

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1122nd
MEETING**

**Wednesday, 29 March 1961,
at 11 a.m.**

New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 45:	
Question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi (<i>continued</i>)	
Hearing of petitioners (<i>continued</i>)	151

Chairman: Mr. Adnan M. PACHACHI (Iraq).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 45

Question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi (A/4689-A/4692, A/4694, A/4706 and Add.1, A/C.4/471) (*continued*)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*continued*)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Germain Gasingwa and Mr. Aloys Munyangaju, representatives of the Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse (APROSOMA), Mr. Calliope Mulindahabi and Mr. Fidèle Nkundabagenzi, representatives of the Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu (PARMEHUTU), took places at the Committee table.

1. Mr. ASSELIN (Canada) said that many of the questions he had intended to put had already been asked by other representatives. He would like to know, however, whether the petitioners regarded the Government which had resulted from the *coup d'état* at Gitarama as a provisional Government or, if not, whether they thought it would agree to being regarded as such until legislative elections had been held under United Nations supervision.

2. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that the party he represented did not regard the present Government of Ruanda as immutable; if it were, electoral rights would lose all meaning.

3. In reply to the second part of the question, he said that in his party's opinion if elections could be held in Ruanda in normal circumstances there would be no need for United Nations supervision.

4. Mr. ASSELIN (Canada) asked what would be the attitude of PARMEHUTU if the United Nations Commission for Ruanda-Urundi were to return to the Territory to supervise elections there in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1579 (XV).

5. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that neither his party nor APROSOMA would oppose any measures which would be likely to lead to the pacification of the country. They considered, however, that there should be preliminary discussions regarding the manner in which such measures were to be carried out.

6. Mr. OWONO (Cameroun) said that he would like further elucidation of a point which had been raised: namely, whether Ruanda-Urundi wished to achieve independence as a united and composite State. He asked whether the principle of the united and composite State was accepted by the petitioners and by the parties they represented. He would also like to know whether they wished a federation, a confederation or some other form of government to be established in Ruanda-Urundi.

7. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that his party was in favour of a united State. The institution of the Bami was, however, an obstacle to the achievement of such a State. The Members of the United Nations appeared to attach great importance to the preservation of that ancient institution, which the members of his party regarded as obsolete. PARMEHUTU and APROSOMA were ready to meet representatives of Burundi at a round-table conference and to try to persuade them that the establishment of a federation would be in the interests of the whole Territory.

8. Mr. OWONO (Cameroun) asked whether the same difficulties in the relations between the various ethnic groups arose in both Ruanda and Urundi.

9. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that he could not reply as far as Burundi was concerned.

10. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that the representatives of Burundi would be better able to explain the situation in their country. He believed that their problems were much the same as those of Ruanda but that there were less marked divergencies of view since the feudal system there was less rigid.

11. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) observed that the notion of a *coup d'état* implied the existence of a State. The Committee, however, was concerned with a *coup d'état* in a Territory which was not a State; it was therefore important to ascertain the exact circumstances. He asked the petitioners against whom and for what purpose the so-called *coup d'état* had been organized.

12. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) agreed that up to 28 January 1961 Ruanda had been a nation, a people, but not a State in the legal sense of the word. The real problem was whether the action which had taken place on that date had given birth to a State. Ruanda was not, of course, a State at the international level, because it had not been recognized as such by the United Nations, but some of the functions of the State were exercised by the authorities.

13. The purpose of the *coup d'état* had been to abolish the institutions which had existed up to then and to establish institutions more adapted to the present situation.

14. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that in his opinion Legislative Order No. 02/16 of 15 January 1961 (A/4706/Add.1, annex XXX) had been the equivalent of a *coup d'état*, since it implied the abolition of the institution of the Mwami. The purposes of the *coup d'état* of 28 January had therefore already been achieved by the Belgian authorities on 15 January. An attempt had been made to obtain the ratification of the *coup d'état* brought about by the Administering Authority by a so-called popular assembly convened to endorse its decision.

