

Amnesty Hearings
TYPE AMNESTY HEARINGS
STARTING DATE 11 October 1999
LOCATION DURBAN
DAY 10
NAMES MATTHEW LECORDIER
CASE NUMBER AM4026/97

CHAIRPERSON: Morning everybody. When we adjourned on Friday, it was indicated by Mr Dehal that Mr Lecordier would be giving evidence this morning. Also just, Ms Kooverjee has been excused for a short while, but she will be joining us later.

Mr Lecordier, do you wish to take the oath or do you wish to make an affirmation?

MATTHEW LECORDIER: (affirms)

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr Dehal?

MR DEHAL: Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Perhaps before we begin, may I just hand these statements out, which are Mr Lecordier's drafts.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That will be Exhibit S.

EXAMINATION BY MR DEHAL: Mr Lecordier, you have a copy of your application for amnesty before you, the application which is contained in bundle A1 and marked pages 195 to 201. Do you see that? These pages.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I have that.

MR DEHAL: Do you confirm that that firstly is your application?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do.

MR DEHAL: Were you aided in the completion of this application?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: Who assisted you?

MR LECORDIER: Mrs Paula McBride.

MR DEHAL: You see contained in your application, apart from the list of the acts for which you seek amnesty and a list of victims, your political motive. Do you see that? You have that on page 197 and it continues on page 199 as your political objective that you sought to achieve.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Do you confirm that as correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do.

MR DEHAL: And on page 199 continuing onto page 200, in paragraph 10(b) continuing to 11(a), (b), (c), you have your justification for regarding such acts, omissions and offences as having a political objective.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: You confirm that is correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. Mr Lecordier, before we begin with your general statement, is it correct that you were for the main, in regard to the various acts for which you seek amnesty, a member of the McBride unit?

MR LECORDIER: That's right, yes.

MR DEHAL: That was an MK unit, was it?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it was.

MR DEHAL: And you worked closely with Mr Robert McBride.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Greta Apelgren, Derek McBride, Allan Pearce and Marcel Andrews, Sharpley are all known to you.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, they are.

MR DEHAL: Is it correct that you all lived in the Wentworth area?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Lecordier, I haven't asked this of anybody before, but I was just wondering, did the unit its own name at all or not? Because I've heard that some units carried a name.

MR LECORDIER: At first, Mr Chairman, we were known as the Fairvale Unit. That was before I joined MK.

MR DEHAL: And when you joined MK, at the Robert McBride cell, did that have any name?

MR LECORDIER: The way Robert - I remember Robert explained to me it was Special Operations.

MR DEHAL: Now arising from all these acts you came to be arrested by the Security Police.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: In the main, two trials ensued, amongst a few minor trials. The two main trials were that of State vs Robert John McBride and Greta Apelgren, now known as Ms Narkedien.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

MR DEHAL: Parallel to that was the trial of State vs Derek McBride and Antonio du Preez.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: With somewhat the same counts in each of those two.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: You were a State witness in those trials, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: Then there were some smaller trials, like State vs Allan Pearce and Marcel Andrews and Others.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: You were not a State witness in any of those, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Against Allan Pearce, yes I was.

MR DEHAL: You were. I see. And against Marcel Andrews?

MR LECORDIER: No.

MR DEHAL: Now your being a State witness, was that of your own choice?

MR LECORDIER: No, it was not.

MR DEHAL: You deal with that in your statement, and we will read that shortly. Before we again - sorry, finally, before we deal with your statement, is it correct that you have now reconciled with Robert McBride and all these other gentlemen that I've spoken of?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I have.

MR DEHAL: And the Wentworth community have largely embraced you and taken you back.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

MR DEHAL: Now I take you, Mr Lecordier, to your statement. You begin in paragraph 1 - perhaps I'll give you this copy, there were some typographical errors in yours. You begin in paragraph 1, dealing with the background political education. Do you mind reading that into the record.

MR LECORDIER

"I was brought up in Wentworth. Antonio du Preez, Allan Pearce, Robert McBride, Greta Apelgren, Marson Sharpley, lived in Wentworth at the time."

MR DEHAL: Sorry, Mr Lecordier, do you mind speaking slower, there are interpreters interpreting this.

MR LECORDIER: Okay.

"There came a time when we were all concerned about the inequalities in the country and the impoverished state that we lived in, in Wentworth. The poor education and the tyranny at the hands of the legal gangsters, the police and Labour Party members, in whom the people had no faith.

During or about 1985, I was employed with a place of safety in Wentworth, as a child care officer. Here I dealt with orphans, children with conditions of severe neglect and abandoned children. I also had the sad experience of observing the abuse of children by the staff members, that is other child care officers.

When I raised this issue at staff meetings, I was told to simply follow orders and to listen and obey the authorities and not raise such issues. When this continued I refused to accept it and I was told that since I refused I could leave this, and this I did. This created feelings of awareness and sensitivity in me towards the suffering of children in Wentworth and the abuse of authority.

I was not recruited at the time into MK, or into the Wentworth Unit. I used to often visit the Allan Taylor residence, listen to Radio Freedom and read the voice of the ANC in exile, Setchaba. I listened to discussions, particularly at the Allan Taylor residence by the students, all of which were in the main political discussions.

During 1984 and 1985, I was also part of a group which included comrade Robert McBride and Marson Sharpley and others as well. We would together hold regular political meetings at Allan Pearce's home. This group later developed into what became known as the Fairvale Unit. These developments took place as a result of our continued political education, aided by our listening to Radio Freedom, reading the Setchabas and attending meetings at the Allan Taylor residence.

The ANC literature, amongst other things, called on the patriots of the country to form units and attack targets, in particular government buildings, policemen and informers and other collaborators. We formed this unit and it is this unit that carried out the Fairvale Secondary School arson attack.

During this period also, one of the members of the group, Marson Sharpley, who was known to favour non-violence, at that stage was arrested by the Security Police and beaten up severely and held in detention without trial for several weeks.

After his release we visited him at his home and there observed that he was so badly beaten up that his body which was light-skinned, was of a different colour as a result of the beatings on his person. We also noticed that Marcel's personality had markedly changed, in that he was now in favour of violence and behaved in a paranoid manner when he observed a police vehicle or one that resembled it.

If he saw such a vehicle, and even if we were then in a middle of a discussion, he would immediately leave the discussion without notice to us and run for his life as though mad and fearful of this vehicle.

These impressions formed a distinct impression on me and encouraged me in the belief that a peaceful resolution for the change in this country was not possible. On a wall in Antonio de Preez's home was a picture taken off from the newspapers, of an unknown black man being assaulted by an armed policeman. It was a big picture, which had a great effect on my mind."

MR DEHAL: Now Mr Lecordier, you then in your statement, deal with the various incidents. You begin with the Fairvale Secondary School arson attack. You've mentioned earlier that the Fairvale Secondary School arson attack was one that was carried out before you became a proper MK member, that means before you were recruited by McBride into MK.

MR LECORDIER: That's right, yes.

MR DEHAL: But that at the time Fairvale - sorry, at the time of the arson attack, there was a unit in existence in Wentworth, to which you belonged, correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: And that prior to this arson attack you had already been attending political meetings at the Allan Taylor residence.

MR LECORDIER: That's correct.

MR DEHAL: Listening to Radio Freedom, the voice of the ANC in exile and reading Setchabas.

MR LECORDIER: That's correct.

MR DEHAL: So you were politicised at the time?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I was.

MR DEHAL: Will you then read what you have from (i) to (vi), under paragraph 2, dealing with Fairvale.

MR LECORDIER: Fairvale Secondary School Arson Attack.

"This incident occurred on the third of September 1985. There were no injuries to any persons in this operation. The persons involved in this operation, within the unit, loosely set up Wentworth at time were Naziem Kassiem, Allan Pearce, Robert McBride and Marson Sharpley.

At the time of this operation we were not formally recruited into the ANC/MK unit, but we understood the policy and the guidelines of the ANC, had been listening to Radio Freedom, reading Setchaba, the voice of the ANC, and actively engaged ourselves in repeated daily discussions about the need to change the situation. We understood that this could not be achieved by peaceful means.

This was the first operation that I was involved in, and indeed the first that this combat unit carried out. The object of this operation was to highlight the inferior and dilapidated condition of the school. A complaint that had been tirelessly take up till then. We hoped that this long-standing issue would now be addressed.

My own activity in this operation was that I, together with Allan Pearce and Marson Sharpley, stood guard at the school whilst comrade Robert and Naziem Kassiem went to the laboratory area of the school, with a view to breaking the windows and pouring petrol into the school. It was agreed that Naziem Kassiem would light a match and throw it into the school, as he was the fittest at the time. The school was set alight, however the damage was at a very superficial level."

MR DEHAL: Now Naziem Kassiem was chosen you say, because he was the fittest, obviously because he could then retreat successfully.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: You then deal with the supply of weapons to yourself in Botswana. The reason you deal with this count is that in bundle A1, at page 7, item 5, you are cited as an applicant under this heading as an incident, one of which Mr McBride is an applicant and seeks amnesty for. Do you recall?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do recall.

MR DEHAL: This however, is not an incident that you seek amnesty for, correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's correct.

MR DEHAL: Okay. Will you read paragraph 1 and 2 in that regard.

MR LECORDIER

"Inasmuch as I did not specifically apply for amnesty in regard to this count, I notice at the bundle A1, on page 7, as per item 5, records that I am an applicant in this regard.

I have never been to Botswana, I have never been supplied with weapons either in Botswana or in any other country. I have never accompanied comrade McBride to Botswana."

MR DEHAL: But any weapons supplied to you would have been within the ambit of your MK unit, by Robert McBride or somebody, on his instructions, correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: You then deal with an incident, an operation that you sought amnesty for and that's the handgrenade attack on the house of Peter Klein.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: You remember that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do.

MR DEHAL: You recall that I took you through bundle A1, on page 9, item 15. You will see that this incident has a date as the 5th May 1986. You say you don't agree with that, it's actually the 1st May 1996, correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's correct.

MR DEHAL: You've conferred with McBride and others to confirm the correctness of the date 1st May as correct.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: And you recall that in the date sequence this grenade attack on Klein was prior to the Edendale operation, correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: So item 14 on page 8, bundle A1, which has the Edendale operation, should actually be after this Klein incident, correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's right, yes.

MR DEHAL: Okay. Now will you then please read (i) to (vii) of paragraph 4 into the record.

MR LECORDIER: The handgrenade attack on the house of Mr Klein, 1st of May 1986. "Shortly after comrade McBride had recruited me and trained me in the use of arms and educated me politically, he instructed me to carry out certain operations against collaborators and Security Force personnel.

Comrade McBride had discussed with me a number of targets, including attacks on an armed personnel carrier, police casspir and the attack on policemen, the attack on Labour Party collaborators and the attack on police reservists.

I selected Klein as the target. I knew that Klein was a police reservist and closely associated with the Labour Party. At that stage police reservists were viewed as collaborators and Klein was known to be an influential member of the Labour Party.

I confirm Mr McBride's testimony in regard to Mr Klein and confirm that this was also my view at the time.

One of the reasons I chose Klein as a target is that logistically I would not need to arrange transport to carry out this operation. Additionally I was aware of the room in the Klein's house, which was his bedroom.

I went to the house with Antonio du Preez, in the early hours of the morning. As instructed by comrade McBride, I threw the handgrenade through the window. I had one handgrenade and Antonio du Preez had another. Mr du Preez' handgrenade did not enter the house. The handgrenade that I threw exploded within the house and that which Antonio du Preez threw, exploded on the outside of the house. I accept that there was injury to both Mr and Mrs Klein. Mr McBride had not participated in this operation.

I am also aware that Mrs Klein featured prominently within Labour circles, in support of her husband who was a Labour Party member. Even if Mrs Klein was not closely and actively involved in the Labour Party, I would still have gone on with this operation, in view of Mr Klein as a legitimate target. In that case, Mrs Klein, being caught in the crossfire, would have been an acceptable justifiable casualty."

MR DEHAL: Now you say that before you carried out this operation you had information, presumably from your intelligence, as to which room in the house of the Klein's was his bedroom.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: And is that the room that you threw the handgrenade into, through the window?

MR LECORDIER: That's right, yes.

MR DEHAL: Did you know whether Mr Klein had any children?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I did.

MR DEHAL: Would they have been about the same age as you?

MR LECORDIER: No.

MR DEHAL: We heard the other day about Marson Sharpley, who was friendly with Klein's son.

MR LECORDIER: I think that's Marcel Andrews. Thank you.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, we heard that here.

MR DEHAL: Do you know that son?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON: You say that you knew that the Kleins had children and that they, you said they weren't the same age as you. How many children did they have and what was their approximate ages at the time of the incident on the 1st of May, do you know?

MR LECORDIER: Mr Chairman, I don't know their ages, but the one, his daughter is much older than me and she wasn't living at home at the time and his son who's younger than me, was living at home at the time.

CHAIRPERSON: And that son was the one referred to by Marcel Andrews.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Did you have information that these children occupied a separate bedroom?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I did have that info.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. You then deal with the Edendale Hospital operation, where Gordon Webster was removed, and that you say occurred on the 4th of May 1986.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: You seek amnesty for this operation. And this is dealt with in bundle A1, page 8 on item 14, correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Will you please read the entire two pages dealing with Edendale Hospital.

MR LECORDIER

"Sometime towards the end of April 1986, Antonio du Preez and I were training in the use of AK47s. Comrade McBride had so trained us. He advised us that we will shortly be embarking on an operation in which we may be asked to use these weapons.

Shortly before the 4th of May, on a date I'm not too sure of, comrade Robert informed me he would shortly be calling upon me to make myself available for an operation.

As mentioned, we operated strictly on the need-to-know discipline and all I advised him of was that I would be available within the next few days and did not ask any questions about the operation.

If I recall correctly, at about 4.30pm on the 4th of May 1986, comrade McBride called me to his father's workshop, where other comrades were present and we received a briefing on the Edendale operation. A map was used to advise us each of our respective task, duties, in this operation.

We then left in two separate vehicles to the Edendale Hospital. I travelled with comrade McBride and others. We travelled in a blue van.

When we got to Pietermaritzburg we had to wait until visiting hours were over. And since we had enough time a reconnaissance was carried out on this operation.

Comrade Robert drove onto a dirt road to a fence outside the hospital and again explained to me my role. We also went to a takeaway where we had coffee and tea. When we later got to Edendale Hospital to carry out the operation, my task was to cut a hole in the fence and to remain at the vehicle with the bonnet open, to create the impression that it was broken down. So as not to draw any undue suspicion to it. Comrade Robert McBride and Derek McBride had entered the hospital premises and after a short while I heard gunshots. Shortly thereafter a person was brought, wheeled on a stretcher to the vehicle I was at. I later learnt that this person is Gordon Webster. He was introduced to me shortly after the operation as Steven Mkhize.

Comrade Webster was then placed into the vehicle and we drove to meet Greta Apelgren. We did not meet her. I was to have handed over the firearms to a Welile Khumalo, alias Themba, for him to safely bury them.

Comrade McBride then decided to drive to Wentworth, which we did. At Wentworth, comrade Webster was placed into the Factorama(?) premises. I assisted in looking after the ailing Webster. I removed my socks and placed it on Webster's legs, massaged his feet and generally kept him comfortable. Later comrade Robert took me to my home by car."

