3 turns 24948:24 two 24839:23 24874:25 24881:6 24916:19 24920:13 24921:25 24932:19 24934:7 24936:23 24945:25 24946:4 24949:17 24955:6,6 24956:15 24959:8 24962:3 24971:19,25 24972:5 24972:6 24974:15 24979:9 24989:25 24992:5 24993:17 twofold 24881:14 typed 24864:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>ultimate 24940:9 ultimately 24933:19 24936:10 24937:24 24986:18 ultra 24919:4 24950:14 24958:23 un 24956:12 unable 24877:10 24925:1 24949:10 unconstitutional 24852:11,17 24853:6 24853:7 24944:6 24945:15 uncontrolled 24870:4 underlying 24868:2 24881:3 underpin 24835:12 underpins 24835:16 understand 24832:6 24841:11,17 24844:17,20 24847:23 24850:4 24867:5,6,15 24868:8 24868:22 24872:5 24879:15 24885:23 24890:19 24892:24 24897:21 24898:6 24899:13 24900:14 24903:3,4,8,23 24904:25 24905:5 24909:22 24911:20 24932:24 24933:23 24934:8 24941:2 24963:9 24977:17 24994:2 24995:6 24996:2 understanding 24861:13 24865:20 24894:9 24916:18 24917:18 24931:25 24993:15 understood 24953:7 24971:7 24982:16 undesirable 24956:20</p>	<p>undisclosed 24934:4 undoubtedly 24975:13 unduly 24860:17 24900:13 unfair 24893:1 24969:13 unfolding 24885:14,21 unfortunately 24839:6 24955:14 University 24926:25 unnecessary 24868:24 unreasonable 24934:11 unrelated 24949:1 unreported 24887:11 24980:19 unrepresented 24993:12,15 24994:2 unsafe 24892:19 24962:15 unseemly 24967:24 urge 24924:16 USB 24939:9 use 24871:10,12 24882:20 24898:16 24904:13 24935:10 24942:17 24954:11 24955:17 24956:13 utilised 24930:10 utility 24879:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/> <p>v 24852:20 24855:7 24863:25 24867:23 24887:10 24896:17 24896:17,21 24901:11 24939:24 valid 24854:6 24909:12 24918:12 24919:8 valve 25000:10 varied 24908:17 variety 24987:15 24988:3 various 24838:18,20 24876:12 24890:23 24977:25 vast 24866:18 24995:14 24995:24 venue 24934:5 24970:11 24985:5 24990:9,10 24991:17 24991:18,23 Vermaak 24844:20,21 24844:23 version 24856:9 24864:23 24897:17 24932:24 24933:1 24965:3 versus 24854:25 24859:11 24902:11 24922:17,25 24929:17,23 24973:11 24975:20 24976:14 24977:6 vested 24975:16 victims 24985:17 24988:12 24989:7,11</p>
---	---	---	--	---

<p>24989:17 24991:4 video 24832:21 24833:1 24834:2 24840:1 24843:15 24852:15 24857:12 24879:20 24880:6 24889:12,19 24890:1 24891:13 24892:22 24894:3 24895:16 24896:1,7,14 24897:2 24897:9,14,19,25 24899:6,8 24902:7,20 24903:6 24904:3 24905:13,16 24906:9 24916:14 24920:16 24920:20 24929:2 24930:20 24933:22 24933:23 24934:8 24938:1 24939:20 24941:19 24943:11 24946:7 24954:22 24956:15 24958:5,13 24966:2 24972:17 24986:12 24989:3,5 24989:25 24990:8 view 24831:22 24868:16 24877:16 24879:9 24881:9 24943:1 24947:12 24963:16 24965:16 24965:21 24966:3 24968:17 24987:11 views 24955:9,24,25 violate 24950:14 violence 24848:21 24931:12 24933:2 24948:25 vires 24919:4 24928:24 24950:14 24958:24 