15. He asked whether the political parties represented by the petitioners were in agreement with the terms of Legislative Order No. 02/16 of 15 January 1961.

16. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that he was unable to recall any passage in that Order setting up a republic.

17. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) pointed out that in Legislative Order No. 02/18 concerning the institutions of Burundi (A/4706/Add.1, annex XXXII) there were a number of references to the Mwami, whereas Legislative Order No. 02/16 concerning the institutions of Ruanda referred to the Head of State. In his opinion that constituted a confirmation of the then existing state of affairs in Ruanda and the abolition of the institution of the monarchy.

18. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that in the opinion of his party that was a somewhat arbitrary interpretation of the Ordinance.

19. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that the petitioners appeared unwilling to state their attitude towards the Legislative Order issued by the Administering Authority. A party which claimed to have the support of the majority of the population and to constitute a Government exercising effective authority must surely have some opinion regarding an Order which defined the institutions of the country.

20. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that the representative of Poland appeared to feel that the Order in some way sanctioned the *coup d'état* of 28 January. That was not the case; the *coup d'état* had been carried out in defiance of the Order. The question whether his party approved of the Order did not therefore arise.

21. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) expressed agreement with Mr. Munyangaju's remarks.

22. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said he did not consider that he had received a satisfactory reply to his question but he would not press the point further.

23. He asked the petitioners whether they approved of Ordinance No. 02/17, concerning the legislative elections in Ruanda (A/4706/Add.1, annex XXXI).

24. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that his party had been offered no opportunity to discuss the terms of the Ordinance in advance.

25. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that his party, too, had not been consulted before the Ordinance had been drafted. In view of its restrictive character his party was unable to support it entirely.

26. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that he attached more importance to the views of PARMEHUTU than

to those of APROSOMA, since the former claimed to have the support of an overwhelming majority in the country. The representative of that party claimed that it had not been given the opportunity to express its views with regard to the Ordinance; he was offering it the opportunity to do so now.

27. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that his party naturally had an opinion on the subject, since it was affected by the Ordinance in question. Its opinion was not the same as that of its political opponents or of the representative of Poland.

28. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) pointed out that his opinion was not in question. He wished to know the opinion of PARMEHUTU on the subject. The representative of that party, however, for some reason refused to divulge it.

29. He would like to know the attitude of the political parties regarding Legislative Order No. 221/296 of 25 October 1960, concerning the trusteeship powers (A/4706/Add.1, annex XXIX).

30. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that his party would like the powers defined in that Order to revert to the inhabitants of the Territory.

31. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) asked how the powers which, according to the petitioners, were vested in the authorities of Ruanda could be exercised within the framework of Legislative Order No. 221/296. He had been unable to elicit an answer to that question.

32. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) remarked that there was a difference between failure to provide the kind of reply desired by the questioner and inability to reply to the question.

33. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that it would have been interesting to know PARMEHUTU's attitude to the policies of the Administering Authority. The only conclusion to be drawn from the petitioner's statements was that he was trying to avoid replying to questions on issues vital to Ruanda. He asked whether the petitioner would define PARMEHUTU's attitude to immediate and unconditional independence for Ruanda-Urundi.

34. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) replied that his party's attitude was clear and precise. It combined the goal of independence for Ruanda-Urundi at all costs with a realistic appraisal of the situation. If immediate independence meant independence granted there and then without any preparations, such as the holding of elections, his party would have certain reservations. Similarly, it had reservations concerning the term "unconditional" since it believed that the granting of independence should be negotiated. Both the United Nations and the Administering Authority had obligations in that matter; it was also necessary for the people concerned to settle their internal differences. His party was in favour of accession to independence on the basis of a reasonable timing.

35. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) asked what kind of time-table PARMEHUTU proposed for independence.

36. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that his party regarded the acquisition of independence as a patriotic duty. Inde-

pendence should be granted not later than the end of 1962.

37. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) asked what were the preliminary conditions which PARMEHUTU regarded as a *sine qua non* for the accession of the Territory to independence.

38. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) replied that the constitutional conditions necessary for the existence of a viable State capable of exercising full sovereignty were known to the Polish representative.

39. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) remarked that constitutional considerations were irrelevant. He had asked a question concerning the stages which, in the view of PARMEHUTU, should be attained before the country could accede to independence. A political party should have clear views on that subject. For instance, if he had understood the petitioner correctly, the latter seemed to think that legislative elections should be held before independence was granted. That raised the question of PARMEHUTU's attitude to the Ordinance on the conduct of the elections. The petitioner had failed to give him an answer.

40. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that if a questioner started out from the premise that he would get no clear answer there was no point in pursuing the questioning.

41. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) recalled that the petitioner had just said that PARMEHUTU regarded immediate and unconditional independence as not realistic because certain preliminary conditions, such as the holding of elections, had to be fulfilled. In the view of the Polish delegation elections were indispensable. In the circumstances he was fully justified in asking what PARMEHUTU thought of the provisions of the Ordinance on the elections.

42. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that the Polish representative could perhaps define PARMEHUTU's attitude to the Interim Decree of 25 December 1959.

43. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) remarked that the questions were addressed not to members of the Committee but to the petitioners who came before it. It was apparently impossible for the Committee to learn exactly what the political parties in Ruanda-Urundi thought of the political problems of their country. The reticence of the PARMEHUTU representative concerning the policies of the Administering Authority was significant.

44. Mr. ADAM (Ghana) recalled that the petitioners, while agreeing with the principle of an amnesty, were opposed to an immediate release of the prisoners. He asked whether that meant that their parties did not wish to see the leaders and influential persons who were now in prison or in exile participate in moves designed to restore peace and unity.

45. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) replied that his party's attitude was well known: it favoured a general amnesty for political prisoners but had reservations concerning an unconditional and immediate amnesty.

46. Mr. ADAM (Ghana) asked whether, in view of the statements by the petitioners that there were difficulties in the way of persuading the refugees to attend a round-table conference, PARMEHUTU would be agreeable to a United Nations commission organizing and supervising a reconciliation conference.

47. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) replied that, to the best of his recollection, he had never said that his party would have any difficulty in organizing a round-table conference. He had merely said that such a conference was necessary. The majority parties were eager to avoid the setting up of double trusteeship and did not want to be ensnared into it. His party had never rejected the idea of the presence of United Nations commissioners at a round-table or an emergency conference designed to restore calm and resolve the differences among political parties.

48. Mr. ADAM (Ghana) asked whether the petitioners did not think that the presence of a third party would promote rapid reconciliation.

49. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that it was among the political parties that the question of national reconciliation had to be settled. Since Ruanda-Urundi was not yet independent, every one was agreed that the United Nations and the Administering Authority should be represented at such a round-table conference.

50. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that his party envisaged an emergency conference attended by all the political parties of Ruanda. He did not think that an outside party should be brought in from the outset; that would be tantamount to prophesying the inability of the local political parties to reach agreement among themselves. If, on the other hand, it proved impossible to reach agreement without outside assistance, the presence of a third party would be welcomed.

51. Mr. ADAM (Ghana) asked on what conditions the minority parties were expected to participate in such a conference.

52. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that minority parties occasionally had great pretensions. If he was not mistaken the Indian representative had said at the 1121st meeting that it was not for minority parties to make concessions. It should also be remembered, however, that majority parties always believed that right was on their side. The majority parties would do everything in their power to ensure an easing of tension. The only constructive approach was for the parties to come to grips with the essential problems while eschewing reciprocal recrimination.

53. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) explained that what he had had in mind was that, while it was for all parties to make concessions, a minority party was often not in a position to concede too much whereas a majority party, which wielded power, could better afford to be generous.

54. Mr. ADAM (Ghana) asked what definite steps would be taken by the majority parties to ensure the success of the conference.

55. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that they had already taken certain steps: they had said that they would attend such a conference and that they hoped that the opposition parties would do likewise. As a representative of his party he could do no better than approach the conference in a spirit of goodwill.

