



CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 13: Report of the Trusteeship Council (<i>continued</i>)	
Hearing of petitioners (<i>continued</i>)	329
Question of supplementary hearings of the petitioners on the future of the Cameroons under British administration and the Cameroons under French administration	330

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 13

Report of the Trusteeship Council (A/3822) (*continued*)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*continued*)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. John Kale took a place at the Committee table.

1. Mr. CAMILION (Argentina) asked Mr. Kale whether he was an indigenous inhabitant of Uganda, whether his family were inhabitants of Uganda and how long they had been there, and what members of his family lived in Ruanda-Urundi.
2. Mr. KALE said that he had been born in the part of Ruanda which was administered as part of Uganda. That was his home but his family was not confined to that area; for example his uncles lived on the other side of the border, in the Belgian-administered Territory. He had lived most of his life in the part of Ruanda which was administered by Uganda but that did not prevent him from visiting his relatives on the other side of the border.
3. Some of his family lived in the Belgian-administered Territory and others in the British-administered Territory.
4. Mr. CAMILION (Argentina) asked whether his father and mother lived in the British-administered Territory and whether they had taken up residence there before or after the division between the Belgian- and British-administered zones.
5. Mr. KALE said that part of his family had lived in what was now the Belgian-administered Territory before the arbitrary frontier had been drawn, and had continued to live there after the division had taken place. He had sisters who had been born in the British-administered Territory but had married in the Belgian-administered Territory. His point was that his people refused to admit the existence of the artificially drawn frontier.
6. Mr. CAMILION (Argentina) asked approximately how often during the past ten years Mr. Kale had visited the Belgian-administered Territory and how long he had stayed on each occasion.

7. Mr. KALE replied that he had attended college in the British-administered Territory but during his vacations he had returned home and on each occasion he had visited the Belgian-administered Territory. Thus he had visited Ruanda-Urundi every year until he had been deported from that Territory.

8. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) felt it might be of assistance to the Committee if he explained that in Africa the word "family" was used in a much wider sense than it was, for example, in Europe.

9. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) asked the petitioner whether he would agree that his father's house was not in the Trust Territory. He added that he knew the petitioner's father well and had frequently visited his house.

10. Mr. KALE confirmed that his father lived in British-administered Ruanda. He endorsed the remarks of the Sudanese representative to the effect that "family" was an elastic term in Africa.

11. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked the petitioner whether he was married, whether he had any children and, if so, how many.

12. Mr. KALE replied that he was not married and had no children.

13. Mr. ZIKRIA (Afghanistan) said that at the previous meeting the representative of the United Arab Republic had asked the petitioner about the attitude of the Administering Authority for Ruanda-Urundi towards emigration and the petitioner had replied that the Administering Authority was favourable to emigration to the Belgian Congo. He would like to know what was its attitude regarding emigration to other neighbouring countries.

14. Mr. KALE observed that emigration from Ruanda-Urundi seemed to be encouraged in the sense that the policy of the Administration was to force people to leave the country. As he had explained at the previous meeting, the people of Ruanda-Urundi resisted that encouragement to emigration in so far as it tended to fuse Ruanda-Urundi with the Belgian Congo.

15. Over 40,000 people emigrated every year from Ruanda-Urundi to other East African territories because of the political persecution in the country, and because, owing to the lack of industry, it was impossible for the 4 million inhabitants of the Territory to earn a decent livelihood.

16. There were labour-recruiting centres on the border which encouraged emigration in order to obtain cheap labour for the East African territories. Thus emigration from Ruanda-Urundi to the Congo was encouraged officially for political purposes and emigration to the other East African territories was encouraged unofficially for economic purposes.

17. Mr. FELD (United States of America) said he had gained the impression at the previous meeting that Mr. Kale felt that political developments in Africa had left his territory somewhat behind, that there was a unanimous urge on the part of all elements of the population to advance and that the principal obstacle had been the attitude of the Administering Authority towards such advancement. He drew attention to paragraph 37 of the chapter on Ruanda-Urundi in the Trusteeship Council's report (A/3822, vol. II, p. 40), which referred to a document entitled "Statement of Views" prepared by the High Council of Ruanda which declared that it was difficult at the present stage to specify when it would be possible to grant self-government, since the State must be trained for it. Furthermore, paragraph 38 mentioned a document entitled "Manifesto of the Bahutu", which said that the problem was primarily that the political, economic, social and cultural monopoly was in the hands of the Batutsi and that that monopoly should be abolished. The report went on to say that the Administering Authority had explained to the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1957, that on the one hand the High Council of Ruanda, consisting of Batutsi, called for higher education for the élite of the country and the granting of increasing political power, while on the other hand the Manifesto of the Bahutu placed political reform after economic and social reform in order to ensure the emancipation of the peasant masses.

