

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

## SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 435th

MEETING

Tuesday, 4 November 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

## CONTENTS

Page

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.255/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.257/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.262, A/C.3/L.263, A/C.3/L.265, A/C.3/L.266) ( <i>continued</i> )	99
--	----

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.255/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.257/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.262, A/C.3/L.263, A/C.3/L.265, A/C.3/L.266) (*continued*)**

[Item 29 (a)]\*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (A/C.3/L.255/Rev.1) (*concluded*)

1. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation had voted for the USSR draft resolution (A/C.3/L.255/Rev.1) even in its amended form, because the Saudi Arabian (A/C.3/L.270) and Indian (A/C.3/L.269) amendments, although they had made it less effective, had not distorted its basic purpose. That purpose had been to draw the attention of all States Members of the United Nations to the fact that war propaganda had been intensified in spite of the General Assembly resolutions against it and that United Nations organs should take effective action to insure the termination of such propaganda.

2. Mr. CORDOVA (El Salvador) explained that he had abstained from voting on the Saudi Arabian and Indian amendments because, although his delegation appreciated the spirit of conciliation in which they had been submitted, the amendments were directed towards approval of a resolution which had been drafted to support USSR policy, and not for the constructive promotion of freedom of information.

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

3. Begum LIAQUAT ALI KHAN (Pakistan) had abstained from voting on the Saudi Arabian and Indian amendments because, although she agreed with their purpose of bringing the USSR resolution into line with General Assembly resolution 110 (II), she did not consider that the best method of implementing General Assembly resolutions was to multiply them.

4. Mr. DERINSU (Turkey) proposed that the nine-Power resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.265 should be considered next.

5. The CHAIRMAN put the Turkish proposal to the vote.

*The proposal was adopted by 34 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.*

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

6. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) pointed out that the nine-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.265) replaced the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.259) submitted jointly by his delegation and the delegations of Lebanon and the Philippines. Although the nine-Power draft resolution referred to the Rapporteur appointed by the Economic and Social Council, whose appointment Egypt had opposed, it was acceptable to his delegation, which had only refrained from becoming a co-sponsor in order to be able to take a more tolerant view of any amendments that might be submitted.

7. Mr. VILLAMAR (Guatemala) stated that his delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.271) had been made to the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.266, but that, since it also related to the nine-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.265), he wished it to be applied to that document and revised accordingly.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See document A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1.

8. Mrs. DOMANSKA (Poland) introduced her delegation's amendments (A/C.3/L.267). The purpose of the amendment to the first paragraph of the preamble was to clarify United Nations activities with regard to freedom of information. The second amendment, calling for the deletion of the third, fourth and fifth paragraphs of the preamble, was intended to eliminate the reference to the Rapporteur designated by the Council; the Polish delegation considered that the problem of freedom of information should be dealt with by the Commission on Human Rights, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, and that the establishment of a supplementary organ was useless. If the amendments were incorporated in the nine-Power draft resolution, it would enable the Economic and Social Council to take concrete action on the problem.

9. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) introduced the nine-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.265), which constituted a revision of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.260) and incorporated the gist of the joint draft resolution submitted by Egypt, Lebanon and the Philippines (A/C.3/L.259).

10. The Australian delegation considered that the Economic and Social Council's decision to appoint a rapporteur was wise and that the Third Committee should not impede Mr. López's work. Governments, however, should give him all possible co-operation and assistance in his work. The Council had had ample time to study the problem of freedom of information before taking its decision and had taken the precaution of appointing the Rapporteur for an experimental period, with extremely wide terms of reference. The Committee's confidence in him must have been strengthened by his able statement on his work.

11. The nine-Power draft resolution was reasonable and constructive; it provided that the General Assembly should benefit by the Rapporteur's work and restated the Egyptian, Lebanese and Philippine proposal that the Third Committee's records on freedom of information should be transmitted to the Economic and Social Council for consideration.

12. The new wording for the first paragraph proposed by Poland (A/C.3/L.267, point 1) of the preamble seemed to be unexceptional, but the Australian delegation preferred the original text. It could not accept the second and third Polish amendments.

13. Mr. KAYSER (France) proposed an amendment (A/C.3/L.276) substituting for the third paragraph of the preamble the words:

*"Considering the continuing need for study, inquiry, and investigation with a view to positive action for the removal of obstacles to the free flow of information,"*

The existing text seemed to be confused and weak; the purpose of study and investigation should be practical, and not speculative or abstract.

14. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines), speaking as a co-sponsor of the nine-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.265), pointed out that the draft resolution had three main purposes. First, it reaffirmed the primacy of the General Assembly's interest in the question of freedom of information. In the second place, it merely noted, without approval or disapproval, the Economic

and Social Council's appointment of a Rapporteur. In connexion with the second and third Polish amendments, he considered that, even though the Polish delegation had not supported the Council's decision, there was no need to delete all reference to the Rapporteur, since it would be strange if the General Assembly failed to take any note of such an important action. The third objective of the draft resolution was to submit the records of the Third Committee on freedom of information to the Economic and Social Council, in order that the Council might consider them together with the Rapporteur's report and submit a statement of its views and plans to the General Assembly at its eighth session.

15. With regard to the first Polish amendment, he suggested that, if the other sponsors of the nine-Power draft resolution agreed, it might be added after the existing first paragraph of the preamble.

16. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that her delegation would vote for the nine-Power draft resolution and considered that the Economic and Social Council's decision to appoint a special rapporteur had been wise. The General Assembly should support the Council's decision and should give the Rapporteur the clearest possible terms of reference. The joint draft resolution had the additional advantage of covering important points which the Council would have to study in connexion with freedom of information.

17. Her delegation also approved of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.276.)

18. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) stated that the positive aspect of the nine-Power draft resolution was its provision that the General Assembly should consider all sides of the problem of freedom of information. The negative aspect, however, was its reference to the work of the Rapporteur. The Yugoslav delegation had been unconvinced by the Philippine representative's arguments in favour of that reference because it considered them contrary to the spirit of a General Assembly resolution. Many representatives in the Committee had made it clear that the Council had merely postponed its work on freedom of information by appointing a Rapporteur; there was no reason why the General Assembly should indirectly condone the Council's doubtful action. The problem of freedom of information was much broader than the questions included in the Rapporteur's terms of reference. All the aspects of the question had to be considered and it could not be narrowed down to the Council's restricted concepts.

19. The Yugoslav delegation would vote for the Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.267), and specially approved of the second and third amendments. It approved of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.276), but considered that it would be better still to delete the third paragraph of the preamble. It fully supported the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1), since Yugoslavia had suffered from systematic and slanderous attacks by international information agencies.

20. Mr. MANI (India) could support the draft resolution, subject to certain alterations. With regard to the third paragraph of the preamble, he wished to make it clear that under his terms of reference, the Rapporteur would not be competent to determine the obstacles to the free flow of information which should be elimi-

nated. Moreover, with regard to the fifth paragraph of the preamble, he pointed out that the Rapporteur could only conduct an inquiry and make a report; he could not recommend specific action to surmount such obstacles.

21. Because the text as it was worded might have an undesirable effect on the Committee's future work, his delegation had joined that of Saudi Arabia in proposing the deletion of parts of the text of those two paragraphs (A/C.3/L.275).

22. The Indian delegation also wished to leave the door open to discussion of the draft convention at the next session, regardless of the status of the Rapporteur's report; he therefore endorsed the Saudi Arabian proposal (A/C.3/L.277) for the addition of a new paragraph to the preamble.

23. Mr. DERINSU (Turkey) considered the draft resolution the best course of action open to the Third Committee in the circumstances. In view of the wide divergence of views on the basic concept of freedom of information, further study of the problem was clearly required; the Committee should be in a better position to take concrete action at the next session of the General Assembly.

24. He would support the draft resolution as amended by France (A/C.3/L.267); he could also endorse the Philippine amendment to the first Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.267). He could not support the remaining Polish amendments.

25. Mr. CASTRO (Brazil) said that his delegation had always supported the principle of a draft convention as necessary to prevent abuse of the right to freedom of information. Nevertheless, in view of the profound divergence of views within the Committee, his delegation was convinced that it would be wiser to await the results of the Rapporteur's investigations before making any further attempt to achieve agreement on a text.

26. The Brazilian delegation, therefore, would support the nine-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.265), which offered the only realistic course of action open to the Committee for the time being.

27. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) said his delegation would support the draft resolution, but it could not agree to the Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.267), which would endanger the work already done in the matter of freedom of information.

28. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Australia in introducing the draft resolution. He accepted the French amendment (A/C.3/L.276), but could not accept the Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.267), which altered the entire substance of the draft resolution. Contrary to the view expressed by the Philippine representative, he felt that a combination of the wording proposed by the Polish delegation with the wording of the original text would only restrict the scope of the preamble. With regard to the second Polish amendment, he felt that the reference to the Rapporteur should not be deleted, since the work to be done by that official might well prove to be of great assistance to the cause of freedom of information; moreover, the text merely noted the action taken by the Council and the Rapporteur, without expressing approval or disapproval.