56. Mr. ADAM (Ghana) said that his delegation was opposed to the Balkanization of African States. While in the past there had been unrestricted freedom of

movement between Ruanda and Urundi, and the Administering Authority had apparently regarded Ruanda-Urundi as one country and a single entity, the situation had changed in recent times.

57. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that the Administering Authority, faced with the existence of the two separate States of Ruanda and Urundi, had set up a super-structure which spanned the institutions existing in the two States. The two States were still in existence and he feared that the Balkanization of Ruanda-Urundi would become a sad reality unless indigenous authorities were placed at the helm in both States in the immediate future. If the institution of the Bami was retained both States would remain conscious of their separate existence, for neither Mwami would be ready to recognize the superior authority of the other. It was for that reason that his party was opposed to too much importance being attached to traditional institutions simply because they were old; the parties which claimed that the institution of the Bami had become an anachronism might seem anarchist, but in fact they had the future welfare of the people at heart. As long as the obsolete institutions remained in existence it would be difficult to set up a unitary or even a composite State of Ruanda-Urundi. The United Nations should bear that vital consideration in mind.

58. Mr. ADAM (Ghana) asked what the functions of the Council of Ruanda-Urundi had been and why it had been abolished.

59. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) replied that they had been purely consultative. He felt that the existence of even such a council was a step towards better understanding between the two States.

60. Mr. ADAM (Ghana) asked on what regional basis the political parties in Ruanda and in Urundi were organized.

61. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) replied that the activity of his party was confined to the State of Ruanda.

62. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that his party had tried to extend its activities to Urundi, where it had sympathizers, but had encountered difficulties and susceptibilities. At the present time it had no active members in Urundi but its plans called for a gradual extension of activities to the whole of Ruanda-Urundi.

63. Mr. TRAORE (Mali), referring to statements by petitioners to the effect that full internal self-government existed in Ruanda, asked how it was exercised in the political, economic and judicial fields.

64. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) replied that although the Administering Authority still controlled foreign relations and had supervisory functions in certain other matters such as finances and internal security, self-government was being effectively exercised by the indigenous authorities within the limits granted by the Administering Authority. In Ruanda there was a Legislative Assembly which could issue edicts, a Government consisting of a number of ministers, and a judiciary. In all the three fields the powers were vested in the people of Ruanda; certain posts, however, which called for special skills which indigenous inhabitants still lacked, were held by non-indigenous incumbents.

65. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) asked how many edicts had been adopted by the Legislative Assembly and how

many had become law. He also wished to know the extent of the competence of the Government and the judiciary.

66. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) replied that he did not know how many edicts had been enacted by the Legislative Assembly. The various ministers were carrying out their duties within their respective fields of competence. He could not supply any details concerning the appointment, transfer or replacement of judges.

67. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) said that he would not press his question further, although he was still not clear what powers were in fact exercised by the indigenous inhabitants.

68. Annex XXVI of the interim report of the United Nations Commission for Ruanda-Urundi (A/4706 and Add.1) reproduced a telegram dated 19 February 1961 from Mr. Gitera, who had been the President of the Legislative Assembly. He wondered if the petitioners, whom he believed to be members of the Legislative Assembly, could explain the telegram in question, which thanked Belgium for its "good intentions" and "outstanding benefits rendered", assured Belgium of eternal gratitude and friendship, and envisaged "treaties of sincere friendship" with Belgium or the European Community "with formal assurances of economic and military co-operation".

69. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) pointed out that the telegram had been sent in the name of Mr. Gitera alone, and not on behalf of the Legislative Assembly; the document had not been placed before the Assembly.

70. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) asked whether the Legislative Assembly had made any statement dissociating itself from the views expressed in the telegram.

71. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) thought that the incident might have been connected with Mr. Gitera's resignation as President of the Legislative Assembly. He had been called to order and it had been pointed out that what he had written committed no one but himself.

72. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) asked Mr. Gasingwa to explain the reason behind the APROSOMA manifesto which had been read out at the 1117th meeting by Mr. Rwagasana, and to which Mr. Gasingwa was a signatory.

