

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL

T/PV.1116
17 June 1960

ENGLISH

Twenty-sixth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 17 June 1960, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. VITELLI (Italy)

Later: U Tin MAUNG (Vice-President) (Burma)

1. Programme of work of the Council
2. Examination of annual reports of Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories: Ruanda-Urundi [3a]
Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1960: Ruanda-Urundi [5a] (continued)
Examination of the possibility of sending a United Nations Observers Group to supervise the elections to be held in June 1960 in Ruanda-Urundi [12] (continued)
Plans of political reform for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi [16] (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.1116 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

PROGRAMME OF WORK OF THE COUNCIL

The PRESIDENT: Before the Council continues with its questioning of the Special Representative for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, I would like to ask the members whether they are prepared to meet tomorrow morning in addition to making as much progress as possible in our consideration of conditions in Ruanda-Urundi this afternoon.

While we are awaiting the arrival of the petitioner from that Territory, there are several items calling for urgent consideration. In particular, I have in mind the 259th report of the Standing Committee on Petitions, contained in document T/L.992, concerning petitions from Ruanda-Urundi; consideration of the joint draft resolution concerning a Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands next year, contained in document T/L.986, and the report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea together with the reports of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions concerning New Guinea and the Cameroons under British Administration, contained in document T/L.983 and Add.1. There are also the oral petitioners from the Northern Cameroons, but this morning they asked if they could postpone their statement to the Council until some time next week.

This is the situation, and I would like the members of the Council to voice their opinions upon it.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, in order to gain time I would ask you to hold a discussion of this problem at the end of the question and answer period; that is, I ask that you postpone the taking of a decision with regard to the possibility of having a Saturday meeting, postpone it until the end of this afternoon's debate.

Now, I do not want to voice opposition to any points of view which the Secretariat and the Chair may have. However, I assume that in the case of Ruanda-Urundi the political problems are the most important problems. Each Territory has its own characteristics. Without advancing an opinion as to the right certain delegations may have to speak about certain items concerning Ruanda-Urundi, I suppose that there are not so many problems in the economic and social fields, but rather the main problems are in the political field, such as this question of national reconciliation, and so forth.

I also get the impression that the Chair doubts that we can solve these problems before 1 July. I beg to differ. And I would like to recall that on one occasion I discussed this point. The facts have shown that I was right, completely right. Furthermore, when it comes to hurrying up the question and answer period, I get the impression that the Chair doubts that the non-administering delegations, or the delegations having questions, can solve these problems calmly within the time laid down by the Chair.

In other terms, Mr. President, I should like to have this question discussed at the end of this afternoon's meeting.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): I would like to support the representative of Bolivia to the extent, at any rate, of agreeing with him that we might take this up at the end of this afternoon's meeting, with a view to making a definite decision at that time. In the meantime, we should get on with the questioning on Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, I would like to ask you, first of all, whether there are any indications as to the time when the petitioner, to whom the Council has granted an oral hearing, will actually come before the Council. Do we have some approximate date?

The PRESIDENT: I might ask the representative of France to which petitioner was he referring.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French): Well, the petitioner from Ruanda-Urundi, from UNAR, to whom we have granted an oral hearing.

The PRESIDENT: I addressed this question to the representative of France because we are confronted with two petitioners: one is that particular petitioner, and the other petitioners are from the Northern Cameroons.

Before I answer his question, I would like to say that I appreciate the observations made by the representative of Bolivia as well as by the representative of the United Kingdom. I do believe, as they seem to, that postponement sometimes is the quintessence of wisdom -- except that we are faced with logistic problems. Tomorrow is Saturday and, therefore, it is not a working day. The Secretariat has to take certain measures, and the wish has been expressed to me that if we could dispose of this particular point before we continue with our work in the Council it would be for the convenience of everybody.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): Sir, what I suggest is that this is a matter which affects the convenience of all delegations and also the work of the Council, and I think that we are all generally agreed in wanting to push on with the work of the Council. If you would allow us to have a little time, at any rate, there can be useful consultations informally between different delegations, and it may be that even before the end of this meeting some delegation could come forward or could let you know that there is general agreement either not to have a meeting tomorrow morning or to have one. Perhaps we can do this by 4.30. I feel that this is better than trying to discuss this matter across the floor. We should try and consult among the delegations and see if we can obtain an agreement one way or the other and let you know, if possible, before the end of the meeting.

If this will suit the representative of Bolivia, I suggest that we get on with the questioning.

Mr. JIA (India): It seems to me that we would save more time by deciding not to have a meeting tomorrow morning.

It is always a bit difficult to decide on meetings in this fashion. I am sure that many people have fixed some engagements for tomorrow morning. Those delegations who are not prepared to ask questions at the end of today's meeting will hardly find it possible to ask questions tomorrow.

My own suggestion is that we do not have a meeting tomorrow but that we have two meetings every day next week and, if necessary, a night meeting. However, the people involved should be notified sufficiently in advance in order to organize their work. Let us also solemnly decide to start punctually. In that case, I am sure that the questioning could be finished, perhaps, by Tuesday and that on Wednesday the statements could be started and also the other things which the Chair has mentioned. The hearings of the oral petitioners should not take more than one meeting. The several resolutions which we have to take up should also not take more than one meeting, and we could certainly go through our work. However, if necessary, we should hold night meetings rather than have snap decisions of taking a weekend away from those who have already made engagements.

Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (interpretation from French):

Mr. President, I must say that you have not completely answered my question; and very frankly, I would like to state our viewpoint. My mind is open to the suggestions of our British colleagues, and at the same time the point of view expressed by the representative of India appears to us to be also a wise one. I shall tell you why. We do have some questions to ask of the Administering Authority, but the coming here of the UNAR petitioner seems to us to be an important matter and we have perhaps more questions to ask of him than of the Administering Authority, if only because we know that UNAR did not participate at the Brussels conference, which seems to be an important element in the position we have to take in the general debate. Under these circumstances I must say that I have some misgivings about the usefulness of a meeting tomorrow which would not make it possible fully to elucidate the issues. On the other hand -- and that is why I have asked my question -- it is very important for us to find out when this petitioner will come before the Council, because that to a certain extent will have to determine the scheduling of our debate.

The PRESIDENT: I would apologize to the representative of France. If I had not been caught up in a cross-fire of statements I would have answered his question. The answer is that as of now we have had no answer from the petitioner. I think that that will probably lend some strength to his position in this respect.

Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I need only sum up by saying that I agree with the various points of view expressed. I agree with the point of view of the representative of India, with that of the representative of France, and I completely agree with the representative of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom invented the week-end, to begin with. We need some time to work, and I think that, if the petitioners arrive, quite possibly next week we might have a night meeting if necessary. I do not wish to hasten things too much, but I think that nevertheless we are in agreement not to meet tomorrow, thus respecting the long tradition established by the United Kingdom.

The PRESIDENT: I believe a certain degree of agreement has been reached so far.

Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom): What I suggested was that we should get on immediately with the questions without any further ado, and that we should have some discussion as to whether it would be desirable to have a meeting tomorrow. I doubt, having heard various delegations, whether it will be found desirable to do so, in which case no action will be necessary. But let us not finally decide this. Will you not now, Mr. President, ask for the questioning to go ahead straightaway, and let us have a little consultation, which is often a much better method than discussion across the floor for settling these questions of procedure without delaying other business. My proposal is that we now immediately go on to the questioning. The position now is that there is no meeting scheduled for tomorrow, and that we can have a little talk behind the scenes and if, as a result of that, the consensus is that there should be a meeting tomorrow -- which I think unlikely -- we could tell you in good time, and then there could be a meeting tomorrow. But I would urge that we get on with the questioning now.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom, but I think it is for the Chair to ascertain whether agreement has been reached. I think, from what I have heard, that this is so, and I would like the Council to go on record that there will be no meeting Saturday, but that there may be meetings twice a day beginning Monday, and possibly night meetings. I want to get this straight.

AGENDA ITEMS 3a, 5a, 12 and 16

EXAMINATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST TERRITORIES: RUANDA-URUNDI (T/1461, 1495, 1536, 1540, 1543; T/L.985, L.992; T/PET.3/L.10 to L.31; T/COM.3/L.26, 27, 29 to 38) (continued);
REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN EAST AFRICA, 1960: RUANDA-URUNDI (T/1538) (continued);
EXAMINATION OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SENDING A UNITED NATIONS OBSERVERS GROUP TO SUPERVISE THE ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN JUNE 1960 IN RUANDA-URUNDI (continued);
PLANS OF POLITICAL REFORM FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF RUANDA-URUNDI (General Assembly resolution 1419 (XIV)) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Reisdorff, Special Representative for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian administration, took a place at the Council table.

Political advancement (continued)

Mr. JHA (India): Before I begin asking my questions I would like to extend, on behalf of my delegation, a cordial welcome to the Special Representative, Mr. Reisdorff, who is with us again. We well remember the contribution that he made to our deliberations last year and we are sure that he will give us equal assistance this year.

We would also like to pay a tribute to the Visiting Mission for the very exhaustive, thorough and illuminating report that they have submitted to the Council. We are grateful to them, because this report is really a very important document and, indeed, it has already been closely studied by all members of the Council and will help us to make our comments constructively when the time comes.

In his introductory statement the other day, the Chairman of the Visiting Mission made the following statement:

(Mr. Jha, India)

"Against this background of political tension and violence it became immediately clear that some move toward national reconciliation would have to be made and made quickly if tensions were to be dampened so that orderly progress toward independence might get under way. Failing this the entire Belgian plan for the political advancement of the Territory -- a plan which was based initially on a series of elections for local communal councils early in June -- was likely to be wrecked." (T/PV.1112, page 47)

This, we are convinced, is the Mission's considered view, and so far as we are concerned it seems prima facie to be a correct view. To promote reconciliation the Visiting Mission the other day, through its Chairman here, advocated two main points: the holding of a round-table conference, before the election, in which a United Nations representative should be associated; and amnesty measures enabling the self-exiled representatives of the UNAR to participate in the conference.

