

PN-ABU-345 <sup>nd</sup> 9/26/94



*National Democratic  
Institute for  
International  
Affairs*

INTER-REGIONAL SEMINAR FOR  
MULTIPARTY LEGISLATURES  
IN EMERGING DEMOCRACIES

*October 10 - 13, 1994  
Bangui, CAR*

**DEBRIEFING AND ANALYSIS**

**BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT**

# National Democratic Institute For International Affairs

conducting nonpartisan international programs to help promote, maintain and strengthen democratic institutions



1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Fifth Floor  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 328-3136  
FAX (202) 939-3166  
E-MAIL 5979039@MCIMAIL.COM

## NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) was established in 1983. By working with political parties and other institutions, NDI seeks to promote, maintain and strengthen democratic institutions in new and emerging democracies. The Institute is headquartered in Washington, D.C., and has a staff of 120 with field offices in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the former Soviet Union.

NDI has supported the development of democratic institutions in more than 60 countries. Programs focus on six major areas:

**Political Party Training:** NDI conducts multipartisan training seminars in political development with a broad spectrum of democratic parties. NDI draws international experts to forums where members of fledgling parties learn first-hand the techniques of organization, communication and constituent contact.

**Election Processes:** NDI provides technical assistance for political parties and nonpartisan associations to conduct voter and civic education campaigns and to organize election monitoring programs. The Institute has also organized more than 25 major international observer delegations.

**Strengthening Legislatures:** NDI organizes seminars focusing on legislative procedures, staffing, research information, constituent services, committee structures and the function and role of party caucuses. NDI programs also seek to promote access to the legislative process by citizen groups and the public at large.

**Local Government:** NDI provides technical assistance on a range of topics related to the processes of local governance, including division of responsibility between mayors and municipal councils, and between local and national authorities. NDI programs also promote enhanced communication between local officials and their constituents.

**Civic Organization:** NDI supports and advises nonpartisan groups and political parties engaged in civic and voter education programs. NDI programs work with civic organizations to enhance their organizational capabilities.

**Civil-Military Relations:** NDI brings together military and political leaders to promote dialogue and establish mechanisms for improving civil-military relations.

### Chairman:

Paul G. Kirk, Jr.

### Vice Chair:

Rachelle Horowitz

### Secretary:

Kenneth F. Melley

### Treasurer:

Marvin F. Weissberg

### Board of Directors:

William V. Alexander

Bernard W. Aronson

Emanuel Cleaver, II

Thomas F. Eagleton

Barbara F. Lister-Jones

Eugene Fidenberg

Dante B. Fascell

Edward F. Feighan

Geraldine A. Ferraro

Hartina Flournoy

Shirley Robinson Hall

John Hendricks

Maxine Isaacs

Gen. M. Joseph

Peter G. Kelly

Peter Kovler

Elliott F. Kulick

Leon Lynch

Lewis Manlow

Azie Taylor Morton

Mark A. Siegel

Theodore C. Sorensen

Michael R. Steed

Maunce Tempelman

Andre S. Young

Raul Yzaguirre

### Senior Advisory Committee:

Michael D. Barnes

John Brademas

Bill Bradley

Richard F. Celeste

Mario M. Cuomo

Patricia M. Deran

Christopher F. Dodd

Michael S. Dukakis

Martin Frost

Richard A. Gephardt

John T. Joyce

John Lewis

Mike J. Mansfield

Donald F. McHenry

Daniel Patrick Moynihan

Edmund S. Muskie

Bill Richardson

Charles S. Robb

Stephen J. Solarz

Esteban E. Torres

Crus R. Vance

Anne Wexler

### Chairmen Emeriti:

Walter F. Mondale

Charles T. Manatt

Kenneth D. Wollack—President • Jean B. Dunn—Vice President for Administration & Development  
Senior Associates: Patricia Keefer—Political and Civic Organization • Thomas O. Melia—Democratic Governance  
Nelson C. Ledsky—Former Soviet Union • Patrick Merloe—Election Processes  
Program Coordination Director: Eric C. Bjornlund  
Senior Consultant: Eddie Charles Brown





# NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Fifth Floor, 1117 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 328-3136

■ FAX (202) 939-3166

■ E-Mail 5979039@MCI.MAIL.COM

## INTER-REGIONAL SEMINAR FOR MULTIPARTY LEGISLATURES IN EMERGING DEMOCRACIES

### DEBRIEFING AND ANALYSIS - TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. NDI Programs to Strengthen Newly Democratic Legislatures
2. In-House Trip Report: Program Development Mission to the Central African States
3. Seminar Report: Inter-Regional Seminar For Multiparty Legislatures in Emerging Democracies
4. Analysis and Evaluation of Responses to NDI Questionnaire
5. Completed Questionnaire Samples
6. List of Participating Deputies
7. Annotated Agenda for International Trainers (English)
8. Final Agenda for Participants (French)
9. Workshop Simulation Exercise
10. Report from Workshop C (French)





# NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Fifth Floor, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 528-5136

■ FAX (202) 939-5166  
■ E-Mail 5979039@NICMAIL.COM

## NDI PROGRAMS TO STRENGTHEN NEWLY DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATURES

The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) conducts a variety of democratic development programs around the world, including several specifically directed at strengthening newly democratic legislatures. The focus is generally on the role of elected officials and political parties in the operation of legislative bodies. The goals are to promote transparent, efficient and accountable law-making, as well as responsive and accessible governance. NDI's parliamentary programs address the internal workings of party caucuses; relations between the executive, government parties and parliamentary opposition; constituency liaison; and the operation of committees and plenary sessions. In these programs, NDI works on an inclusive basis with the range of parties represented in parliament, either by convening all-parties symposia or roundtable discussions, or by organizing parallel sessions with each of the parties.

NDI has conducted programs to strengthen legislative bodies in:

Albania (1991)	Hungary (1990, 1991)
Brazil (1986)	Namibia (1991, 1993, 1994)
Poland (1989, 1990)	Niger (1994)
Bulgaria (1990, 1991)	Slovenia (1992)

NDI is presently developing or implementing programs to strengthen democratizing legislatures in:

Albania	Georgia
Argentina	Latvia
Bangladesh	Namibia
Burundi	Nicaragua
Cambodia	Romania
Central African States	Russia

For further information, please contact Thomas O. Melia, NDI's Senior Associate for Programs in Democratic Governance.





# NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Fifth Floor, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 428-3136

■ FAX (202) 959-3166  
■ E-Mail 5979039@MCIEMAIL.COM

## **NDI Programs to Strengthen Newly Democratizing Legislatures**

NDI has conducted a variety of programs to help strengthen legislatures in democratizing countries throughout the world. While variations in constitutional and electoral systems provide different foundations for legislatures, NDI's programs can be adapted to suit various political and legal situations. These parliamentary assistance projects generally address one or more of four fundamental dimensions of parliamentary life. In a few cases, NDI has undertaken programs to address all four areas, although usually requests to NDI focus on one or another. In all these information-sharing programs, NDI recruits as presenters elected legislators and senior advisors to parties and parliaments from a variety of countries and across the spectrum of democratic philosophies. To date, NDI has included in this manner more than fifty legislators from two dozen countries in its programs.

### *Public Accountability/Constituent Liaison*

These programs involve consultations on constituency liaison (voter contact) and deal with such subjects as the responsiveness and accessibility of MPs to their constituents and accountability both to individual citizens and organized groups. In this type of project NDI focuses mainly on the role of individual MPs. Emphasis is placed on the two-way nature of the communication, the importance of explaining party positions to voters and others, and hearing from the public about their views on issues relevant to parliamentary debates. It is important for citizens to see that MPs are accessible, and that they are responsive to the community that elected them.

These programs also stress that parliament, especially in countries in the midst of political transition, can serve as a highly visible model of practical democracy. For the parliament to earn the respect of the nation's people, and be seen as a legitimate policy-making body, it is also important that the legislative debates and the work of the parliament be visible to constituents, that they see that diverse views can be forthrightly and honestly expressed in parliament, and can be reconciled.

On several occasions, these programs have been organized in collaboration with indigenous civic organizations.



### *Political Parties in Parliaments*

These programs deal with political party management and the development of transparent, responsive political structures. In these projects, NDI focuses on the roles of party groups in parliament -- both as distinct organizations themselves, and as they relate to one another. Specific topics include the relationship between government and opposition parties; coalition management; staff organization; budgeting; research methods; drafting and presentation of legislative proposals; the role and responsibility of the parliamentary whips and other caucus officials; and the relationship between party groups in the parliament and the party apparatus outside of parliament.

### *Technical Assistance*

In another type of project, NDI addresses the role of the parliament itself as an institution and gives technical advice on such matters as the drafting of parliamentary rules of procedure, or helps in the development of basic publications. Specific topics discussed are the division of labor between committees and plenary; record keeping; transparency and accountability of the legislature; and the efficient and equitable management of time in plenary sessions. The importance of these programs relates to the reputation of the parliamentary system as a whole, as well as public confidence in parliament as a useful democratic institution.

### *Issue-Specific Consultations With Law Makers*

Another type of program is designed to help parliaments and MPs with structural issues central to democratic reform such as election law, economic reform, reorganization of local government or the judiciary. These projects frequently are organized in partnership with committees in parliament. International experts share their experiences and knowledge in specific policy areas, and to compare them with the situation at hand. Rather than direct legislators to enact specific laws or policies, NDI's goal is to demonstrate generically how laws can be made -- how expert research, political objectives and the public interest are reconciled in the context of important structural issues.

For further information, please contact Thomas O. Melia, NDI's Senior Associate for Programs in Democratic Governance.

Updated: July 1, 1993

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Ken, Tom, Ned, Senior Staff & EWA  
**FROM:** Chris F & Ben  
**DATE:** August 12, 1994  
**SUBJECT:** Trip Report: Program Development Mission to Central African States

### SUMMARY

From July 23 - 31, NDI sent a four-member program development team to the Central African Republic (CAR), Gabon and Congo. This mission was the first of a three-phase, regional legislative training program to be held in Bangui, CAR. All 85 deputies from the national assembly of the CAR, 10 deputies each from Congo and Gabon, eight deputies from Burundi and six deputies from Madagascar will be participating in the seminar, the dates of which are now set for October 10 - 13. Soon thereafter, NDI will dispatch a field representative or parliamentary expert to the region to evaluate the project and serve as a resource person to members of the participating national assemblies as they implement initiatives that may result from the seminar.

The delegation was led by Maria Leissner, former member of the Swedish Parliament and a veteran of NDI programs. Joining Ms. Leissner from NDI were Tom Melia, Senior Associate for Democratic Governance; Christopher Fomunyoh, Senior Program Officer and Director of the program; and Benjamin Feit, Program Assistant. In the countries visited, the delegation held working sessions with the leadership of the respective national assemblies; conducted separate consultations with each of the parliamentary groups; met with some government officials; and consulted with a few of the civic organizations that have been actively involved in the democratization process in the sub-region.

### MISSION OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the program development mission were:

- to assess the accumulated experience of each legislature;
- to identify those specific issues and topics to be addressed during the seminar based upon the strengths and weaknesses of each of the legislatures.

- to discuss the criteria for the selection of participants in order to ensure that each delegation is as representative of its different partisan and gender components as possible; and
- to determine what issues, if any, may have been addressed already in training programs conducted by other organizations interested in legislative development in these countries in order to avoid any overlap.