MR DEHAL: Thank you. Mr Lecordier, you then deal with the Why Not/Magoo's incident which took place on the 14th of June 1986 at the Marine Parade. You seek amnesty for this operation, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's correct.

MR DEHAL: And this is dealt with in bundle A1, as item 17 on page 9. Now will you please read the next two pages into the record. Slowly please.

MR LECORDIER

"The persons involved in this operation were comrade Robert, Greta Apelgren and I. On the morning of the Magoo's incident, comrade Robert came to see me. He told me to make myself available at about 7pm. He told me that he was going to leave a car for another MK unit which they were going to pick up in the city centre.

He came and picked me up that night and drove me into town. Just before we got into the city centre, there was a bump on the highway. As we drove over the bump, Robert explained to me that there were explosives in the boot of the car. I did not think he was serious.

We drove into town and we stopped outside Hyperama House and Home, in West Street. Robert then told me that we must get out of his car and go into Greta's car, which was parked nearby. I walked with Robert and got to Greta's car and she was instructed by Robert to drive.

We then drove to the Marine Parade. There Robert instructed Greta to drive on the Marine Parade. How precisely we drove I cannot remember, which parts of the streets we drove on, I can't remember. I do know that we drove on the Marine Parade. She was then instructed to drive back to the vicinity of the Hyper House and Home, where our car was parked. This she did.

When we got to our car (sorry, there's a typing error there) ..."

CHAIRPERSON: Where the word "her" appears on the last line of (3), we changed to "our" and then also the first line of (4), we change the word "her" to "our". Is that right?

MR LECORDIER: That's right, Mr Chairman.

"When we got to our car at the Hyper House and Home, both Robert and I alighted from her car and entered our car. Robert and I then got into the blue Ford Cortina and drove and Robert told Greta to follow us.

When we got to the bottom of Pine Street, in the vicinity of Point Road, Robert told me to wait there and handed me a firearm, which he cocked before giving to me. He instructed me that if any person were to come to this vehicle to search the vehicle, I am to shoot them. He also told me that I am to wait there and he would return within a short while to meet me.

Comrade Robert then got into the vehicle with Greta Apelgren and they drove off. After a short while comrade Robert returned on foot to my vehicle, got into the vehicle and drove to the Marine Parade.

We then drove to the Marine Parade where Greta Apelgren was parked in a space which was not a parking bay, closest to the Why Not bar. Details that I subsequently acquainted myself on. Comrade Robert signalled to Greta to come out of the space and as she did that, Robert parked the blue Ford Cortina in that space.

This was the spot nearest to the Why Not bar. It was drizzling at the time and it was shortly after 9pm. The Marine Parade was not too busy at the time, as it was drizzling and getting late in the evening.

Comrade Robert asked me to get the numberplate of the vehicle from the front and hand it to him, which I did. Robert instructed me to be vigilant and to watch around to see if we were being watched. He also instructed me to keep the firearm in readiness. Comrade Robert then showed me a pin. I may at this stage indicate that comrade Robert had trained us that whenever an explosive device is detonated, the

pin removed is to be shown to the Commander before it is disposed of where convenient. The reasoning for this is firstly, that it is confirmation that the explosive device has been initiated and secondly, to prevent any abuse. The moment comrade Robert showed me the pin I knew immediately that this was a car bomb operation."

MR DEHAL: Sorry, Mr Chairperson, the word "defused" is to read initiated. Carry on, Mr Lecordier. ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, if you could just explain that, Mr Lecordier. What do you mean "showed me a pin"? Showed you a pin that was lying on the seat, or what is the situation?

MR LECORDIER: Mr Chairman, he told me that I must look around to see if anybody is watching us and that's when he said he's going to pull the pin of the bomb itself.

CHAIRPERSON: Where was this? Was it in the boot of the vehicle, or ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: From what I recall it was - sorry, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: Where was the pin when you saw it?

MR LECORDIER: In comrade Robert's hand.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh okay, so he just showed you a pin, you didn't know where he had pulled it from or whatever?

MR LECORDIER: No, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thank you.

MR DEHAL: Sorry, Mr Lecordier, you say that it was a disciplinary rule that when a detonator is activated, the pin is to be shown to your Commander.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: And did you say there are basically two reasons, the one is to show that the detonator has been activated or initiated?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: And secondly, to prevent abuse.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Now in this case, when comrade Robert showed you a pin, did you understand that he had now activated an explosive?

MR LECORDIER: That's how I understood it.

MR DEHAL: And by the way he carried himself within the car, did you understand that the explosive was within the car?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: And you say then you now came to know that this was a car bomb operation.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. May I take you then to (ix), where you say

"Comrade Robert and I then walked to where Greta was, got into the vehicle, later filled petrol and drove back to Wentworth."

Do you see that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: That's paragraph 11, Mr Dehal.

MR DEHAL: Sorry. Thank you, that's paragraph 11.

And then go to paragraph 12.

MR LECORDIER

"On the way we got to the top of Ridge Road where we stopped at a spot near the Ridge Road Police Station. And Robert said he wanted to establish which way the

cops were going. He was concerned that we may have cordoned ourselves within the circle thrown around the town.

Thereafter we drove on a roundabout route back to Wentworth. When we got to Wentworth, Robert drove me to my home, where he left me and he and Greta drove off. Greta was smartly dressed on that night."

MR DEHAL: Thank you. Then you deal with three operations, all of which took place on the same day/night, namely the 21st and 22nd of June. That's the Umlaas Mobile Oil pipeline explosion;

The mini-limpet mine explosion at the vegetable oil tank and;

The limpet mine explosion outside the Copper Shop.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: You were involved in all three these operations.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I was.

MR DEHAL: And these operations all took place on the same day, following into that night.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Leading up to that night. Now may we start with - sorry, the sequence of these operations is as per Annexure A1 in bundle - sorry A1 on pages 9 and 10.

Do you remember that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do.

MR DEHAL: You're simply following that sequence, is it?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Shall we begin with the Umlaas Mobile Oil pipeline. You have one paragraph there. Sorry, before we deal with that. You seek amnesty for each of these applications, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. Now will you read that which you have under the Umlaas Mobile Oil pipeline.

MR LECORDIER

"There were three operations ..."

...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: The word "exposition" should read "explosion".

MR DEHAL: I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON: Proceed, Mr Lecordier.

MR LECORDIER

"There were three operations on this night. The others were a mini-limpet mine explosion, the vegetable oil tanker storage facility in Chamberlain Road and the third one was the limpet mine explosion outside Copper Shop, Brickhill Road.

All these three operations were done on the same day. There were no persons injured and none killed. Comrade Robert, Antonio du Preez and I carried out these three operations.

Antonio drove. He dropped Robert and I and we pretended that we were going fishing. Comrade Robert and I went and placed the charges on the oil pipes. Two limpet mines. We walked off, Antonio came back and picked us up."

MR DEHAL: Thank you. Then you deal with the mini-limpet mine explosion at the vegetable oil tank at the corner of Lawley and Chamberlain Roads. You say the same method of operation was used here.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: And that this operation was the same as the one preceding, namely the Umlaas Mobile Oil pipeline explosion.

MR LECORDIER: Except that Robert got out of the car alone and placed the charge himself.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. I then take you to the limpet mine explosion outside the Copper Shop in Brickhill Road. This is an operation in which you featured by carrying out the explosion, by taking it to the police vehicle, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

MR DEHAL: Will you please read (i) into the record.

MR LECORDIER

"This was an unsuccessful operation. The target was originally a police vehicle that was parked almost on a permanent basis at the bottom of Point Road. My task was to place the limpet mine in this vehicle and comrade Robert agreed to pick me up afterwards.

On my way to the police vehicle, after being dropped off, I became scared because I was under the impression that I had been spotted by the police and I panicked and dropped the explosive device into a refuse bin.

In fact it was daily noticed that the police would park the vehicle and move away from it, but on this particular day when I got to the police vehicle, I noticed they were still in it.

In all three incidents carried out on the 21st and 22nd of June, there were no injuries and no-one was killed. The three operations were all intended to continue the sabotage campaign, disrupt the oil supplies as in the first one, the economic sabotage and armed propaganda. This, as per the instructions and policy of Robert McBride and the ANC, as he had told us."

MR DEHAL: Mr Lecordier, in this Copper Shop operation, you say that the police parked their vehicle there daily and your intelligence showed that they would leave their vehicle and move away from it and you intended to place this explosive device beneath their vehicle.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: But on this particular day you saw they were still in their vehicle, and is it they that you were worried about, as having spotted you?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: And you say then that you took this explosive device and placed it in a refuse bin?

MR LECORDIER: That's right, yes.

MR DEHAL: Is that the one closest to the Copper Shop?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

MR DEHAL: And is it as a result of this explosion that the Copper Shop sustained substantial damages?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Lecordier, just as a matter of interest, what is a Copper Shop?

MR LECORDIER: It was a curio shop, Mr Chairman, they sell a lot of ornaments made from copper.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And when you placed that mine in the refuse bin, was there traffic, pedestrian traffic on the pavement? What was the situation?

MR LECORDIER: There were a few pedestrians walking around at that time.

CHAIRPERSON: Could you give an estimate of the time of night that this took place?

MR LECORDIER: No, Your Worship, I don't want to go into that, I'm not sure of the time there.

JUDGE PILLAY: Well was it night-time or daytime?

MR LECORDIER: It was at night.

JUDGE PILLAY: Yes.

MR DEHAL: But Mr Lecordier, you say that there were no injuries in this operation and no persons killed, is it?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: And this is in Point Road - sorry, this Copper Shop was in Point Road, at the corner of Point Road and the projection of West Street leading up to the Marine Parade?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right, in that vicinity.

MR DEHAL: Not too far off from the Why Not area?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. You then deal with the sabotage of the water pipeline, which took place on the 29th to 30th of June 1986. This is an item you sought amnesty for and is dealt on bundle A1, page 10, item 21, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: Will you please read (i) to (v) into the record.

MR LECORDIER

"Allan Pearce, comrade McBride and I were involved in this operation.

At the stage this took place, Allan Pearce had been recruited by myself into the cell that was made up of Antonio du Preez and myself. As an operation which was in line with the disruption of industrial water supplies to the New Germany/Pinetown area, and which sought economic sabotage and armed propaganda on behalf of the ANC. This operation was also planned as an initiation operation for Allan Pearce, as he and I and Antonio would be working together. The method of operation was the same. Robert dropped off Allan and I. The intention being that we must get confidence of placing charges without comrade Robert. Comrade Robert then picked us up after about five minutes after we placed the charges and we drove off. The pipes were damaged and the water supply to the industrial area was disrupted for a few days. There were no deceased, no persons injured. Comrade Robert was convicted and sentenced for this operation. We attach the charges to the valves as the pipes had lagging around them and the magnet could not hold onto it."

MR DEHAL: Thank you. Then you deal with illegal possession of arms and ammunition. This deals with the two Shangwene DLBs. You recall that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do.

MR DEHAL: Will you please read (i) and (ii) into the record.

MR LECORDIER

"I made two separate trips to the Shangwene area, for the purpose of bearing arms. This I did under comrade Robert's instructions.

On our first trip I went with Robert and we dug a hole. On the second trip we took the arms and buried it there."

...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, just before you continue. "We took the arms and buried it there", did you just have one weapon or is this a typing error?

MR LECORDIER: No, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: Can you just give an indication of the quantity of arms and the type of arms that were buried when you buried them.

MR LECORDIER: It was a variety of weapons, Mr Chairman.

MR DEHAL: And were these weapons placed in plastic bags and buried into the hole that was dug there?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: So it was an arms cache, is it?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: That concludes the number of incidents/operations, for which you seek amnesty and the one of course that was mistaken as being an operation that you sought amnesty for.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: You now deal with your role as a State witness, as a State witness in the trial of State vs Robert McBride and Derek McBride, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

MR DEHAL: Will you please go to page 10, paragraph 12 and read that into the record, slowly please.

MR LECORDIER

"As is common knowledge I was arrested by the Security Police. I was repeatedly assaulted, humiliated, intimidated, threatened and abused by the Security Police in diverse ways. Under the threats, amongst other things, that they would take my family away from me, cause harm to my family, in particular to my son, to his mother and to my mother and father. And pursuant to various acts of assault on my person, I was induced into becoming an State witness.

The Security Police insisted that hand-write a statement. Which I did over several days. When they were dissatisfied with the first attempt, they made me rewrite it, insisting that I include in it various suggestions and versions they had proffered to me.

I subsequently, over the many days that passed, made various statements, one after the other and as they rejected each one, I was required to rewrite same. The final statement was a very detailed statement that went over many, many pages. I was frustrated and tired through this exercise.

During the course of the trial, the various State prosecutors from the Attorney-General's office, including the Security Police, insisted that I comply with my statement and keep to it. And if I dared to deviate from it when I entered the courtroom, they would deal with me when I came out of the courtroom, for I had to return to them as I was in their custody.

During the course of the trial I was very afraid of both my standing against my comrades and of standing with the police and indeed my fear of standing against the police as well, and indeed against the prosecutors.

When I entered the courtroom I was very nervous. I tried to help Robert, but could not do this as shortly after that attempt of mine and during the adjournment that followed, the Security Police and the prosecutors threatened me and held a noose in front of me, which they had on various previous occasions as well, and said that I was close to my death if I dared attempt to save or help Robert in any way.

I recall that when on the various subsequent adjournments I was placed in a room. The Security Police and the prosecutors would bring my police statement to me and insist that I go through it thoroughly and keep to it. I was being brainstormed."

...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Brainwashed.

MR DEHAL: Thank you, that is correct, it's "brainwashed".

CHAIRPERSON: Are you alright, Mr Lecordier?

MR LECORDIER: I'm okay.

CHAIRPERSON: You don't want a short break?

MR LECORDIER: Please, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: This will be an opportune time to take the short tea adjournment.

MR DEHAL: Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

COMMITTEE ADJOURNS

ON RESUMPTION

MATTHEW LECORDIER: (s.u.o.)

EXAMINATION BY MR DEHAL: (cont)

Mr Lecordier, you were busy with the background and your involvement as a State witness in those trials, earlier trials. Do you mind looking at the top of page 11 and beginning at (ix). "In the result ..."

MR LECORDIER

"In the result, the judge found that I was not a satisfactory State witness, having not made full and open disclosure and did not indemnify me.

My version as a Security Police witness, as a State witness in the trial was largely incorrect, being a version that the police suggested to me. In particular, the version relating to my intention at some stage to carry out an armed robbery, was one that the Security Police made up and insisted I add, so as to criminalise this whole political event. On occasions I attempted to argue this against them, but they beat me up and repeated their threats. I had to say this in Court.

I have since the trial was over, apologised to McBride and we have reconciled and he has understood that I was a victim of circumstances, a victim of the brutal Security Police.

At some stage after the trial, the Security Police congratulated me on the assistance I gave to them. They paid me an amount of money, although I do not recall the precise sum. I think it was either R2 000 or R2 500. They arranged an employment for me in Cape Town. However, they wanted me to be a spy for them. When I refused to continue to participate with them, I was forced out of this employment. This happened as a result of a fight I was engaged in with one of the co-employees. On reflection, it appears clear to me that this was set up to force me out of my employment.

In Cape Town there was a Security Policeman who was in charge of me and whom I remember as Kannemeyer, a Coloured man from Mitchell's Plain. Shortly I left the above employ, the Security Police again approached me and requested that I infiltrate some of the unions and give information on them. As I was under pressure from them, I decided that the best thing for me to do was to simply escape, so that they could not trace me.

