

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

Thursday, 4 December 1958,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 35:

Freedom of information: report of the Secretary-General on consultations concerning the draft Convention on Freedom of Information (continued)

Page

333

Chairman: Mrs. Lina P. TSALDARIS (Greece).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Calamari (Panama), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 35

Freedom of information: report of the Secretary-General on consultations concerning the draft Convention on Freedom of Information (A/3868 and Add.1-7, A/C.3/L.706, A/C.3/L.706/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.707) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the meeting was supposed to be the last to be spent on agenda item 35. If the speakers on his list had not all made their statements by 5.30 p.m., he would ask the Committee whether it wished, in conformity with rule 124 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, to reconsider its decision to devote only eight meetings to the item under discussion.

2. Mr. RYAN (Australia) said the Australian delegation had during the debate on procedure expressed its view that it was absurd to vote for the immediate consideration of a draft convention on a matter which was still the subject of profound differences in opinion. The procedural proposal submitted by Liberia and the Philippines (A/C.3/L.704) had not been adopted, the vote having been equally divided; nor had the Dominican compromise proposal (897th meeting) been any more successful in reconciling the points of view, since it, too, had provided for a debate on the draft Convention at the current session; and it had been withdrawn by its sponsor. It was to save the Committee from facing a similar situation at the fourteenth session that Australia and Ireland were presenting their amendments (A/C.3/L.708) to the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.707).

3. The Australian delegation had no objection to the first two paragraphs of the preamble to the draft resolution.

4. Citing article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which the third paragraph of the preamble referred, he said that it was the words "regardless of frontiers" contained in that article that had prompted his delegation and that of Ireland to submit their amendment to the paragraph in question. Such international freedom of information was recognized by Australia; but since it continued to be one of the principal bones of contention between delegations, it was questionable whether the proposed convention

would truly promote it. In the absence of broad agreement, States would not sign such an instrument, which would then remain a dead letter. It was therefore extremely important that the convention should be generally acceptable.

5. The purpose of the amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph was to avoid any undue haste. The Australian delegation was not opposed on principle to a convention on freedom of information, but it subordinated considerations of time to considerations of effectiveness.

6. In the context of what he had said, the amendment to paragraph 1 of the operative part was self-explanatory.

7. If delegations wished to give unmistakable proof of their genuine desire to draw up a generally acceptable and thus effective instrument, they would support the amendments he had just submitted.

8. Miss MacENTEE (Ireland) said that two facts had become plain in the discussion. First, a considerable number of delegations still felt that the Committee should continue to deal with the question of the draft Convention; the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.707) was a reflection of that view. Secondly, the prospect of an immediate textual discussion of the draft had paralysed the debate; and as soon as that prospect had disappeared so far as the current session was concerned, the paralysis had ended.

9. In the circumstances, a more flexible approach would appear to be desirable. The Irish delegation had always advocated conciliation, provided that it was not bought at the price of principle. To insist on consideration of the draft Convention so long as the situation had not changed might well perpetuate the Committee's deadlock. Delegations had said all they had to say on the matter, and the time had come to concentrate on the factors that had brought about the deadlock, that is, to study conditions regarding freedom of information in the various countries, to examine more closely the ideas of Member States on the subject and to see to what extent those factors governed the attitude of each State to the possibility of a convention. Only in that way, to quote the words of the amendment co-sponsored by Ireland (A/C.3/L.708), would there be any "substantial prospect of the early conclusion of a useful instrument commanding general support". In that connexion, the replies communicated by Governments on their operative legal provisions relating to freedom of information could be highly useful, and the Irish delegation hoped that a digest of those communications would be circulated to the Governments of Member States during the coming year.

10. As an example of the issues which could be studied in more depth, she cited the question of the control of information media. It was common knowledge that there were forms of control other than governmental control, and that control in all its forms could lead to abuses;

but the question was whether the substitution of one type of control for another was the best way to avoid those abuses, and whether it would not be preferable to consider some system of intra-professional controls of the type of which the press councils and organizations of journalists existing in certain countries offered interesting examples. Those were questions on which the Committee had barely touched, and which it might discuss with great advantage. If all abuses could be eliminated in all countries, a convention would scarcely be necessary; unfortunately, however, that ideal was still distant. In the meantime, it would be dangerous to regard the existing draft Convention (A/AC.42/7, annex) as a panacea. In her view, consideration of the articles of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights relating to freedom of speech and opinion should precede any further discussion of the draft Convention itself. The Committee would then be able to attack the root of many abuses and clear away numerous misunderstandings on the issue under discussion.