The consultations and meetings conducted by the development team were useful in exposing the team to the political realities faced by some of the deputies that will participate in the Bangui seminar. The team also began to formulate some recommendations on how to best conduct the regional training seminar in October.

## MISSION FINDINGS

### *Central African Republic*

The constitution of the CAR provides for a National Assembly with 85 seats. 79 of these seats have been filled. Because of the deaths of two deputies and the fact that some of the election results were not validated, six vacancies now exist and may have to be filled through by-elections. Deputies in CAR have grouped themselves into three main coalitions, two in the opposition and one in the majority. President Ange Felix Patassé's ruling party, the *Mouvement pour la Libération du Peuple Centrafricain* (MLPC) constitutes the nucleus of the parliamentary majority which also comprises four other parties including the *Parti Libéral-Démocrat* (PLD), the *Alliance pour la Démocratie et le Progrès* (ADP), the *Mouvement pour la Démocratie et le Développement* (MDD), and the *Parti Social Démocrat-Convention Nationale* (PSD-CN). All of these parties but for the MDD, were formed prior to the legislative elections held in September 1993. The MDD was formed in December 1993 (after the legislative elections) by deputies who had initially supported the candidacy of David Dacko. Former president David Dacko ran in the August 1993 presidential elections as an independent, came in third and was eliminated in the first round. The deputies who are now members of the MDD parliamentary group also competed in the legislative elections as independents.

The *Rassemblement Démocratique Centrafricain* (RDC) and the *Front Patriotique pour le Progrès* (FPP) are the two parties that have formed opposition parliamentary groups within the National Assembly of the CAR. The RDC, the former single party under former President Kolingba, occupies 13 seats in the National Assembly. Professor Abel Goumba, who came in second in the presidential elections under the banner of the *Concertation des Forces Démocratique* (CFD)- a loose alliance of various parties, remains the leader of the FPP. Like the MLPC and the RDC, the parliamentary group of the FPP is headed by an elected deputy.

Although the MLPC, MDD, ADP, PLD, and PSD-CN are all part of the majority coalition, each of the party caucuses insisted on meeting individually with the NDI team. The

NDI delegation conducted separate one-on-one consultations with all seven parliamentary groups. During each of the consultations the delegation members presented NDI's programmatic approach and broad outline for the training seminar. Each parliamentary group delegation was asked to raise any concerns that they had with respect to the functioning of the national assembly and make suggestions on concepts which they had not yet mastered fully or topics which they would like to see discussed during the seminar.

The delegation also met with the Minister in charge of relations with the assembly and his close associates. During the discussions that followed, it became apparent to the NDI team that issues as basic as the exact manner in which the legislative calendar was set and deputies called into session needed to be clarified and explained to deputies and some members of the executive branch.

### *Gabon*

One of the effects of the December 1993 presidential elections in which incumbent President Omar Bongo was declared winner with 51% of the vote while opposition parties raised serious charges of fraud, electoral irregularities and errors in electoral roles, has been the polarization of political discourse in Gabon in the post-election period. Opposition presidential candidate M'Ba Abessole claimed to have won the election even though official results indicated that he had 26.51% of the vote. M'Ba Abessole proceeded to form a High Council of the Republic and a parallel government which included a majority of opposition presidential candidates. The entity soon changed its name to the High Council of Resistance. It then made demands on President Bongo's government to hold negotiations aimed at normalizing the political environment in Gabon and reviewing the electoral process for future consultations. The NDI delegation arrived in Libreville, Gabon as negotiations for political reconciliation between the Government and the High Council of Resistance were being undertaken.

While in Libreville, the NDI delegation met with the president of the Gabonese national assembly, leaders of two opposition parliamentary groups: the *Rassemblement National des Bucherons* (RNB) and the *Parti Gabonais du Progrès* (PGP). Attempts were made to meet with the leadership of the majority *Parti Démocratique Gabonais* (PDG), and the third major opposition party called the *Forum Africain pour la Reconstruction* (FAR). Leaders of both groups seemed to have travelled out of Libreville. The delegation upon reviewing the representation of these four groups in the Gabonese assembly, made a determination as to the allocation of slots for participation in the Bangui seminar. Letters were then addressed to the presidents of these parliamentary groups inviting them to designate deputies to participate in the seminar. The NDI delegation was also informed that recent modifications to the Gabonese constitution provide for a Senate. This second chamber has not yet become functional.

## **Congo**

Like in the CAR, deputies in the Congolese assembly have organized themselves into three principal parliamentary groups. The parliamentary majority or the *Mouvance Presidentielle* is a coalition of President Lissouba's *Union Panafricaine pour la Démocratie Sociale* (UPADS) and several other minor political parties. The *Union pour le Renouveau Démocratique* (URD), composed of Bernard Kolelas' *Mouvement Congolais pour la Démocratie et le Développement* (MCDDI) and the *Rassemblement pour la Démocratie et le Progrès Social* (RDPS), is one of two parliamentary coalitions in the opposition. The third group, the *Parti Congolais du Travail* (PCT), the former state party under the one-party rule, is also part of the opposition. Although the Congolese legislature has a Senate which functions as a second chamber, the delegation focused its attention entirely on the assembly.

The NDI delegation found the Congolese national assembly to be functioning relatively well in spite of the civil strife that characterized political events in Brazzaville since the legislative elections of 1993 until early this year. One positive development was the formation of an Ad Hoc committee of legislators instituted by parliament to work towards the peaceful resolution of political conflict and the restoration of peace in Congo. The by-partisan committee is composed of 12 deputies, evenly split between the parliamentary majority and opposition groupings. The committee has been effective in successfully influencing parliament to adopt directives concerning measures that would help in the disarming of the militias and the installation of a credible national force capable of controlling all residential areas of Brazzaville. This show of bipartisan collaboration to solve the most acute problems in Congo was viewed by the NDI delegation as a positive indicator of creative and effective legislative functioning.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### *Overview*

Meeting with deputies from the three assemblies in rapid succession provided the team with an opportunity to conduct a comparative assessment of the levels of understanding of legislative principles and practices. Several themes came up repeatedly through the course of the delegation's consultations with parliamentary groups and government officials regarding ways in which NDI's training program could help improve the legislators' understanding of their functions and responsibilities in a democratic society. Some of the themes worth consideration include the following:

- the relationship between the state and the ruling party;
- access to information by deputies and the necessity for the public to be informed about the functioning of parliament or the interaction between deputies and the media;

- the role of political parties in the democratic process and, in particular, the relationship between the allegiance of deputies to the legislature as an institution, and loyalty to their respective party hierarchies.
- intra-parliamentary group relations and the role and contribution of parliamentary opposition
- how to nurture democratic culture in the sub-region and consolidate the gains made so far within the context of a history of one-party authoritarian rule;
- relations between the legislature and the military (Congo);

### *General Impression*

In the case of the CAR for example, a majority of deputies portrayed the most difficulties understanding the complexities involved in functioning as legislators in a multiparty context. This could be explained in some measure by the fact that legislative elections in the CAR only recently took place (August-September 1993) and the national assembly has convened only a few times. The newly elected deputies also come from very diverse backgrounds and in some cases have only become politically active with the transition to multipartism in 1991/92. This raises the issue of how to tailor the training program in a way that will be seen as interesting and beneficial to deputies at different levels of political sophistication.

Deputies from the ruling coalition in the CAR were hard pressed to provide any substantive comments for the NDI delegation. They seemed to focus their attention most of the time on more general discussions relating to the consolidation of democracy in the CAR. In some cases, they openly acknowledged their own lack of experience with the functioning of democratic institutions. Some of the younger and least experienced deputies brought up AIDS, population control and human rights as responses to our questions of how they believed that the parliament could function more effectively as a viable instrument of democratic governance. Interestingly, the one parliamentary group that was able to articulate specific problems with the functioning of the assembly was the RDC, the former single party now in the opposition. This confirms a pattern that is noticeable in most other emerging democracies where there has been a change of regime or an alternation in political leadership. Elements of civil society hitherto excluded from decision making now find themselves in the realm of political power and have to run governmental institutions, whereas those who initially monopolized power find themselves in the opposition and use knowledge accumulated during their previous experience to criticize the newcomers.

The delegation found through its consultations in the three countries visited, that the Congolese deputies were best able to articulate the problems faced in trying to foster the work of the legislature. They raised many practical and relevant issues. In addition to the concerns raised by deputies in all three countries and listed above, Congolese deputies posed numerous questions about how to manage better the interaction between the legislature and the military,

how to establish an impartial electoral commission, how to deal with differences in the interpretation of the Constitution and legislative control over the executive branch of government.

Interestingly, the Congolese deputies, unlike their counterparts in Gabon or the CAR, also voiced other concerns regarding the fundamentals of building a democratic society. Congolese deputies in both the ruling party and opposition were grappling with how various democratic institutions could be made to function in a way that would be compatible with the historical, cultural and political context of Congo. Ethnic diversity and national unity; how to inculcate democratic culture in a country that has only experienced military and authoritarian rule; and how to allocate scarce resources in the struggle to achieve both democracy and development were raised as issues of primary concern to both ruling party and opposition deputies. The deputies with whom we met emphasized the need to reconcile African traditions and western style democracy and were interested in building a system of governance that is most relevant to the African/Congolese context.

The NDI delegation was exposed to deputies from three legislatures at different levels of political development. The team also detected different levels of political experience and sophistication among deputies even in cases where they belonged to the same national assembly. This certainly highlights the advantage of providing a forum for the deputies from the CAR for example to learn from their counterparts from Gabon and Congo. Similarly, the Congolese and Burundian legislators may have much to share with each other with respect to the contribution that elected deputies can make to conflict resolution at the national level. On the other hand, this diversity in experience among participants will require a lot of skill on the part of faculty to prepare presentations in plenary sessions and workshops in a manner that would retain the interest and attention of participants at all levels. It also calls for special attention in designing scenarios or case studies that could be seen as relevant by legislators on both sides of the learning curve.

Developing an agenda that is relevant to all participants will be a major challenge. Emphasis will need to be placed on the constant exchange of experience between all participants and the seminar would have to be organized in such a manner that encourages and facilitates such an exchange. At the same time, it will be useful to address some of the preliminary notions about democracy and enabling instruments early in the process in order to raise the comfort level of participating deputies from some of the very young legislatures.

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Ken, Senior Staff & EWA Team

**FROM:** C.A.S Team

**DATE:** November 28, 1994

**RE:** Inter-Regional Seminar for Multiparty Legislatures, Bangui, CAR:  
Seminar Report

### INTRODUCTION

The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs conducted an inter-regional seminar on "Multiparty Legislature in Emerging Democracies" in Bangui, Central African Republic (C.A.R) from October 10 to 13, 1994. 65 deputies from the CAR, 10 deputies from Congo, 10 deputies from Gabon, seven deputies from Burundi and three deputies from Madagascar participated in the seminar. All country delegations were composed of deputies from both ruling and opposition parties. One government official each from the Ministry in Charge of Relations with the Assemblies of Congo and Gabon were also invited to attend. Leaders of the most active civic organizations in C.A.R were invited to attend as observers.