29. With respect to the second amendment submitted by India and Saudi Arabia (A/C.3/L.275), he pointed out that the text of the paragraph in question merely reproduced a phrase from the Council's resolution (442 C (XIV)) laying down the terms of reference of the Rapporteur. He could see no valid reason for the proposed deletion.

30. He could not support the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1), which would introduce a controversial element. He suggested that the representative of Guatemala might redraft his amendment or submit it as a separate proposal.

31. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) pointed out, with reference to the second paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution, that during the previous year the initiative in the study of problems of freedom of information had largely passed from the General Assembly to the Economic and Social Council. He did not object to the wording of the paragraph, but expressed the view that, unless the draft resolution was amended, the Council would retain that initiative, and the draft convention on freedom of information would become, in effect, a dead letter.

32. It was for that reason that his delegation had submitted the amendment set forth in document A/C.3/L.277, and had joined the delegations of India, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico and Pakistan in sponsoring the amendment given in document A/C.3/L.274. Both those amendments were essential in order to give due consideration to the views of delegations which had voted in favour of consideration of the draft convention at the current session.

33. He did not object to the appointment of the Rapporteur, or to the inquiries the Rapporteur would carry out, since he had full confidence in him. In principle, however, he felt that such an official should have been appointed by the General Assembly. For that reason he had joined the delegation of India in sponsoring the amendments set forth in document A/C.3/L.275.

34. Mr. ORBAN (Belgium) supported the French amendment (A/C.3/L.276), which rendered the third paragraph of the preamble clearer, more concise and more effective. He could not support the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1), since it introduced a new subject and, accordingly, could hardly be considered an amendment. He had no objection in principle to the Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.267), but did not feel that they represented an improvement over the original text.

35. Mr. GREEN (United States of America) would support the draft resolution in an amended form. With regard to the second paragraph of the preamble, the Charter of the United Nations provided that both the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council should take initiative in the field of freedom of information; therefore, the text should be improved by the substitution of the wording proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.278), which referred only to "the United Nations".

36. He would vote in favour of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.276), but agreed with the representative of Greece that the deletions proposed by India and Saudi Arabia (A/C.3/L.275) were unnecessary.

since the paragraphs in question merely reproduced a phrase from resolution 442 C (XIV) of the Council.

37. With regard to the first Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.267), he asked whether the Polish delegation would accept the substitution of the word "promotion" for "protection". He felt that the word "touchstone" should be retained, as suggested by the Philippine representative, since it had appeared in a previous General Assembly resolution (resolution 59 (I)).

38. As regards the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1) he agreed with the representative of Greece that it would merely introduce a controversial element into a draft resolution which was not otherwise controversial; he could not, therefore, support it.

39. Mr. DUNLOP (New Zealand) recalled that during the general debate the Committee had discussed at length its responsibilities in the matter of freedom of information and the action which it should take in view of the action being taken by the Council through the Rapporteur and in co-operation with UNESCO. The Committee should not go out of its way to regain the initiative; it should await the analyses and recommendations to be made by the Rapporteur before taking further steps. Accordingly, he would support the draft resolution.

40. He could not support the second and third Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.267); as regards the first, he preferred the alterations suggested by the Philippine and United States delegations.

41. He shared the views expressed by the United States and Greek delegations regarding the deletions proposed by India and Saudi Arabia and the Guatemalan amendment.

42. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Polish amendments. The original text of the draft resolution laid too much stress on the work to be done by the Rapporteur. He recalled that his delegation, among others in the Council, had objected to the appointment of a rapporteur; and he thought it inappropriate that a resolution dealing with the future work of the Third Committee on freedom of information should make that work entirely dependent upon the recommendations contained in the Rapporteur's report.

43. Mr. ZAMOR (Haiti) could not support the Polish amendments, which would have the effect of weakening and distorting the draft resolution. He endorsed the French delegation's amendment, which clarified and strengthened the text.

44. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that the joint draft resolution seemed to be intended to express the General Assembly's primary interest in freedom of information, but the emphasis on the Rapporteur appointed by the Economic and Social Council counteracted that. It had been stated that the word "noting" did not imply approval or disapproval; but if it meant anything at all, it must imply either one or the other. The operative part was equally vague. The General Assembly would decide merely to consider the problem of freedom of information at its eighth session; but there was no reference to action, particularly with regard to the draft convention on freedom of information, although consideration of it had been rejected at

the current session only by a tied vote. The expression "after the Rapporteur has submitted his report" was still vaguer; even the Rapporteur himself, highly competent though he was, could not forecast when he would complete his work, since that depended on so many factors outside his control. The invitation to the Council to submit a statement of its views and plans regarding future work in connexion with freedom of information again showed how far the subject had been removed from the General Assembly's control. The draft resolution was of no use for the Committee's purposes, and merely to insert a reference to the draft convention on freedom of information would not improve it.