11. The Irish delegation was in no way proposing the abandonment of the idea of a convention on freedom of information. It merely sought to draw attention to the obstacles in the way of drafting an effective instrument: for by endeavouring to remove those obstacles it would be possible to clear the way for the conclusion of an effective agreement.

12. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) asked whether the Committee intended to vote at the current meeting on all the drafts before it, or whether it proposed to devote any further meetings to the study of the question.

13. The CHAIRMAN said he could only leave the decision on that point to the Committee. He announced that the revised text of the United States draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.706/Rev.1) would be circulated during the meeting.

14. Mr. WISE (United States of America) explained that the purpose of draft resolution A submitted by the United States (A/C.3/L.706) was to encourage technical assistance in the field of information and to make information media available to a constantly increasing number of Member States. Draft resolution B contained recommendations, limited in scope, on action which might be taken by Member States to improve the quality of information.

15. Replying to a question asked by the Liberian representative at the 900th meeting concerning the way in which UNESCO might assist Member States desirous of building up their information media, he drew attention to his own statement at the 899th meeting, in which he had discussed at some length the work already done by UNESCO in that field.

16. He went on to offer some additional explanations regarding the proposals contained in sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of draft resolution B, which seemed to have been misunderstood.

17. With regard to sub-paragraph (a), the United Nations information programmes took two forms: publications and radio broadcasts, of which the programme "UN on the Record" was perhaps the most significant. To reach the entire world, that programme had to be relayed to, or rebroadcast in, many countries. It was an impartial report of happenings in the

Security Council, the General Assembly and the specialized agencies. He believed that world understanding would be improved if the peoples of all Member States had access to United Nations publications and the opportunity to hear United Nations broadcasts. At the current time, some seventeen Member States had no sales outlets for United Nations publications, and a number of others, for technical or policy reasons, did not receive radio broadcasts. Sub-paragraph (a) in the draft resolution was designed to remedy that situation.

18. Sub-paragraph (b) referred to United Nations information centres, which existed in only twenty-four Member States. Member States could promote the establishment of other centres and support the work of those already in existence in many ways, for instance: by giving them material and moral support in arranging commemorative events; by affording appropriate status to their international staff; by simplifying procedures for the importation of information material; by helping centres to adapt their output to local languages and customs; and by providing premises and encouraging projects directed towards schools and other sectors of the population. Showing the members of the Committee a brochure entitled *Ghana and the United Nations*, he read aloud the inscription on its back cover, which testified to the co-operation achieved between the local authorities and the United Nations services in its publication. That was a practical example of what could be done.

19. The ideas set forth in sub-paragraph (c) were simple, and his delegation understood them in the following way: in times of peace, the reporting of news should not be subject to special laws or regulations, apart from the laws of libel and slander and those dealing with public morals and welfare, which could not be taken as implying censorship in the normal meaning of the term. Limitations which the United States considered abnormal were those designed to prevent the dissemination of statements by Heads of Government or political leaders and of particular political ideas and concepts of facts relating to economic or social developments. Such restrictions did exist, and they impaired the right of peoples to know and their capacity to make independent judgements.

20. Replying to a question from the Liberian representative concerning sub-paragraph (d), he said that his delegation had had in mind, in drafting that clause, the fact that some countries found it convenient, for internal political reasons, to withhold from the world certain data of a non-security nature which were important to the joint activities of the international community. Such data were freely furnished by most countries, and were important in the studies made by the United Nations Social Commission and the Economic and Social Council in connexion with reports such as those on the world social situation and the world economic situation. Those reports were defective to the extent that certain countries had been reluctant to furnish data on such items as agricultural output, the production of non-ferrous metals, diamonds, petroleum derivatives, civil aircraft, merchant ships and chemicals, wholesale and retail prices, personal incomes and consumption patterns, and population and crime statistics. By withholding such data, Governments were making it impossible to gain a full understanding of the world economic and social situation, which was so important to all.

21. After consultation with the secretariats of the Third Committee and the Commission on Human Rights and with many delegations, the United States had decided, in a spirit of compromise, to revise its draft resolution. He presented the revised text (A/C.3/L.706/Rev.1) and hoped that it could be accepted by a large number of delegations.