It seems to us, from the statement of the Belgian representative made on 14 June, that neither of these recommendations is acceptable or, in any case, fully acceptable to the Belgian Government. We should, therefore, like to know what measures the Administering Authority contemplates for the achievement of national reconciliation in Ruanda and in the Territory as a whole. How does it view chances of reconciliation after, or in consequence of, the planned elections? Perhaps the Belgian representative could also give a detailed account of the specific measures that have been taken to this end in the Territory since the Visiting Mission's return.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I have listened carefully to the question put by the representative of India, and if I have understood him correctly he seems to have gone a bit further than the facts when he voiced the opinion that the Administering Authority had rejected all the proposals made by the Visiting Mission. That is not at all the case; quite on the contrary. The Administering Authority believes that the proposal for holding conferences before elections was a good measure and one which the Administering Authority implemented. It will be recalled that the communique of the Visiting Mission called for a meeting of delegates from Ruanda and Urundi. When we analysed the situation on the spot it seemed that this was not possible because none of the delegates from Urundi wished to become involved in the problems and tensions existing in Ruanda. They wanted to keep completely out of the situation in the northern territory of Ruanda. Therefore we had to split up the two meetings that had been foreseen.

Furthermore, the first reaction of the Administering Authority with regard to the Visiting Mission's proposal was to reply that because of practical difficulties concerning the large amount of work which the Brussels Government had at that moment it was not possible to have these meetings before the month of August. However, after closer examination of the problem and so as not to overlook any possibility of reaching an agreement, the Government decided to hold the conference in the month of May, thus going along with the views advanced by the Visiting Mission itself.

With regard to the question of the membership of the delegation, the Belgian Government felt that the membership should be as broad as possible and discussions took place on this matter between the representatives of the various groupings. I believe in my preliminary statement I gave an account of the results reached at these talks, namely that in view of the fact that at the present stage no party can claim support based upon electoral figures it was considered that the Special Provisional Council, including the members of all shades of public opinion of Ruanda-Urundi, was qualified to participate in this conference.

The Special Provisional Council on 9 May adopted a motion which I have already read out and which I shall read out again:

"The Council,

"1. Notes that the State is divided upon important questions principally the essential question of the person Kigeri V, Mwami of Ruanda;

"2. Notes that the Special Council remains the only uncontested official autonomous organ;

"3. Feels that it has the obligation to confer with the representatives of the Trusteeship to discuss the situation of the country and urgent measures to be taken;

"4. Believes that, during the holding of the conference in Brussels, the Special Council must speak on behalf of the State and in the interests of the State, and not on behalf of the parties and in the interests of the parties. To this effect, the members of the Special Council wish to avoid as far as possible any partisan considerations." (T/PV.1112, pp.59-60)

This motion was approved unanimously by all the members of the Special Provisional Council and it was on that basis that it was decided to hold the conference in Brussels on 27 May along these lines.

I believe that the representative of India also raised the question of amnesty. I have already made the position of my delegation very clear on this point, but I shall repeat it perhaps in other terms. The Administering Authority is not opposed, in principle, to the amnesty, but we feel that it is for the parties themselves to decide the question. In fact, an amnesty measure taken unilaterally by the Administration without the consent of the population concerned might very well be a measure that would unleash new violence rather than contribute to calm.

Mr. JHA (India): I appreciate the points that have been made by the representative of Belgium. He is quite right in saying that a meeting was held in May. We are aware of that fact. But the point is that the meeting was not and could not be the round table conference envisaged by the Visiting

Mission. The Visiting Mission's idea seems to have been -- and we think it was a very reasonable and sensible approach -- that there can be reconciliation only after the representative political parties have met and have tried to work out their future on the basis of "give and take", and thereafter to have elections for the purpose of introducing democratic forms. We gather -- we may be wrong and we would like the representative of Belgium to correct us if that is so -- that the idea of the Administering Authority is that the process should be just the reverse; that is to say, you should have the communal elections, and so forth, introduced, the democratic form, and then later have a round table conference. One of the arguments advanced in favour of that is what the Provisional Council has said. That is a question of opinion, and that is something on which the Council will no doubt comment and make suggestions in due course.

However, does the representative of Belgium consider that the meeting that was held in May as the sort of round table conference that was contemplated by the Mission? I see from his statement that there was to be a conference at the ultimate stage. "The Government of Belgium intends to organize during 1961 a general conference with delegates of the Governments of the two States, so as to discuss the type of independence..." our impression was that that was the round table conference for settling the future of Ruanda-Urundi which the Administering Authority had in mind. We would like to have some clarification on this matter. It does not seem to us that the meeting which took place in May was in fulfilment of the recommendation of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUJAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): In the mind of the Belgian delegation, the meeting in May was a good follow-up of the proposal made by the Visiting Mission. I have explained the reason why it was not possible to organize a conference involving all of Ruanda-Urundi as a whole. It was necessary first of all to divide it into the two States concerned. I have also explained the reasons why it was difficult at the time to arrive at compromise solutions so long as the parties and the trends of public opinion could

not claim any definite support freely expressed by the population itself. I think that the problem will be progressively dealt with as soon as we know where we stand and when the parties can prove that they speak for one or another section of the population. It will then be easier to achieve compromise solutions. In any event, the Administration is aware of the fact that this Administration itself will be leaving the Territory and we do not wish to prolong our responsibilities there.

(Mr. Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

We also know that if the Administration leaves, the populations of Ruanda-Urundi will have to live together, and we are ready to help them to that end. We will help them to achieve all possible compromise solutions, but in order to study these compromise solutions with the necessary knowledge of what it is all about, preliminary measures will have to be taken to allow the population freely to express its wishes, and it will be upon the basis of those facts that at a later stage negotiations can be undertaken upon a solid basis in order to determine what is common to all and what is in the interests of the population as a whole so as to adjust the future institutions to their needs.

Mr. JHA (India): This seems to me really to be the core of the whole question that is before the Council, and I would like to comment further. At the meeting in May, apart from the fact that it was not a meeting representative of Urundi -- which is understandable for the reasons the representative of Belgium stated -- the delegates were six persons appointed by the Administering Authority, and the UNAR, which by all accounts is a very important party in the Territory, did not participate. How, then, can the Administering Authority satisfy itself that there has been that measure of national consultation which should be a good prelude to any kind of democratic elections which would lead eventually to reconciliation.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): The Administering Authority is not convinced that this preliminary consultation will not have the character of a general confrontation of opinion. The general ideas voiced by the Special Provisional Council have not yet been put into effect because at the very last moment one of the political parties refused to attend the conference. With regard to the type of membership in the Special Council, I would say that if it is true that this Special Provisional Council is composed of persons whose title depends somewhat upon recognition by the Administration, it was not the Administration which chose them. These persons were chosen by the various political parties, and the four principal political parties representing a broad spread of public opinion in Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. JHA (India): Naturally we will take up these matters in our statement. I have only one other question in regard to the same matter, namely, if the Administering Authority admit and recognize that UNAR is an important party, then obviously it should be brought into any kind of consultation which might result in durable arrangements. What is the Administering Authority doing to try to bring the UNAR into any conference, whether it is in May, October or at any future date, because it is obvious in the history of all colonial territories that the Administering Authorities have had to go back to the popular party, even if that party does not happen to be popular with the Administering Authority, if any final settlement is to be reached? We would like to know what steps it has taken or is taking to bring UNAR back into the fold.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): Before calling upon the Special Representative for some supplementary information, I should like very much to reassure my colleague from India that the Administering Authority has daily contacts with all parties, including UNAR. UNAR is a member of the Special Provisional Council through its representatives on the Council, and, therefore, UNAR has the opportunity in the Council to express its views and its political platform. UNAR was invited to participate in the conference, as were all the other parties. UNAR accepted, and the statement I made a few minutes ago was countersigned by representatives of UNAR.

I would ask you now, Mr. President, to call upon the Special Representative, who has certain information which he would like to give.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative)(interpretation from French): To begin with, I should like to thank the representative of India for the words of welcome which he addressed to me. I should like to assure him that I will co-operate in the Council's work to the best of my ability.

I should like to add some information to that given by the representative of Belgium. I endorse his statement that in the Provisional Council representatives of all parties, including UNAR, have been able to devote themselves to questions of general interest with regard to the elections,

(Mr. Reisdorff,
Special Representative)

including questions concerning the practical arrangements for the elections and the procedures to be followed. The Special Provisional Council has agreed on measures which are satisfactory to the representatives of all the parties. UNAR, through its representatives in Ruanda, co-operates every day with the Administration. Only recently, it held congresses in which, as I pointed out this morning, decisions were adopted concerning the organization of its electoral campaign. At the conclusion of one of those congresses, a telegram was sent by the President to the Minister for Belgian Congo in Ruanda-Urundi. This telegram contained a motion adopted by UNAR, and concluded as follows:

"In the name of my party, and my own name personally, I cannot conclude without reiterating our feelings of profound gratitude to you and our sincere attachment to Belgium and its Government. We are convinced that the Belgian Government, which you represent in Ruanda, will do everything in its power in order to restore calm and tranquillity in the Ruanda country, and that in so doing it will have cemented once again the eternal bonds of friendship which have tied the two peoples of the two countries now for more than two score years."

That was signed by the President of UNAR.

In an atmosphere in which all parties have the opportunity to organize their electoral campaigns and where public meetings are permitted, conditions for the reduction of tension can arise which will enable the country to designate its local representatives and specify the political arrangements and apportionment of future deliberative councils in Ruanda. This will be the first step towards a general reconciliation in Ruanda which cannot fail to develop, once the atmosphere of personal antagonisms and personal designs have been dissipated, thanks to this fulfilment of democratic ideas.

Mr. JHA (India): I thank the representative for his answer, and also the representative of the Administering Authority. I listened to the telegram which was read out which was sent by UNAR to, I believe, the Resident General or the representative of the Belgian Government in Ruanda. I might say that that may be the beginning of an answer to my question of how the Administering Authority proposes to bring UNAR into the field of consultation and conciliation.