73. Mr. GASINGWA (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) explained that the manifesto had been published in connexion with the campaign preceding the elections which had been expected to take place in January. Mr. Gitera had persuaded other APROSOMA leaders to sign a manifesto and had then abused their confidence and inserted certain passages which calumniated PARMEHUTU. A disclaimer had later been issued by APROSOMA; in fact, that party enjoyed very good relations with PARMEHUTU.

74. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) suggested that a manifesto put out by a political party must surely be based upon facts. He wished to know whether the facts stated there, such as the statement that nearly all the burgomasters and councillors appointed by the Administration belonged to PARMEHUTU, were correct.

75. Mr. GASINGWA (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that he was unable to answer for Mr. Gitera's actions.

76. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) observed that Mr. Munyangaju had referred to his party as a working-class

party, representing the masses. The working classes in all countries shared the same interests and in many countries, such as his own, working-class parties were in power and had led the fight against colonialism. He wondered whether Mr. Munyangaju's party, as a gesture of solidarity, had protested when Radio Usumbura had broadcast propaganda attacking such countries.

77. Mr. MUNYANGAJU (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said that he had been deeply touched by the remarks of the representative of Mali; he, too, felt a real sense of solidarity with the working class of Africa as a whole. His party was not aware of any such attacks in the broadcasts by Radio Usumbura, though naturally they might have been broadcast without his party's knowledge. If it had learned of any attacks on the African working classes broadcast by a radio station which should be at the service of the people, his party would certainly have protested and would do so if it happened in the future.

78. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) said that he was not satisfied with promises regarding the future. He felt that Mr. Munyangaju's reply implied a certain acceptance of what had happened.

79. At the previous meeting, replying to a question by the Indian representative, Mr. Nkundabagenzi had expressed the view that all who had voted on the General Assembly resolutions, whether they had voted in favour or against or had abstained, had done so with the interests of the Ruandese people in mind. He wondered whether the petitioner believed that it was true of all the Assembly's resolutions relating to Trust Territories, and to the Territory of South West Africa, that both those voting in favour and those against were guided by a concern for the well-being of the people.

80. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) explained that he had merely expressed his conviction that those who had voted for the resolution on Ruanda-Urundi had considered their action to be in the best interests of Ruanda-Urundi and of its speedy accession to independence, and that the same was true of those who had voted against or who had abstained. It was not for him to question the motives of any State and he assumed that they had all acted in good faith.

81. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) considered that the petitioner, if he was a representative of the people, should be able to express a view on what was in the interests of the peoples of Trust Territories.

82. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that his understanding of the interests of his country was embodied in the measures which his party had proposed with a view to the rapid accession of the Territory to independence. His point was that he had no right to doubt that all the Members of the United Nations, and especially the members of the United Nations Commission for Ruanda-Urundi, were actuated by the best intentions.

83. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) asked why, if PARMEHUTU believed the actions of the United Nations to be in the best interests of the country, the telegram reproduced in annex XVIII of document A/4706/Add.1, which was signed by four leaders on behalf of the institutions created on 28 January, spoke of the attitude of the United Nations as "equivocal".

84. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that it was important to distinguish between motives and consequences. The

signatories of the telegram had not wished to criticize the intentions of the United Nations but had considered that the resolutions were not appropriate to the actual situation in the country.

85. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) observed that the petitioner was saying that everyone was right and no one was wrong.

86. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) said that the petitioners had repeatedly spoken of the "legitimate interests" of their country; he would be grateful for any fuller explanation of that expression.

87. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) replied that the petitioners were thinking of those rights which civilized nations recognized as belonging to other peoples, such as the right to freedom, independence, life and security; at the moment, their primary concern was for the right of their people to independence.

88. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) asked in what respects the United Nations had disregarded the "legitimate interests" of Ruanda-Urundi.

89. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said he did not think such an allegation had been made, or would be made, by any of the petitioners present.

90. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) welcomed that assurance, though he had understood several of the petitioners to make assertions of the kind he had indicated.

