UNITED NATIONS

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Distr.
LIMITED

T/L.544
7 March 1955

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifteenth session
Agenda item 4

PETITIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF RUANDA-URUNDI

110th Report of the Standing Committee on Petitions

Chairman: Mr. Salah Eddine Tarazi (Syria)

Table of Contents

Section:	Petition from:	Symbol in T/PET.3/... Series:	Page
I.	"Association pour la Défense du Mulatre"...	70	2
II.	Mr. Costas A. Mazis	71	3
III.	Mr. Barnabé Ntunguka	72) 72/Add.1-4) 77)	4
IV.	Mr. A. Bigiraueza	73	8
V.	Merchants of the Business Centre of Bitare	74	10
VI.	Mr. Runiga	75	11
VII.	Chairmen of the Batutsi of Ruhahe	76) 76/Add.1-4)	12
VIII.	Mr. Halifa Bin Nassor	78	15

Draft resolution proposed by the Committee — Annex

1. At its 235th, and 236th meetings on 28 February and 3 March 1955, the Standing Committee on Petitions, composed of the representatives of Belgium, France, India, Syria, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America, examined the petitions concerning the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi which are listed in the preceding table of contents.

2. Mr. P. Leroy participated in the examination as the special representative of the Administering Authority concerned.

3. The Standing Committee submits herewith to the Council its report on these petitions and recommends, in accordance with rule 90, paragraph 6 of the Council's rules of procedure, that the Council decide that no special information is required concerning the action taken on resolutions I-VIII inclusive.

I. Petition from the "Association pour la Défense du Mulatre" (T/PET.3/70)

1. The petitioner expresses concern over the problem posed by several thousand mulattoes in the Territory, most of whom are said to have been abandoned and to "constitute a disturbing element". He states that existing legislation has not been effective to meet the problem, and he requests that the Administering Authority be recommended to enact legislation whereby, with certain exceptions, all relationships between indigenous women and European or Asian persons be prohibited under penalties prescribed by law. The exceptions that he proposed are between married persons, or - when the persons are not married - when a prior declaration is made to the Authorities of the Territory "giving full particulars of the two parties and containing a pledge that the non-indigenous person will be responsible for the maintenance of any mulatto children born as a result of the relationship".

2. The petition was examined and discussed at the 235th and 236th meetings of the Standing Committee (documents T/C.2/SR.235 and 236).

3. The special representative stated that in the whole Territory there were some 350 mulattos, about half of whom were recognized by their European parents or at least cared for by them and the other half lived as indigenous inhabitants. The Administration saw to it that the maximum number of mulattos were cared for by one or other of their parents.

4. At its 236th meeting, the Committee adopted by 5 votes to 0 with 1 abstention draft resolution I, annexed to the present report, which it recommends that the Council adopt.

II. Petition from Mr. Costas A. Maziz (T/PET.3/71)

1. The writer begins by expressing dissatisfaction at the outcome of the petition (T/PET.3/60 and addenda) which his brother, Mr. Angelos Maziz, submitted on his behalf and on which the Council at its twelfth session adopted resolution 656 (XII).

2. After having stated that "Justice is bought and sold in Ruanda-Urundi ... and is characterized by deceit, theft and sacrilege, their penal code is a mask for dishonesty ...", Mr. Maziz urges the United Nations to put an end to a number of evils that he imagines to be rampant in the Territory. The first two are "Ruin" and "Brutal murder". Most of the others concern the public health service, the hospitals, prisons, markets and slaughter houses, and the morals of the European population.

3. There remain three charges concerning smuggling. It is stated that gold is smuggled out of the country - and that "the highest colonial officials are involved" - that there is traffic in narcotic drugs, and that whisky is smuggled in and sold to indigenous chiefs for 200 francs a bottle and to Europeans for 136 francs a bottle.