The fear I had was, I could not return to Wentworth, my home town, as the people regarded me as a sell-out in view of my having assisted the Security Police in being a State witness against comrade McBride and the other comrades.

I was at a loss to understand where to go and in the result felt hopeless and lost. I had no-one to turn to. The Security Police had made a misery of my life. They had caused me to be an outcast by my own people and indeed caused me, forcibly, to turn against my very own comrades. They were not concerned about this position they placed me in, but were selfish in their desires, continuing in their instance that I infiltrate organisations to help them. In the result I was left alone without friends and family, without a job, utterly frustrated, deeply distressed and not knowing which way to turn.

As earlier indicated, I was neither indemnified in the earlier trial, nor charged with the acts for which I seek amnesty. I seek amnesty for all these counts and apologise to any persons that may have been injured or killed, directly or indirectly as a result of my participation in any of the aforesaid operations.

I have no hesitation in engaging in reconciliation with any of the victims of the family members of the deceased. I am sorry for this. It was understood by us that the Security Police were keenly desirous to destroy us after they used us as State witnesses and threw us back into society. The society kills us for being State witnesses. The Security Police knew this and wished it upon us.

When I was in detention and before I became a State witness, the Security Police questioned me only about operations that I was involved in and this made me suspicious about whether any of my comrades had sold out on me, as they were not talking of any other operations and knew of all the operations that I was involved in. At this stage I became concerned and in the belief that I was sold out by my own comrades, felt it easier to handle being a State witness. I mention this as I am concerned generally about the people in Wentworth and what view they may hold of me when I am released to Wentworth. I want them to know that I was forced into this situation.

I repeat that I am very sorry for all the sorrow, hurt, harm, that I have caused to the victims and their family members as a result of my participation in the various operations."

MR DEHAL: Thank you. Mr Chairperson, in (xix), on the fourth line the word "their" should read "they". So it would be as "they were not". I apologise for that, Mr Chairperson.

Mr Lecordier, you say that at the time you were so threatened by the Security Police and on occasions by the prosecutors, you had a son, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: You had also had threat issued to you in regard to your mother and father.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: What was the threat in regard to your Mom and Dad?

MR LECORDIER: The Security Police told me that they would take everything away from my Mom and Dad, meaning the house that they had worked so hard for.

MR DEHAL: And as regards your son?

MR LECORDIER: They told me they would kill my son if I did not do what they wanted me to do.

MR DEHAL: And your son's mother?

MR LECORDIER: And my son's mother, they would kill her as well.

MR DEHAL: Is this the only child you had at the time?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. If I may take you to the Klein incident. Klein as a target, was that chosen by you or McBride?

MR LECORDIER: It was chosen by me.

MR DEHAL: What was McBride's instructions to you on incidents of this nature? Was it a general set of instructions on collaborators, Labour Party members? Was he specific about different people?

MR LECORDIER: He never specified who we must attack. He gave me a few names of people and police collaborators, like Mr July, Mr Pearce, Mr Klein, and I chose Mr Klein.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. Mr Chairperson, that's the evidence, thank you.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS BY MR DEHAL

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Dehal. Ms Kooverjee?

MS KOOVERJEE: No questions, Sir, thank you.

NO QUESTIONS BY MS KOOVERJEE

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Richard - sorry, Mr Prior.

MR PRIOR: Mr Chairman, sorry. We've agreed that I go before Mr Richard, I have a few general questions.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, Mr Prior.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY ADV PRIOR: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Lecordier, the Fairvale Unit was in existence, or you were part of the Fairvale Unit before you were drafted into Special Ops, or were you never drafted into Special Ops?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I was recruited into Special Ops.

ADV PRIOR: But you were first part of the Fairvale Unit?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: Did you perpetrate the attack on Mr and Mrs Klein as part of the Fairvale Unit or part of Special Ops?

MR LECORDIER: As part of Special Ops.

ADV PRIOR: And how long had you been with Special Ops before you decided that Klein was a legitimate target?

MR LECORDIER: I think if I remember correctly, it was about a month before the Klein incident that I was recruited into Special Ops.

ADV PRIOR: And is it clear from your statement you wished to kill Mr and Mrs Klein by throwing grenades into the bedroom? That was your intention.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it was.

ADV PRIOR: To kill both of them.

MR LECORDIER: To kill Mr Klein, yes.

ADV PRIOR: And Mrs Klein.

MR LECORDIER: Well I accepted it as she would be a justifiable victim caught in the crossfire.

ADV PRIOR: I don't want to go over to Mr Richard's cross-examination, I'll leave that there.

When you were arrested by the members of the Security Police, was that more-or-less at the same time as your other comrades?

MR LECORDIER: I'm not sure on that because I didn't know they were arrested.

ADV PRIOR: And did you at first deny all knowledge of what they were saying? Well, just tell us what the position was.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I did deny it at first.

ADV PRIOR: And then did they start torturing and assaulting you?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

ADV PRIOR: Did they suggest to you that you should turn as State witness against

...

MR LECORDIER: Yes. I wouldn't say suggest, I would say I was forced.

ADV PRIOR: And that was as a result of the treatment you received?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: Now I have understanding as to your predicament, you were obviously - you were being held under Section 29, is that correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Prior.

When you were giving evidence as a State witness at these trials you've referred to, were you still a Section 29 detainee or were you released?

MR LECORDIER: I was not released, Mr Chairman, I was still detained at the time.

CHAIRPERSON: So you were in custody the whole time during the course of both those trials, I think three trials weren't there? Where you testified, the three trials.

MR LECORDIER: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Yes, Mr Prior.

ADV PRIOR: I'm particularly concerned about the run-up to your giving evidence. It seems that you were never in a situation that you could either report your treatment at the hands of the police to anyone in partial, like a magistrate or a judge or some other independent body. Is that the position?

MR LECORDIER: The thing is, what you're asking me is who was I supposed to report this to.

ADV PRIOR: Well, were you ever visited by a judge or a magistrate whilst in custody?

MR LECORDIER: Not that I recall.

ADV PRIOR: And at the trial ...(intervention)

JUDGE PILLAY: If they did come, you would have remembered it surely.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I would have.

ADV PRIOR: Before you testified against Mr McBride, you had been assaulted, you had been treated as you've described, in addition to that the life of your child and his mother and your parents had also been threatened.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

ADV PRIOR: During the trial you indicated that at various adjournments or intervals, the prosecutors and the members of the Security Police would visit you and show you statements that you had made, or a statement that you had made to, that you would go over in order not to forget. Was that done within the precincts of the Court itself?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it was done in the Court building.

ADV PRIOR: Can you recall who the prosecutors were, the State prosecutors?

MR LECORDIER: I think it was Mr Shope(?), Mr de Wet, I'm not sure on the third name.

ADV PRIOR: Were they the counsel that were representing the State at Mr McBride's trial?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: From the record I think there's reference to a Mr Slabbert SC.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: Is it your evidence that during various intervals these three persons ... Was it at the same time or at various times?

MR LECORDIER: At different times.

ADV PRIOR: ... whilst you were giving evidence, caused you to refresh your memory or to refer to your statement that you had made to the police?

MR LECORDIER: The thing is you say whilst I was giving evidence. There were adjournments and this is when this took place.

ADV PRIOR: Yes. Yes, I mean you were giving evidence then the matter would be adjourned and during those intervals you were approached, as your evidence indicated, by State prosecutors as well as members of the Security Police.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: And there they would at those occasions, impress upon you the need for you to adhere to the statement that you had given to the Security Police before you had started your evidence.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: Did you ever complain to, for example, Mr Slabbert, who was the leader? Obviously, the leader of the prosecution.

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not complain.

ADV PRIOR: Are you able to recall any of the Security Police that attended those particular meetings whilst you were giving evidence, in order for you to adhere to your statement?

MR LECORDIER: The thing is it was such a long time ago, I can't recall it.

ADV PRIOR: Yes, but are there any names that stick out? For example, the investigating officer must be known to you.

MR LECORDIER: I think it was de Beer ...(intervention)

ADV PRIOR: Was he there, for example?

MR LECORDIER: ... and Adendorf.

ADV PRIOR: Are those two names that ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: Those were the ones that were always working close with me.

ADV PRIOR: And were they present on those occasions where you ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: On some of these occasions, yes.

ADV PRIOR: Now I see from the record there was some stage where there was almost a trial within a trial, because you had referred to a statement and it turned out that it was a statement that you had prepared yourself to assist yourself, in other words it was your own notes. Is that correct?

MR LECORDIER: I wouldn't say it was my own notes, there were quite a few statements that I had written that I was forced to write.

ADV PRIOR: Sir, I'm just referring to the record where any summation, Judge Sherrer refers to a problem in your evidence where you had referred to some notes and it turned out that they were notes that you had made and the defence on behalf of Mr McBride, raised this and properly so. I just want to get clarity on that. What comes across in the trial record is that you had made those notes yourself, unbeknown to the police and the prosecution. What is your explanation about that?

MR LECORDIER: I don't where you got that information from.

ADV PRIOR: Alright, well ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: The thing is I was forced to write those things that were said in there. It's not a thing that I just did on my free will.

ADV PRIOR: Yes, I understand. I'm asking you whether you can explain what the true position is. We know from evidence ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: I've just explain it to you.

ADV PRIOR: Just hold on, just hold on. We know from evidence given by Mr McBride, that a lot of what was said at the trial was not true, it was done specifically to, for a purpose because they didn't trust the system. And I think you may have gone along with that, to whatever extent. I'm asking you, there was a passage in the judgment, and if you give me a chance I'll get to it, where there was some discussion about notes that you had referred to whilst giving evidence. Do you remember that passage? Or that point in the trial while you were giving evidence.

MR LECORDIER: You know, it was such a long time ago, there's a lot that I don't remember because I've tried to put this thing behind me and go ahead with my life.

ADV PRIOR: I hear you, but we're here now listening to amnesty applications and we have to dredge up the past and we have to hear what the truth is. So just calm down and listen to the question. It's not a trick question. You see, do I understand you to say that it was the Security Police that were getting you to make statements?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: They were also getting you to refer to your statements whilst you were giving evidence.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: In was something that in those days was not permissible. Do you see what I'm getting at? And during the trial, in the judgment of Sherrer, and one of the reasons why your evidence was rejected as unreliable was because the notes you referred to differed from the statement that you had given. Do you remember that or don't you remember that at all?

MR LECORDIER: I don't recall that too clearly.

ADV PRIOR: Right.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, excuse me. Were you present in Court when the judgment was delivered?

MR LECORDIER: No, Mr Chairman.

ADV PRIOR: I'll refer just for reference to complete this, A2, bundle A2 at page 1872 of the judgment, the last third of the - in other words, two-thirds down the page, from the sentence

"At one point his evidence, his reference to a statement prompted investigation under cross-examination."

Just before I move on from that point, can you maybe just assist us. On how many occasions did the prosecutors and the Security Police visit you whilst you were standing down during the course of your evidence to impress upon you the need to stick to your statement that you had made to them?

MR LECORDIER: It was on many occasions.

ADV PRIOR: Too many to remember?

MR LECORDIER: I can't give you a number of exactly how many.

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Lecordier, when you gave evidence, for approximately how long were you in the witness box? Let's say in the trial of Mr Robert McBride.

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember.

CHAIRPERSON: Was it a question of days or was it a morning session or before tea? Can you give us just some idea, for how long did you testify for?

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: Have you got no idea, you don't know whether it was one day or more than a day?

MR LECORDIER: I know it was more than one day, but ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: More than one. So quite a long time?

MR LECORDIER: It was a long time, but I can't say exactly how long.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

ADV PRIOR: Mr Chairman, my understanding is that he was almost five days in the witness box.

CHAIRPERSON: A very long time.

MR DEHAL: I will confirm that, yes.

ADV PRIOR: Just one final question on this aspect. You indicated that you were also intimidated by the fact that in addition to this prompting by the prosecutors and the Security Police, you were also shown a noose. Who did that?

MR LECORDIER: It was one of the Security Police, I don't who exactly it was because it wasn't always the same guy doing this thing, the policeman doing it.

ADV PRIOR: Did that ever happen in the presence of any of the State prosecutors?

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember if it happened in their presence.

JUDGE PILLAY: Would it have happened in one of the rooms in the Court building?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, Judge.

JUDGE PILLAY: A noose brought to the Court building.

MR LECORDIER: Sorry, Judge, can you repeat that.

JUDGE PILLAY: That threat with the noose had occurred in one of the rooms of the Court building during one of the adjournments.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: I want to refer you to page 10 of your statement, (vii), paragraph (vii).

I just want clarity on this because what you've told me just now in response to my question, differs somewhat from you said in that statement. You said

"... and during the adjournment that followed, the Security Police and the prosecutors threatened me and held a noose in front of me (which they had on various previous occasions as well) and said that I was close to my death."

Could you possibly just think about that and come back to my question, was the noose and the threat of death made by either the Security policemen alone or the prosecutors alone or when they were both together?

MR LECORDIER: The threats were made without the prosecutors. When we go back to the noose story, I'm not sure if it was done in front of the prosecutors or not, in their presence or not. I can't remember that clearly.

ADV PRIOR: We know from Mr McBride's evidence that his version under oath at the trial was in the main, regarding the Why Not bar, was not true, in respect of who had identified the target and so forth. And the evidence that he gave was that you at a very late stage on the evening in question, had said why bomb an innate building, it was just glass and bricks and mortar, you knew of a place on the beachfront where white people could be killed, proper targets, that's what the people wanted. Do you agree with that?

MR LECORDIER: No, I do not.

ADV PRIOR: No, no, that was what was said at the trial. Or don't you remember what happened at the trial?

MR DEHAL: Sorry, I'm just wondering whether there's clarity on this question. Is the question that that is what was said at the trial, or is the question do you agree that that is now your version?

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I think my understanding of the question was, do you agree that during the trial evidence given by Mr McBride to the effect that it was you at a very late stage in the incident, who suggested the Why Not or Magoo♦s as a target. That that was said as evidence.

MR LECORDIER: I agree with that.

ADV PRIOR: Yes, what I'm putting to the witness is what happened at the trial and obviously it's in that context.

MR DEHAL: Sorry, the only difficulty I have is, I was present during the entire trial proceedings and I know that Matthew Lecordier was not present when any of the witnesses testified, and particularly not when McBride testified.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Dehal.

ADV PRIOR: Let me rephrase it. That was Mr McBride's version when he gave evidence.

CHAIRPERSON: Well perhaps we can ask Mr Lecordier. Were you present when Mr McBride testified in his trial?

MR LECORDIER: No.

ADV PRIOR: So you don't know what he said at the trial?

MR LECORDIER: No.

JUDGE PILLAY: Was it perhaps put to you by his counsel that you may have said so?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: And you denied that because - well, maybe you can answer that.

MR LECORDIER: Was I supposed to admit something that I never said?

ADV PRIOR: So you denied it?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I did.

ADV PRIOR: That that was the correct position.

MR LECORDIER: If I recall, I did deny it.

ADV PRIOR: And in fact that was the truth, because you hadn't planned and you hadn't identified Why Not bar as a target, is that right?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: That was Mr McBride's doing.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: Thank you, Mr Chairman, I have no further questions.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS BY ADV PRIOR

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Prior. Mr Richard?

