

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION  
*Official Records*



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 979th  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 1 December 1959,  
at 3.20 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 36:</i>	
<i>Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued):</i>	
(b) <i>Information on educational conditions;</i>	
(c) <i>Information on other conditions;</i>	
(d) <i>General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;</i>	
(e) <i>Report of the Secretary-General on new developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community;</i>	
(f) <i>Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . . .</i>	577

Chairman: Mr. L. N. PALAR (Indonesia).

**AGENDA ITEM 36**

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4081 and Add.1-4, A/4082 and Add.1-5, A/4083 and Add.1-3, A/4084 and Add.1-4, A/4085 and Add.1-4, A/4086 and Add.1-10, A/4087 and Add.1-5, A/4088 and Add.1-14, A/4089 and Add.1-5, A/4111) (continued):

- (b) Information on educational conditions (A/4111, part one, section VI, and part two; A/C.4/L.629 and Rev.1, A/C.4/L.631);
- (c) Information on other conditions (A/4111, part one, sections VII and VIII);
- (d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/4096 and Add.1, A/4111, part one, section X, A/4115, A/4226, A/4227, A/C.4/405, A/C.4/406);
- (e) Report of the Secretary-General on new developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community (A/4197 and Corr. 1);
- (f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General (A/4196 and Add.1)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.629 AND REV.1, A/C.4/L.631) (continued)

- 1. Mr. LORINC (Hungary) explained that at the 978th meeting his delegation had voted in favour of the Roma-

nian draft resolution (A/C.4/L.625) because that resolution was entirely in harmony with both the spirit and the letter of Chapter XI of the Charter, the fulfilment of which was the responsibility of his delegation as of all other delegations.

2. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) submitted a draft resolution (A/C.4/L.629) concerning equal treatment in matters relating to education in Non-Self-Governing Territories. His delegation and that of Ceylon, the co-sponsor, had felt that such a draft resolution was called for since the General Assembly had only adopted resolution 328 (IV) on the subject, and that had been at its fourth session. The basic intention of that resolution had been to obtain equal treatment in education for the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Paragraph 2 spoke of "exceptional reasons", but the sponsors of the present draft resolution did not consider that any reasons could justify separate educational facilities for different communities.

3. The third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recognized that some progress had been achieved in the matter. In including that paragraph the sponsors had had in mind particularly the progress made in higher education. They felt, however, that more must be done, particularly in the elementary and primary schools, and considered that that fact should be brought to the attention of the administering Powers and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories so that the question would be dealt with appropriately by that Committee. The language of the draft resolution was moderate and he hoped that it would receive unanimous support.

4. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) drew attention to paragraphs 34 to 37 of the report on educational conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4111, part two), which were relevant to the draft resolution. Paragraph 35 made it clear that the Committee on Information had been aware of some of the historical reasons for the present situation. With reference to paragraph 36, he said that his delegation, like most of the delegations to the Fourth Committee, was unable to endorse the continuation of separate schooling as a matter of policy. In support of the view, expressed in paragraph 37, that education on a racial basis could not be justified, the delegation of Ceylon had joined that of Ethiopia in sponsoring the draft resolution. The success of multiracial development in many Non-Self-Governing Territories augured well for the future of those Territories, and the foundation for multiracial harmony must be laid in the primary schools. His delegation considered that the Committee on Information should pay special attention to that subject.

5. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that, having regard to the terms of rule 121 of the rules of procedure, he formally dissented from a vote being taken on draft resolutions on the day on which they had been submitted.

6. Mr. ZULOAGA (Venezuela) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, he considered that it would be improved by the insertion of a preambular paragraph on the same lines as the fourth preambular paragraph of resolution 1328 (XIII), which read: "Having regard to the fundamental importance of race relations, particularly under modern conditions, for the attainment of the objectives of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations".

7. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) supported the suggestion made by the representative of Venezuela and asked that her delegation should be included as a sponsor of the draft resolution.