4. The petitioner concludes with a protest against his expulsion from the Territory.

5. In its observations (T/OBS.3/8) the Administering Authority states that the first part of this petition contains nothing new, and refers the Council to the observations that it made regarding his earlier petition.

6. The Administering Authority emphasizes, however, that the petitioner was not expelled. He was repatriated at the charge of public welfare authorities on 1 October 1954, at his own request and after an approach had been made by the Royal Greek Legation in Brussels.

7. Regarding the second part of the petition, the Administering Authority states that the charges made therein consist of a series of vague and baseless allegations to which it cannot possibly reply.

8. The petition was examined and discussed at the 235th and 236th meetings of the Standing Committee (documents T/C.2/SR.235 and 236).

9. At its 236th meeting, the Committee adopted by 4 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions draft resolution II, annexed to the present report, which it recommends that the Council adopt.

III. Petition from Mr. Barnabé Ntunguka (T/PET.3/72 and Add.1-4 and T/PET.3/77)

1. In T/PET.3/72 the petitioner's statement is as follows. He owed a man 51,000 francs, but another man owed him 50,000 francs. He pressed the latter to pay his debt, but succeeded in obtaining 10,000 francs only from him. A few days later the petitioner received a summons from the parquet in connexion with his debt of 51,000 francs and, on obeying the summons, the assistant judge handed to him an attestation. The petitioner states that he encloses a copy of this attestation, but what he encloses is a copy of a registered letter addressed to him by the assistant judge and containing some legal advice for him. The letter is dated 12 May 1954, and the petitioner is advised regarding his debt that a writ of execution by distraint can be issued only by court judgment preceded by a hearing at which the parties are summoned to appear. He is advised also that, if judgment had been given against him by default, he is entitled to contest the judgment in accordance with the Civil Procedure Code.

2. On 23 May 1954 a Chief arrived and, in the petitioner's absence, seized twenty-six of his cows. As soon as the petitioner heard of this, on his returning home, he set off in pursuit. He was unable to overtake the Chief - "but by chance came upon the aforesaid Chief's cows and selected sixty-three of them". The next day three officials, of whom one was the Chief in question, went to the petitioner's home and broke down his fence and struck members of his family.

3. The petitioner is now in prison although - he says - no judgment had been delivered at the time of writing. On 28 May some friends of his produced 30,000 francs, but this was refused (by whom, the petitioner does not state). He states that his counsel declined to act further for him on the grounds that he was in touch with the United Nations and "dropped me by arrangement with the authorities". In this connexion attention is drawn to a communication (T/COM.3/L.17) from Mr. M.F. Jamar, the petitioner's counsel, in which he protests against and denies this allegation.

4. Writing from prison on 10 June 1954 the petitioner states in the first addendum to his petition that he has not been fed at all since he was sentenced on 24 May. He has been obliged to buy his food at a restaurant. He states also that judgment had not been delivered at the time of writing. He again says that he has 40,000 francs, and that if he is set free he is perfectly willing to pay the balance of his debt. In a postcript, he adds that at least three times the governor of the prison has ordered the warders not to accept food which the petitioner's friends have brought for him.

5. In the third addendum to his petition, dated 27 December 1954, the petitioner states that he was sentenced by the Court of Appeal to a prison term of one year and twenty days, that his property at Buringa was seized and that the cattle which was taken from him has not been returned. He adds that he has paid 60,000 francs towards the settlement of his debt of 50,000 francs and requests that steps be taken to effect his release from prison. He states that no credence should be given to statements that he had committed any misdemeanour in the Territory, but that his difficulties are due to the fact that he had communicated with the United Nations. He requests that the United Nations settle all his legal problems, but on the other hand he says that once he is released from prison he will go to court with a view to clarifying his Murundi nationality and, consequently, his land claim.

6. In the second addendum to his petition, dated 27 September 1954, the petitioner states that he has requested the King of the Belgians to permit him to go to Uganda in order that he may avoid the growing difficulties in which he meets in the Territory.

