



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Freedom of information (<i>continued</i>): (a) Problems of freedom of information, including the study of the draft convention on freedom of information (A/AC.42/7, A/2172, chapter V, section VI, A/2181, A/C.3/L.239, A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.243, A/C.3/L.244, A/C.3/L.257/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.262, A/C.3/L.263/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.265/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.266, A/C.3/L.281) (<i>continued</i>)	115
Tribute to the representative of Chile	120

Chairman: Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

Freedom of information (*continued*): (a) Problems of freedom of information, including the study of the draft convention on freedom of information (A/AC.42/7, A/2172, chapter V, section VI, A/2181, A/C.3/L.239, A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.243, A/C.3/L.244, A/C.3/L.257/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.262, A/C.3/L.263/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.265/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.266, A/C.3/L.281) (*continued*)

[Item 29 (a)]*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY AUSTRALIA, BELGIUM, DENMARK, GREECE, LEBANON, NETHERLANDS, NORWAY, PHILIPPINES AND SWEDEN (A/C.3/L.265/Rev.1) (*concluded*)

1. Mr. AZMI (Egypt), explaining his vote on the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.265/Rev.1), said that the apparently illogical position he had taken in abstaining on the paragraphs dealing with the Rapporteur's report while voting for the draft resolution as a whole had been due to the fact that in the Economic and Social Council his delegation had opposed the proposal to appoint the Rapporteur, but at the same time it was deeply interested in the protection of freedom of information and wished it to remain on the agenda of the Council and of the General Assembly.

2. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that she had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole, since certain vital amendments had been rejected. The question whether the completion of the draft convention on freedom of information depended upon the submission of the Rapporteur's report still remained unsettled; the Lebanese representative had stated that it was not so dependent. If other delegations agreed with him, the

Iraqi delegation might withdraw its abstention and vote in favour of the draft resolution.

3. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) explained that he had voted against the draft resolution because, as he had repeatedly stated, he had expected that some practical steps would be taken at the current session with regard to the draft convention on freedom of information; none had however been taken. The draft resolution had been a step backward, not an advance.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY HONDURAS (A/C.3/L.257/Rev.2)

4. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to take action on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Honduras (A/C.3/L.257/Rev.2).

5. Mr. WECKMAN (Mexico) feared that the discussion of an annual report on freedom of information on the basis of data supplied by national and international information organizations would simply lead to further protracted debates in the United Nations.

6. Accordingly although he favoured the principle embodied in the Honduran draft resolution, he would abstain in the vote on it.

7. Mr. HESSEL (France) agreed. He urged the Honduran representative to withdraw the draft resolution; the Rapporteur would certainly bear its substance in mind when continuing the work entrusted to him by the Economic and Social Council.

8. Mr. MANI (India) said that the draft resolution appeared to restrict the invitation to be issued by the Secretariat solely to national and international information organizations; but such organizations did not exist in many countries, and, accordingly, the Secretariat would have to apply to governments for the information.

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

9. He therefore proposed (A/C.3/L.283) that in the draft resolution the words "supplied to the Secretariat at its invitation, by national and international information enterprises," should be replaced by the following: "which the Secretary-General may collect on the subject from various sources,".

10. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) accepted that amendment.

11. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Secretariat would have to know from what sources it was to collect the relevant information.

12. Mr. MANI (India) acknowledged that difficulty, but said he had hoped that the Secretariat would take the discussion as a guide. Obviously the only competent sources would be the professional organizations and the governments. He had thought it better to use general language in the text itself.

13. Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America) wondered whether it would be wise to ask for annual reports on the subject, since expenses would inevitably accumulate, and the whole subject was somewhat nebulous and likely to be controversial. If accused of suppressing freedom of information, some countries would wish to justify, from their own point of view, the suppressive measures of which they were accused. Furthermore, the Rapporteur had already been authorized to cover similar ground, and his report would be ready shortly. The Committee should await that report and the Rapporteur's recommendations before it took any further action.

14. Mr. AGUIRRE (Uruguay) thought that the information to be gathered under the Honduran draft resolution, if it was adopted, would be of value, but wondered whether it would not be wiser to await the Rapporteur's report, particularly since the Committee had at the previous meeting adopted a draft resolution (A/C.3/L.265/Rev.1) dealing with that report.

15. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) said that the annual reports referred to in the Honduran draft resolution should not be confused with the Rapporteur's report, which would deal only with the subject of freedom of information in general and the organization of future work in that field. Moreover, the wording proposed by the Indian representative and accepted by the Honduran representative was so vague that it might permit individuals to supply irresponsible information.

16. Replying to Mr. KHALATBARY (Iran), Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) said that the annual reports were intended to help the practical work of the United Nations in the matter of freedom of information by giving the General Assembly a picture from year to year of the progress or regression of that freedom in all the countries surveyed.

17. Mr. KHALATBARY (Iran) said that, if the purpose of the draft resolution was practical, not academic, he would support it.

18. Replying to Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon), Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) said that the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, at its fourth session, had recommended (E/2190, para. 31) that the Economic and Social Council should request the Secretary-General to include a special section dealing with freedom of information in the *Year-*

book on Human Rights. The Council had not, at its eleventh session, accepted that recommendation but, in its resolution 306 F (XI), had requested the Secretary-General to continue to approach governments with a view to obtaining regularly from them information on new legislative and administrative measures adopted and also to obtain any relevant reports or surveys from enterprises or associations, in accordance with Council resolution 240 B (IX). The Secretary-General had received only one report from an information enterprise, the Associated Press, and so had not been able to circulate an analysis of the replies; but it had distributed the one reply it had received.

19. The Committee should bear in mind that the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/C.3/L.272) on the financial implications of the Honduran draft resolution could not apply to it in its amended form. Originally, the Secretariat had been asked merely to compile reports received from information agencies; the amended draft resolution would place a much greater burden on the Secretary-General, who would have to make a full report on the basis of reports received from a variety of sources.

20. Mr. HUNEIDI (Syria) thought the method of annual reports might be satisfactory, but in the instance under discussion they might duplicate the Rapporteur's work. The Honduran proposal, moreover, was premature, since the Committee had rejected (430th meeting) the proposal (A/C.3/L.256) that it should immediately embark upon a detailed consideration of the draft convention on freedom of information—yet it was hard to see what progress could be made until the convention was signed and put into effect.

21. He would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Honduras.

22. Mr. MANI (India) said that he did not think that the financial implications of the amended proposal would be excessive.

23. Publication of such reports by the United Nations would be worth while because few countries would wish to see themselves placed in an unfavourable light and might thus be deterred from restricting freedom of information. The draft resolution might perhaps be expanded to include references to action by the Economic and Social Council and to the proposals, still to be discussed, concerning technical assistance in connexion with freedom of information.

24. Mr. TSAO (China) feared that the Secretary-General would find it embarrassing to select material from the variety of sources referred to in the amended proposal. Furthermore, governments would be given no opportunity to express their views and to explain the problems which had given rise to allegedly repressive legislation.

25. He could not support the Honduran draft resolution.

26. Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom) agreed with the views of the United States representative. Under Council resolution 442 C (XIV), the Rapporteur would be preparing what amounted to an annual report. His substantive report covering major contemporary problems and developments in the field of freedom of information would make any additional report on the

subject superfluous. To recommend that an annual report should be drafted was only too often a way of avoiding work in committee, and such reports were rarely read. It behoved the Press itself to produce such reports; if some countries lacked the means to do so, it was unlikely that they could supply any useful information for an annual report. The financial implications, furthermore, were too indefinite and might lead to a request for increased staff to cope with the inevitable pressure of work. On the other hand, occasional reports would be not only useful but essential.

27. She would vote against the Honduran draft resolution.

28. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) said that experience had shown that the sending of questionnaires regarding freedom of information had not produced very successful results; only one reply had been received, although some five hundred professional organizations had been consulted. Any information received, moreover, was not likely to be very reliable, as governments tended to minimize facts unfavourable to them and to magnify those that were favourable.

29. The Honduran draft resolution as amended would place a tremendous burden on the Secretary-General, particularly if all the governments and professional organizations replied to his invitation. The task of analysing them for a report would not only be onerous, but would entail the exercise of more discretion than he could properly be asked to exercise. On the other hand, conscious of his international responsibilities, he might be tempted to be too cautious and thus impair the usefulness of the report.