22. Miss PELT (Netherlands) reaffirmed that her delegation would be the first to rejoice at a convention on freedom of information being drawn up, signed and put into effect; for it was the earnest desire of the Netherlands delegation that the full exercise of freedom of information should be enjoyed by all countries, as it was in the Netherlands. Unfortunately, however, it had become clear even at the time of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information held at Geneva in 1948 that although all delegations were striving for "freedom of information" and "freedom of expression", the meanings given to those terms varied widely and were sometimes even diametrically opposed. Despite the efforts undertaken, the points which had divided delegations in 1948 still existed. It would of course be desirable to be able to present to the world a convention acceptable to all Governments. But an article-by-article discussion of the draft Convention would serve no useful purpose unless agreement was first reached on the meaning of the principal terms used in it. A compromise convention, moreover, would do nothing to improve the existing situation. For that reason, her delegation thought that it would be better to suspend all efforts to draft an international instrument of that kind. Nevertheless, if the majority of the members of the Committee felt that such efforts should be continued, it would not stand in the way, since it was not in principle opposed to a convention.

23. A convention was not the only means of promoting and strengthening freedom of information. Her delegation, together with others, had always declared its willingness to co-operate in any practical action which would further the exercise of that fundamental freedom. The Committee might profitably consider an intensification of initiatives towards strengthening the material and cultural bases necessary for the efficient functioning and use of information media. The Commission on Human Rights and its Committee on Freedom of Information, the Economic and Social Council and UNESCO had already done highly constructive work along those lines. Her delegation would continue to support any proposal designed to assist the under-developed countries to develop their information media, for that, in its opinion, was the soundest way of making it possible for peoples everywhere to enjoy a freedom which the people of the Netherlands considered fundamental.

24. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) observed that most of the members of the Committee were agreed that a debate on a draft convention, although perhaps inappropriate at the current session, was one of the measures best suited for safeguarding and promoting freedom of information, a freedom which was the foundation of all others. His delegation would state its views later on the revised text of the United States draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.706/Rev.1). The original text of draft resolution A (A/C.3/L.706) used the same terms as resolutions 6 (XIV)^{1/} and 7 (XIV)^{2/} of the

Commission on Human Rights. Resolution 7 (XIV) provided, as did paragraph 1 of the United States text, for "constant review of problems of freedom of information". It might perhaps be useful for the General Assembly at least to express its views on the procedures by which such a review could be carried out. He raised the questions whether the Commission on Human Rights should set up a sub-commission or a sub-committee and whether the body thus established would be composed of experts, or of representatives of Governments. His delegation did not wish to put forward any proposal, but it thought that the General Assembly should try to help the Commission on Human Rights in the task which, under its resolution 7 (XIV), it was proposing to undertake at its fifteenth session. Draft resolution B was addressed to Member States only, and all the measures to which it referred would necessarily be unilateral. His delegation felt that further explanation of certain points in the text would be useful. In particular it wondered what would be the extent of the support to be given to the activities of United Nations information centres (sub-paragraph (b)) and what was the scope of the recommendations set forth in sub-paragraph (c). It also wished to know what was the difference between "freedom of the Press" (sub-paragraph (c)) and "freedom of information" (sub-paragraph (d)). Moreover, it feared that the provisions of sub-paragraph (d) might be incompatible with certain national laws relating to political matters and State security.

25. The best means of safeguarding and promoting freedom of information was to adopt a convention; and the text prepared by the fifteen-Power Committee (A/AC.42/7, annex) could serve as a basis for the discussion of such an instrument. The draft was not perfect, and his delegation itself was intending to propose certain amendments designed to improve it. But before a draft could be improved it must be examined. A debate on the draft Convention was, moreover, the only means whereby delegations could state their views, get to understand those of others and thus reach agreement. President Eisenhower himself had said at the Geneva Conference in 1955 that the barriers to the exchange of news and ideas must be removed. His delegation hoped that at its fourteenth session the General Assembly would set out to remove those barriers and, by initiating the study of the draft Convention, to translate article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into reality. All the peoples of the world were longing for freedom and peace; yet the world today was divided into two hostile camps. That division would continue, if the United Nations failed to take strong measures to combat propaganda. International understanding would be possible only if all countries were prepared to communicate with each other. They need not all hold the same view; but they must all be inspired by the same desire for peace; and given that desire they would be able, if they tried, to draft a convention on freedom of information. By forgetting that they belonged to any particular bloc and joining together to prepare an instrument of that nature, the members of the Third Committee would be bringing the world a message of reconciliation and good will.