91. He asked whether the petitioners were conversant with the manifesto which had been quoted in Mr. Rwagasana's statement.

92. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that he lacked the text of the statement and was unable to discuss the document in question.

93. Mr. GASINGWA (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) said he thought that the Nigerian representative was referring to the document signed by Mr. Gitera and himself, which had already been mentioned.

94. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria):¹ That is the document I am referring to. According to the statement made by Mr. Rwagasana at the 1117th meeting, it was submitted on 8 December 1960 and among other things in this document the signatories accused the Belgian authorities of favouritism towards PARMEHUTU. May I ask Mr. Gasingwa, who was one of the signatories of this document, whether he admits the authenticity of the document as quoted here?

95. Mr. GASINGWA (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) (*translated from French*):¹ I answered that question just now. I know this document. I admit that this document contained something written by Mr. Joseph Gitera. I do not intend to defend Mr. Gitera's actions.

96. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria):¹ But Mr. Gasingwa signed the document. Do I take it, then, that he did not read it, that he just signed it?

97. Mr. GASINGWA (Association pour la promotion sociale de la masse) (*translated from French*):¹ I will repeat the statement that I made just now, since the

¹ The Committee decided, on the proposal of the representative of Venezuela, and in accordance with its decision at the 1117th meeting, that the text of this statement should be reproduced in full.

representative of Nigeria did not hear it. The idea was to publish a manifesto of our party just before the opening of the electoral campaign, which was to go on from 15 December 1960 to 15 January 1961, in preparation for the elections we had been promised for January 1961. Mr. Gitera, the founder of the APROSOMA party, who is also a journalist, explained the idea of this manifesto to us. We were at the Kisenyi talks. We trusted him and gave him *carte blanche* to draft the article. He included in the manifesto both the programme of our party and some slanderous statements about PARMEHUTU. The manifesto came up at the Kisenyi talks and the Chairman replied that it was only an electoral campaign by political parties. PARMEHUTU, for its part, protested against this manifesto and asked us for a correction, which was subsequently published. If I had been able to foresee that I should be called upon to give this explanation, I should have taken care to bring the document with me, as evidence. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that we would have criticized PARMEHUTU in this way, because APROSOMA has always been, and I hope always will be, PARMEHUTU's brother. The two parties have always stood together and we should not have dared to commit such an act.

98. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) considered that the reply showed the petitioner in a poor light and made it doubtful whether the party leaders spoke for their parties.

99. He wished to know the attitude of the petitioners to Legislative Order No. 221/296 of 25 October 1960 which denied the possibility of recourse to law to those to whom it was applied.

100. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that if an objective examination of the Legislative Order in question revealed that it denied recourse to law or prejudiced public liberties it should certainly be abrogated.

101. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) asked whether, in its concern for the aspirations of the people, PARME-

HUTU had made such an examination of the Order and, if so, what had been the result of that examination.

102. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Parti du mouvement de l'émancipation hutu) said that he thought that other parties which were affected by the Legislative Order had studied it. He was not in a position to speak on behalf of those parties.

103. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) said that, *prima facie*, the Legislative Order restricted public liberties and did not provide the necessary conditions under which fair elections could be held.

104. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) suggested that, in future, all the petitioners from Ruanda should be invited to the Committee table at the same time; the same questions could then be asked to all the petitioners at once and time would be saved.

105. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the present procedure had already been adopted by the Committee.

106. Mr. WEEKS (Liberia) recalled that at the 1120th meeting a petitioner had requested time to prepare a reply which would be given at the present meeting. He asked whether the matter could be dealt with at the next meeting.

107. The CHAIRMAN said the petitioner had informed him that the document in question was not yet ready.

108. He recalled that at the 1119th meeting, another petitioner, Mr. Biroli, had requested time to prepare a memorandum in reply to a question from the representative of Bolivia. The Chairman had been informed that that memorandum was now ready. He suggested that it should be circulated as a document.

*It was so decided.*²

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

² See A/C.4/476.