(Mr. Jha, India)

I shall now go to my next question. As a result of disturbances, many chiefs and sub-chiefs -- practically all of them Tutsi -- either resigned in protest or were removed by the Administering Authority. The Visiting Mission report states that, in filling the vacant posts, the Administration chose Hutu by preference. Even accepting that these are not final appointments, but only interim appointments, the Administration's action would appear to be somewhat partial to one section of the Territory's population. It would also seem to run counter to the theory that the Administering Authority's role is that of an indirect ruler and that administration is carried on largely by tribal authority. What I should like to ask is why were Hutu selected for most, if not all, of the vacant sub-chiefdoms? Does the Administering Authority not think that it would have been right and confidence-inspiring among the Tutsi for the sub-chiefdoms in the vacancies caused by the dismissal or killing or flight of Tutsi sub-chiefs, in consequence of the Hutu attacks, to have been filled by Tutsi -- or at least a large number of them? I should be grateful for the Special Representative's comments.

Mr. Claeys BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I thought that I had answered this question, at least in part, at this morning's meeting. It is in fact true that the authorities who were dismissed were all Tutsi, for the simple reason that there were no others. Until 1959 all the customary authorities were Tutsi, or people classified as such, with one single exception, namely, Mbonyomutwa, a sub-chief, who was the object of an attempt on his life; and this, in fact, unleashed the violent phase of the disturbances in Ruanda in 1959.

As regards the replacements, the Special Representative may be able to give some clarification, but I can say that it is inaccurate to assert that all are Hutu. There are a considerable number of Tutsi among them.

The Administration's policy has been the following. We found ourselves in a chaotic situation, a factual situation. In addition to normal vacancies through deaths, resignations or, in some cases, dismissals because of maladministration, there was in certain areas a complete vacuum because the traditional authorities had been properly expelled owing to a popular movement against them. In that case the Administration had no option but to enquire of the population at mass meetings as to their preference: who were the people whom they preferred? What intermediaries, what spokesmen they wanted placed at the head of their districts,

(Mr. Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

spokesman who would have administrative duties, such as the maintenance of order, collection of taxes, enforcement of health regulations, etc. And this is what the Government proceeded to do.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

I have only a few words to add to the statement by the representative of Belgium. When vacancies occurred, either through the spontaneous departure of those involved or because the population had engaged in insurrection against the notables, the Administration, in many cases, endeavoured to restore the authorities after the event. In many cases such attempts ended in failure. The Administration, therefore, organized consultations designed to install interim authorities. Within a few days the sub-chiefs will have completed their terms of office, those who have been sub-chiefs for a number of years and those designated for an interim period as well. They will have an opportunity to be re-elected in a commune, but the number of communes is one-third of the number of sub-chiefdoms. A number of them, in fact, have refrained from putting forward their candidacy; they prefer to seek jobs as secretaries or communal tax collectors.

Thus we have been faced with a temporary problem, and for a number of months we were obliged to secure the continuity of local administration, and the best means available to us was to ascertain the preferences of the population.

As for the chiefs, they also are authorities, perhaps interim authorities -- certainly in the form in which they now carry out their functions, since the issue of the command functions of the chiefs will be taken up after the elections at the time when the general colloquium of Ruanda-Urundi takes place. It was provided that chiefs would become administrative officials; chiefdom having been abolished, administration would replace it, and they would become administrative officer like the Administrators of the Territory and the Assistant Administrators. Therefore, decisions regarding these two sets of authorities are necessarily provisional in character -- they are interim decisions -- and it seemed to be preferable to act in this domain by ascertaining the wishes of the inhabitants, who would have to pronounce themselves subsequently in any event. There was no discrimination in favour of any part of population, nor any intervention by the Administration; neither was there any bias. There was a deep anxiety to ensure that democratic procedures should be followed.

Mr. JHA (India): I am sorry,,but I am a little confused. The Special Representative has said that, after the departure of the sub-chiefs -- whether their departure was voluntary or enforced or because they were killed, or whatever else happened -- they felt that it was necessary to consult the population in the matter of the appointment of sub-chiefs. Evidently, this population was the remnant of the old population after the Tutsi had fled; so this seems to be a rather extraordinary procedure. Also, I gathered that these were only interim appointments. I should like to have confirmation of that. If they were interim appointments, how soon is a further revision of the sub-chiefdoms to be undertaken? I do not know whether I made my point clear. My point was that here were these sub-chiefs -- and there is no doubt that, in the first phase of the disturbances, the Tutsi were the sufferers -- who fled their homes; and then, instead of appointing a substantial number of them in order to create confidence among them to come back, the Administering Authority appointed sub-chiefs from among those who were left behind and who, according to all accounts, had been responsible for driving away the others. There is something in that which does not sound quite right. Perhaps my understanding is wrong, but I would be grateful for some clarification.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): To answer the question of the representative of India, I should like to say that about two or three sub-chiefs were killed, a more considerable number were expelled bodily, and an almost equal number were forced to resign because they found it impossible to continue to perform their functions owing to the refusal of the population to continue to regard them as sub-chiefs. So there was a movement in a number of regions in Ruanda which emerged from the will of the mass of the people. The Government had to take measures, and the measures took the form of the appointment of interim authorities. In a number of cases, as the representative has pointed out, attempts were made to reinstate the chiefs expelled. It simply did not work.

As for the interim authorities, as the representative of India himself has emphasized, they are indeed provisional, pending the implementation next month of the reforms that will institute the communes. As of that time the interim authorities will vanish completely, but they will be replaced by magistrates or dignitaries selected by the population. Nothing prevents the former sub-chiefs or the present interim authorities from standing as candidates, and a number of them are doing so. Others have made it clear that they will not.

To answer the other part of the question by the representative of India, I should like to assure him that these interim authorities will have been in office only from November 1959 until July or August 1960, at which time they will be replaced by elected dignitaries.

Mr. JHA (India): I should like to ask the representative of the Administering Authority whether it was necessary to fill these posts immediately or whether they could have been left vacant for some time. He himself has said that these were provisional appointments and that this whole thing would be revised in a few months, but was it necessary to appoint these people immediately after the offices fell vacant following upon the disturbances?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

The office of sub-chief is at the basic administrative and executive level. It is as essential for the life of Ruanda as the continuation of the economic and traditional life of the country as a whole. The functions of the sub-chief include the civil register, collection of taxes, local road maintenance, and direction of the sub-chiefdom council, which deals with all current business in the sub-chiefdom, including real estate and land tenure questions, cattle questions and personal questions. He is in charge of the local conciliation tribunal. He is really the key authority. He will be replaced by the mayor or the head of the commune, who will have more extensive responsibilities in certain fields. The sub-chiefdom is the work-horse of the administration, both as customary authority and as spokesman for the Administering Authority, for all the principal wheels of the administrative machinery. All information is obtained from the sub-chief, and all economic policy is carried out through the work of the sub-chiefs, who are in charge of its implementation. The 1952 decree, in fact, describes the various responsibilities of the sub-chiefs, which are numerous.

Mr. JHA (India): During the first few days of November, while certain sections of the Hutu population were indulging in large-scale incendiarism and assassination, the Mwami of Ruanda offered to use his influence and resources to restore order and to suppress the general uprising. The Visiting Mission's report mentions that these offers were not accepted by the Administering Authority. We should like to have the Administering Authority's comment as to why it thought fit to ignore the offer of the highest native authority to restore law and order in the Territory. Is there any reason why the Administration did not favour co-operation between native authorities and its own forces in this matter?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

The Administering Authority is responsible for the maintenance of order and is in charge of such means as are available for the maintenance of order and the prevention of offences. What the Mwami and certain Tutsi reactionaries wanted was to be put in charge of repression and to liquidate by force those who opposed

(Mr. Reisdorff, Special Representative)

them. I am referring mainly not to the Mwami but to the reactionary Tutsi forces, about whom the report of the Visiting Mission gives a good deal of information. This is precisely what the Administering Authority was eager to avoid. We wanted to avoid having one faction administer justice for its own benefit. It was only from 9 November that the leaders of this faction were made to realize that the Administering Authority was resolved to have order and legality respected and have the guilty ones called to account whoever they might be. Until that time, with or without the authorization of the Administration, that faction administered justice for its own benefit, and thus about fifteen Hutu leaders were assassinated.

Mr. JHA (India): I should like to know if the Mwami and the officers in his administration -- as I gathered from the answer of the Special Representative -- have no functions at all with regard to law and order.

Mr. CIAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The Mwami has rights and responsibilities, which are recognized, for the maintenance of order. These rights, like all others he exercises, are under control of the trusteeship. The question arose as follows. Following the October incidents there was a peasant insurrectionary movement and uprising in certain areas. It was limited at the beginning and it was in the north of Ruanda, specifically affecting the regions of Ndiza, in the Nyanza territory, and Ruhengeri and certain regions of the Kisenyi territory. Subsequently the Mwami offered to take in hand the maintenance of order. This could well have been considered dispassionately, since the customary and traditional ways for the maintenance of order might well have operated, if at the same time there had not been a large-scale movement for the assassination of Hutu political leaders in precisely those areas which had not been affected by the disturbances, areas which had hitherto remained perfectly peaceful.

When the Administration was confronted with this problem, it had to face up to its responsibilities and it had to inform the Mwami and the traditionalist

(Mr. Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

authorities that it was resolved to ensure the restoration of order by itself, because acting otherwise would have been tantamount, under the guise of the restoration of order, to allowing a large internal purge designed to murder systematically all the leaders of opinion opposed to the traditionalist group, shall we say, who then represented the institution of the Ibwami.

Mr. JHA (India): I have understood the point of view of the Special Representative and I would accept, for purposes of the present questioning, the fact that the Administering Authority is really responsible for law and order and that they have no reasons for not accepting the offer of the Kwami. But I would like to draw attention to the account of the disturbances which is given by the Visiting Mission in paragraphs 198 to 221 of its report. Several facts have emerged. The report makes reference, for example, to:

"... a long series of incidents in which Hutu hordes pillaged and set fire to thousands of huts belonging to the Tutsi." (T/1538, paragraph 200)

If disturbances of this nature take place over a period of days, surely something ought to be done by the authorities responsible for law and order to prevent it. It seems very unusual to us that in any Territory which has an organized Government, houses should be burned for days and nothing is done, or at any rate no substantial steps are taken to stop such outrages. I would like to know from the Administering Authority what exactly happened. Why was it not possible to prevent this orgy of fire and burning of huts, and so on, which, according to the Visiting Mission's report, did not take place as a snap incident but rather took place over a period of several days?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from ;French): It is not accurate -- and I should like to emphasize this in answer to the question of the representative of India -- to say that the Administration and the public force and the gendarmerie had not, from the first day, done their best to prevent the spreading of incendiarism and arson and to put an end to the spontaneous uprising of the Hutu, following the incidents described in the report of the Visiting Mission.