virtually 24879:22 visible 24897:5 visiting 24962:16 volume 24881:5 voluntarily 24912:19 volunteered 24884:3 volunteering 24884:6 volunteers 24884:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>W 24859:12 waiting 24915:16 waived 24999:21 Wales 24925:17 24926:7,7 walk 24987:21 walls 24952:15 want 24831:7 24834:12 24847:25 24861:23 24861:25 24864:21 24865:14 24868:16 24868:18 24877:21 24878:16 24899:13 24900:1,9,18 24908:7 24908:8 24915:25 24930:21 24938:2 24940:24 24942:20</p>	<p>24944:8 24945:7 24956:7 24957:11 24958:8 24959:9,10 24966:6,12 24990:23 24995:13 wanted 24903:25 24929:4 24957:16 24958:2 24969:5 24970:22 wants 24857:5 24901:7 24958:4 24960:2,14 warned 24886:3 Warrant 24947:22 warranted 24884:17 24902:16 24982:2 wasn't 24832:9 24861:2 24882:2,17 24882:18 24996:22 waste 24943:22 wasted 24912:10 watching 24995:18 water 24879:20 watered 24987:9,14 24988:2 watered-down 24938:4 way 24838:11,13 24846:11 24850:20 24851:1 24852:15 24853:13,15 24859:25 24862:21 24865:15 24870:5 24875:14 24876:8,8 24878:11 24892:19 24894:11,12 24895:22 24897:9,9 24898:8 24900:7 24901:1,2 24906:2 24908:11 24915:14 24928:15 24938:15 24947:24 24960:7,22 24963:4 24972:6,22 24991:11 24993:7 25000:9 ways 24866:23 24885:13 24958:13 24970:18 wayside 24970:6 weaker 24867:4 website 24856:7,8,24 24856:25 websites 24926:20 Wednesday 24844:3 24927:7 week 24845:15 24900:21 weeks 24932:19 24993:17 weigh 24932:22 24939:17,17 24941:24 24986:19 weighed 24883:11 weights 24937:3 weight 24872:7,8 went 24955:25 24956:1 Western 24929:18 we'll 24839:11</p>	<p>24845:13 24855:23 24856:1 24857:1 24862:3 24863:15 24901:18 24908:2,3 24908:23 24910:23 24912:19 24915:12 24927:4 24938:25 24944:25 24945:2 24953:5 24955:17 24970:25 24981:2 25004:17 we're 24831:23 24844:2 24845:6 24853:24 24894:3 24895:3,11 24897:11 24906:25 24915:2,16 24930:13 24937:13 24937:17 24942:13 24942:21 24943:2,2 24944:20 24950:16 24969:22 24977:19 24998:2 24999:23 we've 24831:15,15,16 24831:19 24838:7,8 24856:23 24864:11 24895:1 24908:3,11 24910:15 24912:10 24924:4 24925:10 24926:10,15,18,22 24929:8 24931:3 24933:6 24936:8 24938:3 24942:1,6 24975:19 whatsoever 24837:9 24920:10 24933:14 24964:20 what's 24866:19 what's 24868:23 24869:1 24883:14 24907:25 24935:23 24937:18,19 24995:20,25 whereabouts 25001:15 25002:13,21,22 who's 24888:9 24897:14 24898:2,9 24908:21 who've 24932:9,9 wide 24870:4 24918:5 24921:14,15,20 wider 24872:2 Wigmore 24880:9 24881:4,11 24889:16 24890:24 24938:10 24938:14 24947:16 Wigmore's 24882:21 wil 24869:22 willing 24888:25 willy-nilly 24954:12 winning 24971:24 wish 24832:13 24844:10 24845:10 24847:8 24864:1 24865:12 24895:5 24900:23 24907:24 24909:1 24991:14</p>	<p>wished 24955:11 wishes 24832:11 24955:13 wishing 24833:13 24838:18 withheld 24872:1 24878:25 withhold 24859:23 24860:2 withholding 24983:21 withholds 24878:3 witnesses 