7. In the fourth addendum to his petition, dated 10 January 1955, the petitioner complains "on behalf of all the Barundi" concerning "the division of Cattle". He states that the Higher Indigenous Council had resolved and ordered the division when, as the petitioner charges, the inhabitants no longer wanted it. Moreover, not a single Batutsi or Bakutu attended these meetings. He states that "the division is made when a dependant is unwilling to serve his master, or when his master wants to divide the cattle".

8. In a letter (T/PET.3/77) dated 25 July 1954 addressed to the Visiting Mission, the petitioner states that he was arrested on 23 May 1954 and subsequently sentenced to penal servitude for three years and twenty-one days "for reasons unknown to him".

9. Commenting on T/PET.3/72 and Add.1, the Administering Authority states (T/OBS.3/9) that Mr. Pierard, a retail butcher at Usumbura, had advanced various sums of money to the petitioner on account for cattle which the petitioner was to deliver to him. As the cattle were never delivered, Mr. Pierard instituted legal proceedings against Mr. Ntunguka. On 3 March 1954 Mr. Ntunguka was sentenced by the court of first instance to pay the sum of 52,549.50 francs to Mr. Pierard. As he was unable to obtain voluntary execution of the judgment, the creditor, armed with his court order, had action taken to distrain upon the petitioner's property. On 22 May, a process-server, accompanied by the Administrator of the Territory, went to the petitioner's house to proceed with the seizure of twenty-five head of cattle. The petitioner was present at the outset of the operation but later went to Usumbura to report his dissatisfaction to some authorities. Upon his return home, noting that the twenty-five head of cattle had been taken, he set out to search for them with the intention of recovering them. He had learned that his cattle had been sent to the Iranda School-Farm by Chief Nyarusage, who had been appointed custodian of the property seized. On the way there, he came across a herd belonging to this chief and decided to take them. The herdsmen fled at the approach of Ntunguka and his men, who were armed, whereupon the petitioner drove the cattle to his own rugo and locked them up.

10. After informing the local territorial authorities, Chief Nyarusage reported the matter to the parquet. A warrant was issued against Ntunguka, who was arrested the following morning and brought before the Examining Magistrate, who had him committed to the central prison at Usumbura.

11. In a judgment of 6 July 1954 the Residency court of Urundi sentenced Mr. Barnabé Ntunguka to three years' penal servitude for robbery and infringement of article 136 of the Penal Code, Book One. This sentence is not yet final, as an appeal was brought by the first three accused, including the petitioner, and the Procureur du Roi is following up the appeal.[1/]

12. Regarding the petitioners complaint concerning the food given to him at the central prison at Usumbura, an investigation made in reply to the petition disclosed that:

(a) the petitioner, like all the other prisoners, receives the regulation ration of food regularly;

(b) from the outset of his imprisonment, and as a pure favour, the petitioner has been authorized to receive food sent to him by his family;

(c) this prisoner's wife brings him his favourite food daily and so far the Administration has not denied the prisoner this exceptional privilege;

(d) the Administration is not aware that the petitioner ordered food to be sent in from a restaurant; in any case, no such authorization was granted by the prison administration.

13. As regards the petitioner's charges against his lawyer, the Administering Authority states that like the petitioner's other allegations, this statement is pure fantasy since the Administration has never discussed this matter with his lawyer.

14. Commenting on T/PET.3/77, the Administering Authority observes (T/OBS.3/11, section 4) that the matter again came before the Court of Appeal on 25 October 1954.

15. The petitions were examined and discussed at the 235th and 236th meetings of the Standing Committee (documents T/C.2/SR.235 and 236).

1/ Copies of the two judgments delivered in this case are attached to T/OBS.3/9.

16. The special representative stated that the Court of Appeal had subsequently reduced Mr. Ntunguka's sentence from three years to one year and two months.

17. At its 236th meeting, the Committee adopted by 3 votes to none with 3 abstentions draft resolution III, annexed to the present report, which it recommends that the Council adopt.