The first phase of the action was the intervention of the local administrators. The Visiting Mission, in paragraph 215 of its report, speaks of what they did and also makes clear the large number of fires which had been set, and the fact that no group opposed the action of the Administrator and the forces, but rather scattered themselves and then reformed to act in groups of two and three. This tactic of scattering exists in a country where people have residences all over the place. There are no villages, as the Council knows.

(Mr. Reisdorff,
Special Representative)

The Visiting Mission, like its predecessors, was able to realize that the indigenous inhabitants live scattered over all the hills.

The tactic of the Hutu incendiaries was analysed and explained by the members of the Visiting Mission, which showed to what extent this movement was difficult to handle. The action of the Administrators of the Territory was immediately supported by the forces of the maintenance of order, and there were a number of clashes. The tactic of the Hutu was always to flee, never to offer resistance or even to avow that they were responsible for the arson. When they were met or encountered on the hills, they claimed that they were about their business. Then they got together again a little further away. They circumvented the forces of order and began their work, shall we say, again. This was starting all over the place.

On 8 November there was a clash between the arsonists and the public forces. Unfortunately, the result was two dead and two injured on the side of the Hutu. At Mabanza on 8 November and then on 9 November at the Nyondo region clashes occurred. But the generalized and widespread nature of the Hutu uprising made it necessary to take exceptional measures. These exceptional measures were embodied in a five-phase military operation. The first phase was inaugurated as early as 24 October. That is what we call phase number one. The second phase involved the sending of platoons, through the most endangered regions, on 2 November. Then there were phases three, four and five on 4 and 5 November. Only on 6 November was the whole machinery set in place and the emergency situation proclaimed.

Then military forces occupied the whole country, and they were strengthened substantially. So that within a few days they did in fact stop the disturbances. By 14 November the disturbances had been arrested. It is therefore inaccurate to upbraid the Administration on grounds of inaction. The Administration acted from the outset with the means at its disposal. It deployed all of its resources and it was after considerable effort that it was able to stop the disturbances after they had been going for about two weeks.

(Mr. Reisdorff,
Special Representative)

The Visiting Mission, in its report, spoke of the action of the forces of public order and said the following:

"On this question the Commission of Inquiry felt that the military action had been carried out with the greatest possible rapidity, precision, coolness and effectiveness, and that it reflected a firm desire to avoid any bloodshed. The Commission believed that, although the country was very unsuited to military action, mountainous and with few means of communications, and although the lack of co-operation by a part of the population raised obstacles, the Force publique had succeeded within several days in putting an end to the disturbances with a minimum loss of human life. It had the clear impression that everything possible had been done to avoid needless brutality." (T/1538, paragraph 221)

Mr. JHA (India): I have heard the reply of the Special Representative. I would like to ask one other question in this connexion. It appears that some time before the disturbances, the military authorities had drawn up a five-stage plan of action under the title "General Disturbances: For Use in the Event that Difficulties Occurred". Two questions arise from this. First, did the Administration anticipate the first disturbances, and if so, why did the police and military authorities not intervene in advance, in some ways, to prevent the situation, arising in the way it did, or to minimize the intensity of the first disturbances? Also, were they in a position to do that and did they do anything towards that end?

Mr. CIAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): It is true that the Administering Authority had been aware for some time that rising tension was characteristic of life in Ruanda. In his speech to the Council last year Mr. Reisdorff, the Special Representative, said in his opening statement that the specific feature of evolution in Ruanda-Urundi was turbulence, with an increasing consciousness and awareness on the part of the unsatisfied peasant masses who were demanding reforms. Reforms were at that time in course of preparation and had, in fact, virtually been decided upon. They were no secret, and on broad lines they were fairly well known to be based by the Administering Authority on the swift democratization of institutions and the implementation of the decree the principles of which had been carefully studied by the working party which had visited the Territory at the time. It is true to say that for both the Administering Authority and the traditional authorities the suddenness of the outbreak of violence came as a surprise. It was a flash outbreak, it was like a prairie fire; it took place in November and there were of course numerous acts of provocation during the period from August to October; the outbreak was the result of these. The restoration of order was a complicated process owing to the fact that certain groups of the population identified with the traditionalist forces wanted to avail themselves of the disturbances for the purpose of carrying out a vast operation designed to liquidate all their political opponents. The work of restoring order would have been much easier if the Administering Authority and the forces of order had been able to concentrate on the localized areas where actual arson was occurring.

Mr. JHA (India): In the same connexion, I would like to ask how many Hutu and Tutsi leaders or others have been apprehended by the Administering Authority for serious offences relating to the disturbances. How many in either category have been punished and in what manner? What charges are held against the self-exiled leaders of the UBAR and how many persons are thus affected? Is it intended that they should be tried by the military court or will they be tried under civil law?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French): The Visiting Mission was able to secure information about the questions raised by the representative of India. When the Visiting Mission went to the prison at

(Mr. Reisdorff,
Special Representative)

Kibuye it was addressed by two substantial groups representing the two tendencies which had confronted each other during the disturbances. The leaders of the Hutu movement and the reactionary leaders of the Tutsi were all locked up in the Kibuye jail and they addressed the Visiting Mission, in separate delegations, of course, when it went there. The Administration and the judicature acted dispassionately and without bias; they tried to seek out all offences and crimes and these, according to the Visiting Mission's report, involved 85 per cent of cases of arson, the remainder being connected with violence and murder. When the Visiting Mission was in the Territory, 1,183 persons had been arrested. The Council of War had declared itself incompetent in twenty-eight cases; there were still 207 cases on the books and 153 cases relating to 1,013 persons had been dealt with by 15 March 1960. Of the total, 85 per cent related to pillage, robbery and arson and the others related to murder. Two death sentences have been handed down; 1,400 persons have been arrested and by now about 1,200 have been judged, some 200 remaining to be tried. The action of the judicial authorities was impartial and dispassionate; all cases were sought out and all the guilty have been prosecuted.

Mr. JHA (India): I thank the Special Representative for that answer but my question related to the number of people from among the Tutsi and the Hutu leaders who have been apprehended, brought to trial and punished. I believe that information was not given in the Special Representative's answer.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to know exactly what the representative of India wishes to ascertain. What does he mean by leaders? Is it chiefs? Only Tutsi chiefs were prosecuted because only Tutsi chiefs were in existence, if he means chiefs in the sense of traditionally recognized authorities. If he means by leaders political leaders in general of some importance, it may be found that among the political leaders or personalities who were known by their political actions before or after the disturbances were only political leaders belonging to the traditionalist and legitimist faction of the population. No act of violence, incitation to violence,

(Mr. Claeys Bouúaert, Belgium)

conspiracy to commit violence or torture or arbitrary detention or any similar crime has been proved with regard to persons representing the democratic currents of opinion.

Mr. JHA (India): I will try to clarify what I had in mind, because I still have not got my answer. Among those arrested, how many were Hutu and how many were Tutsi? Among those, how many were Hutu leaders and how many were Tutsi leaders? It is true that the word "leader" is not defined in any statute as far as I know, but a leader is one who takes part in organizing something, a political party or action committee or whatever it is, and such people are usually known. So it should not be very difficult to mention those who were considered leaders of these revolts or uprisings or whatever they may be called. If the Administering Authority is in a position to give me that answer, I would like to have it; if not now, perhaps at a later stage. It is in my opinion an answer which is capable of being given.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): As to the arson convictions, I can assuredly reply that the large majority of cases regarded persons who were Hutus. To what extent leaders were involved, well, this is a bit difficult to answer, virtually impossible, because, as the representative of India himself has pointed out, the very notion of leadership is, after all, a subjective one. Among those arrested a number may have been regarded as leaders, in the sense that they were chiefs of gangs.

This question of leadership has never been taken into account by the courts. The courts have sought dispassionately and without bias to prosecute and convict all those who were guilty. The question of their political influence surely was not one which the courts would have been expected to have taken into consideration, and they did not.

Mr. JHA (India): I think we are at cross-purposes. I never said that leadership in itself is an offence or is a matter that could be taken up by the courts. But I understand the difficulty of designating who was a leader and who was not. Surely it should not be difficult to say how many, in the category of Hutu and Tutsi, men or women, were apprehended, how many had been put on trial, how many had been convicted and their offences. If the Special Representative does not have this information, we would be grateful if he would give this information to us later on. The information as to how many Hutus and how many Tutsis had been arrested and put on trial is not classified and it should be able to be obtained.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Of course, there is nothing classified in this information, to the extent to which it exists or can be secured. Toward the end of the examination of the report we might possibly get that information, but I would like to point out that there is an inherent difficulty. The representative of India himself said, very properly, that leadership is not a qualification upon which it is possible to prosecute somebody; nor is it taken into consideration one way or the other by the courts. The courts ignore that. The fact that someone considers himself to be a leader or is regarded

(Mr. Claeys Bouúaert, Belgium)

by others as being a leader is totally irrelevant to what action the courts may wish to take.

The courts prosecute an individual independent of whatever faction of the population to which he may belong, whether it be to the Tutsi, Twa, European or Asian, without any bias, without any regard for his political influence or political status. This is a matter which the courts simply disregard.

It would not be possible, therefore, to furnish a list of persons who are leaders, because the notion of leadership is a subjective notion which depends on the views of the persons concerned themselves or their neighbours or others. It is possible that a number of persons arrested considered themselves to be leaders or are considered to be leaders by a group of the population and are not considered as such by others. They may consider themselves to be leaders alone and nobody else does.

Mr. JHA (India): We could go on with this discussion, but, as I say, the information which I have requested, merely as to numbers, not as to leaders, ought to be available, and we would appreciate it being furnished to us. If the Special Representative does not have the information, I am sure he can get it from the Territory itself.

In connexion with the main question that I asked, may I request the Special Representative to let us know if there are any charges against the self-exiled leaders of UNAR and, if so, what is the nature of the charges?