MR RICHARD: Thank you, Chairperson.

ADV PRIOR: Mr Chairman, sorry, before Mr Richard - you would obviously have noticed that I questioned somewhat at length regarding the conduct of certain personnel of the Court and policemen. Maybe that can be raised later. There certainly seems to my mind to have been improper conduct, if it in fact did happen, which borders on either defeating the ends of justice or some other criminal conduct, and I would at the appropriate stage ask this Committee to consider what steps to be taken, if any.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Richard?

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR RICHARD: Thank you, Chair.

Mr Lecordier, you say you were born in Wentworth in Durban, is that correct?

MR LECORDIER: I never said I was born in Wentworth.

MR RICHARD: Where were you born?

MR LECORDIER: In Durban.

MR RICHARD: Now where did you live?

MR LECORDIER: I first lived in Clairewood.

MR RICHARD: For how long?

MR LECORDIER: I think till I was about 9 or 10 years old.

MR RICHARD: And after you turned 9 or 10, where did you go to live?

MR LECORDIER: My Mom and Dad had bought a place in Wentworth.

MR RICHARD: Thank you. Now from then on, did you live anywhere else besides in Wentworth?

MR LECORDIER: I'm not sure what you're asking me now. From then on until what stage?

MR RICHARD: From the age of 9 or 10 or whatever it was, you moved to Wentworth and after then, to be precise, until the time of your arrest, did you live anywhere else besides in Wentworth?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not.

MR RICHARD: Now how far is Wentworth from the centre of Durban?

MR LECORDIER: I would say about five or six kilometres.

MR RICHARD: How old ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Richard. Just for my own information, was Wentworth its own place, did it have its own municipality, because you said you were born in Durban and not in Wentworth? It's not part of, or wasn't part of Durban?

MR LECORDIER: No, it's part of Durban, Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON: Was it just a suburb?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it's a suburb.

CHAIRPERSON: I mean if somebody says were you born in Durban and you say no, I was born in Wentworth, you're fiddling around with words basically. I mean, because Wentworth is part of Durban.

MR LECORDIER: It's just the way he asked the question. He said to me "You say you were born in Wentworth". I did not say that to anybody.

MR RICHARD: Let's get back to my last question. I had asked how far is Wentworth from the centre of Durban, the beachfront area?

MR LECORDIER: I think it's about five or six kilometres.

MR RICHARD: My next question was, how old were you when you were arrested?

MR LECORDIER: I think I was 21 at the time. Yes, 21.

MR RICHARD: During the period from when you moved to Wentworth until your arrest, how often had you been to the beachfront area of Durban? Many times, seldom?

MR LECORDIER: I can't remember.

MR RICHARD: Give us an indication please.

MR LECORDIER: I can't remember. If you're asking me to remember from when I was 10 years old ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Were you familiar with the Durban beachfront?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I was.

CHAIRPERSON: It was the sort of place you used to go to fairly regularly, as an inhabitant of Durban.

MR LECORDIER: I won't say I used to go there regularly. The thing is being a black we weren't allowed to be there, in that part of town.

CHAIRPERSON: But you were familiar with ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: I was familiar with the area.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR RICHARD: Now from the time that you joined the Fairvale Unit you say, or before maybe, you attended various meetings at the Allan Taylor residence. Was it from before when you joined or formed the Fairvale Unit, or afterwards that you started attending meetings at the Allan Taylor residence?

MR LECORDIER: Can you repeat that please.

MR RICHARD: Did you go to meetings at the Allan Taylor residence before joining the Fairvale Unit?

MR LECORDIER: Before.

MR RICHARD: How often would you go to meetings at the Allan Taylor residence?

MR LECORDIER: I can't really remember how often I used to go there.

MR RICHARD: Was it frequently, was it seldom?

MR LECORDIER: I used to go there I would say frequently.

MR RICHARD: Frequently meaning once a week, every second night or what?

MR LECORDIER: About once or twice a week I used to attend meetings.

MR RICHARD: Who convened those meetings?

MR LECORDIER: Members of ANC.

MR RICHARD: And what was discussed ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: Students who lived at that residence.

MR RICHARD: I beg your pardon?

MR LECORDIER: Those were students who lived at the residence, members of the ANC.

MR RICHARD: And what was discussed at those meetings?

MR LECORDIER: We discussed lots of things about the situation in the country and what the ANC's policy is on changing the situation.

MR RICHARD: Now in and during the period 1985, what was the ANC's policy regarding changing the situation?

MR LECORDIER: I think you should refer to my amnesty application.

MR RICHARD: I've asked you the question.

MR LECORDIER: Mr Chairman, can I just speak to my attorney?

CHAIRPERSON: Well, can't you answer the question?

MR LECORDIER: No, it's not that, I'd just like to confer with my attorney.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR RICHARD: I must point out that the witness is under cross-examination.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. You are under - when a witness is under cross-examination, it's not done to consult with one's legal representative.

MR LECORDIER: Sorry, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: Even during adjournments.

MR LECORDIER: Can you repeat your question.

MR RICHARD: And during the period 1985, when you went to meetings at the Allan Taylor residence, you say that the police the ANC regarding changing things in South Africa was discussed. My next question was, what was the policy of the ANC at that time regarding changing the situation in South Africa?

MR LECORDIER: Sir, my answer to you is this. There were lots of things that I do not remember, I have put it behind me, I have been trying to get on with my life and with the result that there are lots of things that I don't remember anymore. I mean you're asking me to do something which I think is impossible, to remember every aspect of what was said ...(intervention)

JUDGE PILLAY: Mr Lecordier, in 1985 there was a significant change in policy of the ANC, its armed struggle. Can you not remember that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I do recall a bit of it, Judge.

JUDGE PILLAY: Well isn't that part of the answer to the question? I can understand there's certain things that you through the passage of time, you can't remember, but surely one can't blank out. Those were important days of the South African lives.

Proceed.

MR RICHARD: What do you understand the ANC's policy to have been at that time during 1985, regarding how it would cause South Africa to be changed?

MR LECORDIER: The ANC had called for patriots and supporters of the organisation to form units and to attack targets, meaning collaborators and policemen who supported the oppressors and oppressed us in this country.

MR RICHARD: And what else would those units do?

MR LECORDIER: I just explained to you now. They called units, they asked us to attack targets, which are collaborators, policemen and supporters of that government at that time.

JUDGE PILLAY: Mr Richard, are you referring to the policy in respect of the armed struggle only, or in general?

MR RICHARD: My next line of questions or sequence of questions would be along the lines, was there in his knowledge, separating the two, whether he was aware of any.

JUDGE PILLAY: No, I need to clear it up in my own mind, I'm not asking you about why you're asking questions. I'm just wanting to find out what you're referring to, because your initial question was very broad.

MR RICHARD: The applicant said he attended meetings at least twice a week at the Allan Taylor residence, at which things were discussed. Amongst this that were discussed was how the ANC would go about changing South Africa. I then asked what did he understand and his answer is that they would form cells and would attack policemen, collaborators. My next question is, is that all that units would do? Now by asking that question my question leaves it open for the witness to say they would recruit new members to create more cells, or they would propagate ANC propaganda, or they would - you know, I think it's a permissible question.

JUDGE PILLAY: I'm not saying it's not permissible, Mr Richard, you must understand me. I'm trying to figure out what you're actually asking. Proceed if you're going on a bit.

MR RICHARD: Apart for attacking policemen, collaborators, were there any other things that an ANC cell at this stage, like the Fairvale Unit, would do?

MR LECORDIER: Also intelligence gathering. We were required to do such things.

MR RICHARD: Did you do intelligence gathering?

MR LECORDIER: I did a little of it.

MR RICHARD: Can you remember what intelligence gathering you did do?

MR LECORDIER: Not clearly, no.

MR RICHARD: What would you do with the information you obtained, the intelligence you obtained?

MR LECORDIER: Can we get something clear here, are you talking about Fairvale Unit before I was recruited into MK?

MR RICHARD: With respect, Sir, it is for you to answer my questions, not me to be questioned by you. My question was very simple, it requires a direct answer and I submit you've been evasive.

SIMULTANEOUS TALKING BY MR RICHARD AND APPLICANT

MR DEHAL: Sorry, may I come in at this stage. The last question was not correct. I mean I think the clarity that the applicant seeks is fair, he wants to know whether it was before Special Ops or after.

CHAIRPERSON: Well if intelligence was gathered, either as a member of the Fairvale Unit or as a member of the Special Operations Unit, what would you do with the material gathered, with the information gathered?

MR RICHARD: And to be more specific I'm now going to confine it to at the time you were a part of the Fairvale organisation, what would you do with the information you gathered?

MR LECORDIER: That information we gathered, when we met together, those of use who took part in the Fairvale arson attack, we shared it amongst ourselves.

MR RICHARD: Now I've already asked this question. Can you remember any specific item of information, apart from things relating to the Fairvale School, that you did gather and discuss amongst your unit?

MR LECORDIER: No, I don't.

MR RICHARD: Was the information that you gathered ever discussed at the Allan Taylor residence?

MR LECORDIER: About Fairvale, no.

MR RICHARD: Now when were you recruited into Special Operations?

MR LECORDIER: About a month before the Klein incident.

MR RICHARD: When was that?

MR LECORDIER: I've just answered you, Sir.

MR RICHARD: Your answer means that I have to work out and put it to you, a month before the 1st of May is about the 1st of April. It would be easy for you to answer the 1st of April 1986. Now I put it to you, were you recruited into Special Operations around the 1st of April 1986?

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember the date, that is why I said "about a month before the Klein incident".

MR RICHARD: Now before you were recruited into the Special Operations Unit, were you ever taught what would be an acceptable target or an unacceptable target?

MR LECORDIER: No, I was not taught anything like that before.

MR RICHARD: So, prior to approximately the 1st of April 1986, you had no knowledge at all of whether a particular target would be legitimate or not.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: Now am I correct in understanding that it was not on the 4th of May 1986, but more like the 1st of May 1986, that the attack happened on the Klein household?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: Now we know that whatever training you received regarding target selection, happened after the beginning of April. What training did you receive as to target selection during that month?

MR LECORDIER: I was trained in the use of handgrenades and AK47s.

CHAIRPERSON: The question was, what training did you receive regarding the selection of targets, after your recruitment to the Special Ops Unit? Prior to the Klein incident.

MR LECORDIER: I was instructed to look for targets, people who were collaborators and supporters of the apartheid regime and policemen.

MR RICHARD: Very well. Yes, you were instructed to identify such people, but my question is more specific. ♦ What training, if any, did you receive as to what criteria would constitute a legitimate or acceptable target as to what would not?

JUDGE PILLAY: Let's put it this way. Why did you choose the Klein household?

MR LECORDIER: Judge, Mr Klein was a Labour Party member at the time, also a reserve policeman.

JUDGE PILLAY: Ja. Now did you choose him as a result of your own personal vendetta against him or how did you know that he would be an acceptable target?

MR LECORDIER: From the intelligence gathering that we had done.

JUDGE PILLAY: Ja well, what about the intelligence gathering? That he was a member of the Labour Party?

MR LECORDIER: He was a member of the Labour Party, he was a reserve policeman.

JUDGE PILLAY: But how did you know that members of the Labour Party should be attacked?

MR LECORDIER: This was the policy of the ANC.

JUDGE PILLAY: Who told you that?

MR LECORDIER: It's what I read in the Setchabas and also listened to the voice of the ANC.

JUDGE PILLAY: I see. Yes, Mr Richard.

MR RICHARD: I return to my question. I put it to you that no-one gave you any training whatsoever prior to the attack on the Klein household, as to what would be an acceptable target or not an acceptable target. Am I correct in my proposition?

MR LECORDIER: You're wrong.

MR RICHARD: Then my question is, what training did you get as to what criteria you would use to ascertain what is a legitimate as opposed to inappropriate target? What training did you receive? It's a simple question.

MR LECORDIER: I think Judge Pillay put the question in a simpler form and I answered it.

MR RICHARD: No, you have not answered my question, you appear to be reluctant to do so. What training did you receive? I know that you were told to select people who were Labour Party members, but that is not an answer to the question.

JUDGE PILLAY: Mr Richard, what type of training would you have in mind?

MR RICHARD: Target selection and choice of, as is termed in these proceedings "the mission", involves a number of factors. If the witness's evidence is, which is certainly not so far, that he was told find labour party members and go and attack them, so be it. However, he says it was more than that. In which case I want to know what the more is, was he told when civilian casualties would be acceptable and when weren't, and all those sort of criteria.

CHAIRPERSON: Perhaps you could be more specific in your questioning Mr Richard, because you asked him if he was trained in target selection, he said yes, well he was told to target policemen, police reservists, members of the Labour Party. Then your next question was well, what criteria were you trained in. I mean now if I was told that policemen were a target, what more do you need to say? So perhaps if you could be specific because otherwise we might, you might not be getting an answer to your question for the simple reason that the witness is not exactly sure of what you're trying to get at.

MR RICHARD: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Ask him if there was anything about crossfire and civilians etc.

MR RICHARD: Was the question of crossfire and casualties in the process of crossfire ever discussed during April 1986?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it was discussed.

MR RICHARD: With whom did you discuss it?

MR LECORDIER: My Commander, comrade McBride.

MR RICHARD: What did your Commander instruct you and say to you in the discussion?

MR LECORDIER: It was accepted that on certain missions people might get caught in the crossfire, who were not our intended targets.

MR RICHARD: Under what circumstances would it be accepted to have people caught in the crossfire?

MR LECORDIER: You say to have people caught? Like we placed them there or something.

MR RICHARD: Under what and in what circumstances would it have been acceptable to go on a mission which resulted in, to use the phrase nowadays, collateral injuries?

MR LECORDIER: Sir, I was trained as an MK operative, combatant, by my Commander, Robert McBride. I was not allowed to ask questions or to question his decisions.

MR RICHARD: I come to the essence. When you went on that exercise that night to throw handgrenades at the Klein residence, did Mr McBride know that you were going to attack the Klein residence?

MR LECORDIER: He didn't know from me.

MR RICHARD: Did you at any stage tell him that you were going to throw handgrenades at someone's bedroom window?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not tell him that.

MR RICHARD: Was the choice of the target yours and yours alone?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it was.

MR RICHARD: Now the next question is, during the month-long training that you admit that you received, was there anything that was taught to you as to when it would be acceptable to throw handgrenades through a bedroom window or not?

MR LECORDIER: As to when it would be acceptable?

MR RICHARD: Under what circumstances might you be appropriate in throwing handgrenades through someone's bedroom window?

MR LECORDIER: Exactly what do you mean by that?

MR RICHARD: During the month of April, which is the entirety of the time you had been trained, according to your evidence, did anyone ...(intervention)

ADV SIGODI: Sorry, Mr Richard, I don't recall the witness saying that he was ...(intervention)

MR RICHARD: I asked him the question "Did you receive any training prior to 1 April, as to the selection of targets?" and the answer was "No, I did not".

So now ...(intervention)

ADV SIGODI: Sorry, ...(indistinct) that he got the training for a month after being recruited. Because the impression that it gives me at least, when you say during the month-long training it's as if he was on a continuous training for that particular month after being recruited into Special Ops. That is the impression that it leaves me with.

MR RICHARD: In the circumstances obviously I'm questioning, I don't take down notes while talking, so ...