IV. Petition from Mr. A. Bigiraneza (T/PET.3/73)

1. The petitioner first refers in general terms to a number of outstanding matters which have not as yet been settled. His reference to cattle-grazing at Buringa is related by the Administering Authority (T/OBS.3/11, section 1) to the subject matter of a petition submitted by Mr. Barnabé Ntunguka (T/PET.3/67 and Add.1) which the Council examined at its twelfth session. It will be recalled that the complaint in that petition related to a land matter, regarding which the Council by its resolution 662 (XII) decided that no recommendation was called for.

2. The petitioner also states that "many people want to write to you (Visiting Mission) but they are afraid of being maltreated after your departure". The Administering Authority observes (T/OBS.3/73, section 1) that the petitioner's fears are entirely groundless and that the Administration has always respected complete freedom of petition.

3. Regarding his complaint that in May 1954, the Administrator of Bubanza, accompanied by the Chief forced his wife to apply her thumbprint on a piece of paper, the Administering Authority states that the persons in question visited the petitioner's home to serve a summons in accordance with law on him in a civil case. In the petitioner's absence, the summons was served on his wife, who was given a copy after having affixed her thumbprint on the original.

4. The petitioner further charges that "all the Watutsi refuse to leave Bwinga, where they have grazed their cattle for generations, and to go elsewhere where their cows would die".

5. The petitioner states that the rooms prepared for the Visiting Mission's inspection in O.C.A.F. houses (Office des Cités africaines) cost 250 to 400 francs a month and that clerks from the Society were not in contact with the Mission. The Administering Authority states that it does not know what the petitioner means to convey. All information regarding these houses was given to the Visiting Mission and all inhabitants of the Territory were given an opportunity to contact the Mission.

6. Finally, the petitioner charges that "the Government wants to demolish my house without paying any indemnity, despite the fact that it cost 150,000 francs to build". The Administering Authority states that this refers to a house situated near km.25 on the former highroad to Shangugu between Masenyi and Mpanda. There is no expropriation project in hand or even contemplated in this area, and if any expropriation were essential for the public works programme, the party concerned would receive reasonable compensation in advance.

7. The petition was examined and discussed at the 235th and 236th meetings of the Standing Committee (documents T/C.2/SR.235 and 236).

8. At its 236th meeting, the Committee adopted by 3 votes to none with 3 abstentions draft resolution IV, annexed to the present report, which it recommends that the Council adopt.

V. Petition from Merchants of the Business Centre of Bitare (T/PET.3/74) dated 31 July 1954

1. The present petition, which was received by the Visiting Mission, contains a request for a wholesale warehouse, which would improve the trading facilities and conditions of the traders of Bitare. The petitioners state that at present they have no space for keeping supplies in their shops, but that they want the goods to fill orders. For this reason they make their request for a depot for which, they say, they "will pay afterwards; if we don't, the shops are yours".

2. The Administering Authority states (T/OBS.3/10) that the problem is a genuine and complex one which is receiving its attention. It must be appreciated on the one hand that questions of credit and of the number of middlemen are involved, and on the other hand that the solution of the problem depends mainly on the characters of the indigenous traders themselves, their business reliability, business experience and business ability, thrift, etc.

3. The Administering Authority suggests that one possible solution would be to maintain free and fair competition. It also notes in that connexion that the more prudent non-indigenous traders are gradually shifting their main business from retail to wholesale and that some local firms are making the supplying of indigenous traders their chief concern. There is a perceptible movement in this direction, the result of which is that the greater part of the retail trade is falling into the hands of the indigenous inhabitants. An alternative solution might be to establish a group buying service among independent native traders or a traders' co-operative.

4. The petition was examined and discussed at the 235th and 236th meetings of the Standing Committee (documents T/C.2/SR.235 and 236).