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French): I can give an answer to the question of the representative of India with respect to the number of cases judged. Eighty-five per cent of the cases related to arson and robbery, which corresponds to the period of the Hutu uprising. The Batutsi were guilty of few cases of arson. Arson was usually the provocation but the big wave, shall we say, of incendiarism was part of the spontaneous disturbances caused by the Hutu. So 85 per cent of the cases were cases of robbery and arson and 15 per cent of the cases were cases of murder. A few cases were charged to the Hutu, but most of them were charged to the Tutsi; that is, many cases were found to be imputable to the Tutsi.

Mr. JHA (India): From a perusal of the Visiting Mission's report, and I refer in particular to paragraphs 21 and 217, it would appear that the Mwami of Ruanda is a man of considerable personal popularity and his presence seems to be a calming influence on crowds in circumstances of political excitement, irrespective of their party affiliations. I should like the Chairman of the Visiting Mission or any other member of the Visiting Mission, if they so wish and if they can, to comment on this impression that we have formed. We would like to know what their estimate is of the general feeling about the Mwami and the office of the Mwami. That would be my first question in this connexion.

Mr. SEARS (United States): I would like to answer that question, but before answering it I would like to again make the personal observation that when a Visiting Mission submits its report, as all Visiting Missions have, they represent -- at least in this case -- the combined attitude of all the members, and it may not be helpful to the consideration of problems involved in the report if the Chairman or any other member, speaking on behalf of the Mission, were to state something which could not be agreed to by all the others. I think in this case I am being over cautious. I will not reply as Chairman of the Mission, but I will reply as the United States member.

Under those conditions, speaking not as the Chairman but as the United States member, I consider that the Mwami Kigeli V is a good man, a young man with a sense of humour and a Mwami or king who has repeatedly expressed his desire to serve, not as an absolute monarch, but as a constitutional monarch. Under successful national reconciliation I believe he is capable of being a humane and an effective leader of a democratically organised Ruanda.

It might be helpful to the Council if I were to make another observation, as the United States member. Throughout our travels through Ruanda we were accosted by literally hundreds of thousands of people. Some would have these big banners calling for immediate independence. Others would have banners saying: "We want democratic institutions."

(Mr. Sears, United States)

I believe that 99 per cent of those who raised these apparently opposing banners did not really and truly contemplate exactly what they were saying; because it is a fact that you cannot have independence without democratic institutions, nor can you have democratic institutions without, resultingly, having independence. So, with the central point of the Mission being one of reconciliation, we considered that the big dispute throughout the Territory, that based on democratic institutions versus immediate independence, was a fictitious issue which could be resolved immediately if some force could be brought into the situation which could bring about what we called national reconciliation.

Mr. JHA (India): I am grateful to the representative of the United States for his giving his own impression, and quite likely he emphasized that he was speaking in his individual capacity as representative of the United States. I wonder if any other member of the Visiting Mission would like to give us his impression -- because, since we study these things only on the basis of the report and what is stated in this Council, it seemed to us that any future, stable political arrangement in Ruanda-Urundi has to centre around some symbolic head, and that that might very well be the office of the Mwami at present.

This is purely a provisional thought that we have. We attach importance to this question and we would like to have the comments of other members. Naturally, if the representative of the Administering Authority or the Special Representative would like to comment, we would also like to hear them.

The PRESIDENT: I see that besides the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, there are two other members who are present and sitting at the table. I wonder whether the representative of Paraguay would like to comment in answer to the question of the representative of India.

Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (interpretation from Spanish): If I have correctly understood the question put by the representative of India, our comment as a Mission member would be in reference to the extent of the influence and popularity of the Mwami. I would say that my personal impression is that

(Mr. Solano Lopez, Paraguay)

the institution of the Mwami really enjoys great influence throughout the whole Territory. Mr. Sears has just told us that all along the road in various places he saw thousands of persons divided into two great groups: those asking for immediate independence, and those asking first for democratic institutions. Save for certain exceptions, especially among certain leaders of the Hutu, we heard nothing said against the Mwami.

Perhaps this reply is satisfactory to the representative. If not, I would be prepared to say something more.

Mr. JHA (India): I thank the representative of Paraguay for giving us his impression, and my question is still open for answers by others whom I mentioned a short time ago.

Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand): It is not very easy to sum up the personality of a man and his influence when you see him usually in circumstances which are rather tense and circumstances in which he himself is involved. I think there is no doubt, as the representative of Paraguay has said, that the institution of the Mwami enjoys a very great mystique in Ruanda. The institution of the Mwami is very highly respected by almost all the people, I should say. As far as the person of the Mwami is concerned, the person at present filling this position, there was some criticism of him, as mentioned in the report, by certain of the Hutu leaders. Some of these Hutu leaders even went so far as to suggest that the institution of the Mwami no longer served a useful purpose. But most of them admitted that the institution did possess the mystique that I have mentioned, even if some of them have reservations concerning the present incumbent of the office.

Mr. CLAEYS ECUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe the Council is grateful to the members of the Visiting Mission for having expressed their opinion, and as regards the Belgian delegation, we appreciate the frankness with which they have advanced their opinions. I have no comment to make with regard to this matter; I have no opinion which differs from theirs and which I would have to advance and defend here. All I can say that in the last analysis the institution

(Mr. Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

of the Mwami is, to be sure, deeply rooted historically in the feelings of the people of Ruanda. It will evolve and in the future take that shape which the masses of the people wish to give it. This is a question concerning the people of Ruanda. The Administering Authority has no comment to make at this moment.

Mr. JHA (India): In paragraph 61 of the Visiting Mission's report the Visiting Mission stated as follows:

"Until recent years the differences between conditions in Ruanda and Urundi had been minimized and the political situation in the Trust Territory had been presented as a whole. The disturbances of November 1959 in Ruanda drew attention to the differences between Ruanda and Urundi and led the Administering Authority to follow in Ruanda policies which it did not feel obliged to apply in Urundi."

Elsewhere the Mission notes that the feudal and racial problem in Urundi is basically the same as in Ruanda, that the Tutsi-Hutu question is potentially just as explosive; that all this would seem to indicate the necessity for pursuing different policies in Ruanda and Urundi.

Would the representative of the Administering Authority please let us know the policy which the Administering Authority feels obliged to apply in Ruanda and not in Urundi.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe this question is similar to a question put yesterday by the representative of Burma to which I replied by saying that the Administering Authority is not following different policies in the two states. The political status and its future in these two states are the same. They are all in the Trusteeship; they form part of a greater whole; their political destinies are similar. The policy of the Administering Authority is identical in the two states. The differences which the Visiting Mission noted do not concern the policy followed there but concern simply the methods used. It is true that certain measures had to be taken in Ruanda because of an open revolution which broke out, whereas such measures were not necessary in Urundi.

The Special Representative in his opening statement emphasized certain differences in the movements which are agitating the population in the two states; and with regard to prospective solutions of problems, the Special Representative emphasized that there were good reasons to hope that the modification of the psychological structure and modifications of institutions which inevitably will be necessary might take place in Urundi quite peacefully in the guise of freely accepted evolution.

Mr. JHA (India): I appreciate the points that were made by the representative of the Administering Authority, and it is true that the conditions in Ruanda and Urundi are different at the present moment with respect to tensions and the question of law and order. Nevertheless, does not the Administering Authority think that the basic policies of democratization ought to synchronize in both parts, otherwise one part might be left far behind the other, which might cause difficulties in later adjustment between the two parts and the possibility of their working together.

Mr. RIESDORFF (Special Representative)(interpretation from French): That is exactly what the Administering Authority is doing. Urundi at the end of the year will have basic political representation identical in principle with the representation in Ruanda. Urundi, like Ruanda, will have communes. The administration of the communes will be directed by a council of communes and by a burgermeister. Urundi at Brussels will soon have an opportunity to reach agreement on a certain number of points set forth recently by the representative of Belgium identical with those discussed by the Special Provisional Council in Ruanda, with the exception of national reconciliation, which was not a point on the agenda in Urundi. Urundi is evolving in a parallel manner with Ruanda and in an identical direction, but the tension there is at a much different level and this allows us to hope that Urundi, without any crisis or grave difficulties, will achieve its independence. The same democratic methods are applied in Urundi and the same democratic goals are sought there by the Administration.

Mr. JHA (India): I come now to a question which relates to the refugees. We were surprised and rather disturbed to see the extraordinary large number of refugees, 22,000 in number, and worse still that these persons are refugees in their own homeland. In paragraphs 232 and 233 of the report of the Visiting Mission, it is stated that as of 19 April 1960 there were 22,000 refugees in Ruanda and that the measures taken by the Government for their resettlement had not yet brought entirely satisfactory results. Referring to this question of refugees in his opening statement, the representative of Belgium stated the other day: "In this field the situation is very confused and it varies considerably from region to region, but already the picture is somewhat more

encouraging. In several regions the reinstallation of these refugees is gradually coming about with the co-operation of the local authorities which are often provisional authorities set up because of the failure or the forced departure of the sub-chiefs of other days." (T/PV.1112, page 62)

What is the Administering Authority's idea of resettlement and reinstallation? Obviously these so-called refugees must go back to their own homes and lands to which they have a full right to return, and it becomes the duty of the authority in power to see that these are not denied to them because of any extraneous reasons.

Mr. RIESDORFF (Special Representative)(interpretation from French):

I had the honour of replying to this question this morning in answer to a question put by the representative of China. However, I shall be happy to sum up my reply and perhaps I may be able to add something.

The first installation of refugees in administrative centres, reception centres and so forth, has been described in the Visiting Mission's report, but each case of a refugee gives rise to a dossier. They are invited to state what they have left behind, how much property, livestock, land, which they possessed, and then these dossiers are verified by the Administration on the spot. The compensation is handled just as if it were for war damages. The methods to be applied will be drawn up by the Council of Ruanda-Urundi when they study the dossiers which we are preparing. We are undertaking this measure to ensure that the rights of each refugee will be upheld and that compensation will be paid as determined by the representatives of Ruanda-Urundi themselves.