30. Furthermore, the Rapporteur had already circularized some five hundred professional organizations with encouraging results. He had requested factual data concerning actual conditions, as well as an account of legislative and administrative measures. A similar request from the Secretary-General would undoubtedly annoy the recipients, who would assume that there had been duplication.

31. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization had been gathering similar data in closely related fields for several years. Its findings were easily available in published form. There again, duplication should be avoided.

32. The Honduran representative would accordingly be well advised not to press his proposal at that stage. He might reintroduce it after the Rapporteur had presented his report to the Economic and Social Council and the future work of the United Nations in the matter had been better organized. The Council itself might conclude that annual reports similar to that of the Rapporteur would be desirable.

33. Mr. DUNLOP (New Zealand) said that there was a limit to the number of reports which the Secretariat could prepare. He therefore hoped that, in view of the opinions expressed in the Committee on the questions of overlapping, of the pressure that might be exercised on possible sources of information and of the poor results of earlier questionnaires, the Honduran delegation would withdraw its draft resolution.

34. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) pointed out that two objections had been raised to his draft resolution.

35. The first consideration was economic and such considerations should properly be dealt with in the Fifth Committee. There was a tendency in the United Nations to object to the publication of reports because of their financial implication; that tendency had been especially manifest with regard to the use of Spanish as a working language. Nevertheless, that argument had not been used in the case of certain other resolutions, such as the draft resolution submitted by El Salvador and Guatemala (A/C.3/L.281), the financial implications of which were similar to those of the Honduran draft resolution.

36. His delegation had no intention of requesting a voluminous report or of giving rise to criticism of the news services of any Member States, but thought that information on laws governing the free expression of opinion might be useful. The original reference in the draft resolution to national and international information organizations could apply to State or independent organizations; with the incorporation of the Indian oral amendment, however, such a report would simply constitute an account of events which had taken place with regard to freedom of information. The sources of information could be many and various. The substance of the question dealt with in the draft resolution had not yet been discussed in the Committee and he felt that it would serve as a basis for fruitful work in the future.

37. Nevertheless, in view of the opinions expressed by many representatives, he withdrew his proposal.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY AFGHANISTAN, CHILE, EGYPT, FRANCE, GUATEMALA, INDIA, LEBANON, PHILIPPINES AND YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.3/L.266)

38. The CHAIRMAN stated that the next document to be considered by the Committee was the nine-Power draft resolution on information facilities in underdeveloped regions of the world (A/C.3/L.266) and the Afghan amendment to that resolution (A/C.3/L.268/Rev.1).

39. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) pointed out that the word "based" should appear after the word "article" in his amendment (A/C.3/L.268/Rev.1).

40. Mr. HESSEL (France) proposed that the words "and should include" in the fifth paragraph of the preamble to the nine-Power draft resolution should be replaced by the word "including" since "information enterprises" already included the specified media.

41. Mr. FRONTAURA ARGANDOÑA (Bolivia) considered the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.268/Rev.1) of great importance. Any propaganda action tending to distort truth was prejudicial to the inalienable rights of all peoples, especially their economic rights, and any proposal to reduce obstacles to the impartial judgment of States and peoples should be supported. The United Nations had made efforts to create a system which would safeguard freedom of information, without supporting action by minority groups which would tend to falsify news for their own profit. If States Members of the United Nations had not considered that freedom of information was liable to lead to distortion of truth, the proposed convention on freedom of information would not have contained a special provision on the right of correction among its first provisions.

42. The right to nationalize any activities or industries serving minority or subsidiary interests was a fundamental part of the sovereignty of a State and could not be questioned even indirectly. The Bolivian delegation would support any international action which would corroborate that right and would therefore vote for the Afghan amendment, provided it referred to the sovereign right of States to nationalize any enterprise for the welfare of all peoples, in accordance with universal legal standards. Moreover, the Economic and Social Council had already stated in its report to the General Assembly that the right of peoples to self-determination should include permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources (A/2172, paragraph 551).