NDI planned this seminar in response to requests from deputies of some of the participating national assemblies. The program was designed in three phases: an advance trip which was conducted by an NDI delegation in July 1994 to plan the seminar and develop a specific agenda; the seminar itself; and a follow-up presence by an NDI field representative to assess the impact of the seminar and to assist in any initiatives that may result therefrom.

The structure of the seminar was developed following a 10-day program development mission to the CAR, Gabon and Congo. In each of the three countries visited during that trip, the delegation had working sessions with the leadership of the three national assemblies, conducted one-on-one consultations with leaders of parliamentary groups or caucuses and met with some of the government officials who interact regularly with these parliaments. Issues raised during the survey trip that were then incorporated into the seminar agenda included: legislative oversight of the executive and judiciary branches of government; the internal functioning of a multiparty legislature including the role of the opposition, access to information and the effective utilization of parliamentary staff; and constituency servicing and public relations.

NDI invited parliamentary experts from four established democracies as discussion facilitators to permit an exchange of information and legislative experiences with the participants. The international delegation of parliamentarians was comprised of Jim Higgins, a parliamentarian from Ireland; Isabel Espada, a former member of the Portuguese parliament; Donald Cravins, a U.S. state senator from Louisiana; and Alan Ganoo, former Minister of Justice and currently a member of parliament from Mauritius. Assisting the international delegates during the plenary sessions and serving as co-moderators during the

workshops were two "lead participants": Kané Nana Sanou from Mali and Ramatou Baba Moussa from Benin. These two deputies had previously served as heads of their respective country delegations to NDI's inter-regional seminar held in Niamey, Niger in January, 1994. NDI had also invited two other deputies from Niger to act as lead participants. Unfortunately, a political crisis in Niger led to parliament being dissolved thereby preventing the two Nigerien deputies from attending. The participation of the West African deputies who are slightly more experienced legislators than their Central African counterparts, helped to provide a broader African perspective to discussions during the seminar.

## **BACKGROUND**

Over the past four years the Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon, Burundi and Madagascar have undergone considerable changes with respect to the development of democratic political institutions. Even though the degree of success varies from one country to another, in a broader sense these changes have led to the embrace of political pluralism as presently reflected in their respective legislatures. All of these countries have now experienced competitive multiparty legislative elections and are facing new, and often times similar challenges in consolidating democratic governance in the post-election phase.

Legislators in each of these five countries operate under constitutional frameworks modeled after the French semi-presidential / semi-parliamentary system. Commonalities in the constitutional models are also reflected in the standing orders of their national assemblies which operate under similar rules and procedures. These similarities made it easier for NDI to design the syllabus and implement a training seminar tailored for deputies from these five countries. One advantage of such a regional program was that it allowed for lessons learned at one training session to be applied with only minor modifications in countries at the same level in the development of democratic institutions and faced with similar challenges. It also creates an environment which facilitates the cross-fertilization of ideas and experiences, thereby making an enriching contribution to the program content in ways that cannot be achieved through country specific programs conducted in political isolation.

In the **Central Africa Republic**, the Constitution provides for an 86-member national assembly, elected in single member constituencies on the basis of a two-round absolute majority system. In that system, if none of the candidates got more than 50 percent of the votes in the first round, then every candidate with more than 10 percent of the votes qualified for the second round. The candidate with the highest number of votes in the run-offs won the seat. The final results of the 1993 legislative elections in CAR showed most seats to have been won by five major political parties. The *Mouvement de Liberation du Peuple Centrafricain* (MLPC), party of the in-coming President Ange Patasse, won 33 seats. The party of former president André Kolingba, the *Rassemblement Démocratique Centrafricain* (RDC), won 14 seats. The *Front Patriotique pour le Progres* (FPP) of Abel Goumba won seven seats, as did the *Parti Liberal Démocratique* (PLD). The *Alliance pour la Démocratie et le Progres* (ADP) won six seats. The *Parti Social Démocrate* (PSD) and *Convention Nationale* (CN) each won three seats. The *Forum Civique* (FC) won two seats, while the *Mouvement Démocratique Sociale de L'Afrique Noire* (MESAN), *Parti Republicain Centrafricain* (PRC) and the *Mouvement Démocratique pour la Revolution Centrafricaine*

(MDREC) each won one seat. Eight seats were won by independent candidates, five of whom belonged to the *Mouvance DACKO*. Some of these parties have coalesced around the ruling MLPC to form the parliamentary majority, while the former single party (RDC) and the FPP constitute the core of the parliamentary opposition.

In Congo, as the country went through the transition into multiparty democracy in the early 1990s, the former 133-member People's National Assembly of the one party state was dissolved in 1991 by the National Conference. A more representative legislative body of 153 members, named the High Council of the Republic was created to implement the decisions of the national conference during the transition period. The new constitution drafted in December 1991 and approved by popular referendum in March 1992 provides for a bicameral legislature composed of a Senate and a National Assembly of 125 deputies. Deputies to the national assembly are elected for a five-year term.

Like in the CAR, deputies in the Congolese assembly have organized themselves into three principal parliamentary groups. The parliamentary majority or the *Mouvance Présidentielle* is a coalition of President Lissouba's *Union Panafricaine pour la Démocratie Sociale* (UPADS) and several other minor political parties. The *Union pour le Renouveau Démocratique* (URD), composed of Bernard Kolelas' *Mouvement Congolais pour la Démocratie et le Développement* (MCDDI) and the *Rassemblement pour la Démocratie et le Progrès Social* (RDPS), is one of two parliamentary coalitions in the opposition. The third group, the *Parti Congolais du Travail* (PCT), the former state party under the one-party rule, is also part of the opposition. Although the Congolese legislature has a Senate which functions as a second chamber, only deputies from the assembly were invited to the seminar.

The NDI delegation found the Congolese national assembly to be functioning relatively well in spite of the civil strife that characterized political events in Brazzaville since the legislative elections of 1993 until early this year. One positive development was the formation of an Ad Hoc committee of legislators instituted by parliament to work towards the peaceful resolution of political conflict and the restoration of peace in Congo. The bipartisan committee is composed of 12 deputies, evenly split between the parliamentary majority and opposition groupings. The committee has been effective in successfully influencing parliament to adopt directives concerning measures that would help in the disarming of militia groups and the installation of a credible national force capable of controlling all residential areas of Brazzaville. This show of bipartisan collaboration to solve the most acute problems in Congo was viewed by the NDI delegation as a positive indicator of creative and effective legislative functioning.

In Gabon, national legislative elections were held in October 1990, the timing of which was heavily criticized by opposition parties. The ruling party won approximately 55 percent of the seats in parliament with the remainder obtained by various opposition parties. Opposition parties claimed they had not had sufficient time to organize or to lend input regarding decisions pertaining to the electoral process or the manner in which the elections were administered. The National Assembly consists of 120 elected members. The *Parti Démocratique Gabonais* holds 63 seats, the *Rassemblement des Bouchers* holds 20, the *Parti Gabonais du Progrès* holds 18, the *Mouvement de Redressement National* (MORENA) holds

seven of the 120 seats; and the remaining 12 seats are held by minor political parties. Although Gabon is experiencing a highly polarized political environment, some progress appears to have been made between the parliamentary majority and opposition in gaining consensus on the functioning of the national legislature.

The National Assembly of **Burundi** which had functioned under previous military regimes was temporarily suspended after the 1987 coup and reinstated in June 1993. Legislative elections took place in July 1993, with a voter turn out that was reported to be as high as 91.38 percent of registered voters. The National Assembly consists of 81 representatives elected on a proportional basis on party lists from 16 multi-member districts. The *FRODEBU* won 65 seats while the Unity and National Progress Party (*UPRONA*), the former ruling party won 16. The October 1993 coup attempt initially prevented the assembly from operating. When it finally reconvened in an extraordinary session, it was faced with the tasks of electing a new leadership for the assembly and amending the constitution to enable the assembly to elect a new head of state. Partisan conflicts and procedural technicalities became major hurdles that needed to be resolved by deputies, many of whom had little legislative experiences. Having accomplished these preliminary tasks, Burundian deputies began preparing to focus on a legislative agenda that would include dealing with issues such as institutional reform, economic development and refugee relief. Due to the death of President Ntaryamira on April 6, 1994 Burundian deputies were again confronted with the issue of electing a new head of state for the second time in under three months.

The present legislature in **Madagascar** was instituted under the constitution of August 1992, replacing the older institution that was abolished in 1991 during the national conference and the adoption of constitutional reforms. The bicameral legislature consists of the senate whose members are elected by an electoral college and a 138 member national assembly whose members are elected by direct suffrage on the basis of a mixed single and multiple member districts. The current national assembly was elected into power in June 1993. The dominant party in the assembly is the *Rasalama Forces Vives Cartel* (FV) with 46 seats while the second largest is the *Mouvement pour le progrès de Madagascar* (MFM) with 15 seats. *Leader- Faniho* and *FAMIMA* occupy 13 and 11 seats respectively while two other parties, the *AKFM-Fanavaozama* and *UNDD*, have five seats each. The rest of the seats are occupied by deputies from a host of small parties.

## **PROGRAM OBJECTIVES**

In planning and implementing this program, NDI sought to achieve the following objectives:

- Participating deputies would be able to acquire an understanding of the process of reconciling political party interests with the need to enact legislation, thereby avoiding unnecessary gridlock, which in turn could threaten the legitimacy of the institution as a whole.
- Participating deputies would be able to examine how other parliaments organize and conduct legislative business, including the role of political parties

in a multiparty legislature, access to information and analysis, the committee system, floor debate and voting procedures.

- The seminar would provide a forum for participating deputies to share information about parliamentary procedures established by their respective legislatures, including the relationship between the government and the loyal opposition, the system of consultation between majority and minority parties, the relationship between the legislature and the executive, and legislative oversight.
- Legislators from emerging democracies in Africa would develop a better sense of their roles and responsibilities as parliamentarians, and the communication skills necessary for an effective relationship with other entities like the civil service, the press and the public.
- NDI also hoped that participating deputies would use the opportunity to informally discuss the need to establish regional support systems, such as regional legislative network centers or committees. Such committees could serve as resource centers and provide ongoing mechanisms to foster more dynamic and symbiotic processes among the African legislatures concerned with confronting common problems in these early stages of democratic consolidation on the continent.

## **SEMINAR ACTIVITIES**

The seminar was designed to have three separate but very complementary components which included a roundtable discussion, presentations in plenary session and discussions in smaller workshop settings. This approach was helpful in providing the international faculty with valuable exposure to the political realities of the host country. It also had the advantage of familiarizing younger and less experienced deputies to the practice of participating in large and public settings while at the same time allowing for more interactive and in depth discussions in the smaller hands-on environment of workshops.

### **A. Roundtable discussion on civil society and the evaluation of parliamentary activity in C.A.R**

In an effort to familiarize the trainers with some of the political issues currently being discussed in the Central African Republic, as well as to provide a preview of issues that were likely to be raised during the seminar itself, NDI organized a three-hour roundtable discussion on the role and functioning of the National Assembly in the CAR. Another reason for organizing the roundtable was to initiate debate between civic activists and other political critics, and Centrafrican deputies on how the national assembly has conducted its business since the election of October 1993. Invited to the roundtable were representatives from over 15 civic organizations, three trade unions, leaders from each of the parliamentary groups of the C.A.R legislature and journalists of the local media. Christopher Fomunyoh moderated the discussion and the international trainers served as one of the panels.