This morning I read out a bulletin which showed that the efforts for resettlement undertaken by the Administration are now bearing fruit and that throughout the country the resettlement of refugees is under way with excellent chances of complete success. Thus, at the end of April several thousand Tutsi refugees were resettled in the sub-chiefdoms from which they had been expelled during March. In the chiefdom of Ndorwa, forty out of fifty families were resettled; in Buberuka, 200 families returned and an estimated 150 other families will return shortly. In the chiefdom of Rutiga, 420 families were accepted for return by the population, but 300 of them had fled to neighbouring regions the day before they should have returned to their homes. False rumours had been circulated to intimidate and bring pressure on these refugees.

(Mr. Reisdorff,
Special Representative)

In most of the areas of Ruanda where there had been incidents since the beginning of the year, the Administration's efforts to resettle the refugees -- Tutsi for the most part -- in the sub-chiefdoms from which they had been expelled have met with remarkable success.

The most difficult arose in Byumba. In that area order had been disturbed by certain refugees who, from abroad, conducted intensive propaganda against the democratization of institutions, thus stiffening the attitude of those on the spot. On several occasions the Special Resident and his assistant visited certain areas to help the territorial authorities in their work of reintegration. Meeting with the customary authorities, the sub-chiefdom councillors, representatives of the population and of the refugees, and using the services of intermediaries among the antagonistic groups, the authorities of the Residency and of the Territory finally succeeded in reintegrating 60 per cent of the refugees. In the chiefdom of Buyaga, reintegration was almost complete.

(Mr. Reisdorff,
Special Representative)

Among the refugees who were not resettled, that is to say 40 per cent, must be counted those who had left Ruanda and gone to Uganda. They represent about 9 per cent of the total.

In the territory of Astrida, 2,500 refugees out of a total of 3,200 were settled without great difficulty. At Kisenhi, the Administration will resettle in the Kingogo chiefdom all the refugees who fled to Katumba and Mbororo during the month of March. In Bugoyi, however, reintegration was much more difficult. The populations at first refused to accept a single refugee. Little by little, however, reintegration began and in this chiefdom has now reached nearly 50 per cent; 15 per cent of the refugees preferred to leave the district and resettle themselves in their original chiefdoms in Astrida, Nyanza, or Kibuye. Several hundred persons emigrated to the Congo. This emigration is probably only temporary, many of them having now returned to Kisenyi.

The latest incident took place during May in Kibuye territory. Exasperated by the threats and intimidations of certain Tutsi who were basing themselves on information coming from Uganda and who claimed to possess arms with which to subdue the Rutu, the population of Budaba in two days set fire to 500 Tutsi huts in the area, which is far from the capital of the district but near to Kingogo and Ndiza where the November troubles arose.

The Administration, as soon as it was informed, called a meeting of the entire population of the region and succeeded in putting a stop to the burnings. Further, it succeeded in convincing the inhabitants to reaccept almost the whole of the refugees, so that 96 per cent of those affected returned to their own hills. The best result of all, however, was that the Administration succeeded in persuading the entire population to help in rebuilding the burned huts and taking care of the women and children who had suffered.

Finally, for those refugees which do not desire to return to their original chiefdom or their place of origin, new settlement zones have been provided in Bugesera, in a region which has been surveyed and for which funds have been appropriated, particularly from the European Common Market. Some 3,000 persons will be settled in that region. Refugees expressing a preference to be settled there will receive priority over other persons.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I should like to sum up the refugee situation as it now stands, based upon the information available to us. The situation, of course, is a grievous one, but the problem will be solved as soon as calm is restored and when false rumours are no longer circulated in an attempt to persuade the population that on a given date the former order of things will be re-established.

A certain number of refugees, certainly the minority, though it is difficult to state the size of this minority, cannot go back to their place of origin because they have no land rights there. However, the great majority of refugees can return, and they are doing so at an accelerating pace. But they are the people who had recognized land rights. We want this resettlement to be peaceful, and the refugees are returning under different conditions. It is evident that the real masses of the people accept their return and in many cases assist in their resettlement. They assist in the building of huts, but they do not accept them any longer as overlords. They accept them as equal citizens, and not as members of a privileged class.

This resettlement is being continued. Perhaps certain families will not be able to go back to their point of origin because their rights to the land there are being contested, but the great majority will return, and they must agree to return not as members of a privileged class, but as equal citizens.

Mr. JHA (India): I quite agree that none of the returning, so-called refugees should have any special privileges; that is a sound principle. I should like to thank the Special Representative for giving me a lot of information on this subject, information which I am afraid he had to repeat, but I hope he will forgive me for asking a question which might have been a duplication of another question asked.

The representative of the Administering Authority said that the refugees "can return". I should like to know whether the Administering Authority has laid it down by means of a declaration of policy that these persons have the right to return to wherever they belong, because that seems to me to be a very essential and fundamental principle. Of course, if someone did not wish to return, that would be different. It is also possible that it may take some time for them to return because the conditions in particular areas may not be suitable.

(Mr. Jha, India)

I should like to know whether a definite declaration of policy has been laid down that these refugees have the right to return to their native villages or to wherever they were before and be restored to the situation, not by way of privileges but in the matter of ownership of property, houses and so on, which they had before.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): In reply to the question of the representative of India, I must emphasize that the Administering Authority never approved these expulsions. The Administering Authority never said that this was legal or normal and that it approved of it. We were faced with a situation of fact, and all the practical action taken by the Administration has been in an effort to convince the people that not only must they accept these refugees, but also assist them in their resettlement. This reinstallation is being carried out peacefully, and sometimes easily, when the question of the rights of the people are clear and when the people have the assurance that the refugees belonging to a certain class of society will not go back as members of a privileged class, possessing rights which the rest of the people contest, but will go back simply as equal citizens.

Mr. JHA (India): I have followed what the representative of the Administering Authority has said. I only want to know whether, after these disturbances, after the so-called refugees left their homelands or were driven from their homelands and took refuge in very large numbers, any policy decision has been taken or statement made by the Administering Authority with regard to the right of these refugees to return to their own places. Of course, the question of special privileges certainly is not appropriate, and we agree that nobody should have any special privileges. We ask this question because it seems to us that a declaration or a decision of that kind might have a very good effect from the point of view of morale. If that was not done, the Special Representative need only answer that they had not done it or that they did not think it necessary to do it.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

I can assure the representative of India, without being able to quote a declaration -- because in practical administration these things are not necessary -- that every assurance has been given to the refugees that they can recover what belongs to them, including their rights. This is the very basis of the life of the administration in Africa, namely, to return to people what belongs to them. These assurances have been given orally at every level to those people who had to leave their property. They have been assured that they can recover what belongs to them and will be authorized to return to their homes. I do not think that any general declaration was made, but, in my opinion, it was not necessary because it has been implemented. The Resident and all the administrators in the Territory have constantly seen to it that, after the disturbances, and once the situation had been restored to normal, the parties concerned could return to their point of origin, to their hills, as the representative of India put it; they could come back to their houses and their property and would receive compensation for damages. Everyone has been able to make a statement as to his losses. Thus, although a formal declaration has not been made, nevertheless such a statement has been implemented; any other attitude on the part of the administration would be unthinkable.

Mr. JHA (India): I have one more question in this connexion. The Special Representative has mentioned compensation. Who pays the compensation? Is it the State or the party who caused the arson or the damage? And is there any organized decision or law, or anything of the sort, or is it entirely determined on a rough and ready basis by executive authorities? I should like some clarification on that point.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

There is no compensation paid at the present moment. There is simply recognition of rights. These rights are then verified by the sub-chief council. Each such council takes up the statement made and verifies whether the person involved actually owned the thing for which he is claiming. If he does, when the refugee comes home his property can be returned to him either through rebuilding his hut or by returning his livestock -- because measures have been taken to protect the livestock -- or he can claim damages which will be paid to him.

Discussion of this will be held later by the assemblies of Ruanda when they have been seized of the various requests for damages by those who have not been able to get their compensation in kind either by reconstruction of their huts or the return of their livestock.

Mr. JHA (India): I come from a country which is, unfortunately, visited by a large number of natural calamities and, normally, when large numbers of people have suffered hardships of any kind, some kind of special organization is set up, an administrative organization, to deal with these matters. There are questions of resettlement, or compensation, or payment of gratuity, or something of that sort. I should like to know whether the Administering Authority has set up any special organization to deal with this matter and, if so, how it has been formed.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French): As I have said, it will be the local councils which will register the rights of the individuals concerned, but it is the Administration which maintains the refugees, transports them, cares for them, lodges them, etc. Packages are distributed among the refugees and everything is done to see that they are taken care of until they return home or go elsewhere if they prefer. It is the Administration itself which undertakes the burden of maintaining these persons until some solution of their situation is found.

Mr. JHA (India): I should like to proceed to a different question. It seems to us that all political parties in the Territory, including UNAR -- and in this connexion reference is invited to paragraph 306 of the Visiting Mission's report -- are agreed that Ruanda should develop on the lines of democracy and constitutional monarchy. We are glad to know that, on this latter point, the Mwami has also declared himself in favour of democratic principles by accepting the idea of a referendum, based on universal adult suffrage, to settle this question once and for all. We wonder if the Administering Authority has any views on this and would care to tell us its opinion of this question of a referendum.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

The Administering Authority has a plan for reforms which the Administration proposes to apply in Ruanda as well as in Urundi. At the present stage this plan is based upon the present state of the political stratifications in Ruanda and the maintenance of the constitutional monarchy. When Mwami Kigeli succeeded, the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi laid down as a principal condition that the Mwami should reign as a constitutional Mwami. These, then, are the views of the Administration at this time. It is not for the Administration at the present stage to decide to have a referendum, because the institution of a constitutional Mwami as provided for in the interim resolution has not been called into question.