45. Some of the Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.267) would improve the draft resolution, if it were at all susceptible of improvement. The phrasing of the first paragraph of the original text of the preamble was platitudinous and unnecessary; the Polish wording was much better, but still unnecessary, and he would abstain from voting for it. He would also abstain from voting on the second Polish amendment. He would vote against the third Polish amendment because still further consideration of the problem would be better than nothing at all.

46. He would support the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1), either in its existing form or in any other, and thanked the Guatemalan representative for raising the point he had raised. The fact that it might be controversial should not deter the Third Committee from giving it the consideration it warranted.

47. Mr. CORDOVA (El Salvador) whole-heartedly supported the joint draft resolution and deprecated any pessimism with regard to future failure to achieve practical action. He would, however, suggest to the sponsors that in any revised version they should pay more attention to simplicity and conciseness in drafting. The paragraphs of the preamble should also bear a close relation to the paragraphs of the operative part and avoid verbiage, such as that in the first, fourth and fifth paragraphs, which, in addition, had little relevance to the three operative paragraphs. He agreed that the words "after the Rapporteur has submitted his report" in paragraph 2 of the operative part were vague; some such phrase as "on the basis of the report which the Rapporteur submits" would be better.

48. The first Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.267) was acceptable; a phrase like "the touchstone of all freedoms" should never have been allowed to creep into United Nations documents. The United States representative might be right in calling it restrictive; he must reserve his final judgment on it.

49. The Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1) embodied such an important principle that it warranted submission as a separate draft resolution with an explanatory preamble; it would be out of place as one more paragraph in a draft resolution dealing with a different subject. Furthermore, the phrase "systematic and slanderous attacks" might give rise to delicate problems of interpretation.

50. Mr. SECADES (Cuba) whole-heartedly supported the joint draft resolution, although he might be in favour of some drafting amendments, such as that proposed by the French representative (A/C.3/L.276).

51. There was some danger that the discussion might degenerate into a mere repetition of the debate on the draft convention on freedom of information. The sponsors should therefore see whether they could agree on the incorporation of some of the amendments and thus save time.

52. Mr. HUNEIDI (Syria) supported the joint draft resolution because it provided the only logical course of action after the rejection of the sixteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.256). He also supported the first Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.267), preferably with the United States oral amendment thereto, and joint Indian and Saudi Arabian amendment (A/C.3/L.275) and the Saudi Arabian amendment (A/C.3/L.277). He could not accept the other Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.267).

53. Mr. EDBERG (Sweden) agreed with the views expressed by the Australian representative when introducing the joint draft resolution. His own delegation was eager to find a constructive way out of the difficulties in which the Committee had become involved, and accordingly would accept the United States amendment (A/C.3/L.278) as a reasonable compromise, the French amendment (A/C.3/L.276) and the amendment submitted orally by the representative of El Salvador. He could not, of course, speak for his co-sponsors.

54. He could not accept the Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.267), as they would remove essential parts of the proposal, nor the deletions proposed by the Indian representative. The Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1) introduced a controversial element. If it were adopted, the amended draft resolution would not receive the support otherwise to be expected. The Guatemalan representative should submit his text as a separate proposal.

55. Mrs. BERGER (Canada) supported the draft resolution. As some speakers had been uncertain of the exact meaning of the second paragraph of the preamble, the words "in part" might be inserted after the words "has rested". The Economic and Social Council had also taken some initiative in the study of the problems of freedom of information.

56. Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom) asked the sponsors of the joint draft resolution on information facilities in under-developed regions (A/C.3/L.266) whether they would be willing to have paragraphs 2 and 3 of the operative part of their draft resolution inserted in the joint draft resolution under discussion (A/C.3/L.265).

57. It would be undesirable for the specific study of domestic information agencies to be confused with the comprehensive survey to be completed by the Rapporteur. Thus a new paragraph might be added after paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution given in document A/C.3/L.265, requesting the Economic and Social Council, when reviewing the problems of freedom of information in the light of the Rapporteur's report and the study on measures to remove obstacles to the free flow of information, to consider, *inter alia*, the matters set forth in the subparagraphs of paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution given in document A/C.3/L.266.