Then the question can be put slightly differently. Were you ever told when it was permissible or might it have been permissible to go to a house late at night, approximately 2am and throw handgrenades through a window?

MR LECORDIER: How do you mean by "permissible"? When it's allowed to do such things?

MR RICHARD: Yes. When within the policies of the ANC you could do it.

MR LECORDIER: We were at war at the time. I don't understand what you are asking me.

MR RICHARD: My question is so simple I don't understand the confusion.

MR LECORDIER: Of course it was permissible, we were at war.

CHAIRPERSON: The question was, were you told that it was permissible to go to a house and throw a handgrenade through a window at 2am in the morning? Were you told that it was permissible or not, that is the question.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I was told, but I wasn't told whose house to attack.

MR RICHARD: Very well. Now I would like you to discuss your knowledge of Mr and separately, Mrs Klein's involvement with the Labour Party. Why do you say that Mr Klein was involved with the Labour Party?

MR LECORDIER: That's the information we had.

MR RICHARD: Where did you get the information from?

MR LECORDIER: From my Commander and also from my own intelligence gathering as well.

MR RICHARD: What intelligence gathering did you do?

MR DEHAL: Sorry, may I interject. I don't think it's ever been Mr Richard's contention that he's placing in dispute that Mr Klein was a Labour Party member, and if that's not an issue I can't see the relevance of this line of questioning.

MR RICHARD: I don't see the relevance of the objection, the question is straightforward and relevant.

CHAIRPERSON: No, I'll allow the question. Just repeat it, Mr Richard.

MR RICHARD: What intelligence gathering efforts did you make?

MR LECORDIER: By following Mr Klein and seeing him attending these meetings and also his behaviour as a police reservist in Wentworth.

MR RICHARD: When, or how often did you follow him?

MR LECORDIER: Sir, I used to live very close to Mr Klein and I was aware of his actions and what he was doing, abusing the authority that he had.

MR RICHARD: How did he abuse the authority that he had?

MR LECORDIER: I think it was explained to us during this hearing, the course of this hearing.

MR RICHARD: I'm asking you the question.

MR LECORDIER: He used to go around in Wentworth and think that he was you know, there's nobody who could touch him, he could do what he wanted to do. In other words in my own words, a legal gangster, because if one went to complain by the police station about such people, nothing was done or we were chased away from the police station.

MR RICHARD: How did he abuse his authority, what did he do?

MR LECORDIER: I'll give you a small example. If he came round the corner and he saw a guy sitting without a fence by his yard, sitting in his front yard and drinking a beer, he would walk up to the guy and slap him up and tell he's drinking in public and take him to the police station and place him under arrest for something like that.

MR RICHARD: How often did incidents of that nature happen, to your knowledge?

MR LECORDIER: Sir, I had many other things to do, I never followed Mr Klein around every day. So I can't tell you exactly how often these things took place.

MR RICHARD: You've used ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: But it was often ...(intervention)

JUDGE PILLAY: Mr Lecordier, you say you used to follow him to meetings, to Labour Party meetings, where would that be?

MR LECORDIER: Sometimes they used to hold them in the school buildings.

JUDGE PILLAY: Now how would you know those were Labour Party meetings and not educational meetings perhaps?

MR LECORDIER: Because of the people who used to attend. Most of those people weren't in the Education Department, or teachers for that matter.

JUDGE PILLAY: But how do you know those people were members or attached to the Labour Party then? How did those meetings acquire the label of Labour Party meetings, or why do you say they were Labour Party meetings?

MR LECORDIER: Judge, from information I used to get from people who used to attend these meetings too. By speaking with these people, that's how I got to find out such things.

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Lecordier, were these big public meetings or were they meetings attended by a small group of people?

MR LECORDIER: Actually, Sir, I can't really say if the group was big or small because they never really had much support, and I never used to like go and stay there, I just used to follow and see oh, he's going there okay.

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Richard.

MR RICHARD: You say you spoke to people who went to these meetings, did I understand that comment correctly?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR RICHARD: Please may I have the names of the persons or people.

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember the people's names that I've spoken to. The thing is I used to speak to them and make like I'm interested in what they were doing and these meetings that they were attending. That's how I used to gather some of my information.

MR RICHARD: How many such people did you speak to?

MR LECORDIER: I can't remember.

MR RICHARD: Was it one or more than one?

MR LECORDIER: It was more than one I'd say.

MR RICHARD: What - how often would you have spoken to such people?

MR LECORDIER: That I don't remember.

MR RICHARD: Now if I put it to you that it might have been that in and during '83, Mr Klein's involvement with the Labour Party consisted of assisting in putting up some posters, but very little more than that, would you agree with that proposition or deny it?

CHAIRPERSON: Just to make it clear, before we get into another debate. You're putting to Mr Lecordier that his only involvement with the Labour Party was assisting in putting up posters during or about 1983, or are you saying during or about 1983 his only involvement was putting up posters, then something else happened in '84 and something else in '85?

MR RICHARD: The extent was that in and during ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Is that his ...(intervention)

MR RICHARD: ... his involvement was and thereafter ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: So it was - his only real active involvement in the Party or to do with the Party, was assisting in putting up posters during or about 1983?

MR RICHARD: Correct, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: That's been put to you, what would you say to that, Mr Lecordier?

MR LECORDIER: I wouldn't really know what or how deep Mr Klein was with the Labour Party when say "assisting in putting up posters". That's the information you got, you weren't living in Wentworth where I was living at the time.

JUDGE PILLAY: Mr Lecordier, you misunderstand. Mr Richard is entitled because he disputes Mr Klein's involvement the way you explain it. He is then entitled to put his instructions to you and he said that the only involvement, in terms of his instructions, is that Mr Klein helped the Labour Party in its election campaign in 1983, by putting up posters. What do you say about it?

CHAIRPERSON: The implication being that your evidence relating to his attendance of meetings when you were doing your own intelligence gathering, is not correct. That's what's being put to you.

MR LECORDIER: Then I'd say he's wrong. And then for one to put up posters for the Labour Party, doesn't that show that one is a supporter or a member of them? If you did not support the Party that I belonged to, would you go and put up posters?

MR RICHARD: What profession did Mr Klein practice at the time?

MR LECORDIER: He was a teacher at the time, or a principal of the school.

MR RICHARD: You've mentioned a number of other names, what profession did they belong to?

MR LECORDIER: If I remember correctly, they were teachers as well.

MR RICHARD: Now if a number of teachers gathered together, would that be sinister in your mind?

MR LECORDIER: Could you be more - rephrase the question please.

MR RICHARD: If a number of ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: I think if you can be a bit more specific because teachers usually gather together when they go to work in the morning during term time and although many people might think that's sinister, it's not really.

MR RICHARD: If a number of teachers gathered together at a time outside ordinary work hours, would you see that as something sinister?

MR LECORDIER: No, I wouldn't.

MR RICHARD: Now at these meetings which you say you know Mr Klein went to, do you know who else was at the meetings?

MR LECORDIER: No, I wouldn't remember who else was there. The thing is I was concentrating on one person at a time.

MR RICHARD: So that means you are telling us that you didn't know who else Mr Klein met with when he went to these meetings.

MR LECORDIER: It's not what I said.

MR RICHARD: I put my question again. Your evidence is Mr Klein attended certain meetings, am I right? My next question is, do you know who else besides Mr Klein was at those meetings? Your answer was "No", do you want to correct your answer?

MR LECORDIER: I said no, I do not remember the other people who were there because I was concentrating on Mr Klein at the time.

ADV SIGODI: Sorry. How did you link Mr Klein, the meetings and the Labour Party together, what was the common link?

MR LECORDIER: I was aware that these were Labour Party meetings that he was attending.

ADV SIGODI: How did you know that they were Labour Party meetings, that they were not some other meetings?

MR LECORDIER: Sometimes these meetings used to be advertised, sometimes people in Wentworth used to discuss that they've been asked to attend these certain meetings, Labour Party meetings.

ADV SIGODI: Yes. And if they were advertised, how would they be advertised?

MR LECORDIER: Like on a poster just placed on a wall or somewhere in Wentworth.

ADV SIGODI: And would this poster state where the meeting would be?

MR LECORDIER: The venue and the time.

ADV SIGODI: And the time?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: Was it on a Labour Party poster? You know I think they used to have an anchor or something.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

JUDGE PILLAY: Would that be the type of poster?

MR LECORDIER: That's right, Judge. I can't remember the exact poster, what it looked like.

JUDGE PILLAY: What I'm trying to get at, their name would be there and their logo would be there on the poster.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, you're talking about public meetings, the sort of meetings that would be held in a school hall rather than in some office somewhere.

MR LECORDIER: Open to the public.

CHAIRPERSON: Public meetings?

MR LECORDIER: That's right, yes.

ADV SIGODI: And did you at any stage follow Mr Klein to any of those meetings which were ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: I did.

ADV SIGODI: Thank you.

JUDGE PILLAY: What type of information would get to people who also attended that meeting, about Mr Klein's participation in such meetings? Or did you get in fact - let me ask it this way, did you get any information about that.

MR LECORDIER: Can you repeat that, Judge.

JUDGE PILLAY: Well you testified that you spoke to people who also attended those meetings, in the exercise of your intelligence gathering about Mr Klein. Would they tell you whether they participated in the meeting or not?

MR LECORDIER: Judge, I don't think I said it the way you're saying it to me.

JUDGE PILLAY: Well that's how I understood it.

MR LECORDIER: From what I said was ...(intervention)

JUDGE PILLAY: Tell me then what you meant.

MR LECORDIER: What I said was from the intelligence gathering I did and also talking with people who attended these meetings, that's how I was aware that it was Labour Party meetings.

JUDGE PILLAY: Okay, now let me follow. Now these people who informed you that these were Labour Party meetings, did you ask them about whether Mr Klein participated in those meetings?

MR LECORDIER: No, Judge, I could not go into that because the people would get suspicious.

JUDGE PILLAY: Oh.

ADV SIGODI: Do you know who were the leaders of the Labour Party at that time?

MR LECORDIER: Sorry, Chairperson.

ADV SIGODI: Do you know who were the leaders of the Labour Party in Wentworth at that time?

MR LECORDIER: If I remember correctly, I think it was Pearce and July. I'm not saying I'm right, I'm not sure if I remember correctly.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, could you just repeat that name, I didn't catch it, Mr Lecordier.

MR LECORDIER: Pearce and July.

CHAIRPERSON: Pearce and July?

MR LECORDIER: Mr Pearce and July.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR RICHARD: May I proceed?

Now ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: No, sorry, I'd just like to add, I also think it was Mr Abrahams as well.

MR RICHARD: Thank you. Now am I correct in understanding that what went on at these meetings is not within your knowledge?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: Am I also correct in my understanding that as to the fact that Mr Klein went to these meetings, is a product of discussions between you and somebody else who did go to the meetings?

MR LECORDIER: That and also my own following Mr Klein.

MR RICHARD: Now do you have any other information that would support your statement that he was an active member of the Labour Party?

MR LECORDIER: No, I don't.

MR RICHARD: Now we then get to the point of Mrs Klein. My question there is, firstly, on what basis do you say she was a member of the Labour Party?

MR LECORDIER: I thought Mrs Klein was a member of the Labour Party.

MR RICHARD: My next question then is, what led you to think that Mrs Klein was a member of the Labour Party?

MR LECORDIER: At the time she used to attend some of these meetings, Labour Party meetings. She used to accompany Mr Klein to them.

MR RICHARD: It may as well be put on record that Mrs Klein denies ever going to any Labour Party meetings.

Now which meeting did you - alright, let me rephrase that. You say she went to Labour Party meetings, on basis do you make that allegation?

MR LECORDIER: The times when I went to these venues, not every time I'm saying, but there were times when I saw Mrs Klein with Mr Klein there. I don't know if she drove him there and was supposed to drive the car back or what, but her presence alone, her presence, she was there.

MR RICHARD: Now on your version, was that once, twice or more often?

MR LECORDIER: It was more than once.

MR RICHARD: More than three times?

MR LECORDIER: I can't say if it was more than three times, I said more than once.

MR RICHARD: Now, do you believe that in and during the mid-'80s it was inappropriate for an ordinary member of the public to go to a meeting for no other reason than to hear what was said there?

MR LECORDIER: Can you repeat that please.

MR RICHARD: Do you think it was permissible, in and during the period '85/'86 ... (intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: I think your first wording was appropriate rather than permissible.

MR RICHARD: Do you think it was appropriate in and during the mid-'80s for an ordinary member of the public to go to a meeting for no other reason than to find out what is being said?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I think it was appropriate.

MR RICHARD: You've also conceded that you had ... (intervention)

JUDGE PILLAY: Even a meeting that was run by a supporter of the apartheid parliament?

MR LECORDIER: It depends what reason he's going there for. It could be to gather intelligence, to see who is the main speakers or who is really attending. He could have his reasons for attending there. I'm not saying he's attending for the support of that Party.

MR RICHARD: Thank you. And if the reason for going there might have been nothing more than to go and hear what's being said, so as to be informed, would it be permissible for anyone at their will to go to that meeting?

CHAIRPERSON: You keep using this word "permissible", it wasn't an illegal Party, was it Mr Richard?

MR RICHARD: The Labour Party at the time was particularly, as then defined, legal.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, it wasn't a banned Party, so I mean it would be permissible to go.

MR RICHARD: Sorry, Chairperson, the use of the word "permissible" as opposed "appropriate" is incorrect.

Do you think it was inappropriate for an ordinary member of the public to go to a Labour Party meeting, or any other meeting convened by a Party that might or might not support apartheid, to find out nothing besides what's being said at the meeting?

MR LECORDIER: I don't see anything wrong with that.

MR RICHARD: And your evidence earlier was that you had no knowledge of what Mr Klein did while in the meetings.

MR LECORDIER: Sir, to take you back on your own words, you said Mr Klein used to put up posters for the same party.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Richard, just to get to the bottom of this line of cross-examination. You've put it on record that Mr Klein's - is it Kline or Klein, sorry?

MR RICHARD: Klein.

CHAIRPERSON: ... Mr Klein's only association with the Party was helping putting up posters in 1983. Now is it denied that he ever went to meetings?

MR RICHARD: It's not specifically denied that he ever went to meetings, but it is denied that he was an active participator and supporter of the ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thank you, I just wanted to get that clear, to understand why these questions were being put.

JUDGE PILLAY: Mr Richard, let's just get something straight, I don't want to get caught in the crossfire as it were. Putting up posters, is that not an act of participation, whether as a member or supporter?

MR RICHARD: What might or might not have happened in 1983, doesn't necessarily mean that in 1986, three years later ...(intervention)

JUDGE PILLAY: I suppose he could have resigned, ja.

MR RICHARD: Thank you. Now let's go to the next point. The houses in Wentworth, many of them are almost identical to each other, is that not so?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR RICHARD: So when you went and examined the outside of the Klein household, is it not correct that you knew precisely which was the bedroom?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

MR RICHARD: Now, if I take it further, am I correct in assuming that you would have known which end of the room the head of the bed would be positioned in that room, by virtue of where the doors and windows were?

MR LECORDIER: The thing is it sounds like you're putting words into my mouth here. I ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: The question, Mr Lecordier, is did you know how the bed was situated in the Klein's bedroom? Where the bed would be for instance and ...

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not know. No, but I knew it was the bedroom.