Mr. JHA (India): The position of the chiefs under the new reforms is not particularly clear. It is stated in paragraph 243 (b) of the Visiting Mission's report that "The present chiefdoms would no longer be political entities and...The present chiefs might be integrated into the general administration of the country, thus becoming officials with no political mandate". How is it proposed to bring this about? Is it intended that, after the present chiefs are absorbed in the Administration cadre, no further appointment of chiefs will be made? How long will the transition be in process? It is not clear what will happen to the chiefdom councils under the new setup, and we should like to know what the position and powers of the corresponding ranks of officials in the Belgian Administration will be vis-à-vis the communal councils and administrative circonscriptions.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

The general structure, as described in paragraph 395, might allow us to have a general view as to the organization of the country. In the interim decrees the intention is that there be two Governments, for Ruanda and Urundi, then there would be a trusteeship Government, and the modalities might be discussed with the representatives of the new Government, but within these new Governments there would be a certain number of departments. The chiefs would be under one of these departments, in the same capacity as European officers. There would not be two parallel staffs. There would be simply one staff comprising European officials and African officials of the so-called unique cadre, because the two cadres will have been merged, and the chiefs will be integrated so that the inhabitants of Ruanda and the inhabitants of Urundi will themselves lay down the modalities according to their preferences. Thus, the Chiefs will become civil servants and will no longer have the traditional powers of their traditional role as chiefs. The modalities for the integration of the chiefs will be determined subsequently with the assemblies of Banyaruanda and Barundi.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium): (interpretation from French): I believe I should point out to the representative of India that we have a very complex traditional organization which in the past has been largely simplified. Formerly -- thirty years ago, say -- there were many customary ranks. In the same geographical area there was a very complicated mixture of competences, so to speak. We had land chiefs, cattle chiefs and other feudal dignataries, each one of whom was called upon to contribute to the maintenance of this pyramid, intervening in such customs as the collection of taxes. However, this has been greatly simplified. At present we have sub-chiefdoms, chiefdoms and then the State. The Territory is essentially an idea introduced by the Administration.

The basic idea of the reforms, decided upon after sounding out public opinion, would be to constitute the two States upon the basis of the communes and the State, and we would do away with the chiefdoms. The existing chiefs would be integrated with the administrative structure, not the political structure of the Territory, in a way which has yet to be determined. They could be inspectors or counsellors or burgomasters, and on the level of the communes they could disseminate the decisions taken by the Government of the State, but their political status would be

(Mr. Claeys Bouúaert, Belgium)

different. They would no longer be dignataries as under the old feudal order. Rather they would be civil servants. They will not be elected; they will be designated by the Government. Thus, the political ranks would be the commune, at the head of which there would be a burgomaster designated by the Council, and appointed by the Kwami, and then there would be the Legislative Assembly of Ruanda and Urundi, with their responsible Governments.

Mr. JHA (India): As the representative of the Administering Authority has rightly pointed out, the intermingling of the traditional and the modern administration is confusing, and that was the reason why we asked this question. We fully understand the idea of the Administering Authority of abolishing these chiefdoms and replacing the chiefs by officials of Government in a democratic set-up -- in a commune perhaps. However, we will naturally wait for the details of these rearrangements.

On account of the forthcoming independence of the Congo several questions arise. Some of these were posed by the Visiting Mission, and we hope that the Committee on Administrative Unions will consider these in detail. However, in his statement of 3 March 1960, as indicated in paragraph 418 of the Visiting Mission's report, the Resident-General made some points, and I wish to solicit specific information on two of these at the present time. First, he said:

"Wherever the new administration of the Congo makes it possible, it seems to me that it would be wise to avoid persuading our Territory to give up such assistance needlessly."

He said, further:

"All the necessary arrangements have been made with the Belgian and Congolese authorities to ensure that Ruanda-Urundi has at all times enough security troops." (T/1538, para. 418)

I should like to know what information the Administering Authority has with respect to the future intentions of the independent Government of the Congo to offer assistance to the Territory. Secondly, what are the arrangements that have been made with the Congolese authorities -- and which authorities are meant here -- to ensure that Ruanda-Urundi, after the Congo attains independence, has enough security troops? In what way does the Administering Authority regard the Congo after its independence responsible for the maintenance of law and order in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi?

(Mr. Jha, India)

Thirdly, I should like to repeat the question posed by the Visiting Mission in paragraph 433. What steps are being taken with regard to the maintenance of peace and good order in the Territory between the time when Congo becomes independent and the time when it will be possible to recruit the entire force locally?

Mr. CIAEYS BOJUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe that I answered the first part of the question when I replied yesterday to a similar question asked by the representative of Bolivia. If the representative of India would look at page 26 of the French text of document T/PV.1114, he would see that I explained at that time how the adjustment of the economic union to the new circumstances would be carried out. There is a joint commission comprised of delegates from Ruanda and from Urundi, assisted by the Administering Authority, which continues to be responsible for the joint administration, and also delegates from the future Congolese Government. It is true that there is a measure of reluctance on the part of the Congolese delegates to pronounce themselves on the future of this economic union.

(Mr. Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

It is possible therefore to take only provisional interim measures which may eventually turn into long-term or definitive agreements once Ruanda-Urundi will have acceded to independence. The agreements will be taken between the independent State of Congo and the Government of Ruanda-Urundi. As for the maintenance of order, measures have been taken eventually to replace the public force to the extent to which the Congolese Government may ask for its immediate return, having it replaced by a limited number of contingents furnished by the Administering Authority, pending the completion of accelerated measures for setting up a local gendarmerie. I think that information has already been furnished to this effect.

I would also like to refer to some passages of the report of the Visiting Mission, in particular paragraph 435. I think there were four questions and I am not sure that I answered all of them. Would the representative of India perhaps help me by letting me know on what points he would like to have additional clarification.

Mr. JHA (India): It is a fact that often there is a duplication of questions. It is not always from the same angle, but I do recognize that sometimes members ask questions part of which has already been answered. However, we cannot altogether avoid it.

My question was a little different from what the representative had asked, the answer to which has been very fully given. The representative of the Administering Authority has drawn our attention to that. There are two or three things about which I am concerned and I might elaborate slightly on them. It is quite true that since the independence of the Belgian Congo will take place in a few days and since there were some common services between the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, it will not be entirely possible to dissociate the common services. But at the same time, the fact is that from 30 June, or some such date -- I hope I am correct in that date -- the Belgian Congo will become independent. How can an independent territory, over which the Administering Authority will have no control, be entrusted with any services such as the maintenance of the public force or even the maintenance of

(Mr. Jha, India)

common services for customs, taxation and that kind of thing, although, of course, these are much more technical than the question of the maintenance of a public force.

That is the first point. Secondly, we want to know not merely the intentions of the special council, but the intentions of the Belgian Congo Government, the government to be. That was what the first part of my question indicated.

Thirdly, there has to be some kind of information given to the Trusteeship Council and some sort of approval by the Council -- although I realize that the time is really very short -- to any kind of new arrangements which bring in an independent territory over which we will have no control for they will not be sitting in the Trusteeship Council. A similar situation arose with regard to the Cameroons, and as the representative of Belgium knows, the United Kingdom Government gave us considerable information, which we discussed here and to which we gave our general approval as regards the steps that were necessary before the dissociation of Nigeria, shall I say, from the administration of the Cameroons.

We do not have anything of this sort. My question is directed more to the technical aspect and also to an indication of the intentions of the Powers that are going to take over in the Belgian Congo.

Mr. CIAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The representative of India is very right when he says that it is a matter of technical adjustment. As regards the maintenance of order, I should like to recall that there is no question of charging the independent State of Congo with maintaining order in Ruanda-Urundi. The responsibility will only belong to the Administering Power and measures will be taken to substitute, for Congolese forces, forces that will be exclusively under the Administering Authority.

As regards other techniques designed to meet problems arising from current uncertainty about the future agreements which the two independent Governments might wish to enter into, a decision was taken and approved by the general council

(Mr. Claeys Bouuaert, Belgium)

of Ruanda-Urundi to have the question taken up by joint committees, which committees are now at work preparing technical agreements on limited matters relating to the monetary union, commercial policy, imports and customs policy. The general council, as I think I already stated in answer to another question, has proposed that these limited agreements should have a time limit of four months, although they might, of course, eventually be prolonged.

As regards the monetary union, there has been some controversy owing to the fact that the statute of the Central Bank of Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo is for the moment still under consideration. It is being discussed. For the moment, the statute calls for pooling the reserves of the Central Bank of Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo with the National Bank of Belgium, even though their assets and operations are altogether distinct. The question is whether the future independent State of Congo will retain this set-up. It is quite possible that it will. In that case the problem will be easy. Since Ruanda-Urundi will, until the end of Trusteeship, still be under the authority of Belgium, it will be associated in and will benefit from the operation of a central bank, which will involve in its operation the National Bank of Belgium.

If the Government of the State of Congo decides to separate completely its monetary issue system from that of Belgium, then the retention of the monetary union between Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo will be difficult and will pose thorny problems.

In principle, it would then be necessary to modify the present statute of the Central Bank the operations of which cover the two countries which were administratively united, and, until the expiry of Trusteeship, it will be necessary to set up a local organization which would act in co-operation with, and which would benefit from, the support of the National Bank of Belgium by using appropriate techniques to that end. I think that this should meet the point of the representative of India.

Mr. JHA (India): While I thank the representative of the Administering Authority for his detailed exposition, I would say quite frankly that his last sentence does not really satisfy me, although we understand that because of the speed at which events are happening we may have to wink at the technical side for a while and I would only say now that I propose in my general statement to ask for a full report by the Administering Authority to be available for discussion and acceptance by the next session of the General Assembly, since this is an important point which is related to the very fundamentals of a Trusteeship Agreement.

Passing now to my next question, after reading paragraphs 395 and 396 of the Visiting Mission's report we wonder what functions the indigenous authorities will exercise at the communal level, at the circonscription level or at higher levels. It is stated in these two paragraphs that the services of the Resident-General, formerly the services of the Vice-Governor-General, are to exercise control over a large number of functions. It is a long list, divided into two groups, the first group including internal and external security of the Territory, political, administrative and financial control over the administration and public autonomous bodies, political development, the administration of justice, the protection of individuals and minorities, human rights and fundamental freedoms and external affairs. In the second group we have development planning, judicial affairs, administration and religious affairs, social affairs, information, labour, finance, economic affairs, land and mines, agriculture and stock-breeding, public works, education -- quite a list. What is left? There is nothing very much left beyond these and what therefore is the measure of the autonomy that is supposed to be given to these communes? It seems to us that the communes, the establishment of which is contemplated -- and this will certainly be a process towards democratization -- will have very little authority left and whatever authority they have will be subject to the full control of the Administering Authority. I do not know whether our understanding is correct, but we should like to have some clarification from the Administering Authority. What we would have preferred in order to train these people for self-government would have been a division made vertically rather than horizontally, that is to say a few subjects would have been given to them to be treated in an autonomous manner, leaving reserve powers to the Administering Authority, as might be necessary in the interim period, on the more important subjects.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French):

Paragraphs 395 and 396 relate to the interim decrees which call for a provisional system under which the governments of Ruanda and Urundi would set up their own organizational structures. It is a provisional regime designed to enable the two governments to express their views. This division of services has been indicated only by way of suggestion. The idea was to decentralize powers, handing them over to local governments. There are services which the two countries may wish to have in common; it will be up to the countries themselves to decide which or whether they want to have any common services at all. The structure described in the two paragraphs referred to relates only to the solution outlined in the interim decree and designed to enable the governments of Ruanda and Urundi to decide on the forms of union which they might wish to set up between them and also on the forms of their administration. These services should not be regarded as comprehensive, but they will comprise African as well as European elements.