24837:25 24838:8,10,12 24856:14 24860:3 24871:8,15 24924:21 24924:22 24925:4,12 24927:23 24929:14 24930:4 24932:7,9 24935:25 24944:1 24958:4 24960:3 24968:4 24969:17 24973:20 24990:12 24991:3 24994:18 24998:15,22 24999:15 25003:11 witness's 24880:2 24881:15 WLD 24887:11 woman 24898:2 wonder 24908:10 won't 24861:4 24910:2 24964:25 24969:7 word 24847:25 24881:13 24898:17 24918:6 24935:13 24978:17 wording 24836:11 24982:18,19 words 24834:15,16 24846:3 24866:3 24870:21 24892:5 24903:15 24933:25 24934:4 24946:5 24956:10,11 24957:8 24982:19,24 24983:1 24983:15 25000:8 25002:18 work 24888:9 working 24868:21 24907:1 works 24900:7 world 24965:15 wouldn't 24870:18 24918:13,15 24919:2 24940:22 24988:19 24994:12 would've 24866:19 write 24888:12 24946:18 24972:10 writing 24847:7 24926:23 writings 24926:11 written 24841:22 24907:25 24910:13 24996:2 wrong 24911:11</p>	<p>24971:9 wrongdoing 24856:20 wrongly 24868:25 24983:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>X's 24870:12 24875:14 24917:4 24931:10,14 24932:24 24933:3 24941:16 24943:23 24945:13 24963:14 24984:11,25 24992:5 24992:15 25003:16 25003:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>years 24872:16,19 yesterday 24831:24 York 24941:4 24952:16 24952:18 you'd 24890:14 you'll 24831:25 24862:16 24935:20 24939:11 24962:12 24971:9 24979:1 25004:1 you're 24840:15,16 24845:8 24854:18 24858:1,10 24859:14 24872:2 24873:2 24882:22 24883:3 24888:7 24892:25 24893:1 24900:10,16 24910:19,24 24924:2 24936:2,21 24947:1 24950:6 25004:2 you've 24861:21 24862:21 24863:3,13 24865:6 24878:23 24882:23 24892:3 24893:7 24894:4 24900:16 24906:9 24910:13 24911:22 24923:18 24935:9 24936:22 24938:17 24996:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>000 24964:24 24965:7 24965:10,13,13,14 09:14 24831:2 09:34 24843:5 09:54 24856:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>1 24833:1 24856:17,21 24859:11 24867:23 24886:12 24947:8,9 24988:25 1(b)(1) 24920:25 24954:23 10 24837:3,12 24840:6 24840:14,16 24848:10 24854:7 24858:12 24862:18 24862:22 24920:6,12</p>
--	---	---	--	--

24972:12,21 24973:6 10.1 24840:17 10:36 24863:23 10:56 24876:16 11 24848:4,13,18 24878:20 24884:20 24885:2,12,17 24980:24 11.2 24878:19 11.3 24848:16,16 11.3.1 24848:18 11.3.2 24848:19 11.3.3 24848:22 11.7 24878:14,15 24883:22 11.8 24884:19 11:16 24888:15 11:35 24901:4 12 24848:22 24887:9 24954:21 24998:23 12.1 24859:10 24886:15 24886:17 12.2 24886:14,17,18 12.3 24887:9,10 24888:13 12.4 24896:16 12.6 24896:21 12.8 24901:25 12:07 24901:21 12:27 24916:8 12:46 24931:3 13th 24832:4 24875:2 24882:6 24964:9,10 13(6) 24999:17 13:52 24939:5 130 24857:21 14 24939:15 14:12 24950:23 14:32 24959:25 14:51 24968:12 15 25000:3,7 15(2) 25000:10 15:14 24971:3 15:34 24984:6 15:54 24996:17 153 24852:13 24856:13 24869:19 24871:20 24949:14 153(2) 24982:20 153(2)(b) 24887:13 24888:22 