8. Mr. NEKLESSA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, which was in harmony with its views and with the conclusions set forth in paragraph 37 of the report on educational conditions. It was understandable that a certain time was needed to eradicate illiteracy; it was not, however, the time factor that hindered the abolition of racial discrimination but the manner in which the problem was approached. All that was required was a change in the policy of the Administering Powers.

9. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) observed that General Assembly resolution 328 (IV) contained qualifying phrases which in his delegation's view were out of place at the stage of development which had now been reached. As his delegation had stated repeatedly in the Committee on Information, there were glaring inequalities in the distribution of funds for educational purposes in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and the educational policies for the different communities were framed and put into effect by different administrative bodies. In his delegation's view those arrangements were out of date; there was no place for such disparities in Territories which were moving towards self-government.

10. Although he would vote in favour of the draft resolution, he did not consider that it went far enough and he would invite the attention of the administering Powers to the relevant chapters in the report of the Committee on Information and ask them to comply with the Committee's recommendations without delay.

11. Mr. CASTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would be glad to vote in favour of the draft resolution, for reasons similar to those which had moved the sponsors to introduce it. He assured the Indian representative that his Government would pay careful attention to the views of the Committee on Information. He did not consider that the radical change in policy called for by the Ukrainian representative would be necessary, since his Government's policy already corresponded to the principles embodied in the draft resolution.

12. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) welcomed the Liberian delegation as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution. He entirely agreed with the representatives of Venezuela and Liberia regarding the general question of racial discrimination, but pointed out that the draft resolution under discussion related only to discrimination in education. Resolution 1328 (XIII), to which the representative of Venezuela had referred, should be read in conjunction with resolution 1326 (XIII), which related to the report on social conditions in

Non-Self-Governing Territories. At its tenth session the Committee on Information, in accordance with its three-year cycle, had concentrated on educational conditions. For that reason the draft resolution referred only to racial discrimination in education.

13. In reply to the representative of India, he pointed out that paragraph 34 of the report on educational conditions (A/4111, part two), which had been unanimously adopted by the Committee on Information, mentioned encouraging trends in various Non-Self-Governing Territories in the development of inter-racial education. In view of that fact it was impossible to claim that no advance had been made since the fourth session of the General Assembly.

14. Paragraph 35 of the report referred to Territories in which advancement had been less than was desirable; it was for that reason that the sponsors had recalled General Assembly resolution 328 (IV).

15. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) pointed out that paragraph 37 of the report expressed the view that on no ground whatsoever could education on a racial basis be justified. The Indian delegation fully endorsed that opinion and would have preferred a draft resolution on those lines. Nevertheless it would vote in favour of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.629).

16. He suggested that a paragraph might be added to the draft resolution drawing the attention of the administering Powers to the observations and recommendations of the Committee on Information in part two, section IV, of its report.

17. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) emphasized that his delegation did not approve of any racial segregation whatsoever in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It considered that there should be absolutely equal treatment for all communities and it fully endorsed the conclusions of the Committee on Information.

18. His delegation would have no objection to the addition of a paragraph such as had been suggested by the Indian representative if a formal proposal was made to that effect.

19. He, too, welcomed the Liberian delegation as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution.

20. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that France had been foremost in proclaiming and putting into practice the principles embodied in the draft resolution. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, although France had no Non-Self-Governing Territories under its administration with the exception of the New Hebrides.

21. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) proposed the insertion of the following new paragraph between operative paragraphs 2 and 3:

"Endorses the view expressed by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories that on no ground whatsoever can education on a racial basis be justified."

22. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) supported that proposal.

23. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) said that his delegation would have no objection to incorporating a preambular paragraph reproducing the fourth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 1328 (XIII), as proposed by the representative of Venezuela.

He also accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of India.<sup>1/</sup>

24. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) accepted the Venezuelan amendment.