26. Mr. SIMPSON (Liberia) regretted that the procedural motion submitted by his own delegation and that of the Philippines (A/C.3/L.704) had not been adopted. He hoped that a convention would be approved and would come into force in the near future. His Government would make known its views on the draft Convention

^{1/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 8, para. 123

^{2/} *Ibid.*, para. 130.

before the Committee before the fourteenth session of the General Assembly.

27. The Liberian Constitution guaranteed freedom of the Press and freedom of opinion and expression. Accordingly, his delegation was entirely in favour of considering the draft Convention. A discussion of the text would offer the opportunity for a fruitful interchange of opinions enabling each country to acquaint itself with the laws of the others in that field. His delegation would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.707), the purpose of which was to ensure that such a discussion would be held at the fourteenth session. He thanked the United States representative for his explanation of his draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.706); the Liberian delegation would now be able to support those texts, subject to the understanding that they would not in any way prejudice the adoption of a convention on freedom of information.

28. Mr. SUDJAHRI (Indonesia) said that freedom of information was declared in General Assembly resolution 59 (I) to be a fundamental right, and as such was incorporated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But like all other rights and freedoms, it was necessarily subject to certain limitations of a legal or moral nature. Abuses of freedom of information gave rise to tensions which endangered peace; those who controlled the media of information throughout the world should therefore take their responsibilities very seriously. The draft Convention was one of the best ways of ensuring that freedom of information should be used in a responsible and constructive way. In addition, it would guarantee freedom of expression and the free interchange of ideas, both of which were indispensable for international co-operation and understanding. His delegation was therefore disappointed that the Committee had not adopted the proposal submitted by the Philippines and Liberia. In the course of the past seven years the draft Convention on Freedom of Information had been under consideration at four sessions of the Economic and Social Council and at five sessions of the General Assembly. Thus every Member State had had time to study it in detail and to make known its views; there was no justification therefore for further delay in examining its substance. The Indonesian delegation considered that the proposed convention would facilitate the constructive application of the principle of freedom of information, and held that it was only by discussing the text before it that the Committee would be able to narrow the gap between the different viewpoints and draw up an instrument acceptable to a very large number of countries.

29. The seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.707) set forth a procedure which would guarantee freedom of information for all the peoples of the world, and he took pleasure in supporting it.

30. Information media were essential to countries like his own which were faced with the task of developing in their people a sense of civic responsibility. His delegation therefore fully appreciated the motives underlying draft resolution A submitted by the United States (A/C.3/L.706). Draft resolution B, however, dealt with only some of the problems relating to the free flow of ideas and the principle of freedom of information. The draft Convention was much more comprehensive in that respect, and would make for a much more complete solution of the problems in question.

31. Mr. ALDUNATE (Chile) said he was on the horns of a dilemma: as a journalist and parliamentarian of a democratic country in which freedom of information was a veritable religion, he found it difficult to oppose a convention on the subject. On the other hand, the draft Convention prepared by the Committee on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information (A/AC.42/7, annex) was based on entirely false premises and might well be prejudicial to the purpose which it was intended to serve. There were, however, obvious abuses which should certainly be ended by means of a reasonable system of regulation. In view of those points, and after consultation with other delegations, he felt that a certain number of changes should be made in the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.707), so as to make sure that the final decision, on such an important issue, was not voted only by a very small majority.

32. Some of the changes he had in mind were relatively minor ones. In the third preambular paragraph, he supported the insertion of the words "generally acceptable", as proposed by the Australian and Irish delegations in their amendments (A/C.3/L.708). On the other hand, he would prefer the retention of the word "can", which the same delegations wished to replace by "could", since the former was more consistent with the facts. The words "additional time" in the fourth paragraph should be replaced by "the opportunity"; in addition, the word "further" should be deleted, since it could not be logically justified. The word "final" in the fifth paragraph should be changed to "generally acceptable", as proposed in the Australian and Irish amendment.

33. With regard to operative paragraph 1, he proposed a formal amendment (A/C.3/L.710), the purpose of which was to avoid having the discussion based solely on a text the dangers of which were only too clear. The principle on which his delegation had founded its position was that smaller countries should be protected from the propaganda directed against them.