After opening the session with a series of thought provoking questions on how the participants perceived the role of the legislators, the moderator let the Centraficans dominate the discussions , talking back and forth with only minute and occasional intervention from the international faculty. One of the issues that surfaced in a glaring manner was the lack of appreciation or understanding between civic groups and deputies of the other's role. Representatives from GERDDES, the Association of Women Jurists and the Human Rights League accused the deputies, irrespective of their party, of lacking the courage to challenge the executive branch and mindlessly endorsing government bills with little debate or thought. The deputies responded that the civic groups were just repeating platitudes and had no way of knowing the reality of the situation since they rarely bothered to attend open parliamentary sessions. Other issues discussed included the reputed lack of access by minority parties to the state media outlets and the difficulties encountered by deputies trying to stay in regular contact with their constituents given the shortage of private transportation and the lack of private cars for the deputies.

Beyond the casting of blame, both civic leaders and deputies seemed misinformed about the other's proper functions in a democracy. Both groups also admitted that they had never really tried to work towards achieving a constructive, interactive relationship. Particularly in countries like the CAR where civic organizations have a degree of popular support, civic groups may be able to influence the parliament to function more effectively and more in the interest of the citizens. Parliamentarians, on the other hand, may also benefit from increased contact with civic organizations who often times have much needed information regarding the real problems of people at the local level. In the course of the discussions both sides stated that this was the first open forum in which they had the opportunity to exchange views on how the national assembly of C.A.R functioned. The participants suggested strongly that NDI consider replicating such roundtable forums of civic leaders and members of parliament in the future in an effort to facilitate the exchange of information and discussions on ways in which the two could interact and be constructive in their contribution to the consolidation of democracy.

## **B. Plenary Sessions**

During the assessment mission of July 1994 to the CAR, Congo and Gabon, the NDI delegation met with leaders of parliamentary groups or caucuses, government officials and other independent observers of political developments in these countries. In the course of the delegation's consultations with those groups several issues were identified and suggestions made regarding ways in which NDI's training program could help improve the legislators' understanding of their functions and responsibilities in a democratic society. Useful information gathered during that process was incorporated into the agenda and a concerted effort was made to address most of these themes during the seminar. They included:

- the relationship between the state and the ruling party;
- access to information by deputies and the necessity for the public to be informed about the functioning of parliament or the interaction between deputies and the media;

- the role of political parties in the democratic process and, in particular, the relationship between the allegiance of deputies to the legislature as an institution and loyalty to their respective party hierarchies.
- inter-parliamentary group relations and the role and contribution of parliamentary opposition
- how to nurture democratic culture in the sub-region and consolidate the gains made so far within the context of a history of one-party authoritarian rule;

During the course of each day, two plenary sessions were held during which presentations and discussions were moderated by a panel of three: two international trainers and one lead participant. The plenary sessions were well attended and usually ran over their allotted time. Each theme was broken down into two or three sub-topics, each of which was addressed by a faculty member. After presentations by the international experts, the lead participant from NDI's parliamentary training program in Niamey focused in detail on an African country-specific case study relevant to that topic of discussion. Following presentations by the panelists, the floor was opened for questions, and all panelists were invited to contribute their comments. Unfortunately though some of the participants seemed to be most interested in using the opportunity to make long statements and pose extensive questions. (One participant in responding to the questionnaire commented that he benefitted greatly from the plenary sessions because they allowed him to practice delivering speeches to large audiences).

The plenary sessions were planned so that initial discussions would focus on general topics with a concentration on more specific topics later in the program when the participants would have attained a consistent level of attention and interest in the faculty and their presentations. NDI sent an annotated version of the agenda to the faculty in advance of their travel to C.A.R in order to enable them prepare the presentations for the seminar. The briefing material sent in advance to the trainers also included an NDI produced training manual - "Tips for Trainers".

Presentations in plenary session focused on the following five topics:

- *The Role of the Deputy within the context of the democratization process in Africa*

The presentation was led by Espada, Higgins and Cravins. Panelists discussed the deputy's role in resolving problems that arise in all democracies as well as those unique to emerging democracies like those in Africa. Panelists also discussed how MPs in emerging democracies could help by participating and shaping the public discourse on democratization in ways that could ultimately determine democracy's success or failure in a given country. The panelists emphasized that deputies need to understand that they are only in office temporarily and could lose their jobs if they did not meet the needs and demands of their constituents. Possible connections between economic development and democracy were also debated.

- *The Deputy and the democratic principle of the separation of Powers*

In a discussion led by Ganoo, Cravins and Nana Sanou, panelists discussed the conflict between the desirability of maintaining a system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative and judiciary branches of government and the difficulties of maintaining consistent policies under such a system. The need for deputies to undertake independent legislative initiatives was emphasized in this plenary. The panelists encouraged the deputies to move away from the old habits of one-party rule which manifests itself in the executive branch always dictating policy. The role of the legislature in approving and controlling government expenditures was of particular interest to delegates.

- *Legislative oversight of other branches of government (the Executive and the Judiciary).*

Led by Espada, Ganoo and Nana Sanou, this discussion was a continuation of the second plenary with a particular focus on the necessity for legislators, as representatives of the people, to check the activities of the executive and judicial officials. The panelists shared with the African participants their experiences on specific oversight mechanisms like the budget review, hearings, veto power and questioning of ministers in parliament, that they commonly use in their own legislative settings. The participants were sensitized to the fact that most of these instruments are provided for in their respective constitutions and so should be utilized by deputies without fear of reprisal by the executive branch.

- *Internal functioning of a Legislature and the role of the opposition*

Presentations were led by Espada, Higgins and Baba Moussa. During the session, panelists explored the processes and need to work constructively with other political parties in the assembly. The session dwelled extensively on various methods like special commissions and bi-partisan committees through which the contribution of all parties could be incorporated into legislative policy. The importance of legislative oversight, timely access to government briefings, and the use of parliamentary staff were also discussed. The session also examined under what circumstances parliament may have access to classified information, how deputies could verify the reliability of such information and the access deputies need to have to other independent and reliable sources of information.

- *Constituency Relations*

The final panel was comprised of Cravins, Ganoo, Higgins and Baba Moussa. All four panelists discussed the need for deputies to be involved in grassroots civic education by staying in close contact with their electors. Each panelist discussed ways in which elected officials should respond to constituent concerns, resolve constituent complaints and the need for deputies to communicate its accomplishments to the public.

### **C. Workshops and simulation exercise**

After the plenary sessions, participants were divided into four workshops. In these smaller groups of twenty seven participants each, members discussed in further detail issues raised during the plenary sessions. They also took part in a simulation exercise designed to provide a more hands-on approach to the training program. The discussions in each of the workshops were moderated by one international expert accompanied in two of the workshops by a lead participant co-moderated. This pragmatic approach to the training program turned out to be highly appreciated by the participants.

The small-group exercises revolved around the role of the legislature in the formulation of a national budget. Each group of delegates was broken down into three smaller subgroups representing the majority party, the main opposition party and a coalition of small swing parties. Groups were formed so that only in one of the workshops did one of the parties have an absolute majority. In the other workshops parties were constituted so that they needed to form coalitions in order to get a budget resolution out of the workshop.

In preparing for the simulation, a deliberate effort was made to ensure that participants who were members of the parliamentary majority in their various assemblies played the role of opposition party members and vice versa. Fact sheets providing additional details or complications were presented to team members at the end of each day in preparation for the next day's discussions. During the session's final session, each group's conclusions were presented to the plenary assembly in the form of a committee resolution.

During informal discussions with deputies after the seminar, several mentioned that the workshops were very similar to their deliberations last year over the budget. The difference, they said, was that workshops were a little more relaxed and they felt more comfortable making suggestions and contributions. This seems to be one of the great benefits of conducting a scenario exercise as part of a seminar in countries where divisive and contentious political realities can paralyze legislative procedure. Not surprisingly, each of the four workshops working with the same facts produced budget resolutions with different allocations for each of the ministerial departments. Deputies also said that they wished they had a little more time to hash out some of the arguments they were having in the workshops and at times felt pushed to reach conclusions before they were ready.

### **SEMINAR EVALUATION**

NDI had planned to monitor and evaluate the program according to established NDI self-evaluation procedures. Staff members met periodically to review the program as it progressed, collected comments and critiques from participants and faculty, and elicited feedback from other relevant individuals in the countries concerned. With the seminar now concluded, NDI would evaluate the program in its entirety and produce an analytical report which will include a review of written comments submitted by participants.

Questionnaires were handed out to the participants during the training seminar. The questions focused on the deputies' appreciation of various aspects of the program including

the preparations, logistics, agenda, methodology, the format of plenary sessions, workshops and the simulation exercise, presentations by panelists, their evaluations of the seminar as a whole and suggestions with respect to future NDI assistance and programs. The answers provided by the participants will be analyzed and incorporated into our final report on this program.

NDI also planned for a follow-up mission with the in country presence of a field representative who would solicit input from participants on the substantive aspects of the seminar. The essence was to determine those aspects of the seminar that were considered most useful by the participants. The results of the follow-up mission confirmed some of the trends found in responses to the questionnaires and provided new insights which will help NDI ameliorate its approach and methodology in future programs. (Attached are a few general remarks from the field representative)

## **General Observations**

The timing of the seminar could not have been better: the Burundians had just elected a new president and seemed to be guardedly excited about the prospects for long-term stability and peace; the Gabonese had just signed an agreement in Paris to resolve long standing disputes from the last presidential elections; and the Central Africans were beginning a new parliamentary session only two days after the end of the seminar.

It was clear that the seminar was well received and was well covered by the media. The national television news led with 20 minutes of tape of the seminar. NDI staff was also interviewed by VOA's Africa service and Radio CAR. After the seminar, local television and radio continued to devote several newscasts to the proceedings.

Perhaps the best indication of the favorable reception was that President Patassé received the NDI team for an hour to personally show his appreciation. He also requested that NDI organize similar seminars in the CAR for civic organizations. That wish was shared by deputies and members of the NGO community. Patassé's office is currently putting together a formal request for a seminar on the role of civic groups in a democracy in the post-election period. NDI also received requests from several journalists for a seminar on the role of the press in a democratic system and how to cover the legislative branch. With the concept of a free press relatively new in the CAR and with several independent publications struggling to provide an alternative voice to state media, such a seminar could be a useful contribution to the consolidation of democratic gains from 1993.

Deputies generally had favorable things to say about the international trainers and stressed how important they thought it was to gain perspectives from countries other than France. A common theme was that their system was adopted nearly wholesale from France and that some components simply did not fit. They gained from listening to and interacting with representatives from countries with different parliamentary systems. Their only regret however, was that a couple of the trainers were not more fluent in French. Cravins spoke through a translator so that was less of a problem, but it does drive home the importance of ensuring that international trainers who are selected speak fluent French.

Many of the deputies had clearly read the articles on comparative legislative systems provided in the handouts. Several said they found the articles very valuable and asked for copies to share with colleagues who did not attend the conference. Their comments are a reminder that many of the basic ideas that we take for granted are still new ideas which deputies are struggling to understand and put in practice. It is also a reminder of the scarcity of basic texts and other printed resources. Relevant books and journals are extremely difficult to come by, especially since the American Cultural Center is no longer open to the public.