MR RICHARD: Now from what I can reconstruct the one handgrenade that did go through the window, went through in such a way that it landed, as it happened, at the foot of the bed. The other handgrenade, if it had hit its target, would have gone into the room at the other end of the room. Was that a deliberate plan between you and your colleague?

MR LECORDIER: We had planned and we agreed on throwing the handgrenades into the bedroom.

MR RICHARD: Did you agree to throw them through the window in such a way that they would each land in approximately the same place or might land in different places in the room?

MR LECORDIER: We just agreed to throw the handgrenades through the window into the bedroom.

MR RICHARD: Now at the time that you went to that house that night, did you think of Mrs Klein?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I did.

MR RICHARD: Did you believe that she would be in the bedroom with Mr Klein?

MR LECORDIER: It's obvious.

MR RICHARD: Did you consider that there might have been other methods of attacking Mr Klein?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not consider other methods.

MR RICHARD: Is it then correct that you felt that Mrs Klein was a permissible victim in the situation?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR RICHARD: An acceptable, not permissible. Sorry for the misuse of permissible. Now, did you ever doubt your opinion regarding Mrs Klein?

MR LECORDIER: How do you mean doubt my opinion?

MR RICHARD: Did you ever doubt or feel that it might not be acceptable that Mrs Klein be injured in the attack?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not doubt it.

MR RICHARD: Now what was your reason for selecting the Klein household over and above other potential households in the neighbourhood?

MR LECORDIER: Like I explained in my amnesty application ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: I think he said that he selected it because in his view the Kleins, well Mr Klein was a legitimate target.

MACHINE SWITCHED OFF

CHAIRPERSON: Now are you saying you know, why didn't he throw it at somebody who wasn't a member of the Labour Party? I mean there are thousands of houses in Wentworth.

MR RICHARD: May I rephrase that.

There were other people on your potential target list at the time, correct? Yes, or no? Other than the Klein ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: I don't know what list you're referring to here.

MR RICHARD: You listed a number of people other than the Klein family.

MR LECORDIER: But I did not mention there was a list.

JUDGE PILLAY: Look at it this way, was there any other person in the area who was suspected by you of being a member of the Labour Party and also a reservist?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

JUDGE PILLAY: Now given that, at least one other person in the same position, why did you then choose, have you got any particular reason for having chosen Mr Klein?

MR LECORDIER: The reason I chose Mr Klein, he was closest to where we operated from and also I would not need transport to arrange to get away from there, and I had known the area very well.

MR RICHARD: In other words, he was the closest available target.

MR LECORDIER: He was the closest, but I won't say he was the closest available target.

MR RICHARD: Thank you. Now we turn to the question of Mr Klein being a police reservist. When did you first learn that Mr Klein was a police reservist?

MR LECORDIER: That was common knowledge in Wentworth.

MR RICHARD: Now, my question was, when was it common knowledge, 1982 or '85 or?

MR LECORDIER: I can't give you the exact year of when I got that information, but it was known I think, to all who lived in Wentworth that Mr Klein was a police policeman. I don't know from what year.

MR RICHARD: Do you know whether he ever stopped being a police reservist?

MR LECORDIER: I don't know that, I've heard it being mentioned here.

MR RICHARD: Now on what basis did you believe he was a police reservist in 1986, other than the general opinion?

MR LECORDIER: As I told you, it was common knowledge. I was aware that Mr Klein was a reservist.

CHAIRPERSON: You mentioned - you gave an example earlier about somebody sitting and having a beer and he came and slapped him up and took him to the police station. Was that - in what capacity was Mr Klein acting when he did that?

MR LECORDIER: At that time I recall he was still a reserve policeman. And the other thing I'd like to add is, if Mr Klein had resigned from being a reserve policeman, I was not aware of that and the thing is the other reserve policemen who used to be in his click or his gang, they used to still come and visit him often and he used to still go out into Wentworth with them. So I was not under the impression that he resigned from the reservists.

MR RICHARD: It's not disputed that sometime prior to 1986 he was once a police reservist, but it is disputed that by 1986, that he was an active, or involved police reservist. In fact, it's my instructions that he was never either very active or very effective and in fact had dropped it. Would you comment on my instructions?

MR LECORDIER: Sir, those are your instructions ...(intervention)

ADV SIGODI: Sorry, Mr Richard, I don't understand your question ...(inaudible) that he stopped being an active police reservist, but he nevertheless was still a reservist, or are you saying that he stopped being a police reservist in 1986? ...(inaudible) not get a distinction.

MR RICHARD: The distinction is, police reservist is a part-time activity and it's dependent on the particular person as to how much they make themselves available or not. As at 1986 or 1985, my instructions are that Mr Klein had not done anything of any note or significance in and about being a police reservist. He might still have been theoretically on the reserve list. Does that answer the question?

ADV SIGODI: Yes, I just wanted that distinction, so that I could also understand the question. I mean as from the, from stopping from being an active police reservist to being a non-active police reservist, but I don't understand if it's disputed that he was a police reservist at that time.

MR RICHARD: Now did you ever see Mr Klein go out on police duties?

MR LECORDIER: How do mean "go out on these duties"?

MR RICHARD: Travelled in a police van, go to the police station and stand behind the counter, go and investigate the scene of a crime.

MR LECORDIER: I've seen him often with other policemen and police reservists. I've seen him quite a few times ill-treating people in Wentworth.

MR RICHARD: When was that?

MR LECORDIER: When? Do you want me to specify it was on that day on that year?

MR RICHARD: Was it in 1983 or '84 or '85?

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember exactly which year it was.

MR RICHARD: Was it shortly before May 1986, or long before ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: Sir, I just said to you I don't remember.

MR RICHARD: Now let's return before leaving the point. What training did Mr McBride give you before April 1986?

MR LECORDIER: Mr Chairman, before I answer ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: We're talking now besides the intelligence gathering?

MR RICHARD: Besides intelligence ...

CHAIRPERSON: Training for instance with the use of weaponry etc. If you could just briefly explain, Mr Lecordier.

MR LECORDIER: I will answer the question, Mr Chairman, but before I answer I'd like to be excused, call of nature please.

MR RICHARD: It's 1 o'clock, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: I see it's almost 1 o'clock, so we'll now take the lunch adjournment.

COMMITTEE ADJOURNS

ON RESUMPTION

MATTHEW LECORDIER: (s.u.o.)

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you. Mr Richard?

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR RICHARD: (cont)

Thank you, Chair.

Mr Lecordier, before concluding on the attack on Mr and Mrs Klein's residence, I've been requested to put her version squarely to you. Her version is that she denies having ever been politically active or having any association with the Labour Party or the police reserve. Do you have anything to say about whether you accept or reject her version?

MR LECORDIER: I reject her version.

MR RICHARD: On what basis?

MR LECORDIER: You say she did not have anything to do with the Labour Party. Was not being married to Mr Klein, who was a Labour Party member, wasn't that enough?

MR RICHARD: If that is your answer, that is your answer. Is it your answer?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it is.

MR RICHARD: She then goes on to say that at the time she disapproved and did not support her husband's marginal activities with both the Labour Party and the police reserve. Do you have anything to comment on that?

MR LECORDIER: I do not anything about that.

MR RICHARD: Do you dispute her statement in that regard?

MR DEHAL: Sorry, I think he's answered that, he doesn't know anything about that.

CHAIRPERSON: I think he's said he doesn't know anything about it. I suppose the answer would be, he can neither dispute nor agree with it.

MR RICHARD:(indistinct) aspect. And we turn to the Parade Hotel/Magoo's/Why Not/Garfunkel's incident. Now, did you ever go on any reconnaissance exercises with Mr McBride?

MR LECORDIER: Sir, you asked me about Why Not and Magoo's and now you're asking me did I go on any reconnaissance with Mr McBride. Are you referring to the Magoo's incident?

MR RICHARD: Did you go on any reconnaissance exercises ever with Mr McBride, prior to 14th of June 1986?

MR LECORDIER: I don't recall when, but I did go on reconnaissance with Mr McBride.

MR RICHARD: Where did you go on those exercises?

MR LECORDIER: We went to quite a few places, looking at substations and oil pipes and water pipes.

MR RICHARD: Did you ever conduct a reconnaissance of any police or military establishments with Mr McBride or alone?

JUDGE PILLAY: Did you go to the Natal Command?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not go to the Natal Command.

JUDGE PILLAY: Did you participate in reconnaissance of the Why Not bar?

MR LECORDIER: No, Judge.

MR RICHARD: Until the evening of the 14th of June 1986, was the topic of a car bomb ever the subject matter of any conversation between you and anyone else?

MR LECORDIER: No.

MR RICHARD: Now, we turn to page 6 of your statement handed in this morning, paragraph 2. Where were you when Mr McBride came to see you that morning?

MR LECORDIER: Are you finished asking the question?

MR RICHARD: Yes. The paragraph ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: In paragraph 2 you say

"On the morning of the Magoo's incident, comrade Robert came to see me."

The question is, where were you when he came to see you?

MR LECORDIER: I was at home.

MR RICHARD: At what time in the morning was that.

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember the exact time of the morning.

MR RICHARD: Late morning or?

MR LECORDIER: It was early in the morning.

MR RICHARD: Now, did he ask you to have anything with you or to make any preparations for what was going to happen that evening or afternoon?

MR LECORDIER: He just asked me to make myself available that evening.

MR RICHARD: What time did he come and pick you up that evening?

MR LECORDIER: I don't recall the exact time, but it was after, it was dark when he came to see me.

MR RICHARD: Long after dark, shortly after dark?

JUDGE PILLAY: You say that he said you must keep yourself available at about 7pm that night, was it around there or after that or before that, that he came to fetch you?

MR LECORDIER: Ja, he came around about that time.

MR RICHARD: Now, at paragraph 3 you describe a journey into town. Now at that stage did you know where Ms Narkedien was? As you were driving into town.

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not.

MR RICHARD: Who was driving the car?

MR LECORDIER: Which car are you referring to?

MR RICHARD: The car that you were travelling in with Mr McBride.

MR LECORDIER: Mr McBride was driving the car.

MR RICHARD: Now, in the second sentence you state

"As we drove over the bump, Robert explained to me that there were explosives in the boot of the car."

Did he explain to you what sort of explosives?

MR LECORDIER: No, he did not go into detail, he just said to me there's explosives in the boot.

MR RICHARD: Did you know how much?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not.

MR RICHARD: Now, at the Hyperama House and Home, you stopped and then at that stage did you become aware of where Greta's car was?

MR LECORDIER: No, I was not aware at that stage.

MR RICHARD: When did you become aware that she was around?

MR LECORDIER: When comrade McBride told me we must get out of the car and walk down to Greta's car. That's when I realised Greta was in the vicinity.

MR RICHARD: How far away from where you parked was Greta's car?

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember how far away we were parked.

MR RICHARD: Was it a number of car parking bays away or a block away?

MR LECORDIER: I'd say a number of car spaces away.

MR RICHARD: Then you say that she was instructed by Robert to drive and drive to the Marine Parade. Did he tell her precisely where on the Marine Parade to drive to, or just to drive onto the road called the Marine Parade?

MR LECORDIER: From what I remember he just said she must drive on the Marine Parade.

MR RICHARD: Do you remember the route she took to get there?

MR LECORDIER: Not exactly. I remember we drove to the end of West Street and turned left on the Marine Parade.

MR RICHARD: Do you remember why you turned left?

MR LECORDIER: Comrade Robert had instructed her to turn left. If I recall correctly.

MR RICHARD: Now, once on the Marine Parade, what transpired, did you travel Northwards and turn around, did you stop and start, or did you go to a specific place? What was it?

MR LECORDIER: I remember comrade Robert instructing Greta when we got down to the Marine Parade, to turn left from West Street, turn left into Marine Parade and just to drive and after driving for some time he told her to turn off the Marine Parade and drove back into town.

MR RICHARD: Now do you remember how far down the Marine Parade you drove before turning back inland, left I presume it was?

MR LECORDIER: No, I don't remember how far down the Marine Parade we drove.

MR RICHARD: Now, did you notice anything particular about the area that you drove through?

MR LECORDIER: How do you mean "particular"?

MR RICHARD: I'll rephrase and ask a slightly different question. What did you drive past?

MR LECORDIER: We drove past other cars, we drove past buildings on the Marine Parade.

MR RICHARD: Is it not correct that you drove past a number of tourist hotels?

MR LECORDIER: There were many hotels on the Marine Parade.

MR RICHARD: It's obvious if we took that road we drove past these hotels and the other buildings there.

MR RICHARD: Now, on that night, was the beachfront busy, was there a lot of traffic?

MR LECORDIER: I wouldn't say it was busy. As I mentioned, it was drizzling at the time and there wasn't a lot, I won't say there was a lot of traffic around.

MR RICHARD: But were there people around, was there traffic on the road?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, there was traffic on the road.

CHAIRPERSON: We can accept it that there would be some traffic, it was shortly after 7 o'clock on a Saturday night.

MR RICHARD: Thank you, Chair.

Then, you drove back to the Hyperama House and Home and drove back to the Marine Parade. On the second journey, did you drive straight to a specific spot or did you drive around?

MR LECORDIER: No, on the second journey we drove around.

MR RICHARD: Once leaving the Hyperama House and Home, where did you go first?

MR LECORDIER: We drove down to the Marine Parade.

MR RICHARD: And then once on the Marine Parade you say you drove around.

MR LECORDIER: Drove along the Marine Parade.

MR RICHARD: For how long did you drive around the Marine Parade?

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember.

MR RICHARD: Was it five minutes or fifteen minutes or twenty minutes?

MR LECORDIER: I just said I don't remember, Sir.

MR RICHARD: Was it a short or a long period?

MR LECORDIER: I can't recall how long we drove for at that time.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, I just want to get this straight. Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr Lecordier. I thought the evidence was when you'd been driving around, the three of you, you went back to where the blue Cortina was.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON: And then are you saying that you got in the blue Cortina and drove around?

MR LECORDIER: We got into the blue Cortina and drove down to the Marine Parade.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, and where did you drive to?

MR LECORDIER: On the Marine Parade we drove on the Marine Parade and then Robert had turned off at some stage, he turned off the Marine Parade.

CHAIRPERSON: I must have misunderstood your evidence, because I was under the impression that you drove to a particular spot and parked the vehicle and then Robert went off and then came back on foot. What are you saying now about travelling around? You say you went down and you travelled around the Marine Parade? - for a second time.

MR LECORDIER: For the second time ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Who?

MR LECORDIER: Robert was driving the blue Ford Cortina and I was in the passenger seat.

CHAIRPERSON: And Greta wasn't there?

MR LECORDIER: No. And then we drove off the Marine Parade and went and stopped.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you, Mr Richard, you can carry on.

MR RICHARD: Thank you, Sir.

When you say you drove off the Marine and stopped, where did you stop?

MR LECORDIER: I don't remember exactly where, I think it was at the bottom of Pine Street or somewhere like that.

MR RICHARD: Now how far from the beachfront had you drive once you had turned off the Marine Parade, was it a couple of hundred yards or right into Pine Street?

MR LECORDIER: It was close to the end of Pine Street.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, if you could just get my geography right. Pine Street, where does that end? That doesn't go down to the beachfront, is it?

MR LECORDIER: No, no.

CHAIRPERSON: Bree(?) Street goes to the Beach Front, Pine Street stops - is it near ... (intervention)

MR LECORDIER: I think Point Road if I'm not mistaken.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, one - I don't know the street names, but one of those streets. But it doesn't go through to the beach?