43. The Bolivian delegation would support the nine-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266).

44. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) hoped that the nine-Power draft resolution would enable the General Assembly to take definite steps with regard to information facilities in under-developed regions. Although it referred to modest activities, its purpose was to remove the material difficulties with which under-developed countries were faced, and that was the core of the problem. It was an amalgamation of three other resolutions, which had been achieved by the conciliatory and constructive attitude of the co-sponsors; votes for it would be evidence of that same constructive spirit, which was desirable in the Committee.

45. Mr. CASTRO (Brazil) said that he would support the nine-Power draft resolution. Abuses in respect of freedom of information arose mainly from the prevailing inequality of information media in the various countries. That position justified the attempts of the under-developed countries to protect themselves through an international convention which would defend their interests against those of the Powers which controlled information media. It was essential to prevent the defence of freedom of information from becoming a pretext for promoting abuses by the stronger parties; the democratic ideal was to establish, within the framework of the definition of the rights and duties of States, a golden mean between the two extremes of the violation of justice and the violation of freedom. In the sphere of freedom of information, that would amount to finding a formula which would harmonize freedom and justice in such a manner that freedom should not be the privilege of the strongest. That objective could be best achieved through technical assistance.

46. Mrs. HARMAN (Israel) stated that her delegation fully supported the nine-Power draft resolution.

47. It could not, however, vote for the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.268/Rev.1) because it dealt with subjects which lay beyond the scope of the question. The Third Committee was not competent to deal with matters relating to domestic jurisdiction and international agreements, especially in the form of an amendment. Her delegation was aware that the progress in the attainment of freedom of information was hampered and confused by political considerations. At the same time no discussion on freedom of information could fail to be affected by the political situation. But greater progress could be achieved if political complications were avoided as far as possible. The nine-Power draft

resolution contained constructive proposals for practical steps to be taken to achieve improvements in technical matters relating to the development of information media and it was therefore inadvisable to add to it questions which could more properly be discussed in political or economic committees.

48. Mr. FINN MOE (Norway) said that he would vote against the Afghan amendment, although he sympathized with the principle of it. The nine-Power draft resolution in its existing form was not controversial and was likely to achieve positive results; it would therefore be unwise to introduce a controversial element into it. The right to nationalize or denationalize enterprises was indeed inalienable, and as such was not a subject for an international agreement. It hardly seemed to be in the interests of those who favoured the amendment to raise doubts as to whether such action fell within the domestic competence of States. A subject more pertinent to international agreement would be compensation for expropriated owners of foreign information agencies.

49. Moreover, it was not within the Committee's competence to recommend the inclusion, in the convention, of an article based on the right of nations to nationalize information enterprises. The purpose of international agreements was that States should relinquish part of their sovereign rights; the inclusion of an article on full sovereignty therefore seemed to be contradictory.

50. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) stated that his delegation would support the nine-Power draft resolution because it seemed likely to lead to concrete results.

51. He agreed with the Norwegian representative's remarks on the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.268/Rev.1) and considered that, if any delegation felt strongly about the question of the nationalization of enterprises, it should submit a more far-reaching resolution on the matter to an organ more competent to deal with it. Moreover, the addition of such a clause might make it more difficult for delegations to support the nine-Power draft resolution.

52. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) said that, although his delegation was in sympathy with the aims of the Afghan amendment, it felt that it might lead to results which would be contrary to the spirit of the nine-Power draft resolution. From the legal point of view, the undeniable right referred to in the amendment was possessed by all countries, but fell within their domestic jurisdiction and could not, therefore, apply to international matters. In practice, steps taken to nationalize a foreign information agency might sometimes prove contrary to the principle of freedom of information and result in the setting up of "iron curtains". Although the Afghan amendment was obviously intended to eliminate the very real difficulties with which under-developed countries were faced in that connexion, it would be better to try to overcome those difficulties on the national level.

53. His delegation would vote for the nine-Power draft resolution and against the Afghan amendment.

54. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) pointed out that the French oral amendment to the nine-Power draft resolution should also apply to the Spanish text.