The roundtable format worked well both as a vehicle for quickly getting the international trainers up-to-speed on the hot button topics likely to come up during the plenary sessions as well as a more intimate venue for exchanging ideas. Plenary sessions at times seemed too large and too formal for meaningful intellectual exchange. Many of the

same issues could be discussed more effectively at a roundtable setting if the sessions were divided permanently into the four smaller groups that were formed for the workshops. Moving more towards this format would remove some of the temptation that deputies have to give pedantic speeches on the floor.

Lastly, pulling off a seminar of this magnitude in a city with as few resources as Bangui could not have been done without an experienced logistics staff. Although sending a logistics team a week early is expensive, it is essential.

**INTER-REGIONAL SEMINAR FOR MULTIPARTY LEGISLATURES  
IN EMERGING DEMOCRACIES  
October 10 - 13, 1994**

Analysis and Evaluation of Responses to NDI Questionnaire

During the final day of the four-day seminar, a questionnaire was distributed to the 95 participating deputies for the purpose of evaluating the program. 14 questions were asked concerning different aspects of the seminar. 60 questionnaires were completed and returned. The following is an evaluation of the responses to the questionnaires. As much as possible, we have tried to quantify these responses. For example, we asked the participants to rate their overall impression of the seminar on a scale of 1 to 10. An average score of 8.56 was received with 5 being the lowest score given and 10 the highest. In order to succinctly evaluate the responses to many of the other questions of a qualitative nature, we have tended to be more general in our approach to dissimilar answers. To give a better idea of the kinds of responses given, we have attached two completed questionnaire samples to this analysis.

**Q:1 *Why do you think that you were chosen by your parliamentary group to participate in this seminar?*** (This question was asked in an attempt to gain an insight into the internal dynamics of parliamentary groups or caucuses.)

Responses included:

- the parliamentary groups to which some of the deputies belong have set up a rotational system for participation in conferences;
- choice was at the discretion of the president of the group;
- many believed they were chosen because of their relative inexperience as legislators who therefore needed to become better informed;
- others stated that they were chosen because of their current or past positions and their interest in the subject matter. For example, some participants were rapporteurs on the commission for education or were known to be effective debaters in parliament;
- personal interest was also a common response.

**Q:2 *Were you informed in advance by your parliamentary group about the objective of the seminar?*** (This was another attempt to discern the efficiency of existing channels of communication between deputies and the parliamentary leadership.)

11% of the respondents coming from outside of the CAR had not been informed by their respective parliamentary group of the objectives of the seminar. The rest of the respondents seemed to be well informed either by their parliamentary groups or by NDI.

**Q:3 *Were you satisfied with the overall preparation of the seminar?*** (A generic question posed in the early part of the evaluation before engaging the participants on specifics.)

Overwhelmingly, the seminar participants were pleased with the preparation of the seminar. A few of the deputies mentioned specific comments such as: the need to provide a

higher rate of per diem, providing a tote bag for all of the distributed materials, and printing all materials - including the NDI annual report and newsletter - in French. Some respondents had logistical problems in getting to Bangui such as hitches in the pre-payment of airline tickets.

**Q:4 *Were the distributed documents useful? Any suggestions?*** (Responses to this question could be very indicative of whether the participants took the time to read through the print materials.)

Almost all participants responded positively to the fact that printed materials were provided on the seminar topics. Only a few of the respondents stated that they did not have time to read through the material.

Suggestions centered around the need to:

- distribute documents well in advance of the corresponding plenary sessions;
- provide the presentations of the international participants in writing at the end of the seminar;
- provide biographical information on the international participants at the beginning of the seminar;
- provide more detailed documents particularly on the functioning of the judiciary in democracies and legislative oversight of that branch of government.

**Q:5 *Did you experience any difficulties during the seminar?*** (Another opportunity to elicit any critiques from the participants on aspects that would be handled better in future programs.)

41 out of the 60 respondents experienced no difficulties during the seminar. Of the respondents who did comment on experiencing difficulties, nearly all mentioned the following: Central African participants were not satisfied with the transportation to and from the conference site (their national assembly). Some of the participants had problems understanding some of the international participants due to their accents or lack of proper command of spoken French.

**Q:6 *What were you expecting from this seminar?***

Nearly all of the respondents said they hoped to acquire information on how to function more effectively, to exchange ideas and experiences and to be trained in effective legislating.

**Q:7 *What was the most enriching subject for you?*** (In addition to the detailed consultations and exchanges that go into preparing an agenda for our legislative training programs, we always try to have the participants make a judgement on the usefulness of various discussion topics.)

Approximately one-half of the respondents chose the plenary on constituency relations. About one-fourth of the respondents felt that the plenary on parliamentary oversight of the Executive and the judiciary was most interesting. The remaining one-fourth of respondents were split on several topics. They mentioned the discussion on the role of the opposition; the opening plenary on the deputy and the debate on democratization in Africa; the plenary on the separation of institutional powers; and the exercise on the hypothetical budget in the workshops as most

enriching.

**Q:8 Which subject were you least interested in?** (Responses to this question can often indicate to us any important trends in the development of democratic institutions. Certain topics that participants may have found to be most enriching in seminars held two years ago may now be found to be too elementary.)

Over half of the respondents felt that the plenary on the internal functioning of a legislature was the least profitable. Reasons given for this were that participants felt they already knew how their respective assemblies functioned. Their rules of procedure are written in their standing orders and they practice them every day.

Some respondents mentioned the separation of institutional powers, and the deputy and the debate on democratization in Africa. Participants were divided on these two subjects. Approximately the same number of participants were least interested in these subjects as were those most interested in them. This could have been a reflection of the diversity in the levels of sophistication and experience of participating deputies. There were some former ministers who are now in parliament who understood these concepts. On the other hand, some of the participants did not understand even the most basic concepts on the separation of powers.

**Q:9 What suggestions do you have on other subjects that should have been included in the agenda? Should the scope of the seminar have been narrower or wider?**

Nearly all respondents who answered the second part of the question felt that the scope of the seminar needed to be broadened. They also felt that the time allotted for discussions needed to be increased. Suggestions for other subjects of focus included:

- economic development;
- the deputy before, during and after an election;
- a comparative approach to various rules of procedure;
- the role of the deputy in his constituency vis à vis other political parties;
- tribalism and ethnicity;
- decentralization;
- comparative approach to Anglophone and Francophone legislative systems;
- constraints against democratization, the role of the Minister in Charge of Relations with the assembly;
- the bicameral legislature and the relationship between the two chambers;
- the army and emerging democracies;
- the internal functioning of the cabinet;
- visualizing important debates in parliaments of older democracies through the use of films (recommending the use of audio-visuals for future programs); and
- the press in emerging democracies.

**Q:10 *What comments do you have regarding the plenary sessions and the workshops?*** (We wanted to find out what the preference of the participants was, and also determine which pedagogical setting drew the highest level of interest and attention.)

- 37 respondents thought highly both of the plenary sessions and workshops
- 15 other respondents felt that the workshop sessions were more beneficial because of their inter-active nature

Criticisms regarding the plenaries and workshops included the fact that there was not enough time for the workshops, and the exchanges during the discussion period of the plenary sessions could have been better. Some respondents commented that the faculty should have presented more opposing view points during the plenary sessions. Again, a few commented on the need to find trainers who speak better French.

**Q:11 *Did you find the experiences of the international participants during the plenary sessions to be useful and relevant to your situation?*** (In recruiting volunteer trainers for this program we went to great lengths to make sure that all of the trainers were current or former legislators.)

- 54 of 60 respondents found the experiences of the international participants to be useful and relevant
- a few respondents felt they could have benefitted more had the internationals spoken better French
- 3 respondents felt that the experiences of the African lead trainers were more relevant than those of non-Africans, because of the differences in existing socio-economic conditions

**Q:12 *Did you have the opportunity to informally interact with other participating deputies? Did you find these exchanges useful?*** (We place great importance in all of our programs in facilitating interaction among deputies and providing the conditions under which participants can form and maintain informal networks. Such exchanges of experiences are useful in assisting countries seeking to learn from their neighbors in consolidating democratic gains.)

● 57 respondents said they had made valuable contacts with other participants and intended to maintain that network of relationships. Many respondents even cited specific examples of contacts made with deputies from other countries.

**Q:13 *Please give your overall evaluation of the seminar.*** (As mentioned in the introduction to this analysis, we have made an effort to have some quantifiable result from the seminar. This rating system may be a method that we could utilize more in evaluating specific aspects of the program.)

An average of 8.56 was given. 56 responses were taken. 4 respondents had apparently misunderstood the question. The breakdown of scores is as follows:

<u>Score</u>	1-4	5	6	7	8	9	9.5	10
<u>Frequency</u>	0	1	0	1	28	16	1	9

**Q:14 *What do you suggest as a follow-on activity for this seminar?***

- hold another seminar within one year;
- facilitate the exchange of documents among the participating parliaments (Constitutions, Rules of Procedure etc.);
- NDI should conduct an evaluation visit;
- print a brochure on the roles of parliaments;
- formulate a follow-on questionnaire for the executive branch and the judiciary;
- establish permanent contact with the participants;
- organize another seminar focusing on the judiciary; and
- set up a pan-African parliamentary institution.



**NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE  
FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

Fifth Floor 1717 Massachusetts Avenue N.W. Washington D.C. 20036 (202) 428-4136 ■ FAX (202) 949-4166  
■ E-Mail 5079049@NICMAIL.COM



Séminaire Inter-Régional Sur le Thème:  
Les Assemblées multipartites dans les démocraties naissantes

du 10 au 13 octobre 1994  
à Bangui, République Centrafricaine

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

Veuillez retourner ce questionnaire avant la fin du séminaire

## BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

1. Selon vous, quel serait l'élément qui a le plus influencé votre groupe parlementaire à vous désigner comme participant à ce séminaire?

Le séminaire se déroulant à Bangui, dans mon pays, il n'a pas été nécessaire que je fûs désigné.

2. Avez-vous été informé au préalable par votre groupe parlementaire de l'objectif du séminaire?

Oui

3. Avez-vous été satisfait de la préparation matériel du séminaire?

Très satisfait

4. Est-ce que les documents distribués étaient utiles? Avez-vous des suggestions sur d'autres documents qui auraient pu être distribués?

Les documents sont effectivement utiles. Il aurait été plus utile encore de mettre à la disposition des séminaristes la liste la gamme des services matériels que le NDI peut offrir à une Assemblée donnée. Nous entendons la formation des caches de la presse, de la documentation des archives. En outre, offrir un soutien logistique pour la mise en place d'un journal de débats parlementaires constituant un soutien appréciable à la consolidation de la démocratie. Car il faut que la population soit informée des travaux du Parlement.

5. Avez-vous rencontrés des difficultés lors de votre participation à ce séminaire? Si oui, lesquelles?

Aucune difficulté

6. Qu'attendiez-vous du séminaire avant de votre arrivée?

Je m'attendais exactement à ce que vient de faire le NDI. Mais je souhaite qu'il en fasse davantage car dans nos jeunes démocraties notre conception de la démocratie est très fragile et même fragmentaire, tributaire qu'elle est des pensées ethniques ou régionales et des clivages entre anciens et nouveaux c.à.d les partisans du régime décrié et démocratique naissant.