25. With regard to the Indian amendment, he wondered whether the Indian representative would be willing merely to invite the attention of the administering Powers to paragraph 37 of the report on educational conditions.

26. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) replied that he preferred his own proposal because the essential principle upheld in paragraph 37 was set forth in the first sentence, while the second sentence merely elaborated on it.

27. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that his delegation attributed great importance to the subject under discussion and would therefore support the Indian amendment, which was stronger than the addition suggested by Ceylon.

28. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that in view of the statements made by the Indian and Haitian representatives and of Ethiopia's willingness to accept the Indian amendment, he too would accept it rather than press his own suggestion.

29. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) stated that while he would not withdraw his support of the draft resolution on account of the amendment, he was not entirely satisfied with it because the first sentence of paragraph 37, when read out of context, seemed to imply that there were no conceivable circumstances in which it would be reasonable to maintain separate school systems. He thought that position was somewhat extreme and would therefore prefer that the whole of paragraph 37 should be incorporated or referred to in the draft resolution.

30. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that the United Kingdom representative's remarks prompted him to say once again that his delegation could never agree that differences of race were any justification for different educational systems. He himself had been able to observe in certain African Territories how those educational systems which were described as being for Europeans, Asians and Africans operated. The arguments adduced by certain administering Powers to explain why those systems existed were well known: it was said that the three main races were on a different social level, had different ideas of hygiene, and so on. His delegation could not accept such arguments applied on a racial basis as justification for the policy practised in the circumstances in question.

31. Mr. CLAEYS BOUUAERT (Belgium) said that his Government supported the principle underlying the draft resolution and was carrying out a policy of progressive integration of schools in the Territories which it administered. Nevertheless, he felt that the draft resolution was not in conformity with the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter and he would therefore abstain when it was put to the vote.

32. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) recalled that in his statement in the general debate on educational conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories (973rd meeting) he had emphatically endorsed the view set forth in the first sentence of paragraph 37 of the report. He would

therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution as amended by India.

33. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) said that in the view of his delegation, which was opposed to racial segregation in any form, the Indian amendment improved the text of the draft resolution, and he hoped that the administering Powers would find it possible to vote in favour of it.

34. Mr. NINCIC (Yugoslavia) expressed the view that the Indian amendment added considerably to the substance of the draft resolution in that it stated succinctly the concept on which the text as a whole was based. He was therefore whole-heartedly in sympathy with the draft resolution in its amended form.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, although rule 121 of the rules of procedure provided that in general no proposal was to be put to the vote unless copies of it had been circulated not later than the day preceding the meeting, he thought that as the Committee was behind in its work it would be justified in proceeding immediately to a vote on the revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.629/Rev.1).

*At the request of the Liberian representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Romania, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Union of South Africa, Belgium.

Present and not voting: Australia.

*The revised draft resolution was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

36. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that his non-participation in the voting had been dictated out of regard for the provisions of rule 121 of the rules of procedure.

37. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) explained that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because his delegation felt that the integration of school systems was a matter of fundamental importance. He was sorry, however, that the second sentence of paragraph 37 had not been included, because its omission might give the impression that the Committee regarded it as inappropriate, whereas he felt that it reflected careful deliberation on the part of the Subcommittee on Educational Conditions and that despite the misgivings of the Haitian representative, which he fully understood, it would not have weakened the force of the first sentence.

<sup>1/</sup>These amendments were incorporated in the revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.629/Rev.1).



38. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution concerning the dissemination of information on the United Nations in the Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/C.4/L.631).

39. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), introducing the draft resolution, observed that as the remarks he had made concerning the dissemination of information on the United Nations in the Trust Territories during the debate on the report of the Trusteeship Council (953rd meeting) were equally applicable to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, he need not dwell on the considerations which had led him to co-sponsor the present text. The fourth preambular paragraph set forth the basic principle underlying the draft resolution. The operative paragraphs spoke for themselves and he would therefore only point out that although paragraph 54 of the report (A/4111, part two), to which reference was made in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, dealt only with adult education, the sponsors hoped that the administering Powers would not confine their efforts to adults but would strive to promote knowledge of the United Nations and its activities among all sectors of the population.