5. The special representative stated that it was the policy of the Administration to encourage the establishment of co-operatives among indigenous inhabitants, and that there were funds in the budget of the Territory for the purpose of assisting the organization of such co-operatives.

6. At its 236th meeting, the Committee adopted by 3 votes to none with 3 abstentions draft resolution V, annexed to the present report, which it recommends that the Council adopt.

VI. Petition from Mr. Runiga (T/PET.3/75)

1. The first of the two complaints of the petitioner concern the abolition of the ubuhake.[1/] He appears to be opposed to its abolition on the ground that it constitutes the main source of wealth in the Territory and would deprive him of his means of existence. Citing his own case, he states that at the moment he earns 345.50 francs a month, while it costs him 1,370 francs a month to buy the basic necessities of life. Therefore, he argues, if the ubuhake is to be abolished, a substitute would have to be found and he suggests that he receive an adequate minimum wage of 6,000 francs which would enable him to cover his expenses and permit him to educate his children. In its observations (T/OBS.3/75, section 2) the Administering Authority states that a wise but realistic policy is exercised on this problem. On several occasions the Trusteeship Council has encouraged the Administering Authority on the gradual abolition of Ubuhake, and that it was in conformity with this policy that, after careful consideration by the Conseil Supérieur du Pays du Ruanda, the Mwami's decrees Nos.1 and 8/54 respectively were issued on 1 April and 3 August 1954. Regarding the petitioner's claim for pecuniary satisfaction as compensation for the benefits he enjoyed under the ubuhake system, the Administering Authority states that this procedure could not be followed without the risk of departing completely from the objective in view.

2. The petitioner further states that he has no faith in the judges because they are unjust particularly toward the poor. He suggests that they be punished by fine and prison or be "put to manual labour". The Administering Authority observes that while the petitioner denounces the corruption of the indigenous judges he adduces no specific instances in support of his denunciations. Moreover, says the Administering Authority, it would be difficult to overrate the many precautions taken by the Administration to ensure the supervision and control of indigenous justice.

1/ For a description of the ubuhake system see the Report of the Trusteeship Council covering its fourth special session and its tenth and eleventh sessions (A/2150).

3. The petition was examined and discussed at the 235th and 236th meetings of the Standing Committee (documents T/C.2/SR.235 and 236).

4. At its 236th meeting, the Committee adopted by 4 votes to none with 2 abstentions draft resolution VI, annexed to the present report, which it recommends that the Council adopt.

VII. Petition from the Chairmen of the Batutsi of Ruhahe (T/PET.3/76 and Add.1-4)

1. The original petition (T/PET.3/76), which was sent to the United Nations Visiting Mission while it was in the Territory during 1954, contains a complaint regarding grazing land and a cattle tax. This complaint was elaborated in a hearing which the Mission granted the petitioners on 26 July 1954 at Usumbura, a summary (T/PET.3/76/Add.1) of which was attached to the petition.

2. In its observations (T/OBS.3/11, section 3) the Administering Authority states that the title "Chairmen of the Batutsi of Ruhahe" is purely fanciful and is not applicable to anybody either in common or written law. In fact, it refers to a mere handful of Batutsi who are followers of Mr. Ntunguka and who are strongly influenced by him.

3. The petitioners state that the Government took their land in 1949 and that they now have no land on which to keep their cows. This land had been in their possession since the German Administration and when the present Administration offered to buy it they refused because if they sold it they feared that they would not get land for their 7,000 cows. Then the Government took the land and gave them in exchange other land which they do not like, because it is near hills with poor grass and water and there are tsetse flies. Their own land is now utilized by a European who is planting sugar cane. They add that several persons were "imprisoned for several days because they refused to leave their land". Deep ditches have been dug there and when any of their cattle come too close to them they are impounded and fines are levied on their owners. In this way four of them had to pay fines ranging from 800 to 1500 francs each.