I have had occasion to furnish some information on the training given to African elements in the offices of the central administration in Usumbura. None of this should give rise to the belief on the part of the delegation of India that the Administration wishes to reserve certain powers. It offers a scheme or system designed to enable the local governments to envisage, if they wish, the pooling of a number of services. If they do not wish to pool their services, they are entitled to decide in that way. The framework outlined in paragraphs 395 and 396 and based on the interim decree is merely a bridge between the past and the future; it is designed to enable the local administrations to be set up and to take their decisions on managing their own affairs in a knowledgeable way.

Mr. JHA (India): The Special Representative mentioned the word "decentralization" and suggested that this was a measure of decentralization. It is not quite that which we understood, because under this scheme, even though it is provisional -- and sometimes these provisional schemes have a habit of becoming less provisional than was intended -- there is no devolution of authority. The Resident-General retains in his own hand authority over this vast list of matters, although of course it is open to him to delegate that authority sometimes by administrative order. But technically and legally, according to the terms of the

interim decree, authority remains with the Resident-General and we are not very clear how in such circumstances this could amount to decentralization. Perhaps, however, this is not the time to enter into argumentation and perhaps I should go on to my next question to save time, unless the Special Representative wants to supplement his answer.

Mr. REISDORFF (Special Representative) (interpretation from French): To give the representative of India a concrete idea of the Government's intentions, each of the services listed in paragraph 396 will be represented in the governments of Ruanda and the government of Urundi and will be placed under the direction of a chief of department but it is also provided that certain matters may be regarded as jointly under the competence of the two governments. It may for example be decided that authority over the land system may be placed in the hands of the Mwami even before the new Conseil Supérieur du Pays is elected. This is how the Administering Authority intends to proceed.

Mr. JHA (India): The Visiting Mission, in several paragraphs of its report, has recommended the despatch of a United Nations mission to assist in "the Territory's development". On the other hand, the representative of Belgium, in his statement the other day, emphasized the economic aspect of development and said that Belgium has contacted the Secretary-General in order to ask him to send an economic mission to the Territory. Discussions are also said to be advanced in this connexion, and it appears that in the near future a delegation, headed by a qualified and competent person in the field of technical development and assistance, will go to Usumbura.

Would the representative of Belgium tell us the sort of mission they have in mind and the functions of such a mission?

We would also like to know, from the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, what the Visiting Mission had in mind when they recommended the despatch of a United Nations mission to assist in the Territory's development.

Mr. CIAEYS BOUJAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The suggestion of the Visiting Mission was first done on the spot. Mr. Scheyven, a member of the Belgian Cabinet, was there at the time, and he immediately gave his warm support to that suggestion. I do not have the details of the conversations at the time between the Visiting Mission and Mr. Scheyven, but the fact remains that even before the receipt of the report of the Visiting Mission the Belgian Government asked its permanent delegation here in New York to make contact with the Secretary-General with a view to studying the modalities and possibilities of despatching an economic mission to the Territory.

The talks are at a thoroughly advanced stage; in fact, they are about to be concluded. At this moment, it is felt that the United Nations will send a mission headed by a person nominated by the Secretary-General, assisted by a number of officials of the Secretariat and of the Technical Assistance Administration. The mission will carry out a study of the role the United Nations may play in assisting with economic development and extending technical assistance.

Now, these are the intentions and the projects. The mission would eventually, according to the results of its work on the spot, prepare for despatching to the Territory a permanent Resident Representative of technical assistance. This is how matters stand at the moment.

Mr. JHA (India): I am still not very clear about the functions of this mission. What exactly is it supposed to do? What would be its composition? How do we of the Trusteeship Council, or later of the General Assembly, come into this picture? We have a situation here where a Visiting Mission appointed by us has reported about a mission going to this Territory for the Territory's development. And here I was wondering whether the representative of the United States, who was the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, would like to give us precisely what their ideas were in this connexion.

I would further ask the representative of Belgium if there is going to be a report to this Council as to the composition of this mission, because the point is that we are now seized of this matter as a result of the Visiting Mission's report and we would like further particulars about it.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): It is getting late, so I will not go through a lot of polite talk. I am speaking now for the United States representation on the Mission, so my colleagues would not in any way be encumbered. It is true that, as I recall, before the Mission left, the Secretary-General, realizing that we were going to have our hands full on the political problems of the Territory and would not have time to go into the economic and financial end of it, suggested that if it would help he would be prepared, if the Government of Belgium so requested, to despatch an economic group to see what could be done and to see whether they could not be of assistance. I believe that a number of leaders in the Territory and we ourselves thought that the presence of United Nations people in the Territory might contribute to the question of reconciliation.

The next thing that I recall was that when we arrived in Brussels the Belgian Government felt that it would be sort of an imposition to have a United Nations mission presiding over their own affairs; that is, they had the responsibility to run this Territory, and that was it. Thereupon, it became our duty, on behalf of the Mission, to explain that we were more interested in the idea of a technical mission, a technical economic mission; whereupon the Belgian Government immediately agreed to our offer.

I do not know nearly as much as the representative of Belgium as to how far they have gotten, but I do say this: that in the present stage of new African nations coming into their own independence, there appears to be an opportunity

(Mr. Sears, United States)

to have a more direct connexion with the United Nations. The people in Tanganyika have requested it. I believe it is going to be true in Somalia. And I hope it will be productive of making it possible for the emerging sovereign countries to contact more quickly and more efficiently the possibilities of being helped by the United Nations.

Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe that the representative of India asked a question on the role of this economic mission, its purpose and the way in which it would possibly be controlled by this Organization.

It would be controlled by this Organization just as all other technical assistance activities of this Organization are controlled. The procedures are well known. I am not a specialist in this matter myself, but surely this technical mission for technical assistance to Ruanda-Urundi will not run contrary to the way any other technical assistance mission is conducted in other parts of the world. Whether they are independent or not, this will be the same.

The job of this economic mission will be, first of all, to carry out a comprehensive study of the role the United Nations may play in promoting economic development and in rendering technical assistance. The mission will be headed by a person not yet revealed and will have three Secretariat officials from the Technical Assistance Administration. They will go on the spot and will sojourn in Ruanda-Urundi for about three months. On the basis of their findings and recommendations, a permanent office of the Technical Assistance Administration will be set up in the country.

To revert to the question raised by the representative of the United States, it is obvious that the presence of technical assistance representatives and representatives of the Secretary-General would reassure the population as to their future and help them tangibly and practically, indicating the Organization's interest in the country's economic problems.

Mr. JHA (India): This is a question about which we could go on talking for a long time, and I will not pursue it at present. But if I understood the representative of the United States correctly, speaking as representative of his own country rather than on behalf of the Visiting Mission, the idea was somewhat different, and because of certain objections it has been changed into another idea. We are not against the United Nations' interest in Africa; in fact, we also support it. It is a very good thing that in that continent which needs a great deal of attention, much development has been accomplished, and it is certainly open to the Secretary-General to post, within the limitations of his budget and whatever rules he is subject to, a technical assistance director to any part of the world -- although I do not know that he has been posting technical assistance directors to Non-Self-Governing or Trust Territories. However, that is a different thing. But here we have a proposal for a mission, and normally that mission could usefully perform somewhat larger functions. We are happy to see the wording of the report of the Visiting Mission; and in the context of that, we would need some precise information, because this is a matter with which we are seized. We will not express any opinion on that, but will decide about certain implications and possibilities. As I said, the mere posting of a technical assistance director does not concern this Council and we are not really interested in it; but a proposal has been made to us for a United Nations mission to assist in the Territory's development, and we would be interested to understand this, to see what can be done, and, since a United Nations mission is somewhat different from the posting of a technical assistance director, to see in what way that could be brought about.

I do not wish to pursue this question at the present time, but since all this interesting discussion has taken place, I thought it my duty, since I asked the question, to share our thoughts with the Council at this stage.

I do not know how long, Mr. President, you would like to go on. Shall I continue?

The PRESIDENT: If you have only a few more questions, I believe the members of the Council will be patient, but I feel that after fifteen minutes we shall have to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. JHA (India): I shall go on for fifteen minutes if the Council is willing, but I shall not be able to finish in fifteen minutes.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair is entirely in the hands of the members of the Council and I should be glad to hear their views on this matter. However, I think the Council will agree that the Special Representative and the representative of Belgium have been sitting here for a long time and might welcome an adjournment at this time.

Has the representative of India any questions or comments he would still like to make at this time?

Mr. JHA (India): I feel that I should not speak any more since I have already spoken a great deal. However, I had a few questions left, but I shall try perhaps to exclude one or two since certain points we had in mind have already been covered in some of the answers. I shall therefore re-edit my questions and I promise to be very brief on Monday.

The PRESIDENT: Our next meetings will be on Monday at 10.30 and at 3 o'clock. On our agenda there will be five reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions, namely, the 255th to the 259th reports contained in documents T/L.988 through T/L.992. The second item will be the same as today's, namely, the examination of conditions in Ruanda-Urundi. We shall continue the questioning of the Special Representative and shall perhaps be able to hear the petitioner from the Territory if he is ready.

In connexion with the reports of the Standing Committee on Petitions, I would like to suggest that the Council first take up the 259th report, circulated in document T/L.992, concerning petitions from Ruanda-Urundi, leaving consideration of the remaining four reports, should there be any time available, until after the continuation of the questioning of the Special Representative.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.