40. Mr. KELLY (Australia) asked the Indian representative if he would consider amending operative paragraph 3 by adding the words "the metropolitan territories of all its Member States" after the words "dissemination of information concerning the United Nations in".

41. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that he would be willing to give sympathetic consideration to that suggestion although he could not say that he would vote in favour of it.

42. Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria) observed that the Committee on Information rightly stressed that the eradication of illiteracy was a problem of the utmost urgency in most of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Figuratively speaking, however, ignorance of the United Nations and its activities might be considered an even more serious form of illiteracy as far as the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories were concerned than the inability to read and write. Although the Secretariat's report on mass communications in the Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/AC.35/L.273) showed that in certain Territories there were facilities which to some extent provided the indigenous inhabitants with information about the United Nations, the sponsors of the draft resolution felt that a great deal more needed to be done along those lines and that it was high time that the General Assembly adopted a resolution to that effect.

43. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon), referring to the Australian representative's question, said that while there was nothing to prevent the General Assembly from requesting the Secretary-General to issue a report on the dissemination of information on the United Nations in the metropolitan territories of Member States, that was a question which would fall under item 35 of the Assembly's agenda. It had, in fact, been the subject of a report submitted to the General Assembly at its thirteenth session by the Committee of Experts on United Nations Public Information (A/3928) and of resolution 1335 (XIII). The draft resolution under discussion was based on the premise that the whole purpose of Chapter XI of the Charter was to assist the Non-Self-Governing Territories in obtaining the objectives with which the Charter was concerned. If those objectives were to be achieved by the peoples

of the Non-Self-Governing Territories it was essential that they should know what the Charter was about.

44. Mr. KELLY (Australia) pointed out that his Government had voluntarily taken part in the work of the Committee on Information. The purpose of his suggestion had been to promote discussion. The Charter imposed different kinds of obligations on different Member States, but there was no provision for the General Assembly's enforcing certain of those obligations. Chapter XI of the Charter imposed certain obligations which his country recognized, but—though many representatives appeared to ignore the fact—no United Nations machinery for enforcing those obligations existed. When in other Committees reference was made to certain obligations arising from the Charter, Member States replied that, under Article 2, paragraph 7, the United Nations was precluded from enforcing them. His position in the Fourth Committee was similar. Where the sovereignty of Australia extended to a given Territory, Article 2, paragraph 7, and Chapter XI of the Charter, in his view, safeguarded Australian sovereignty and it was not for other delegations to diminish it.

45. The Committee had embarked on a process of tearing up piecemeal the Charter and the rules of procedure and it was ignoring the fundamental legal considerations which, at the present stage of the history of international relations, made the United Nations a viable instrument of the world community. No doubt attention would be given in due course to the amendment of the Charter and perhaps to an enlargement of the area within which the United Nations might assume responsibility for enforcing certain international obligations. When that time came, his country would face those issued in a progressive manner, as it had at San Francisco in 1945; but that time had not yet come and meanwhile his delegation had no compunction in invoking rule 121 of the rules of procedure, Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, and the exact language of Chapter XI. He regretted that the sponsors were not prepared to engage in a comparative study of the dissemination of information in the metropolitan territories of Member States and in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

46. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) observed that the representative of Australia was not entitled to submit an amendment which would interfere with the rights of sovereign States. In her country, incidentally, there were centres for the dissemination of information about the United Nations.

47. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that the Committee was discussing the affairs of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, and references to Australia or to any other Member State were out of place. Article 2, paragraph 7, did not apply to the Non-Self-Governing Territories: if it did, Australia would not be submitting information about Papua. Furthermore, Article 10 provided that the General Assembly could discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the Charter.