4. In this connexion the Administering Authority observes that this refers to an experiment by the Administration on an area of half a hectare free from any indigenous claim. This ground is entirely fenced in and thus protected from untimely incursions by cattle from the plains. Consequently, it goes without saying that no fines have been imposed in this connexion by any authority in the Territory. Actually, the matter referred to is a civil case

which was settled by two judgments pronounced by the Mushasha-Nord Chiefdom Court presided over by Chief Nuarusage. The four respondents were ordered to pay the plaintiffs, by way of damages, in compensation for the destruction done by their cattle to the plaintiffs' fields, the following amounts: 1,000 frs., 800 frs., 1,500 frs. and 800 frs.

5. The petitioners also state that they "will be in great difficulties with the Belgian Government, which does not like them to converse with the Mission".

6. The Administering Authority denies these charges and states that it is a fictitious danger carefully fostered by certain persons.

7. They also state that the authorities had taken Molugi of Kihangu by force and forced him to affix his thumbprint to a piece of paper the contents of which were unknown to him. He did not wish to do so, "and be told that he would have to go to the Belgian Congo".

8. They object to the payment of a cattle tax of 90 francs for each cow and they say that "nothing is paid beyond the Ruzizi or anywhere else in the Congo".

9. The Administering Authority states that the cattle tax is imposed by the Ordinance of 29 April 1935 and by Ordinance No. 54 of 27 November 1953 issued in execution of Ordinance No. 54/199 of 11 June 1953 referring to the tax rate which might be applied to the benefit of the Treasury to pay for the fees, operations and research work of various kinds performed by Government veterinary surgeons. Article 2 of the Ordiance states: "The indigenous owners of cattle shall be charged a fixed rate of 25 frs. for all services listed at 25 frs. or more in Ordiance 54/199 and 11 June 1953. They are exempted from the payment of charges for services which are listed at less than 25 frs. in the said Ordinance".

10. In the second and third addenda to their petitions, the petitioners say that in November 1954 they were visited by the Resident of Urundi, the Territorial Administrator of Bubanza and the agronomist of the Territory who discussed with them their removal to the Ruzizi plain. The petitioners say that they "shall have to suffer heavy losses if we have to demolish our houses and the paddock fences for our cattle". They repeat that they do not want to move because the new land is unsuitable for cattle. They also charge that when they refused to affix their thumbprints to a piece of paper, the Territorial Administrator and the agronomist

"hustled and hit" them "saying that they would take the land and that if our cattle died, so much the worse for them, since we were enemies because we had discussed matters concerning Ruanda-Urundi with you". They conclude by asking why they are singled out for this sort of treatment.

11. In the fourth addendum the petitioners complain that they now have to keep their cows in enclosures. When the Government put up a similar enclosure some time ago at Kizinga all the cows in it died within a few months. They also object to the fact that the Veterinary has ordered them to keep the younger cows in these enclosures while the older cows are marked and taken away for slaughtering.

12. The petition was examined and discussed at the 235th and 236th meetings of the Standing Committee (documents T/C.2/SR.235 and 236).

13. At its 236th meeting, the Committee adopted by 3 votes to none with 3 abstentions draft resolution VII, annexed to the present report, which it recommends that the Council adopt.

VIII. Petition from Mr. Halifa Bin Nassor (T/PET.3/78) dated 27 July 1954

1. The petitioner states that he is the father of six children and that he has to pay a debt of 200,000 francs contracted by his father. He requests help so that he can pay the debt.

2. The Administering Authority states (T/OBS.3/11, section 5) that the object of this petition is beyond the scope of the Administration and of any action by the Trusteeship Council. The petitioner is in business on his own account in the Bitare trading centre.

3. The petition was examined and discussed at the 235th and 236th meetings of the Standing Committee (documents T/C.2/SR.235 and 236).

4. The special representative stated that the banks in the Territory did grant loans, but only when suitable security was offered.

5. At its 236th meeting, the Committee adopted by 4 votes to none with 2 abstentions draft resolution VIII, annexed to the present report, which it recommends that the Council adopt.