7. Quel est le sujet qui vous a semblé le plus enrichissant? Pourquoi?

Celui relatif au Budget. La simulation nous a permis de nous familiariser davantage avec cet aspect du travail parlementaire.

8. Quel est le sujet qui vous a semblé le moins intéressant? Pourquoi?

Le Député et la Séparation des pouvoirs: Si les rapports entre l'Exécutif et le Législatif peuvent être gérés convenablement, il n'en est pas de même avec le Judiciaire. Traiter avec le dernier revient pratiquement à réfléchir en rond, sans chance d'aboutir.

9. Avez-vous des suggestions sur d'autres sujets qui auraient dus être inclus dans le programme du séminaire? Pensez-vous que le champs de discussion aurait du être plus retreint ou élargi ?

La démocratie en Afrique est entachée de régionalisme, tribalisme et ethnicisme. Les Exécutifs ou Législatifs qui ont à cœur d'aller droit à la vraie démocratie sont confrontés à ce problème. Ils doivent "marcher comme sur des œufs" afin de ne pas réveiller ces instincts ataviques. Un travail dans ce sens est à souhaiter. Par ailleurs, le député est perçu dans nos contrées comme une sorte de "Assistance sociale", "Providence" ou autre chose dans ce sens. Une éducation de la population est nécessaire.

10. Quelle est votre appréciation des sessions plénières et des travaux en atelier?

Très bonnes

11. Lors des présentations et débats en séance plénières, avez-vous trouvés les expériences des participants internationaux utiles et pertinent à votre situation?

Oui

12. Avez-vous eu l'opportunité de nouer des contacts professionnels avec d'autres participants? Avez-vous trouvés ces échanges utiles?

oui

13. Veuillez porter ci-dessous une note de 1 à 10 sur votre évaluation générale du programme du séminaire. (La meilleure évaluation étant le 10)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (9) 10 La durée du séminaire est très courte

14. Que suggerez-vous comme suivi à ce séminaire?

Un relevé des résultats du séminaire peut être adressé et à l'Exécutif et au Judiciaire. Bien des choses ont été dites sur la tendance de l'Exécutif à releguer au dernier rang le Législatif. Il serait bon que cela soit dit. Un séminaire analogue peut être organisé à l'intention des deux pouvoirs. Enfin, un questionnaire suivi d'une rencontre de la Direction du NDI avec le Gouvernement et la Justice seraient souhaitables.

Nous vous remercions de bien vouloir apporter ci-dessous tout autre commentaire, remarque ou souhait que vous désirez exprimer.

Je remercie le NDI pour l'organisation de ce séminaire. Je souhaiterais que ce genre de rencontres et discussions soient organisées de manière périodique. Cela, allié à l'expérience sur le terrain, nous permettrait de fixer plus facilement des réflexes démocratiques. En tout état de cause, le séminaire nous sert de la route et des traditions locales qui ne sont pas précisément les bonnes - Il

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

fait entrer l'actuel

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT



**NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE  
FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

Fifth Floor 1717 Massachusetts Avenue N.W. Washington D.C. 20036 (202) 628-4150

■ FAX (202) 949-3166  
■ E-Mail 59790394@NICMAIL.COM

Séminaire Inter-Régional Sur le Thème:  
Les Assemblées multipartites dans les démocraties naissantes

du 10 au 13 octobre 1994  
à Bangui, République Centrafricaine

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Veillez retourner ce questionnaire avant la fin du séminaire



*conducting nonpartisan international programs to help maintain and strengthen democratic institutions*

**BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT**

1. Selon vous, quel serait l'élément qui a le plus influencé votre groupe parlementaire à vous désigner comme participant à ce séminaire?

Notre groupe parlementaire est en quête d'une journal  
périodiquement de ses activités, c'est la recherche de l'efficacité  
dans la société -

2. Avez-vous été informé au préalable par votre group parlementaire de l'objectif du séminaire?

Oui -

3. Avez-vous été satisfait de la preparation materiel du séminaire?

Totalement -

4. Est-ce que les documents distribués étaient utiles? Avez-vous des suggestions sur d'autres documents qui auraient pu être distribués?

Les documents distribués sont très utiles, mais nous  
avons besoin de plus de documents sur les aspects juridiques -

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

5. Avez-vous rencontrés des difficultés lors de votre participation à ce séminaire? Si oui, lesquelles?

La seule difficulté rencontrée est le manque de temps.

6. Qu'attendiez-vous du séminaire avant de votre arrivée?

recevoir une formation qui me mettrait à la hauteur de ma tâche -

7. Quel est le sujet qui vous a semblé le plus enrichissant? Pourquoi?

Le sujet qui m'a semblé le plus enrichissant est celui du Député et ses électeurs, parce que cela m'a permis de mieux saisir les obligations et les contraintes inhérentes à la fonction du Député vis-à-vis de son électeur.

8. Quel est le sujet qui vous a semblé le moins intéressant? Pourquoi?

Le Député et la représentation de pouvoirs institutionnels.

9. Avez-vous des suggestions sur d'autres sujets qui auraient dû être inclus dans le programme du séminaire? Pensez-vous que le champ de discussion aurait dû être plus restreint ou élargi?

Le champ de discussion devrait être élargi -  
à l'actualité ou les thèmes suivants sont inclus dans le programme:  
1) Les contraintes de la démocratisation. (Les institutions de la  
société mondiale) -  
2) Le rôle des Ministres chargés des relations avec les Membres.

10. Quelle est votre appréciation des sessions plénières et des travaux en atelier?

Les sessions plénières sont très enrichissantes mais  
quelques lacunes constatées dans la maîtrise du français  
par certains participants -  
Les travaux en ateliers sont encore plus intéressants -

11. Lors des présentations et débats en séance plénières, avez-vous trouvés les expériences des participants internationaux utiles et pertinentes à votre situation?

Tout pays en développement a besoin  
de l'expérience des démocrates américains pour en  
inspirer.

12. Avez-vous eu l'opportunité de nouer des contacts professionnels avec d'autres participants? Avez-vous trouvés ces échanges utiles?

Oui. Ces échanges nous permettent de mieux nous connaître sur le monde.

13. Veuillez porter ci-dessous une note de 1 à 10 sur votre évaluation générale du programme du séminaire. (La meilleure évaluation étant le 10)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8/10

14. Que suggérez-vous comme suivi à ce séminaire?

institutionnaliser ce mouvement -

Nous vous remercions de bien vouloir apporter ci-dessous tout autre commentaire, remarque ou souhait que vous désirez exprimer.

Espérons les pays participants au séminaire -

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

•••••

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

## LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

### Republique Centrafricaine

#### Mouvement pour la Liberation Centrafricain (MLPC)

AMADOU LEGGOS

ADAMOU Josaphat

ANDET Gabriel

DAMILLY MACKONDJIBE Eloi

DOKOMBO Joseph

DONDON KONAMABAYE Luc Appolinaire (President)

DOUI Nicolas

DOUNIA Gervais Joachim

GBADIN Elie

KOAZO Thomas

KOLEYA Abel

KOSSI BELLA Dennis

KPORON Jacques

LANGOU ABRAHAM Espéré

MAITART DJIM AREM

MANDABA Jean-Michel

MANGA Bernard

MARABENA MAMADOU Guy

MASSANGUEA GREBAYE

MBERIO Albert

MEIGANGA Jean Marc

MONTSOKI Faustin

MOUSSAPITI Simon

NDEBOULI Albert

NDONAM Jean

NGAKO Michel

NGAO Pierre

NGOUYOMBO Anne-Marie

NINGATA Guy

PAMBA Jean Marie

PATTASSE Lucienne

YERIMA Faustin

#### Parti Liberal Democratique (PLD)

BINGO Nicolas

DOCKO Michel

ENENZAPA Robert

GBAGUILI Polycarpe

MESSAKO Alphonse

KOMBOT NAGUEMON Nestor (President)

Mouvement de l'Evolution Sociale en Afrique Noire (MESAN)  
LAVODRAMA Prosper

Forum Civique  
MALENDOMA Timothée

Parti Republicain Centrafricain (PRC)  
RUTH ROLLAND Jeanne Marie

Independent  
N'ZANGA René Théodore

## **Gabon**

Forum Africain Pour La Reconstruction (FAR)  
1. EHYA-OBIANG Thomas

Rassemblement National des Bucherons (RNB)  
1. KOMBILA André  
2. MENGUE M'OYE Alexis (ou à défaut)  
3. NZE AKOU Yvon Lucien

Parti Gabonaise du Progrès (FGP)  
1. IBINGA NZIENGUI Anselme Cisset  
2. MACKAYAT de Setté-Cama Hubert

Parti Democratique Gabonais (PDG)  
1. MOUNDOUNGA Séraphin  
2. OKENKALI Luc  
3. ODOUNGA Faustin  
4. NKOGHE-ESSINGONE Adrien

Ministère des Relations avec des Parlements  
1. ABA NGOUA Bonjean  
**Congo**

Union pour le Renouveau Democratique (URD)  
1. KIBOZI Joseph  
2. MILONGO Jacques  
3. PEMBELLOT Lembert

Parti Congolais du Travail (PCT)  
1. OPIMBAT Léon Alfred  
2. ADOUA Théophile

Mouvance Presidentielle

1. NGANDZIAMI Maurice
2. BOUKONGOU Pierre Justin
3. KEYA-TSANGA Emile
4. LIEM Faustin
5. KEKE Robert

**Burundi**

UPRONA

1. SIBOMANA Abel
2. TUZAGI Henri
3. MBERAMIHETO Ernest

FRODEBU

1. NTAKARUTIMANA Joseph
2. NDORICIMPA Rogatien
3. NDIKUMANA Innocent
4. MANIRAMBONA Marc
5. MUKERABIROLI Josephine

**Madagascar**

1. RAKOTONIAINA Pety
2. ZAFINDRAFAOLY
3. IANONJAFY Marcellin

**DRAFT**

**INTER-REGIONAL SEMINAR ON  
MULTIPARTY NATIONAL ASSEMBLIES IN EMERGING DEMOCRACIES**

**October 10-13, 1994  
Bangui, Central African Republic**

- THURSDAY, Oct 6**      Arrival of international trainers  
(from Canada, Ireland, Mauritius, Portugal & the United States)
- FRIDAY, Oct 7**      Arrival of lead African trainers  
(from Benin, Mali & Niger)
- SATURDAY, Oct 8**      Working session with the experts and assignment of teams
- SUNDAY, Oct 9**
- Day*                      Arrival of participants from the CAR, Gabon, Congo, Brundi  
and Madagascar
- Night*                    Pre-registration of participants and informal reception at the  
Hotel du Centre
- MONDAY, October 10**
- 8:30 a.m.                Registration of Participants
- 9:00 a.m.                Opening Ceremony
- Remarks by the Central African Minister in Charge of  
Relations with Assemblies
  - Remarks by the NDI Project Director
  - Opening speech by the President of the National  
Assembly of the CAR
- 10:00 a.m.                Coffee break
- 10:30 a.m.                Plenary session--general introduction:  
**The Deputy and the Discourse on Democratization in  
Africa**

*In this plenary, we want to set the stage for the seminar by emphasizing the important*

*role of the deputy in a democracy. Rather than have an academic discussion on whether Africans should aspire to democracy as is increasingly becoming the case, we intend to focus on how elected deputies could become the flag bearers of democratization as they interact with their constituents and the populace at large; and most importantly in the way in which legislative business is conducted in the respective assemblies.*

*This plenary will focus on the visibility of the deputies to the citizens and how, particularly in new democracies, they are role models for the nation. How deputies interact with one another, with other branches of government and the transparency in which these relations are conducted are essential elements in reinforcing democratic principles and practices within the body politic of any democracy. This plenary will also discuss how MPs in emerging democracies could help by participating and shaping the public discourse on democratization in ways that could ultimately, determine democracy's success or failure in a given country.*

12:30-2:30 p.m.