MR LECORDIER: No, it doesn't go down.

CHAIRPERSON: But you stopped in Pine Street?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON: Or near the bottom there?

MR LECORDIER: That's right, close to the beachfront.

CHAIRPERSON: Is that near where Bakers Biscuits used to be, or was? It was somewhere down there?

MR LECORDIER: I'm not sure, Mr Chairman.

MR RICHARD: Near the Killarney Hotel, if I go through a ... (intervention)

MR LECORDIER: I'm not sure exactly where, but I know it was close to the beachfront, it wasn't too far away from there.

MR RICHARD: Let me try it this way. You turned left off the Marine Parade and probably turned left and right, something ... (intervention)

MR LECORDIER: I can't remember which way we turned and stuff like that.

MR RICHARD: Now do you know whether on that occasion you drove past the Parade Hotel?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, we drove past the Parade Hotel.

MR RICHARD: Was anything said when you drove past?

MR LECORDIER: No, not that I remember.

MR RICHARD: Now once you parked the car what did Mr McBride instruct you to do?

MR LECORDIER: Once we parked the car where?

MR RICHARD: Somewhere near Pine Street, or at the bottom of Pine Street.

MR LECORDIER: Comrade McBride instructed me, he gave me a firearm and he instructed me that if anybody approached this car I must shoot them and try and get away from there.

MR RICHARD: Now how long did you wait in the car?

MR LECORDIER: I'm not too sure on this, it could have been 30 to 40 minutes.

MR RICHARD: Do you know where Mr McBride went during that 30/40 minutes?

MR LECORDIER: No.

MR RICHARD: Did he ever explain to you what he was doing?

MR LECORDIER: No, he did not. He just told me he'll be back I must wait for him.

MR RICHARD: What do you think - what did you think at that stage was happening? What did you think was going on around you?

MR LECORDIER: I didn't think anything, I just - to my knowledge I knew that we were going to leave this car for another unit to pick up.

MR RICHARD: Then 30 or 40 minutes later Mr McBride returned. Was he alone?

MR LECORDIER: I think he was alone when he returned.

MR RICHARD: Ms Narkedien wasn't with him, correct?

MR LECORDIER: Yeah, that's right.

MR RICHARD: Then once he was in the vehicle what did he tell you to do?

MR LECORDIER: When comrade McBride got into the vehicle, he started the vehicle up and drove it down to the Marine Parade.

MR RICHARD: Where did he drive to?

MR LECORDIER: To the Marine Parade outside the Parade Hotel.

MR RICHARD: Now, is it not there that you saw Greta's car?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: And it is also correct that it did not take you long to drive from where you had stopped in Pine Street to the Marine Parade?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: In fact, nothing more than a couple of minutes or longer?

MR LECORDIER: It did not take long. I don't know exactly how many minutes we took, but it did not take long.

MR RICHARD: Now your evidence is that Ms Narkedien moved out of the parking spot and Mr McBride parked the car in the same parking spot that she had just vacated, and you at that stage were in the car containing, to your knowledge, the explosives. Have I understood it correctly?

MR LECORDIER: Can you repeat that please, you're asking me more than one thing.

MR RICHARD: I'm summing up what I understand of your evidence and I'm asking whether I've got it correctly. You and Mr McBride drove in the blue Cortina which contained what you had been told were explosives, correct? He drove to the Marine Parade and parked outside the Parade Hotel in a parking spot which had shortly before been occupied by the car driven by Greta.

MR LECORDIER: That was after Robert had shown Greta with his hand, a hand sign he used for her to move out of that parking. That's when she moved out and then Robert drove into that parking bay.

MR RICHARD: Did you see where Greta drove to?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not.

MR RICHARD: Now, the events which you mention in paragraph (viii), page 7, at what stage were you asked to get the numberplate of the vehicle from the front?

MR LECORDIER: After Robert had parked the vehicle there.

MR RICHARD: Now when you say "from the front", what precisely do you mean?

MR LECORDIER: It was on the dashboard, the numberplate.

MR RICHARD: You then continue to say that

"He then showed me a pin ..."

That's at paragraph (x). How long between telling you to remove the numberplate from the front dashboard to the point in time that you showed you a pin, was it?

Was it a long period or a short period?

MR LECORDIER: No, it was a very short period.

MR RICHARD: Now, from the moment that you arrived at the Marine Parade and Mr McBride gestured to Greta to move out of the parking spot, to the point in time that he showed you the pin, do you recall how much, approximately, time passed by?

MR LECORDIER: No, I don't recall how much time passed us by.

MR RICHARD: Was it a short period or ...?

MR LECORDIER: I just said I don't recall.

CHAIRPERSON: Did you spend any time hanging around doing nothing there? From the time that you got out of the vehicle, took the numberplate, saw the pin, did you spend any time just being there, loitering or whatever?

MR LECORDIER: No, Mr Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON: One can accept it would have been a reasonably short time?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: Now once you saw the pin, what did you believe was happening?

MR LECORDIER: That's when I was convinced that it is a car bomb operation.

MR RICHARD: And were you in or out the car when you were shown the pin?

MR LECORDIER: I was still in the car at the time.

MR RICHARD: What did you do next?

MR LECORDIER: Comrade Robert instructed me that we must get out the car.

MR RICHARD: Now from the moment you got out of the car, what did you do?

MR LECORDIER: We got out the car and comrade Robert said I must follow him, which I did.

MR RICHARD: Where did you follow him to?

MR LECORDIER: We walked to Greta's car.

MR RICHARD: Where was Greta's car.

MR LECORDIER: It was parked about a block away. As we were approaching, that's when I noticed there's Greta's car parked here.

MR RICHARD: Now when you say you walked about a block, did you walk fast or slowly?

MR LECORDIER: I'd say it was normal, the way we were walking.

MR RICHARD: At a normal walking speed?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: Did you have a chance to observe what was happening around you?

MR LECORDIER: Can your repeat that.

MR RICHARD: Did you have a chance, from the moment you got out of the car to the moment that you got into Greta's car, to observe what was happening around you?

MR LECORDIER: When you say "what was happening", I'm at a loss here. What was happening was normal.

CHAIRPERSON: Could you just be a bit more specific, Mr Richard.

MR RICHARD: Once you were out of the car and walking towards wherever Greta's car was, as you ultimately found out, is it not correct that you then had an opportunity to see firstly where what you knew was a car bomb was parked and the environment it was in?

JUDGE PILLAY: Mr Richard, are you talking about whether he saw any people in the vicinity?

MR RICHARD: That's the next question.

JUDGE PILLAY: Well I think we can safely say on a Saturday night in Durban beachfront, there were quite a few people there, the bomb hadn't gone off yet.

CHAIRPERSON: Just ask him directly what you want to ask him.

MR RICHARD: Did you see people around on the beachfront near where you had parked what you now knew to be a car bomb?

MR LECORDIER: I saw people near where we had parked this car.

MR RICHARD: Where were they?

MR LECORDIER: Geez ...

MR RICHARD: Were they in front of the hotel, across the road or ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: People were walking around in the area, we even walked past some of the people.

MR RICHARD: Did you notice any people in and around the Parade Hotel?

MR LECORDIER: I noticed there were people around, I did not take note of exactly where they were or where they were going to.

MR RICHARD: Were there a few people or many people?

MR LECORDIER: I can't say, it was a long time ago.

MR RICHARD: Now once in the car did you say anything to Mr McBride or to Ms Narkedien?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not.

MR RICHARD: Did they say anything to you?

MR LECORDIER: Not that I recall.

MR RICHARD: At paragraph 15 you make the comment "Greta was smartly dressed on that day"

CHAIRPERSON: It was changed when it was read to "night".

MR RICHARD: "... that night". Why did you make that comment?

MR LECORDIER: Because I recall she was smartly dressed that night.

CHAIRPERSON: I think the import of the question was, why do you mention it in your statement? Has it got any significance at all, if not why did you mention it? Why did you put it in if you think it had any significance? That is what Mr Richard is wanting to know.

MR LECORDIER: The thing is, from what I'd known of Greta she wasn't a person to dress smartly and that's why it stood out that night.

MR RICHARD: At your trial ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, he wasn't tried as far as I know.

MR RICHARD: Sorry. At Mr McBride's trial you told a version different from this version. Did you ever sit down with the police and tell them exactly this, what you told the Committee today?

MR LECORDIER: I tried to, but they didn't want to accept it and they kept threatening me and beating me and asking me to say the things that they wanted me to say and to add to my statement.

CHAIRPERSON: So, your answer Mr Lecordier is - is your answer that you did tell them what you've told us today, but they didn't you, or you tried to but they wouldn't let you? What, I didn't quite ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: That's right, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: That you did actually tell them, but they ...(intervention)

MR LECORDIER: I did tell them, but they didn't want to accept it.

CHAIRPERSON: They didn't want to accept what you said.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR RICHARD: I don't think it takes us any further. I've no further questions, subject to ...

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS BY MR RICHARD

ADV PRIOR: Mr Chairman, I've cross-examined. There are two aspects just on, one on the Klein and one on the Magoo♦s.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION BY ADV PRIOR: Mr Lecordier, hearing your evidence, the attack on the Klein home was the first mission that you'd carried out where you had identified the target and were going to kill people, that was your evidence, was it?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

ADV PRIOR: We've also heard evidence that the military act had to be politically tuned, it had to serve some purpose. What's just bothering me is that because of your relative newness in the unit, your decision to attack and kill people, I would have thought that maybe you would have mentioned it or possibly cleared it with Mr McBride, the Commander. Is there any particular reason why you didn't?

MR LECORDIER: When I was recruited by comrade Robert McBride, I was instructed to obey orders and to carry them out as a soldier and that is what I did.

ADV PRIOR: Yes, I understand the carrying out of the orders on an instruction, but the actual target selection, I'm just worried that in a sense the missions followed a particular schedule, it was left to you to target people.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

ADV PRIOR: Did you not think it important in those circumstances to maybe clear the target with Mr McBride?

MR LECORDIER: The thing is I wasn't allowed to discuss with him who I'm going to attack.

ADV PRIOR: Was that on a need-to-know basis?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: And he didn't need to know who you were going to attack?

MR LECORDIER: He didn't need to know who I was going to attack.

ADV PRIOR: Just one last aspect on the Why Not incident. At page 6, paragraph 6 of your statement, Exhibit S, something has just struck me. All three of you at some stage went down to the Marine Parade in Greta's car, is that correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: You left the blue Cortina behind with the explosives.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: No-one was guarding it?

MR LECORDIER: No.

ADV PRIOR: When the vehicle was taken to the bottom end of Pine Street you were then asked to guard the vehicle, is that correct?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

ADV PRIOR: Are you sure of that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I'm sure of that.

ADV PRIOR: Was there any reason why it wasn't guarded at the earlier stage?

MR LECORDIER: I don't know. The thing is like I said, I acted on a need-to-know basis, I did not question my Commander.

ADV PRIOR: When you left the blue Cortina at the Hyper House and Home on the first occasion, was it locked or unlocked?

MR LECORDIER: I think it was locked.

ADV PRIOR: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS BY ADV PRIOR

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr Dehal, do you have any re-examination?

RE-EXAMINATION BY MR DEHAL: Thank you, Mr Chairperson, very briefly.

Mr Lecordier, during the trial, McBride's trial, you said you were given your statement on various occasions during recesses, tea recesses, lunch recesses, to read. Was the entire statement given to you or just parts of it?

MR LECORDIER: It was the entire statement, but I was made to read parts of it.

MR DEHAL: Now you recall there was one occasion when you were cross-examined by Mr McBride's lawyer and it became apparent that whilst you were under cross-

examination your statement was given to you during a recess, whilst under cross-examination, for you to read.

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I recall.

MR DEHAL: And there was much argument in the trial and you then admitted that the statement was given to you to read.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: An application then followed to obtain your entire statement, do you remember that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: And do you recall what happened thereafter?

MR LECORDIER: I'm not really sure what took place after that.

MR DEHAL: Well do you remember that arising from the application, the defence then obtained a single page of your statement, which is contained in this transcript I showed to you, volume 15, 1 page of your statement. Do you see that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: Is that a copy of a page of your statement, firstly?

MR LECORDIER: And is that the only page that was then handed to the defence as being the only page you read during the recess?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

MR DEHAL: Now as it correct that this was the only page you read during the recess?

MR LECORDIER: No, that's not correct.

MR DEHAL: Did you read more than - sorry, firstly, did you read many pages of your statement during the recess?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I did.

MR DEHAL: How did it come about that this one page was selected to be given to the defence?

MR LECORDIER: During the trial and while they were questioning me it was revealed that I had access to my statement and I admitted that and somehow defence had asked for this, access to this statement of mine.

MR DEHAL: Yes, I mean your statement had many pages.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: How did it come about that the decision was made for this single page, which we now have before us, a copy of which of course, was to be given to the defence as being the only page that you had read? For you now say that's not true.

MR LECORDIER: I'm not sure of the events in Court that day, but I think that they had asked me in Court "Have you been given your statement to read through?" and I said "Yes" and they referred to this certain page.

MR DEHAL: Okay. Do you see in this statement there is a paragraph that says - firstly, is this your handwriting?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it is.

MR DEHAL: Okay. I know that you've said that this was dictated to you and told to you by the police etc. You see there's a paragraph here which says

"We told him we needed money and asked him if he could lend us guns to rob a bank and if he could we can help him. Robert agreed."

Now when you say "We told him ..." the preceding paragraph makes it clear that you told Robert that you needed money and guns to rob a bank, do you remember that?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I remember that.

MR DEHAL: Now firstly, did this ever take place, namely did you ever ask Robert for money and guns to rob a bank?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not.

MR DEHAL: How did that come to be in your statement?

MR LECORDIER: The place, Security Branch threatened me, put a noose around my neck, threatened to kill my family if I did not say things like this. To me it seemed like they wanted to criminalise this whole event.

MR DEHAL: Now did you ever intend to rob a bank?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not.

MR DEHAL: Did you ever discuss with Robert the need to rob a bank?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not.

MR DEHAL: Your statement went into many, many pages you said.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Now this particular page which deals with the criminal element, how was this page selected, did you say that this is the page that you read during the recess, or did the prosecutors and the police, or the police alone decide that this is the page that must be given to the defence?

MR LECORDIER: I'm not sure whether I said this is the page or whether the prosecutors said this is the page that I read during the recess.

MR DEHAL: Yes. Now you talked about the noose briefly just now, in your earlier evidence you talked about how the noose was placed around your neck, or sorry, was shown to you. Was the noose ever placed around your neck at any stage?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it was.

MR DEHAL: On one occasion, on many occasions?

MR LECORDIER: On more than one occasion.

MR DEHAL: By whom?

MR LECORDIER: By Security Branch police.

MR DEHAL: And did they make any threats when they placed the noose around your neck? What did they ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: I think the mere placing of a noose around the neck, whether or not threats were made I mean, is in itself a threat.

MR DEHAL: I accept that.

Did the policemen make it clear with you that your evidence, or did you understand that your evidence against Robert McBride would be the basis for him to obtain the death sentence if convicted?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, they made that clear to me.