ANNEX: DRAFT RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED BY THE COMMITTEE

I. Petition from the "Association pour la Défense du Mulâtre" (T/PET.3/70)

The Trusteeship Council,

Having examined the petition from the "Association pour la Défense du Mulâtre" concerning Ruanda-Urundi in consultation with Belgium as the Administering Authority concerned (T/PET.3/70, T/L.544),

1. Draws the attention of the petitioners to the statement of the special representative;

2. Considers that the suggestion of the petitioners is contrary to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, and therefore that it is unacceptable.

II. Petition from Mr. Costas A. Mazis (T/PET.3/71)

The Trusteeship Council,

Having examined the petition from Mr. Costas A. Mazis concerning Ruanda-Urundi in consultation with Belgium as the Administering Authority concerned (T/PET.3/71, T/OBS.3/8, T/L.544),

Draws the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority, in particular that he was not expelled from Ruanda-Urundi, but was at his own request repatriated from the Territory to Greece at the expense of public funds.

III. Petitions from Mr. Barnabé Ntunguka (T/PET.3/72 and Add.1-4 and T/PET.3/77)

The Trusteeship Council,

Having examined the petitions from Mr. Barnabé Ntunguka concerning Ruanda-Urundi in consultation with Belgium as the Administering Authority concerned (T/PET.3/72 and Add.1-4 and 3/77, T/OBS.3/9 and 3/11, T/L.544),

1. Draws the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority and to the statement of its special representative;

2. Considers that, as the matter has been dealt with by the competent courts of the Territory, no further action is called for.

IV. Petition from Mr. A. Bigiraneza (T/PET.3/73)

The Trusteeship Council,

Having examined the petition from Mr. A. Bigiraneza concerning Ruanda-Urundi in consultation with Belgium as the Administering Authority concerned (T/PET.3/73, T/OBS.3/11, T/L.544),

Draws the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority.

V. Petition from Merchants of the Business Centre of Bitare (T/PET.3/74)

The Trusteeship Council,

Having examined the petition from Merchants of the Business Centre of Bitare concerning Ruanda-Urundi in consultation with Belgium as the Administering Authority concerned (T/PET.3/74, T/OBS.3/10, T/L.544),

Draws the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority, and to the statement of its special representative, in particular that it is the policy of the Administration to encourage the establishment of co-operatives among indigenous inhabitants, and that there are funds in the budget of the Territory for the purpose of assisting the organization of such co-operatives.

VI. Petition from Mr. Runiga (T/PET.3/75)

The Trusteeship Council,

Having examined the petition from Mr. Runiga concerning Ruanda-Urundi in consultation with Belgium as the Administering Authority concerned (T/PET.3/75, T/OBS.3/11, T/L.544),

1. Draws the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority;

2. Invites the Secretary-General to communicate to the petitioner the text of the recommendation which the Council adopted on the ubuhake system during its eleventh session.

VII. Petition from the Chairmen of the Batutsi of Ruhahe (T/PET.3/76 and Add.1-4)

The Trusteeship Council,

Having examined the petition from the Chairmen of the Batutsi of Ruhahe concerning Ruanda-Urundi in consultation with Belgium as the Administering Authority concerned (T/PET.3/76 and Add.1-4, T/OBS.3/11, T/L.544),

Draws the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority.

VIII. Petition from Mr. Halifa Bin Nassor (T/PET.3/78)

The Trusteeship Council,

Having examined the petition from Mr. Halifa Bin Nassor concerning Ruanda-Urundi in consultation with Belgium as the Administering Authority concerned (T/PET.3/78, T/OBS.3/11, T/L.544),

1. Informs the petitioner that there are no United Nations funds available for making loans to individual persons;

2. Draws the attention of the petitioner to the observations of the Administering Authority, and to the statement of its special representative;

3. Suggests to the petitioner that, if he sees fit, he should seek a loan from the usual commercial sources.