18. He would like to hear the petitioner's views on that subject.

19. Mr. KALE said that as a nationalist he strongly supported the Statement of Views of the High Council of Ruanda, which could be taken as an expression of the wish of the population as a whole to acquire freedom and to move with events in Africa towards the attainment of self-government by Ruanda-Urundi. Though himself a Mututsi, he sympathized with the Manifesto of the Bahutu; he did not think that any Batutsi, especially among those who were educated, would fail to sympathize with it. The gap between the Batutsi and the Bahutu had been widened by the Administering Authority; there was no hostility between them. The Visiting Mission had seen evidence of certain moves to abolish the ubuhake system, which subordinated the Bahutu to the Batutsi. Those moves, though they had the support of the Administering Authority, had been initiated by the Batutsi. The existence of different social strata was not peculiar to Ruanda-Urundi. The Batutsi and the Bahutu were in agreement; both wished to unite and form a Ruanda-Urundi nation.

20. Mr. FELD (United States of America) observed that there seemed to be some discrepancy between the petitioner's statements and the Manifesto of the Bahutu, which laid great stress on the differences between Batutsi and Bahutu.

21. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that in her part of Africa, too, the concept of kinship was not so restricted as it was in European countries but often embraced the entire population of a town. Hence it was impossible for a person to know for sure whether certain people were actually his relatives or not. The important thing was that the people claiming kinship with each other had much in common and felt themselves to be one.

22. Mr. ZIKRIA (Afghanistan) requested the petitioner to tell the Committee about the dissemination of information on the United Nations among the inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi and asked whether he thought that an information centre should be established in the Territory.

23. Mr. KALE replied that the people of the Trust Territory as a whole held no consciousness of their link with the United Nations and that the educational system did nothing to make them aware of it. He had told the Committee at the previous meeting of the arrest of a man who had been active in disseminating information about the United Nations; the man's house had been ransacked and the United Nations publications found there confiscated. He appealed to the Committee to take steps to promote the dissemination of such information in the Territory so that the inhabitants might become aware of the true situation.

24. Mr. ZIKRIA (Afghanistan) said that if it was true that the inhabitants were not acquainted with the role of the United Nations in relation to Trust Territories that fact was highly regrettable.

25. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic), supported by Mr. RASGOTRA (India), suggested that delegations should be given an opportunity to put further questions to the petitioner after the complete text of his statement at the previous meeting had been circulated.

26. Mr. KELLY (Australia) thought that as the Committee was so far behind schedule a definite time-limit should be fixed for the completion of the petitioner's hearing and questioning.

27. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as there were no further speakers for the time being, the question should be deferred until the text of the petitioner's statement was available.

Mr. John Kale withdrew.

QUESTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY HEARINGS OF THE PETITIONERS ON THE FUTURE OF THE CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION AND THE CAMEROONS UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION

28. The CHAIRMAN read out a letter dated 17 November 1958 which had been received from the four petitioners from the Cameroons under British administration and the Cameroons under French administration. In it they stated that at its 776th meeting the Committee had adopted the principle of allowing them to participate in the general debate on the Cameroons and to make further statements on that subject. They had therefore been surprised that the Secretariat had prevented them from taking their places on the floor of the conference room, thus in effect depriving them of a right granted them by the Committee. They wished in particular to be permitted to make supplementary statements at the next morning's meeting, in conformity with the reservations which they had jointly expressed at the Committee's 779th meeting, and to be allowed to participate in the general debate so that if delegations had any questions they could answer them.

29. He invited the Committee to comment on the letter.

30. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) said that he thought the petitioners had simply not expressed them-

selves correctly, for there had never been any question of inviting petitioners to participate in the general debate. He gathered that all they wanted was an opportunity to make supplementary statements. It was the custom of the Committee to allow such statements and his delegation would support their request on the understanding that it did not mean they would participate in the general debate. The Committee could, of course, decide to allow them to participate if the majority so desired but that had not been the custom in the past.

31. Mr. FELD (United States of America) said that he was fully in agreement with the point of principle raised by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

32. Mr. EDMONDS (New Zealand) recalled that at the Committee's 720th meeting, held during the twelfth session, it had been agreed that for practical reasons and as a matter of principle it would not be advisable for petitioners to participate in the general debate. His delegation considered it very important that the Committee should not deviate from the principles and practices adopted in previous years.

33. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) observed that there might well be a misapprehension due to the petitioners' lack of understanding of the General Assembly's rules of procedure. As he saw it, the question at issue was whether they should be given the opportunity to make the further statements which they felt were necessitated by the statements of the representatives of France and of the United Kingdom.^{1/} In two cases in the past when the point had been reached at which the early termination of a Trusteeship Agreement was envisaged it had been decided to allow petitioners to remain in the conference room and make final statements before the relevant draft resolutions were voted upon. His delegation was therefore in favour of allowing the petitioners in the present instance to do likewise provided that they did not actually participate in the debate. They should not receive different treatment from that accorded to the petitioners from Togoland under British administration and Togoland under French administration.

34. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said that he had been under the impression that the questioning of the petitioners had not been completed; nevertheless, the Committee had already embarked on the general debate, which presupposed that delegations were in full possession of the facts regarding the Territory in question. The Administering Authorities' answers to certain questions had not been entirely satisfactory and it was therefore logical that the petitioners should be allowed to give the Committee the benefit of their first-hand knowledge of the situation. He recalled that it had been on his delegation's initiative that the decision had been taken at the 720th meeting to allow petitioners to remain in the conference room and answer questions; the same course ought to be followed now.

35. He recognized that it had never been the practice of the Committee to allow petitioners to take part in the general debate. He himself, however, would have no objection to their doing so, for he saw no reason why they should be obliged to remain silent while the

Administering Authorities were represented by large delegations. He would therefore like to suggest that when the Committee examined items involving the termination of Trusteeship Agreements for Territories which the Administering Authorities said were about to attain the objectives of the Trusteeship System, petitioners, as representatives of the people most deeply concerned, should be allowed to take part in the debates.

36. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the question was one of cardinal importance for his delegation. Whatever views might be held by any particular delegation about the hearing of petitioners, the Committee should preserve the essential position, which was that its debates were held between the sovereign States represented on it and that petitioners, whomsoever they represented, should not take part in them. He had been astonished by the petitioners' claim that the Committee had agreed to their taking part in the debate; what the Chairman had said at the 776th meeting was that the petitioners would be free to submit additional statements and answer questions if necessary.

37. The Committee had begun its general debate on the Camerouns and he had made his statement at the 803rd meeting only on that understanding. If the petitioners were now to make further statements they would in fact be taking part in the general debate, which would be wholly improper. During the previous session, at the 720th meeting, the Committee had adopted a proposal by the Philippine representative that the petitioners should be allowed to remain at the Committee table, without participating in the discussion. His delegation had opposed that proposal; moreover, it was a decision which, in his view, did not necessarily apply to the present session. The present proposal, which would allow the petitioners to intervene in the debate was a much more serious one. If the petitioners were to be allowed to make supplementary statements or answer questions, they must do so after the debate, as one or two of them had done at the previous session. He doubted the propriety of such an arrangement but did not exclude it as a possibility.

38. He suggested that the debate should be suspended so as to permit delegations to discuss the possibility of reaching agreement.

39. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) felt that there might have been a misunderstanding over what the petitioners had intended to say in their letter. If the meeting were suspended, the Secretariat might take the opportunity of finding out from them what had been their real intention.

40. He would formally move that the meeting should be suspended.

After a short procedural discussion, that motion was adopted by 20 votes to 8, with 31 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 4.40 p.m. and resumed at 5.30 p.m.

41. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that during the suspension of the meeting certain delegations had discussed the issue. He felt that there was much common ground between them and that there would be a good chance of reaching agreement if more time were made available.

^{1/} See 774th, 794th, 800th and 803rd meetings.

42. He accordingly moved that the meeting should be adjourned.

43. Mr. LOIZIDES (Greece) opposed the motion. The question before the Committee was a simple one, for which it should be possible to find a practical solution. He would suggest that the time allowed to each petitioner for making a supplementary statement should be limited to fifteen minutes.

44. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana), too, opposed the motion. In his opinion the questions whether the petitioners should be allowed to sit at the Committee table and whether they might make statements on the item under discussion should be put to the vote immediately.

45. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), supporting the Indian motion for adjournment, said that his delegation had been taking part in the discussion and the question was not as simple as the two preceding speakers had suggested. He felt that if a little more time were granted agreement could be reached.

46. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) agreed that the issue was one of great importance, since it related to the right of petition and to the rights of sovereign States. He would therefore support the motion for adjournment.

47. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) inquired whether the Secretariat had been able to ascertain from the petitioners what precisely they had had in mind in writing the letter.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that he understood that a representative of the Secretariat had spoken to the petitioners and that they desired their letter to be read in the sense that they wished to be accorded the same treatment as had been given to other petitioners in previous cases before the Committee.

49. Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) inquired whether the petitioners themselves could not be asked to explain to the Committee what their intentions had been.

50. The CHAIRMAN replied that such a suggestion was outside the discretion allowed to him under rule 117 of the rules of procedure.

The Indian motion for adjournment was adopted by 27 votes to 22, with 14 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.