Lunch

3:00-5:00 p.m.

Second plenary:

**The Deputy and the Separation of Powers:  
Relations Between the Legislative, Executive and Judiciary  
Branches of Government**

*This plenary session will focus on macro level issues and provide a general introduction of these three branches of government and how they interact in other democracies. Being able to discern the boundary lines and knowing the rights and responsibilities of each of the institutions helps ensure a healthy co-existence of political institutions and personalities.*

*We will want to emphasize in this discussion the relations between the legislative and executive branch of government and the concept of checks and balances. An issue that could be addressed during this plenary would include the necessity and significance of legislation initiated by the deputies themselves. It will be useful to discuss techniques and approaches that can make the deputies more creative and responsive to legislative initiatives rather than wait for legislation to be initiated only by the executive branch. Legislators need to move away from some of the inherent relics or habits of one party rule.*

*Issues to be discussed regarding to legislative relations with the judiciary would include a general primer on what the judiciary is and how it functions and areas in which they could be conflict of responsibilities. We will want to focus the discussion to cover what is the job of the judicial branch of government and how the deputies need to respect its independence.*

5:00-5:30 p.m.

**Introduction and summary of workshop sessions**

*The purpose of this short session is to assign each participant to the individual workshops. There will be a total of four workshop groups each consisting of about 25 participants. NDI staff with the help of international faculty will predetermine the assignment of workshops. Participants will be divided into groups taking into consideration country specific experiences and political affiliations. The objective will be to have workshops that are as representative and diverse as possible in order to encourage or stimulate an even, and healthy exchange of ideas and experiences.*

*We intend to include scenarios or hypothetical case studies in the workshop discussions. NDI has found that scenarios when properly drafted and facilitated, provide a more interactive and practical context to training sessions. The workshop sessions would begin with general overview of the preceding plenary, continue with a question and answer section and conclude with the scenario exercise.*

**TUESDAY, October 11**

9:00 a.m.

**Third plenary:  
Mechanisms for Legislative Oversight of the Executive and  
Judiciary Branches of Government**

*This plenary will be a follow up to the second plenary and will focus more deeply on the necessity for legislators, as representatives of the people, to check the activities of the executive and judicial officials.*

*The discussion during this plenary should also include specific mechanisms that are used in other democracies around the world for legislative oversight of other branches of government. While in the previous plenary we would have covered the deputy's general role and responsibility in making legislation, in this plenary we would want to cover the specific role of the deputy in regulating and influencing the activities of the other branches of government. Mechanisms to be discussed could include: budget review, hearings, access to information, veto, questioning of ministers in parliament, independent reviews of application of the law and review of appointment of justices.*

10:30 a.m.

Coffee break

11:00 a.m.

Workshops on the Separation of Power and Legislative Oversight

12:30-2:00 p.m.

Lunch

2:30-4:00 p.m.

Fourth plenary:

**The Internal Functioning of a Legislature:**

- The role of the parliamentary opposition
- Access to information and legislative procedure
- Internal organization and the utilization of support staff

*It may be useful in preparing for this plenary, to study the rules of procedure of the various participating national assemblies in order to become more familiar with how each assembly is composed and is supposed to function. These documents, along with a brief on various salient issues in the constitutions and rules of procedure of the countries involved, will be included in your briefing book.*

*Each of the topics to be addressed during this plenary are commonly problematic for many new democracies in Africa. For example, the role of the opposition is seldom clearly understood. Many parliamentary groups in the opposition often do not know how they may influence legislation or that they have any power at all. There still is a tendency in some circles to view politics as a zero sum game in which only the majority can play a productive role while all that the opposition does is be negative. This is something that will need to be discouraged or explained away.*

*The second topic, access to information, is often a problem in Africa where legislators are often not fully informed on certain issues and thus find it difficult to make sound legislative decisions or develop useful legislation. Having adequate access to information from governmental sources as well as from independent experts is instrumental in functioning as an effective legislature. Oftentimes, because of a lack of sufficient information and expert knowledge deputies are intimidated and tend to rely too heavily (if not exclusively) on the executive branch for legislative initiatives*

*In all of the participating national assemblies, there is a common legislative staff that may be faced with the issues of loyalty to the institution (if they are functionaries employed and paid by the executive branch) but also of non-partisanship within a multi party assembly. The staff would need to understand that it is expected to be at the disposal of both opposition and majority deputies. Since the staff must be a resource for all deputies, bringing deputies on both sides of the political divide to understand how they could better utilized the human resources at their disposal would enhance acceptability of the concept of non-partisan staff.*

4:00 p.m.

Coffee break

4:30-6:00 p.m.

Workshops on the internal functioning of a legislature

**WEDNESDAY, October 12**

9:00 a.m. **Fifth plenary:  
Constituency Servicing and Public Relations**

*In the single party state in which the participating legislators had operated previously, political activists became legislators by the whim of the party leader who in most cases had the responsibility of determining who could run for elections on the single party list. Political realities therefore dictated to whom deputies owed their allegiance. The advent of political pluralism and competitive elections now gives more voice to constituents whose demands need to be dealt with.*

*This new element has generated interest and expectations on both sides of the equation. Catering to constituents is one of the issues that deputies in most of these countries are grappling with. Different electoral systems have in some cases made the issue more complicated. Whereas in single member districts, the geo-political constituency is easy to define, that certainly is not the case where deputies are elected under a proportional representation system. Also most of the constitutions require that once elected, members serve as national deputies and not seek to defend purely parochial interests. The purpose of this session will be to help deputies sought through some of these intricacies. It will also include some discussion of ways in which deputies could get their messages out to the public that needs to be informed of what it is that they do. (NB. In our last training program in Niamey, in response to our questionnaire participants mentioned this topic as one of those in which they were most interested.)*

11:00 a.m. **Workshops on constituency servicing and public relations**

12:30-2:30 p.m. **Lunch**

3:00 p.m. **Planning for parliamentary projects for the future**

*This will be a brainstorming session in which deputies will be encouraged to discuss some of their own ideas about what they plan to embark upon or to achieve in their respective assemblies in the near future. The objective of this session will be to gauge the motivation level of participants in revisiting some of the issues raised during the seminar when they return to their respective assemblies. It will also be useful in giving NDI ideas on how to better organize the follow-up program.*

4:30-6:00 p.m. **Preparation of reports from workshops**

**THURSDAY, October 13**

8:00 a.m.

Last plenary session:

**Presentation of the Reports from the Workshops**

9:00-9:15 a.m.

Collect evaluation forms

9:15-10:00 a.m.

Closing Ceremony

- Brief remarks by NDI
- Closing remarks by President of the National Assembly of the Central Africa Republic.



## Pouvoirs et le Contrôle Parlementaire

- 12h:30 - 14h:00 Dejeuner (A l'Hotel du Centre)
- 14h:30 - 16h:00 **Quatrième plénière: Le fonctionnement interne d'une  
Legislature:**
- le rôle de l'opposition parlementaire
  - l'accès à l'information et la procedure  
legislative
  - l'organisation interne et l'utilisation du  
personnel de soutien (technique)
- (conférenciers: Isabel Espada, Jim Higgins  
+ Ramatou Baba Moussa)
- 16h:00 Pause Café
- 16h:30 - 18h Travaux en Ateliers sur le fonctionnement interne  
d'une legislature

## **MERCREDI, 12 Octobre**

- 9h:00 Cinquième plénière: **Le Député et ses  
Electeurs**  
(conférenciers: Don Cravins, Alan Ganoo, Jim  
Higgins + Ramatou Baba Moussa)
- 11h:00 Travaux en ateliers sur le député et ses électeurs et les  
Relations Publiques ( i.e. media)
- 12h:30 - 14h:30 Dejeuner (A l'Hotel du Centre)
- 15h:00 Définition ou identification des  
projets/propositions parlementaires pour l'avenir
- 16h:30 - 18h:00 Rédaction de compte rendu des ateliers
- 18h:30 Réception à l'Assemblée Nationale

## **JEUDI, 13 Octobre**

- 8h:30 Dernière séance plénière: **Présentation de  
compte rendu des ateliers**
- 9h:00 - 9h:15 Evaluation et Propositions
- 9h:15 - 10h:00 Arrivée des Invités et Cérémonie de clôture

SEMINAIRE INTER-REGIONAL SUR :  
LES ASSEMBLEES MULTIPARTITES DANS LES DEMOCRATIES NAISSANTES

BANGUI, DU 10 AU 13 OCTOBRE 1994

---

---

SIMULATION / CAS PRATIQUE / BANGUI SCENARIO

LUNDI - MIDI

-----

Vous êtes membre de l'Assemblée Nationale du FIFAN. Le pays sort d'une décennie de difficultés économiques et politiques. Votre Assemblée est le premier parlement démocratiquement élu depuis l'accession du FIFAN à l'indépendance en 1983. L'Assemblée compte 108 députés. La composition des parties politiques représentés à l'Assemblée Nationale figure à l'annexe I.

Au cours de la première session parlementaire fut adopté le règlement de l'Assemblée, qui est identique à celui du parlement auxquels vous appartenez. Le bureau et les autres organes de l'Assemblée furent également mis en place. Cette deuxième session parlementaire sera essentiellement consacrée à l'examen du projet de budget.

Chaque groupe de 27 participants jouera le rôle de la commission des Finances. L'objectif de cet exercice est d'aboutir au niveau de chaque commission à l'adoption d'une résolution sur le projet de budget.

Lors de la reprise des travaux de l'Assemblée jeudi matin, les résolutions émanant de votre commission (majorité et opposition) seront soumises à un vote en séance plénière. Le budget issu du scrutin public, ainsi que les votes exprimés seront rendus publics.

Le gouvernement du FIFAN, suivant les prescriptions de la loi, a transmis au parlement le projet de budget pour l'année 1994-1995 qui commence au 1er Novembre 1994. Le texte du projet est joint en annexe II. La loi exige également que le budget soit adopté par l'Assemblée et promulgué sous forme de loi avant le 31 octobre 1994. Il vous est demandé de vous faire une opinion sur le projet de budget et sur la conduite à tenir, en tant que membre influent du parlement.

En tant que BLEU, vous êtes membre de la majorité parlementaire qui se trouve être issue du parti au pouvoir. Au cours de la réunion du comité directeur du parti qui a eu lieu ce matin, le représentant personnel du chef de l'Etat vous a fait part du vif désir de ce dernier de voir le budget adopté en l'état. Ceci ne correspond pas à votre conviction personnelle et ne reflète par la tournure prise par les débats au sein de l'Assemblée. La composition de votre commission de 27 membres en termes d'appartenance partisane vous obligera selon toute vraisemblance à rechercher le soutien de membres de la minorité parlementaire en vue de l'adoption de votre résolution en commission, puis en séance plénière.