34. Mr. Chalapathi RAU (India) regretted that some speakers were seeking to set off the supporters and the opponents of a debate on the draft Convention by asserting that the former did not enjoy sufficient freedom in the field of information, and were perhaps hostile to freedom of information, while the latter were opposed to a debate because they felt that more freedom was necessary, rather than further restrictions. To present the facts in that way was unfortunate and profoundly unjust. His own country had never been afraid of the risks of freedom, as it had proved by adopting universal adult suffrage for men and women and by holding two general elections in which the entire population had taken part. It was also willing to accept all the risks involved in freedom of information, and would be only too happy to benefit in that field from the experience of others. It was for that very reason that his delegation hoped there would be a discussion of substance at the fourteenth session, during which all countries would be able to expound their views on freedom of information, to explain the provisions of their laws and constitutions and to examine the articles of a convention without any preconceived ideas, retaining the right not to ratify it if the text drafted seemed to them unsatisfactory.

35. The amendments submitted by Australia and Ireland (A/C.3/L.708) were as a whole unacceptable to

his delegation. As the representative of the Philippines had rightly pointed out, it could not be known in advance whether a convention would be "generally acceptable"; what was more, it might well be asked what "generally" meant. He could, if it was really necessary, agree to the substitution of "could" for "can" in the third preambular paragraph of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.707), since that would improve the English; on the other hand the change proposed for operative paragraph 1 was much too vague, and contrary to the very principle of the seven-Power resolution. In any event, it might be asked who would decide when there existed "a substantial prospect of the early conclusion of a useful instrument commanding general support".

36. He would not be able to give his opinion on the changes proposed by the Chilean representative (A/C.3/L.710) until he had studied them thoroughly with the six delegations which with his own had submitted the joint draft resolution.

37. Turning to the revised United States draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.706/Rev.1), he paid a tribute to the good will shown by its sponsor. Draft resolution A provided for much more concrete action by the Economic and Social Council and by UNESCO and other specialized agencies. He wished in that connexion to make it clear that in his previous statement (899th meeting) he had not intended in the least to question UNESCO or its work. He knew that the secretariat of UNESCO was always ready to carry out the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly; but its resources were limited, and its annual conference had its own ideas on the best way to use them. However that might be, technical assistance from the specialized agencies was always welcome and he had merely meant to say that it could not play the same part as a convention on freedom of information. Nor, accordingly, could draft resolution A be considered as an alternative solution. Draft resolution B dealt with matters which would be more in place in an international instrument.

38. Mr. REYES BAENA (Venezuela) felt that in explaining his delegation's attitude he should point out that at the time of the debate on procedure (898th meeting) he had abstained from voting on the Liberian-Philippine proposal (A/C.3/L.704), not because he was opposed to the idea of an article-by-article examination of the draft convention, but because he believed that the Secretary-General's report (A/3868 and Add.1-7) should be examined first. He had also voted against the Spanish proposal (A/C.3/L.705), because it did not provide explicitly enough for the consideration of the draft Convention. He would have been prepared to support the Dominican compromise proposal (897th meeting) if it had not been withdrawn, although it laid down no time limit for the consideration of the Secretary-General's report. Accordingly, the Venezuelan delegation, desiring as it did to preserve the idea of a convention on freedom of information, was prepared to support the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.707), on the understanding that it in no way committed itself to supporting the draft Convention on Freedom of Information prepared by the Committee on the draft Convention (A/AC.42/7, annex), which, in its existing form, contained some dangerous and unacceptable provisions.

39. The United States draft resolution (A/C.3/L.706/

Rev.1) was entirely consistent with the Spanish proposal (A/C.3/L.705) adopted by the Committee (898th meeting), in that it provided for measures to safeguard and to promote freedom of information. The measures it envisaged exactly reflected the wishes of the Latin American countries. His delegation would therefore vote for it.

40. He could not, on the other hand, accept the version proposed by Australia and Ireland (A/C.3/L.708) for paragraph 1 of the seven-Power draft, since it would have the effect of once again putting off the consideration of the draft Convention.

41. In his delegation's view, any international instrument in that field must be based on the premise that freedom of information was essential. There were, naturally, limits to that freedom, but such limits should conform to the particular circumstances prevailing in each country, and should be regarded as subject to change. Many nations had learned from bitter experience that the attempt to avoid abuses often resulted in an excessive curtailment of freedom of expression itself. On the other hand, freedom of expression could not be allowed to be exercised in a manner contrary to the United Nations Charter, to human rights or to the constitution and laws of each country. Slander, abuse, war propaganda or incitement to crime could not, of course, be tolerated, any more than other activities which were detrimental to good relations between peoples.