55. Although she agreed with other representatives that the nine-Power resolution would lead to concrete measures, she wished to stress the fact that it could not serve as a substitute for other methods recommended by the General Assembly for the promotion of freedom of information, and especially for the need for a careful study of the draft convention. She welcomed the United States representative's remark, in the general debate, that the question of technical assistance with regard to freedom of information had scarcely been broached. The United States representative had also stated that freedom of information could best be protected by increasing the volume of information; the Egyptian representative had qualified that statement by recommending an increase in the volume and an improvement in the quality of information. The latter objective might well be achieved by the nine-Power draft resolution, since it would not only promote the flow of information media from advanced to underdeveloped countries, but would also enable the underdeveloped countries to establish the equilibrium which had not previously existed for economic reasons.

56. She laid special stress on the promotion, among countries, of the exchange of information personnel, referred to in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, since such an exchange would give rise to better understanding among peoples.

57. With regard to the Afghan amendment, she recalled that her country had submitted a similar proposal for inclusion in the covenant on human rights and the proposal had been adopted. There could therefore be no doubt that Chile supported the principle of the amendment. Nevertheless, she thought that the Committee would benefit by some explanations from the Afghan representative.

58. Mr. KHALATBARY (Iran) stated that he would vote for the nine-Power draft resolution and agreed with the Chilean representative that the Afghan amendment called for some explanations by its author.

59. The Iranian delegation considered that every nation had the undeniable right to nationalize any enterprise, domestic or foreign, while recognizing the right of any such enterprise to compensation. Although he was surprised that such a widely recognized right should be the subject of a mere amendment, he would vote for the Afghan text and wished to stress the fact that, even if the amendment was rejected, such a negative vote would be considered to apply only to the amendment itself, and not to the principle involved.

60. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) wished to ask the Afghan representative to clarify two points.

61. Many delegations seemed to be under the impression that the term "foreign information enterprises" referred either to agencies with headquarters abroad staffed by nationals or to foreign agencies working in a given country and staffed by foreigners. It was essential to make it clear which enterprises were meant, since in the case of purely commercial or industrial enterprises which involved large sums of money, sovereignty over resources might be prejudiced.

62. In the second place, he wished to know whether the nationalization of foreign or national enterprises would mean that resources could be withdrawn, as a result of which direct or indirect pressure would be brought to bear on information.

In the absence of the Vice-Chairman, and at the request of the Chairman, Mrs. Figueroa (Chile) took the Chair.

63. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) stated that certain representatives seemed to be under the impression that the Afghan amendment implied a request to a United Nations organ to include an article on the right to nationalization in the convention. That impression was incorrect, since the amendment referred specifically to an article based on that undeniable right. The main arguments against the amendment had been that there was no need for an article, since the right was undeniable, and that such national rights could not be considered within the scope of international instruments.

64. That had been the first argument of the Israel representative, who had gone on to say that, in view of the existing political situation, it would be inadvisable to allow political issues to be included in instruments such as the convention on freedom of information. That argument was self-defeating, since the political situation in itself implied that the inclusion of obvious rights in international instruments would promote the securing of those rights and because it was patently impossible, in the light of the existing situation, to avoid political complications. The Israel representative had said that political and economic committees should deal with the question: those organs would undoubtedly deal with the problem when they were faced with it, but that would not mean that that aspect of freedom of information should not be dealt with in the Third Committee. His amendment did not predetermine the United Nations organ which would be concerned with the matter.

65. The Norwegian representative had alleged that the Afghan amendment was controversial and should not be introduced into a non-controversial resolution; nevertheless, it was difficult to see in what way an undeniable right could be regarded as controversial; moreover, there was no question of a detailed discussion of the principle. With regard to the argument that the question was one of domestic jurisdiction, and therefore did not fall within the purview of international instruments, he did not consider that it could be stated categorically that no matter relating to domestic jurisdiction could be the subject of an international convention. Domestic jurisdiction in most parts of the world could be improved on the basis of international agreements; otherwise, countries would be deprived of benefits they could derive from the experience of other countries. The Norwegian representative's doubts were unfounded since there could be no doubts with regard to an undeniable right.

66. The Greek representative's statement that the principle should be contained in a document of much wider scope merely served as a proof of the unreality of the objections to the amendment.