MR DEHAL: And when it became clear that your statement was read by you during the recess and you had agreed to this under cross-examination, if recall by Mr David Gordon, the senior counsel for the defence, did the prosecutors or the police ever become angry with you about that, about you revealing that you had the statement with you?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, they were very angry and upset about it. And it's one of the occasions when we adjourned when I was threatened again by the Security Branch police and also the prosecutors had told me that I must do what they have asked me to do and if I try and save Robert in any way, the noose is waiting for me.

MR DEHAL: Yes. Now if I may just get away from the Why Not incident and your general evidence, the Klein incident is something that Mr Richard dealt with at

length. Firstly, Klein's house you were told - sorry, you were told that all the houses in Wentworth were the same, therefore you would have known ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Well I said many of them were similar.

MR DEHAL: Sorry, most of the houses were similar and therefore you would have known which bedroom was where. Now Klein you said was a Labour Party member, was his house in any way different at the time it was attacked?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, it was very much different to the other houses in Wentworth.

MR DEHAL: Was it poorer, smaller, larger, bigger?

MR LECORDIER: Actually if one looked at Mr Klein's house and you looked at the houses on either side of him, it seemed like his house doesn't belong there, it's supposed to be in a, I'd say, another suburb with better housing.

CHAIRPERSON: Was it better or worse than the other houses?

MR LECORDIER: It was much better than the other houses, that the normal houses.

MR DEHAL: And you say that despite the difference your intelligence told you which was Klein's bedroom.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: Would you ever have attacked any empty houses?

MR LECORDIER: No, I don't see the purpose in attacking an empty house.

MR DEHAL: Do you recall an incident when Mr Klein was once shot and this matter featured in the press? He was shot whilst allegedly on duty as a ..(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, is this re-examination because you're introducing new evidence ...(indistinct) to allow cross-examination again, Mr Dehal.

MR DEHAL: Perhaps I may just deal with this, I'm sorry, address you briefly on this.

Mr Richard had at great length talked about Mr Klein's police reservist duties and that he was not active etc., I had instructions from Mr Lecordier earlier about his active duties. I did not put the statement because I didn't think it was ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Then I'll have to give an opportunity for further questions because this is new in fact.

MR DEHAL: It is indeed.

Do you recall instructing me that Mr Klein was once, whilst on duty, shot as a police reservist and that this featured in the press and this is how you also knew he was a police reservist?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, that's right.

CHAIRPERSON: Do you know more-or-less when about that was, Mr Lecordier?

When I say more-or-less, which year.

MR LECORDIER: I think Mr Chairperson, it was 1982 or '83, I'm not too sure on the year.

MR DEHAL: And finally, in regard to the Why Not aspect, I know my learned colleague, Mr Richard, talked about the second time and again the first time and I'm not too sure if you understood, I certainly didn't, when you got back to the Marine Parade and you drove along the Marine Parade, did that take place once, twice? How many times? That's with Robert, Greta and yourself.

MR LECORDIER: The three of us in the vehicle we drove along the Marine Parade once I think.

MR DEHAL: Yes. And after that drive you got back to the Hyper House and Home, if I understand it.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: And there picked up the blue Ford Cortina, got to Pine Street where you parked.

MR LECORDIER: Right.

MR DEHAL: And Greta and Robert then went off.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: And then when Robert came back on foot to you at the Pine Street spot, he then drove to where Greta was parked.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: And you said he waved to Greta to come off the bay.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: And then Robert parked the vehicle with the bomb in that bay.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

MR DEHAL: That's when you gave him the numberplate, he pulled the pin and showed it to you.

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

MR DEHAL: So there was no going around the Marine Parade again?

MR LECORDIER: No, no.

MR DEHAL: Thank you. That is all thank you, Mr Chairperson.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS BY MR DEHAL

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr Richard, just on this one point about - I'm not opening the cross-examination all over again, just on this one point about Mr Klein being shot?

MR RICHARD: May it please, Chairperson. The fact that they alluded to this statement doesn't mean that I'm going to cross-examine him on his police statement, even though I might in another fora have had that privilege. I think the only question to ask has been asked, when was it? I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Adv Sigodi, have you got any questions you'd like to ask?

ADV SIGODI: There's just one aspect I want to clarify.

You say after you had left the car bomb at the Why Not bar you then went to the top of Ridge Road, where you stopped near the Ridge Road Police Station and Robert said he wanted to establish which the cops were going. He was concerned that we may have cordoned ourselves within the circle thrown around the town. Now when you got there to Ridge Road, did Gordon say - sorry, did Mr McBride say why he was concerned about the cops? - what he was scared of.

MR LECORDIER: I can't remember exactly what he had said, but gathered that it was to avoid being caught in a roadblock or...

ADV SIGODI: And did he say this in the presence of Greta?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, Greta was in the car at the time.

ADV SIGODI: Did you talk about the car bomb at Ridge Road, did you talk about it?

MR LECORDIER: No, we did not discuss it.

ADV SIGODI: You did not discuss it. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON: Judge Pillay, do you have any questions you'd like ask?

JUDGE PILLAY: Yes. Mr Lecordier, when you first were recruited to political activity in Wentworth, what was your educational qualifications at the time?

MR LECORDIER: At the time I had left school in standard five, so I'd say standard four.

JUDGE PILLAY: And you never improved your education at that stage?

MR LECORDIER: I did go back to night school at Fairvale School, Judge.

JUDGE PILLAY: After this?

MR LECORDIER: No, before joining MK.

JUDGE PILLAY: So by the time Mr McBride's trial was on, what were your qualifications then?

MR LECORDIER: It was still the same, standard four.

JUDGE PILLAY: Standard four. Did you perhaps know that by the time you gave evidence, you were no longer held under Section 29, which entitled you to the assistance of an attorney or legal representation? Or didn't you know that?

MR LECORDIER: I didn't have an idea about things like that.

JUDGE PILLAY: And the pressure you felt being brought to bear on you, to testify against Mr McBride, was that only in respect of his trial and to get his conviction, or what was the position?

MR LECORDIER: Judge, can you rephrase that for me please.

JUDGE PILLAY: You know you say you felt pressure into testifying against him.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

JUDGE PILLAY: Was it intended by the policemen, as you interpret it, that once you testified against him and they were able to secure a conviction and the appropriate sentence that they wanted, that you were no longer in danger and your family was no longer in danger?

MR LECORDIER: That was explained to me by the police, but I personally felt that my family was in danger and I was in danger.

JUDGE PILLAY: Even despite you doing what they wanted?

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

JUDGE PILLAY: Why?

MR LECORDIER: I just felt that way at the time, Judge. I even - I was feeling pressure from, actually from both sides for turning against my comrade, for betraying them.

JUDGE PILLAY: You see, compared to your evidence against Mr McBride, your testimony today is quite different and I just want to test that and I may ask one or two awkward questions of you. You then say - were you released after you testified, or what was the position?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, I was released.

JUDGE PILLAY: And where did you go to?

MR LECORDIER: The police took me to Cape Town.

JUDGE PILLAY: Why did you feel that you had to be under their protection then?

MR LECORDIER: It's not something I felt, Judge, it's the way they used to speak to me and stuff like that. I felt that it was better if I remain under their protection because they were impressing upon me that the people will be out to get me for what I had done.

JUDGE PILLAY: And how long did this feeling of suppression last?

MR LECORDIER: For a long time.

JUDGE PILLAY: Can you give an indication till when? Or is it still like that?

MR LECORDIER: The thing is it still exists, Judge.

JUDGE PILLAY: You see why I ask that question is because at some time during their - let's put it this way, while you were under their influence you refused to become an informer against the Unions.

MR LECORDIER: Yes.

JUDGE PILLAY: Now what strikes me is that you were able to resist it then and yet on other occasions you say you can't ..(indistinct)

MR LECORDIER: The occasions meaning at the trial?

JUDGE PILLAY: Well look, you say even after you testified you felt that you were still subject to their whims and fancies and you went to Cape Town and you felt safe with them, you took money etc.

MR LECORDIER: It wasn't my choice to go to Cape Town, Judge.

JUDGE PILLAY: Ja, you felt you had to go because they insisted.

MR LECORDIER: They insisted on it.

JUDGE PILLAY: Now up to that stage well and good. If you're struggling with this suppression, can you explain how is it you were able to resist their request or their instruction to become an informer against the Unions? How is it that you felt powerful enough to say no, I'm not going to be an informer, then, against the Unions, but yet on other occasions you felt you had to succumb?

MR LECORDIER: Judge, because in my heart I knew that that is not what I wanted to do and I had got tired of their attitude towards me.

JUDGE PILLAY: One last question. Mr Abrahams, Mr Pearce and Mr July, were they teachers or principals or in any way involved in education?

MR LECORDIER: I think maybe two of those names mentioned were teachers or principals, I'm not sure which.

JUDGE PILLAY: And as police reservists?

MR LECORDIER: As police reservists and as Labour Party members.

JUDGE PILLAY: They were all?

MR LECORDIER: That's right.

JUDGE PILLAY: I was just enquiring about their teaching connection and connection to the police. Were they?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, they were.

JUDGE PILLAY: All of them? Either one or the other.

MR LECORDIER: If I remember correctly, all of them.

JUDGE PILLAY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Just very briefly, Mr Lecordier. The Klein incident, you decided that Mr Klein would be a target. Did you then go and get the handgrenades, or did you have them while you were doing your recce work? When did you get the handgrenades that you used in that attack? After you had established your target or prior to that?

MR LECORDIER: I think it was before I established the target.

CHAIRPERSON: So how long would you have been in possession of those handgrenades then?

MR LECORDIER: I'm not too sure of how long, but I'd say about a week.

CHAIRPERSON: How many handgrenades did you get?

MR LECORDIER: Two.

CHAIRPERSON: And did you keep them?

MR LECORDIER: I had kept them and then I had given them to Allan Pearce to keep.

CHAIRPERSON: And when you went to the target on the night in question, were the lights out in the house?

MR LECORDIER: Yes, they were.

CHAIRPERSON: And when you went to the bedroom, were the curtains drawn? If there were any curtains at all.

MR LECORDIER: The thing is, Mr Chairman, we never go right up to the bedroom window.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Well you went- because we know that you threw your handgrenades through the window, was the curtain - did it have any curtains at the window? If so, were they drawn?

MR LECORDIER: I can't remember if the curtains were drawn or not.

CHAIRPERSON: How far away were you from the window when you threw the grenade, more-or-less? If you can just indicate a distance perhaps in this room here.

MR LECORDIER: I'd say from where I'm sitting to where the cameraman is.

CHAIRPERSON: About five paces, six paces?

MR LECORDIER: About that distance.

CHAIRPERSON: Do you know why the other handgrenade didn't hit the window or go through the window?

MR LECORDIER: I can't answer that, Judge, because Antonio had thrown the other handgrenade.

CHAIRPERSON: Do you know where it blew up, did it hit the wall or the garden or miss the house entirely and go into the next-door neighbour's yard or what?

MR LECORDIER: From what I'd heard it landed outside of the house, Mr Klein's premises.

CHAIRPERSON: In the garden on the ground?

MR LECORDIER: In the garden.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Any question arising?

FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR DEHAL: Just one minor aspect, thank you.

Mr Lecordier, when you decided that you did not want to be under the Security Police' influence in Cape Town and you say you did not want to assist in infiltrating the Unions etc., you had just escaped, in terms of your written statement. Did you say to them you did not want to have anything further to do with them, or did you simply just disappear into nothing so that they could not trace you?

MR LECORDIER: No, I did not tell them that I did not want to have anything further to do with them, I just thought it's best if I keep quiet and take myself out of Cape Town.

MR DEHAL: Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS BY MR DEHAL

CHAIRPERSON: Ms Kooverjee?

MS KOOVERJEE: None thank you, Mr Chairperson.

NO QUESTIONS BY MS KOOVERJEE

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Richard?

MR RICHARD: No questions.

NO QUESTIONS BY MR RICHARD

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Prior?

ADV PRIOR: No questions, Mr Chairman.

NO QUESTIONS BY ADV PRIOR

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Lecordier, that concludes your testimony, you may stand down.

MR LECORDIER: Thank you.

WITNESS EXCUSED

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Dehal?

MR DEHAL: Mr Chairperson, I was hoping to actually trace Mr Gordon Webster by now. As I said earlier in chambers, I was given a message from a friend of his that he may possibly be here. I don't see him present in the hall. I have nothing further to present at this stage. Perhaps it may be a convenient time now to adjourn till tomorrow morning so that if he does arrive at the hall I could then take up the matter further.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, because I think we don't want to wait indefinitely for something that might not occur. How can you establish what's going to happen?

MR DEHAL: I think that's a fair question and surely we'll have to wait only until about 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. If he doesn't arrive by ten, then I'll propose to place on record what he has told me thusfar.

CHAIRPERSON: Well I don't know if evidence of that nature can be accepted.

MR DEHAL: Not in the form of evidence.

CHAIRPERSON: It would clearly be hearsay.

MR DEHAL: Indeed, yes. He's not an applicant, he's purely subpoenaed as a witness.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. And what is the position regarding the other applicant, Mr Derek McBride?

MR DEHAL: Ms Kooverjee represents Mr Derek McBride, and I think she would tell you in due course. Perhaps what I can tell you is that Antonio du Preez was also on notice to arrive here. He has not arrived. He called me on the first day the TRC hearings began and he told me that he was ill at home, he told me that he was having difficulty in obtaining leave to avail himself here at these hearings. He asked me to place on record that he confirms, accepts the applicants' applications for amnesty, he does not oppose them and that the versions of McBride, Apelgren etc., he is conformity with.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Is there anything else?

MR DEHAL: Mr Chairperson, insofar as Welile Khumalo is concerned, his also not in a position to avail himself here at these proceedings and has asked me to place on record that he does not oppose the applications for amnesty and confirms the correctness of what the various applicants are saying insofar as they relate to him. That is all actually. That would sum up the applicants I represent and the witnesses, except for Gordon Webster in regard to whom as I've said, if you do not mind, we could wait till 10 o'clock tomorrow. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Ms Kooverjee.

MS KOOVERJEE: Thank you, Mr Chairperson. Insofar as Mr Derek McBride is concerned, he's instructed me that he will withdraw his application for amnesty. That is the position, Sir.

CHAIRPERSON: Does anybody wish to say anything further? We've heard now that Mr Dehal's asked at this stage for an adjournment until tomorrow morning. Mr Richard?

MR RICHARD: No, I have nothing to say except that the statements made, until we know whether Mr Gordon Webster gives evidence or doesn't, doesn't take us any further.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. So is the position relating to person who you represent who may wish to make a statement or whatever, that they would prefer to do it after the conclusion of any evidence led by the applicants?

MR RICHARD: After the applicants' evidence is concluded. It may be that Mrs Klein would like to give evidence this afternoon, but let me ...(intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: Well perhaps you can find out and then we might be able to save some time. We can take a short five minute adjournment and then if you could just let us know, Mr Richard, if she wishes to make a statement or give evidence.

Whatever the position, we can proceed. If not, if you'd prefer to do it after the applicants have closed their case as it were, if I can use that terminology, then we'll just come back and adjourn the matter until tomorrow morning. But we'll take a five minute break at this stage for you to take instructions on that point. Thank you.

MR RICHARD: Thank you.

COMMITTEE ADJOURNS

NO FURTHER RECORDING

site by Black Square

SABC Logo

Broadcasting for Total Citizen Empowerment

[About the SABC](#) [Contact Us](#) [Jobs](#)

[Advertise](#) [Disclaimer](#) [Site Map](#)

DMMA Logo

SABC © 2023

>