48. The Non-Self-Governing Territories had a special place in the Charter and Chapter XI laid down several well-defined objectives in connexion with those Territories. The administering Powers were under an obligation to achieve those objectives, since they were enshrined in the Charter. To that end, it was necessary that the purposes of the United Nations should be well known in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Even

in the Trust Territories, where the United Nations had greater power, those purposes were not well known and in the Non-Self-Governing Territories they were in all probability even less known. The sponsors had sought to remedy that defect and to ensure that information regarding the United Nations was disseminated there; that was surely a desirable aim.

49. He had not wished to raise the question of sovereignty, which, according to the most recent ideas, was latent in the people and became apparent when independence was achieved. The Non-Self-Governing Territories were on the road to independence, but in the meantime the Administering Members had certain powers.

50. The draft resolution was a straightforward one and had no ulterior motives.

51. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) observed that the intentions of the sponsors were laudable; his delegation supported them and would vote in favour of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, he had one or two comments to make. It was his impression that, in the past, some attempt, inadequate though it might have been, had been made by the administering Powers to disseminate such information. Accordingly, in his view, operative paragraph 1 should be amended to read "measures for the more intensified dissemination of information". If, however, no such attempt had been made by the administering Powers, he would not press for the insertion of those words.

52. In operative paragraphs 1 and 3 the phrase "information concerning the United Nations" did not seem to be sufficiently specific if the objectives of the draft resolution were to be achieved. He would suggest that the words "concerning the principles, objectives and activities of" should be inserted between the words "concerning" and "the United Nations" in both paragraphs.

53. Reference was made in operative paragraph 2 to "the recommendations" contained in paragraph 54 of part two of the 1959 report of the Committee on Information. Paragraph 54, however, contained only one recommendation, namely, the books written in simple language on themes such as the principles and purposes of the United Nations and the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be made available to adult literates in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It was surely not the intention of the sponsors to limit the information provided to books for literate adults; that would restrict the scope of the draft resolution. There was therefore room for improvement in the wording.

54. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that there was much in what the representative of the Philippines had said. In Papua, his country had already adopted various methods of disseminating information; they were not confined to literate adults and included broadcasting on an extensive scale. The syllabus provided for the acquisition of knowledge by school children about the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System, and the public was kept informed of the current activities of the United Nations through the Press and broadcasting. An account of the many other methods used would be found in the report on the Territory submitted by his Government.<sup>2/</sup>

<sup>2/</sup>Commonwealth of Australia, Territory of Papua, Annual Report for the period 1st July, 1957, to 30th June, 1958 (Canberra, A. J. Arthur, Commonwealth Government Printer), p. 79.

55. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) pointed out that the intention of the sponsors had been that the whole gamut of information media should be covered by the draft resolution. They had purposely divided the operative part of the draft resolution—except for paragraph 3 which contained the customary request to the Secretary-General—into two parts. In operative paragraph 1, the Administering Members were requested "to adopt necessary measures for the dissemination of information": that covered all media and the sponsors were not dictating to the Administering Members which media should be used. Operative paragraph 2 drew attention to paragraph 54 of part two of the report, which dealt specifically with the dissemination of literature and contained the reference to books to be made available to adult literates. The draft resolution by no means excluded radio, films and other mass media referred to in paragraph 55 of the report.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that reference had been made to rule 121 of the rules of procedure and he wished to know the Committee's views. In the absence of any objection, he would put the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.631) to the vote.

*At the request of the Indian representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour: Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia.

Against: Belgium.

Abstaining: France, Peru, Portugal.

Present and not voting: Australia.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 67 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

57. Mr. CLAEYS BOUAERT (Belgium), explaining his vote, said that his delegation could have abstained for procedural reasons, since Chapter XI of the Charter did not provide for action of the kind contemplated. He had, however, felt constrained to vote against the draft resolution, since its operative paragraphs were impossible to put into effect in the absence of a universally accepted definition of what constituted a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.