67. With regard to the Third Committee's competence to deal with the matter, he pointed out that the Third Committee was not called upon to draft an article on the nationalization of enterprises. In reply to the argument that the amendment would change the structure of the nine-Power draft resolution, he recalled that he was one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution and as such did not consider that the structure of the document would be adversely affected by his amendment.

68. In reply to the Honduran representative, he pointed out the necessity of providing protection for countries whose sovereignty over their resources was jeopardized. The contradiction alleged by the Honduran representative did not exist, since the amendment merely called for the inclusion of an article based on an undeniable right. With regard to the practical application of the amendment, he pointed out that the draft did not specify any kind of information enterprise or medium. The lack of protection of national information enterprises and national culture would be even more likely to lead to the creation of "iron curtains".

69. He was in full agreement with the Iranian representative's statement that the rejection of the amendment would not imply the rejection of the principle.

70. He reserved the right to speak again on the subject and would welcome any constructive modifications of his amendment.

Mr. Ali (Pakistan) resumed the Chair.

71. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that the Afghan representative had not replied to the points he had raised; he hoped that a reply would be forthcoming later.

72. Mrs. HARMAN (Israel) said that the Afghan representative had misunderstood her. She had said that political issues could not be avoided, but that she regretted their intrusion in connexion with a proposal of a purely technical nature.

73. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) explained that he had not wished the Afghan proposal to be broader, but had merely wondered whether the General Assembly wished to express its views on nationalization in connexion with a proposal concerning freedom of information and through the medium of the Third Committee. The right of nationalization, which had its limits, could hardly be denied, but there were more appropriate places for its discussion. Foreign information enterprises which acted in a manner detrimental to national sovereignty or culture could simply be expelled; there would be no need to raise the issue of nationalization.

74. The Afghan representative had said that his amendment fitted naturally into the framework of the joint draft resolution since he was one of the sponsors of the latter text. Mr. Lambros wondered whether that argument was tenable, and pointed out it had escaped his notice that the representative of Afghanistan was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, as it was unusual for the co-sponsor of a draft resolution to propose an amendment thereto.

75. Mr. FRONTAURA ARGANDOÑA (Bolivia) said that the Honduran representative had implied that support of the Afghan amendment might harm rather than help the right of nationalization. The Bolivian delegation wished it to be clearly understood that the nationalization of enterprises serving the interests of

small groups was an inalienable right inherent in the sovereignty of every State under its own law and under international treaty and could not even indirectly be disputed. The rejection of the Afghan proposal would not alter that position in any way. The Bolivian delegation had not wished that principle to be stated merely in connexion with information enterprises, but to extend to all the matters covered by the resolution on national self-determination adopted by the Commission on Human Rights. Indeed, the gist of that resolution might well have been incorporated in the Afghan amendment.

76. The Afghan proposal was not mandatory; it was merely an invitation to the appropriate United Nations organ to heed an historical process which could no longer be halted. That proposal should therefore be supported.

77. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) was wholly in accord with the spirit of the Bolivian representative's statement; the only difference between them was that he had been referring to nationalization in connexion with freedom of information, whereas the Bolivian representative had been speaking of economic matters in general.

Tribute to the representative of Chile

78. The CHAIRMAN regretted to announce that Mrs. Figueroa, the representative of Chile and a former Chairman of the Third Committee, had been recalled to her country and would be unable to participate in the remainder of the seventh session of the General Assembly. On behalf of the Committee, he wished to express his deep appreciation of Mrs. Figueroa's indefatigable co-operation and his regret at her departure.

79. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic), Mrs. HARMAN (Israel), Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia), Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq), Mr. LAMBROS (Greece), Mr. TASWELL (Union of South Africa), Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia), Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom), Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon), Mr. TSAO (China), Mr. HESSEL (France), Mr. AZMI (Egypt), Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America), Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) and Mr. KHALATBARY (Iran), associated themselves with the Chairman's tribute and regrets.

80. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) thanked the speakers and the entire Committee for the expression of their feelings, which she regarded as addressed to the representative of her country rather than to her personally. She pledged herself to continue to work for the equality of nations and of individuals and for the common ideal inspiring the work of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.