58. Replying to Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan), the CHAIRMAN said that, while the draft resolution

given in document A/C.3/L.266 was not before the Committee just then, any delegation was entitled to move any amendment it thought fit to the draft resolution under consideration (A/C.3/L.265).

59. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) said that he wished to withdraw his sponsorship of the draft resolution given in document A/C.3/L.266, in view of the United Kingdom representative's proposal; he would thus recover his freedom of action to introduce any amendments he thought necessary.

60. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia), speaking as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution on information facilities in under-developed regions (A/C.3/L.266), said that he could not accept the United Kingdom representative's proposal, because the draft resolution before the Committee dealt only with more or less academic studies, whereas the other dealt with concrete practical measures, and the two should not be merged.

61. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) said that the joint draft resolution before the Committee had originally included clauses relating to technical assistance, but its sponsors had subsequently come to the conclusion that their purpose would be better served if the two subjects were presented separately. It would be very hard to merge them once more, although he was not entirely opposed to the idea.

62. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) was somewhat surprised at the United Kingdom representative's proposal because she had assumed that the draft resolution dealing with technical assistance in the matter of information would be the only proposal likely to give rise to no controversy. Unfortunately, that assumption had proved to be wrong. A programme of technical assistance—a subject with which the Committee had never before concerned itself—should be practical and specific, as was the programme outlined in the relevant draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266), and should set forth certain criteria to guide the Secretary-General and UNESCO when they prepared their report on the subject to the Economic and Social Council. Thus, she doubted the value of linking that study and the work of the Rapporteur. Certainly there was nothing to preclude the Rapporteur, within his broad terms of reference, from including a similar study in his report, but that should not prevent the Secretary-General and UNESCO from complying with the request made in the relevant draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266).

63. The sponsors of the draft resolution upon which the draft resolution before the Committee had been based had stated originally that it was intended as an alternative to the sixteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.256), which had been rejected. The Chilean delegation had regretted the Council's decision to replace the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press by a rapporteur, however admirably equipped for the work, particularly as his appointment had been stated to be experimental. The Rapporteur had already embarked upon demonstrably important and interesting studies, but at the behest of the Council, not of the General Assembly, and his work should accordingly parallel that of the General Assembly in the field of freedom of information and on the draft convention on that subject. Any attempt to link the two would entail the subordination of one to the other.

64. Accordingly, she would support the Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.267) to the fourth paragraph of the preamble and either the French (A/C.3/L.276) or the joint Indian and Saudi Arabian (A/C.3/L.275) amendment to the third. She would accept the Saudi Arabian proposal (A/C.3/L.277) for the insertion of a new paragraph in the preamble, but the statement should be closer to fact. It was not true that the Third Committee had not had sufficient time to study the draft convention on freedom of information at its seventh session; it had rather failed to agree how to study it. The phrase "had not studied" should be substituted for "had not sufficient time to study".

65. If the fifth paragraph of the preamble were retained—she hoped that it would not be—she would vote for the deletion of the final phrase.

66. She would support the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.274) to paragraph 2 of the operative part, which should be voted on in two parts; she would vote against the latter part, referring as it did to the Rapporteur's report.

67. In principle she was in favour of the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.271/Rev.1), as she had stated in the general debate. The point raised therein was, however, one of the basic problems of freedom of information and had already been dealt with in two articles of the convention on the right of correction, in the draft convention on freedom of information and in the draft international code of ethics for journalists. To take it out of its context would be to give it insufficient weight. Furthermore, the wording did not accurately

reflect the facts; great care should be taken not to exaggerate when dealing with such a vital matter. Although there were more frequent and more defamatory attacks by international information agencies against countries possessing scanty information media of their own than was generally recognized, it was not true to say that such attacks were systematic. She would therefore abstain from voting for that amendment.

68. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the sponsors should consult to see what amendments and suggestions they could incorporate in a revised text of their proposal, to be submitted at the following meeting.

69. Mr. KAYSER (France) suggested that the Secretariat should endeavour to prepare a document embodying the existing or revised text together with the amendments to each paragraph.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would do its utmost to comply with that request within the short time at its disposal. Much would depend upon the prompt submission of any further amendments.

71. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the fact that the *Journal of the United Nations*, No. 485, of 4 November 1952, had incorrectly reported certain of the votes taken on the USSR draft resolution (A/C.3/L.255/Rev.1) at the 434th meeting of the Third Committee, and asked that the necessary steps should be taken to correct the errors.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.