42. The main danger to freedom of information came from the improper outbursts of anti-democratic governments, the influence of commercial interests, international tensions, the incompetence of members of the Press and the irresponsibility and lack of objectivity of those who controlled the media of information. A convention on freedom of information was only one means among many of removing those dangers. For its part, the United Nations must be vigilant and must create a suitable political climate that would permit each country to institute an appropriate system of freedom of expression. Schools of journalism and professional associations also had their part to play, and it was to be hoped that they would shoulder their responsibilities, thereby influencing press agencies and other media of information. A congress of journalists held recently in Venezuela had adopted a declaration of principles based on the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and laying down standards relating to freedom of information and the exercise of the profession of journalism.

43. To avoid any ambiguity, he wished to emphasize again that although he favoured a study of the existing draft Convention, he regarded it merely as a working basis and was in no way prepared to approve it in its entirety.

44. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that as there were still several representatives on his list it did not seem possible to take a vote at the current meeting. On the other hand, the Committee had used up all the time it had allocated for consideration of agenda item 35. He therefore proposed that an additional meeting should be allotted to that item.

It was so decided.

45. Mrs. DE BARISCH (Costa Rica) said that in her country freedom of the Press and freedom of informa-

tion were the very foundations of society; every individual could express his opinion and criticize the Government without fear. The President himself would often reply to criticism from a citizen and engage in a veritable polemic with him. Furthermore, all news was published, whatever its nature or the opinions it reflected.

46. She briefly analysed the two draft resolutions before the Committee (A/C.3/L.706/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.707) and said that her delegation would vote for both of them, as the equally sincere purpose of both of them was to promote freedom of information.

47. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he found the revised text of draft resolution A submitted by the United States (A/C.3/L.706/Rev.1) fairly satisfactory, but would be unable to support it unless its sponsor agreed to incorporate two additional modifications.

48. To begin with, the first preambular paragraph was a verbatim repetition of operative paragraph 2 of resolution 6 (XIV) of the Commission on Human Rights, omitting only the words "accurate and undistorted" before news and information. The wording used by the Commission on Human Rights should, of course, have been quoted in full, or not at all. He hoped, therefore, that the United States delegation would agree to the inclusion of those words in the paragraph in question.

49. Secondly, operative paragraph 2 would require the Commission on Human Rights to report annually to the Council on progress achieved in regard to procedures by which constant review of problems of freedom of information might be assured. However, the General Assembly had, at its twelfth session, already asked the Commission on Human Rights to consider those procedures (resolution 1189 B (XII)); the Commission could therefore be expected to submit a report on the matter in the near future. It was difficult to see why it should be asked, without explanation or justification, to report annually, when it had not had an opportunity to give its views on the subject. He hoped therefore that the United States delegation would agree to delete the word "annually" from operative paragraph 2 of its draft resolution A. If it refused, he would be obliged to ask for a vote paragraph by paragraph.

50. Draft resolution B still had many defects, even in its revised form. His delegation would vote against it. It would also vote against the amendments submitted by Australia and Ireland (A/C.3/L.708) to the seven-

Power draft resolution; it entirely shared the opinions expressed on that subject by the Indian representative.

51. Miss MacENTEE (Ireland), replying to the Chilean representative, said she was prepared to retain the word "can" in the third preambular paragraph of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.707). She would be prepared to retain the whole of the original text of the fourth preambular paragraph, whether or not modified in accordance with the Chilean representative's proposal, provided that the words proposed by the Australian and Irish delegations to replace the end of the sentence, "that its text should in fact be generally acceptable to Member States", were added to it. She asked the Chilean representative to consider that suggestion and state at the next meeting whether he was prepared to accept it.

52. Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) asked that all the amendments and sub-amendments proposed should be submitted in writing.

53. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that for the reasons indicated by the Philippine and Indian representatives he would wish to know the exact meaning of the words "generally acceptable" before the vote was taken. He also hoped that the United States delegation would agree to incorporate in its draft resolution A the changes suggested by the Soviet representative. With regard to the revised text of draft resolution B, he wished to know what was meant by the "free flow of information" referred to in operative subparagraph (c).

54. Mr. KETRZYNSKI (Poland) asked the United States representative whether he would accept the changes suggested by the Soviet representative. He felt, however, that it could now be decided to accept no further amendments.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that so far as the time limit for the submission of amendments was concerned he would leave matters to the discretion of members. He felt, however, that they should submit their amendments and sub-amendments by the end of the meeting at the latest.

56. Mr. WISE (United States of America) said he could not give an immediate decision on the changes suggested by the Soviet representative. He would state his delegation's position at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.