Les participants sont invités à réfléchir entre autres sur les thèmes suivants :

\*\*\* En tant que membre du bureau de votre groupe parlementaire, quels moyens utiliserez-vous pour maintenir la cohésion et l'unité du groupe, étant donné que certains membres éprouvent de sérieuses réserves quant à l'adoption du projet de budget?

Quelles démarches allez-vous entreprendre en direction de l'opposition en vue d'obtenir le nombre de voix supplémentaires dont vous pourriez avoir besoin ? Comment maintiendrez-vous le contact avec l'exécutif pendant le déroulement des négociations à l'Assemblée ?

Vous vous rendez compte qu'il reste seulement 20 jours avant la clôture de la session parlementaire. D'où l'impossibilité de procéder à l'audition de toutes les personnes que vous auriez souhaité entendre.

\*\*\* Si vous ne pouviez procéder qu'à l'audition d'un seul ministre, lequel choisiriez - vous ? Les auditions sur le projet de budget seront-elles entièrement ouvertes au public ? Si oui, quels moyens utiliserez-vous pour éviter la divulgation d'informations touchant à la sécurité de l'Etat ? Si non, comment allez-vous assurer la conservation du résumé des débats ? Qu'en ferez-vous par la suite ?

En tant que **NON BLEU**, vous êtes membre de la minorité parlementaire. Votre groupe parlementaire exprime généralement le point de vue de l'opposition mais la structure de vote varie d'un groupe à l'autre.

Les **ROUGES** s'opposent de manière tranchée aux **BLEU** sur la plupart des questions.

La position des **JAUNES**, des **BLANCS**, et des **VERTS** est plus fluctuante car ils rejoignent parfois la position des **BLEUS** et des **ROUGES** selon la nature des points en discussion. Parfois, au sein même des **JAUNES**, des **BLANCS** et des **VERTS**, les votes ne sont pas homogènes.

Les membres des 3 groupes suivants : **JAUNE**, **BLANC**, et **VERT** font preuve de beaucoup d'objectivité à l'occasion des différents votes. Avant de se prononcer dans un sens ou dans l'autre, ils font appel à des critères objectifs et à une analyse approfondie des faits.

Vous avez procédé à un examen soutenu du projet de budget et vous vous êtes fait une opinion ferme sur certains de ses aspects. Vous devez exprimer vos points de vue pendant les débats. Vous devez également penser à des propositions alternatives car la loi vous permet d'introduire votre propre proposition du budget. Comment allez-vous maintenir la cohésion de votre groupe et quelle initiative allez-vous entreprendre en direction des **NON-BLEU** en vue d'élaborer tous ensemble une proposition alternative de budget ?

Alors qu'ils restent seulement 20 jours pour la clôture de la session parlementaire, il est décidé de procéder à des auditions ; mais compte tenu des contraintes de temps, vous ne serez pas en mesure d'entendre toutes les personnes que vous auriez voulu convoquer devant la commission.

S'il vous était demandé de proposer un seul ministre pour une audition devant la commission, lequel choisiriez-vous ? Exigerez-vous que toutes les auditions relatives au budget soient publiques ? Si oui, quelles mesures prendriez-vous pour éviter la divulgation d'informations sensibles touchant la sécurité de l'Etat ? Si non, comment conserverez-vous les traces des débats ? Que ferez-vous par la suite, des documents retraçant les débats ?

Au cours de ses auditions, la commission a pu trouver du temps pour entendre plus d'un ministre. Ainsi le Ministre de la Défense a été invité à fournir à la commission des éclaircissements sur le projet de budget de son département ministériel. Il vient accompagné du chef d'Etat Major et d'un collaborateur et ils font un exposé impressionnant et détaillé sur les forces armées du FIFAN et leurs projets stratégiques à court, moyen et long terme. Dans leur effort de persuasion, le ministre et le chef d'Etat-Major divulguent des informations et des documents très secrets.

Le second ministre à être entendu par la commission fut celui de la Justice, qui vint accompagné de deux magistrats, l'un étant le procureur général auprès de la Cour Suprême, l'autre, un magistrat en fonction au Ministère de la Justice. En sortant de la salle de commission à l'issue de leur audition, les magistrats emportent par inadvertance des documents laissés par la délégation du Ministère de la Défense. Le soir même, au cours d'une réception restreinte donnée à l'occasion de l'admission à la retraite du Président de la Cour Suprême, les deux magistrats laissent filtrer certaines des informations secrètes dont ils ont eu connaissance. Vous êtes informé de la fuite par un des vos voisins dont la belle soeur est magistrat. Au cours des investigations que vous avez entreprises pour évaluer l'étendue de la fuite, vous tombez sur ce qui constitue à vos yeux des preuves de corruption et de chantage au sein de l'appareil judiciaire, pendant les dix années de régime autocratique et non démocratique.

\*\*\*\* Qu'allez-vous faire ? D'abord, au sujet des fuites, puis en ce qui concerne les présomptions de corruption et de chantage ? Quelles dispositions prendrez-vous afin de vous assurer que vos actions ne nuiront pas à l'indépendance de l'autorité judiciaire et au fait que les magistrats sont nommés par le Président de la République.

\*\*\*\* Que feriez-vous si vous découvriez, à travers vos propres investigations ou à la suite d'un témoignage que le Ministre de la Défense et le chef d'Etat-Major ont de manière délibérée exagéré certains faits dans le but d'obtenir des crédits supplémentaires pour le département de la Défense ? Votre réaction face à chacune de ces deux situations sera-t-elle différente ou les traiteriez-vous de la même manière ?

Vous venez juste de terminer l'analyse des questions qui vous ont été soumises aujourd'hui, et vous vous apprêtez à reprendre l'examen du projet de budget. Votre oncle qui vit en province vient vous rendre visite et vous informe de ce qui suit :

- Dans votre **circonscription électorale**, de nombreuses personnes ont appris le problème qui a surgi avec le corps judiciaire et leurs versions de ce qui s'est réellement passé ainsi que les implications politiques sont très variables.
  - Les deux **établissements secondaires** de votre circonscription projettent une grève dans les deux semaines qui suivront le vote du budget parce qu'ils ont appris que le Ministère de l'Éducation n'a reçu que de maigres ressources au titre des propositions gouvernementales. Compte tenu du fait que ces deux établissements sont les plus anciens du pays, il est à craindre qu'une grève qui y serait initiée ne s'étende rapidement aux autres collèges du pays.
  - Le **personnel hospitalier** brandit les mêmes menaces. De même, les **agriculteurs** et les **éleveurs** qui connaissent d'énormes difficultés du fait de la sécheresse qui a sévi l'année précédente, sont mécontents en raison de ce qu'ils considèrent comme une incapacité du gouvernement à leur venir en aide. En réalité, le problème à leur niveau est lié en partie à leur **méconnaissance de la procédure budgétaire**, la prétendue "dispute" entre **parlementaires et magistrats** ajoutant à leur confusion. Une de ces trois catégories sociales au moins a voté en votre faveur lors des dernières élections.
- \*\*\* Comment allez-vous gérer les relations avec ces différentes catégories d'électeurs pendant que l'examen du projet de budget se poursuit à l'Assemblée ?

Comment allez-vous concilier les intérêts apparemment contradictoires de vos électeurs, de la direction de votre parti, et vos convictions personnelles ? Comment allez-vous prendre en compte tous ces éléments dans la décision que vous prendrez à propos du projet du budget :

- \*\*\* Comment auriez-vous réagi si toutes ces questions vous avaient été posées par un journaliste des médias privés ?

Est-ce que cela ferait une différence s'il (elle) exerçait dans les Médias publics ? Et si non journal soutient sans équivoque l'opposition ?

**FIN DE L'EXERCICE : MERCREDI - MIDI**

Votre commission des Finances dispose maintenant de quelques minutes pour mettre au point une résolution sur le projet de budget qui doit être présentée aux 108 participants à ce séminaire qui constituent pour les besoins de la simulation l'assemblée du FIFAN.

Le temps consacré au débat étant limité, votre groupe parlementaire aura besoin d'un délégué qui prendra la parole pendant 5 minutes pour faire un résumé de différents points de vue émis sur chacune des questions soulevés pendant les débats en ateliers.

Vous aurez 15mn pour essayer de trouver des alliés au sein des deux autres groupes pour soutenir votre proposition de budget. Plus tôt vous parviendrez à former une coalition, plus nombreux seront les autres membres qui supporteront votre proposition de loi, et plus grandes seront vos chances de voir le projet obtenir la majorité requise pour son adoption.

Le vote aura lieu en séance plénière et les résultats seront publiés.

**Tout le peuple du FIFANAIS vous attend \*\*\*\*\* c'est l'heure de la vérité.**

**ANNEXE 1 : LES PARTIS POLITIQUES DE LA REPUBLIC DE FIFAN.**

Il y a cinq partis politiques représentés au sein de l'Assemblée Nationale de FIFAN, tous nouvellement legalisés. Les différents groupes parlementaires composés des députés de chacun des partis sont:

-les BLEUS, les ROUGES, les BLANCS, les JAUNES et les VERTS.

La repartition des députés par groupes parlementaires au sein des ATELIERS est la suivante:

**ATELIER A: 2 PARTIS:**

LES BLEUS 14 DEPUTES  
LES ROUGES 13 DEPUTES

**ATELIER B: 3 PARTIS:**

LES BLEUS 10 DEPUTES  
LES ROUGES 9 DEPUTES  
LES BLANCS 8 DEPUTES

**ATELIER C: 4 PARTIS:**

LES BLEUS 9 DEPUTES  
LES ROUGES 8 DEPUTES  
LES BLANCS 7 DEPUTES  
LES JAUNES 3 DEPUTES

**ATELIER D: 5 PARTIS:**

LES BLEUS 9 DEPUTES  
LES ROUGES 6 DEPUTES  
LES BLANCS 5 DEPUTES  
LES JAUNES 4 DEPUTES  
LES VERTS 3 DEPUTES

ANNEXE II. : PROJET DE BUDGET SOUMIS PAR LE GOUVERNEMENT DU FIFAN  
A L'ASSEMBLÉE NATIONALE EN FONCTION DES PREVISIONS DE RECETTES.

DEFENCE	17 %
AFFAIRES ETRANGERES	14 %
PRESIDENCE	13 %
INTERIEUR ET SÉCURITÉ	9 %
FONCTION PUBLIQUE	8 %
PLAN, COMMERCE ET INDUSTRIE, TOURISME ET CULTURE	7 %
PRIMATURE	6 %
ASSEMBLEES ET INSTITUTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES	5 %
SANTE PUBLIQUE ET POPULATION	5 %
EDUCATION NATIONALE	5 %
TRANSPORT, COMMUNICATIONS ET SPORTS	4 %
AGRICULTURE ET RESSOURCES ANIMALES	4 %
CONDITION FEMININE ET AFFAIRES SOCIALES	3 %
JUSTICE	2 %

# RAPPORT DE L'ATELIER C

**Encadreurs :**

**MM. - Jim HIGGINS**

**Mme - KANE NANA SANOU**