158 24852:15 24856:13 24871:21 24903:9,12 24904:1 24906:1 24922:5 24925:8 24939:25 24958:1,3 24958:10,16 16 24976:6,20 24985:8 24985:8 16th 24832:6 166 24857:8,9 24858:6 24858:7 17 24831:1 24841:4 24888:4 24960:4,5,5 24967:13 25000:16 25000:24	173 24972:22 24973:8 24973:13 18 24841:24 24842:2,23 24842:24 24843:3 24846:8 24912:25 24914:6,7 24960:8,10 24964:11 24973:18 25001:8,22 25002:1,9 25003:8,21 1834 24881:5 185A 25001:1 19 24837:19,22 24838:4 24838:14 24839:17 24892:19,24,25 24902:21 24903:4 24905:10,10,17 24907:21 24921:7,12 24921:19 24924:18 24924:19 24953:4 24955:16,17 24956:23 24957:3,20 24960:5,6 24966:5,6 24972:18 24973:5,24 24974:19 25002:14 25003:17 1914 24922:17 1947 24893:16 1973(3) 24896:17 1976 24881:5 1978(4) 24901:11 1986 24859:11 24926:19 1994 24859:7 1996(1) 24896:22 1999 24887:11 <hr/> 2 2 24833:2 24857:21 24859:12 24939:1,3 24942:3 24988:25 2.1 24915:21 20 24929:12 24981:10 2000(1) 24888:3 2003(1) 24896:18 2008 24852:22,24 24856:22 2009 24856:21 24857:21,21 24923:2 2009(7) 24855:8 24856:5 2012 24942:10 2014 24831:1 21 24924:25 24977:6 218 24901:11 22 24929:7 24978:1 24980:6 24982:6 22-30 24857:20 22-31 24857:21 22-32 24935:8 222 24857:22 232 24896:18 24 24982:14 25001:3 26 24931:7 266 24880:11 27 24986:17 28 25001:13	29 24888:8 24975:21 24987:5 <hr/> 3 3 24833:5 24834:6,13 24834:20 24860:8 24861:11 24862:14 24916:9 24917:13 24942:5 24949:5 24964:24 24965:7,10 24965:13,13,14 24984:18 24992:20 24992:22,23 25000:25 25001:4 3(1) 24921:21 24924:19 300 24964:24,25 31 24934:17 24936:1,3 24936:5 33 24832:5 333 24859:12 336 24947:5,9 34 24832:5 24848:23 24849:4,7,13,17 24850:9,14 24851:11 24851:16,19,22,24 24874:4 24911:6 24959:23 24972:2 24974:10,13,25 24976:4,7,18 24977:21,24 24978:8 24978:13,15,19,21 24980:16 24981:8 24990:20 24991:7,12 34.3 24939:15,24 341 24947:18 345 24949:6 345B 24949:7 35 24911:7 24959:23 24976:4,8,19 35.1 24941:1,7 37 24978:12 24990:18 24992:4 39(2) 24919:25 24924:10 24974:16 24974:21 <hr/> 4 4 24833:10 24835:24 24836:4,11,11,19,19 24836:19 24837:2,14 24849:3 24851:19 24853:25 24854:2 24857:22 24858:23 24859:2,3 24869:21 24869:22 24871:4 24873:11,17 24874:7 24874:14 24888:20 24916:16 24917:25 24918:4,12 24919:7 24929:8 24943:7,12 24950:24 24952:3 24953:16,16 24956:21 24957:18 24959:8,16 24960:16 24972:12 24973:17 24973:21,25	24974:19 24993:16 24993:17 4(c) 24993:23 4.22 24840:25 40 24851:11 41 24992:13 24996:11 42 24970:2 24985:8,8 24985:22,24 24998:12 434 24896:22 46 25000:17 <hr/> 5 5 24833:13 24860:1 24878:19 24943:12 24953:18 24975:5 24988:25 50 24960:6 51.2 25001:12 58 24945:3 582 24896:17 <hr/> 6 6 24833:23 24856:22 24881:5 25003:3 60 25003:2 637 24855:8 <hr/> 7 7 24834:2 24836:2 24967:12,13 25003:3 <hr/> 8 8 24837:21 24978:1 84(2)(f) 24944:13 <hr/> 9 9 24950:6 24984:18,23 24985:9 25004:19 9(1) 24883:23 94 24852:16 99 24964:12
---	---	---	--