

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 432nd

MEETING

Saturday, 1 November 1952, at 10.30 a.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.252/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.252/Add.1, 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>)	79
---	----

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.252/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.252/Add.1, 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 EGYPT, FRANCE, LEBANON, URUGUAY AND YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.3/L.252/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.252/Add.1) (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that a combined draft resolution, based on draft resolutions already submitted, would be forthcoming shortly; in the absence of objections, it would be entertained in spite of the fact that the time limit for the submission of draft resolutions had expired.

2. He invited the Committee to continue its discussion of the joint draft resolution on the right of correction (A/C.3/L.252/Rev.1) and the amendment to it submitted by Lebanon and Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.264).

3. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the text of the joint draft resolution had been revised to eliminate the so-called colonial clause from the draft convention. The Lebanese and Yugoslav delegations were, however, proposing an amendment replacing that clause by the text which the General Assembly had already adopted on the same subject in resolution 422 (V) and which had since been accepted by a large

majority of the Committee on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information in a similar situation.

4. As the text of the amendment had the sanction of the United Nations and would eliminate any doubt concerning the application of the convention to colonial territories, he urged the Committee to adopt it.

5. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) stated that he had not sponsored the amendment because of technical considerations, but would vote for it. If the amendment should be rejected, he would withdraw from sponsorship of the joint draft resolution and would vote against that text.

6. Mr. KAYSER (France) said that the French delegation considered that the elimination of article IX improved the draft convention on the right of correction, making it conform to current practices. After legal study, his delegation had come to the conclusion that the insertion of the text proposed in the amendment was superfluous. He would therefore be unable to vote for it.

7. Mr. KHALATBARY (Iran) strongly supported the amendment submitted by Lebanon and Yugoslavia.

8. Mrs. BERGER (Canada) said that her delegation would not be able to give its support to the joint draft resolution. She recalled the resolution adopted during the second part of the third session of the General Assembly which provided that the draft convention on the right of correction would not be opened for signature separately from the draft convention on the international transmission of news.

9. Mrs. Berger also thought that the decision of the Committee not to proceed at that stage with the draft convention on freedom of information in order to enable the Rapporteur appointed by the Council to com-

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

plete his report, should also be made to cover the draft convention on the right of correction. She added that the text of the draft convention on the right of correction had been carefully studied by the Canadian Government and by the Press associations of her country, and that many questions had been raised as to whether the adoption of the principle on which the convention rested might not amount to an acceptance of the principle of government intervention in the field of information and of the Press. She said that fears had also been expressed that the acceptance of the convention would very probably raise, both for the government and the Press, such technical difficulties as to make its application very difficult, if not impractical. Those fears had been strengthened when it was observed that the convention might permit abuses by countries which would wish to make the right of correction serve their propaganda purposes.

10. Her delegation was unable to accede to the French representative's request (424th meeting) that countries not prepared to sign the convention should not stand in the way of those ready to do so, because it felt that its objections to the draft convention, as well as those stated by other delegations, were sufficiently basic and general to warrant the view that the coming into force of the convention on the right of correction would be detrimental to the issue of freedom of information in its international aspects.

11. Mr. ZAMOR (Haiti) urged the Committee to adopt the amendment submitted by Lebanon and Yugoslavia, as a positive text was needed to replace the limited protection extended by the original article IX.

12. Mr. TSAO (China) remarked that his delegation had voted for resolution 277 A (III), in which the General Assembly had resolved that the draft Convention on the International Transmission of News and the Right of Correction should not be open for signature until the General Assembly had taken definite action on the draft convention on freedom of information. His delegation still believed that the two conventions were closely related and should be open for signature at the same time. Furthermore, the convention on the right of correction, however useful it might be, was a negative measure and the United Nations might well be criticized for beginning its work on freedom of information by enacting limitations on that freedom.

13. The fact that the Third Committee had decided not to consider the draft convention on freedom of information at the current session clearly showed that many delegations preferred to wait for the Rapporteur's report rather than make piecemeal and hasty decisions. He would therefore abstain on any proposals regarding the colonial clause and would vote against the joint draft resolution.

14. Mr. VILLAMAR CONTRERAS (Guatemala) would support the amendment submitted by Lebanon and Yugoslavia and, if it was rejected, he would be unable to vote for the joint draft resolution.

15. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia) was prepared to support the amendment. Nevertheless, as paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution was in contradiction with the stipulations of General Assembly resolution 277 A (III), now that the Committee had postponed con-

sideration of the draft convention on freedom of information, he would have to abstain in the vote on the joint draft resolution.

16. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) remarked that Greece, being one of the small countries for whom the right of correction was a very valuable means for putting across their case was, in principle, favourable to a convention on that subject. His delegation would, however, be unable to vote in favour of the joint draft resolution because it felt that the question of the right of correction should not be separated from the whole question of freedom of information.

17. Mr. MANI (India) said that, while in principle his delegation had always accepted the international right of correction, which would contribute to the maintenance of higher standards in the journalistic profession, a decision to open the draft convention on the right of correction for signature before the other two conventions would amount to abrogation of General Assembly resolution 277 A (III).

18. Furthermore, a careful reading of the draft convention, in particular article III, showed that the convention would confer privileges on governments but not on journalists and that consequently the full support of the professional organizations would have to be enlisted if the convention was to be effective. Without such support, communiqués correcting distorted reports might not even be printed by the publications concerned.

19. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had given no valid reason for taking separate action on the draft convention on the right of correction in contravention of resolution 277 A (III). As his delegation deemed such action inadvisable at the moment, it would vote against the joint draft resolution, and, in order to be consistent with that vote, would abstain on the amendment, with which it agreed in principle.

20. Mr. EDBERG (Sweden) observed that, if the draft Convention on the International Transmission of News and the Right of Correction were to be divided into two, the part which most urgently called for immediate action was that dealing with the international transmission of news, as it would permit the free flow of information across national frontiers. The convention on the right of correction was merely a supplement to that part, and one of doubtful value. He fully agreed with the Indian representative that it conferred privileges on governments, but none on journalists. After listening to the general debate on freedom of information, his delegation had come to the conclusion that before taking definite action it would be advisable to await the results of the Council Rapporteur's review of the entire question.

21. He was therefore unable to vote for the joint draft resolution, but would abstain in deference to States which were anxious to see the draft convention on the right of correction come into force as soon as possible.

22. Mr. KAYSER (France) wished to reply to some of the objections raised against the joint draft resolution.

23. With reference to the remarks made by the representative of Canada, he pointed out that no basic objections had been made to the draft convention on

the right of correction either at the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information or in the General Assembly, both of which had approved it. The text, being the result of a compromise, might of course have technical defects; but no objections of principle could exist now that had not existed then.

24. With regard to the argument that the action proposed in the joint draft resolution meant an abrogation of General Assembly resolution 277 A (III), he recalled the statement of the Secretary-General's representative (431st meeting) to the effect that, even if the convention on the right of correction were opened for signature alone, the General Assembly resolution, which had been intended to apply to the conventions on the international transmission of news and on freedom of information, would remain fully in force.

25. It had also been said that the convention on the right of correction would confer no privileges on journalists. As he had pointed out at an earlier meeting, most journalists were in favour of the convention and felt that it would assist them in their work. An international Press congress recently held at Evian, France, had voluntarily and unanimously adopted a resolution to that effect and the director of the Agence télégraphique suisse had expressed the same opinion.

26. Those who were in favour of postponing action on the draft convention on the right of correction apparently wanted all or nothing. The French delegation, which, in the United Nations, had always defended the cause of freedom of information, would have preferred swift action on all three conventions. As that was no longer possible, however, he urged the Committee to take at least one step in the right direction by opening the convention on the right of correction for signature at once. That step would have the added advantage of making it more difficult indefinitely to postpone a decision on the convention on freedom of information.

27. Mr. AGUIRRE (Uruguay) said that his delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, felt that progress would be achieved if the draft convention on the right of correction were opened for signature immediately. In the general debate, a number of small countries had complained of the injury to their interests resulting from great inequality in media of information; the convention should at least partly remedy that situation.

28. He would vote for the amendment submitted by Lebanon and Yugoslavia; it would improve the convention by introducing a text already adopted by the General Assembly for insertion in the covenant on human rights.

29. He agreed with the French representative that it was better to take one step in the right direction than none, and that the adoption of the joint draft resolution might pave the way to agreement on the other two conventions. It had been said that the convention would permit undue interference by governments and that newspapers would refuse to print retractions; the two statements were mutually exclusive. Actually, there was no danger of such interference, while the issuance by government of communiqués denying false reports would have a great moral effect, even if not always a practical one.

30. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that in principle her delegation favoured the right of correction and would support the draft convention on that subject if it were opened for signature simultaneously with the other two conventions, which represented a positive contribution to freedom of information.

31. It had become clear, however, that the political climate in some countries was such that they were unable to support any convention dealing with freedom of information, while other countries, although cherishing that freedom within their own borders, were not ready to agree to its being regulated for the benefit of the international community. Consequently, until a code of ethics for journalists and conventions dealing with freedom of information in a constructive and positive way had been prepared, the convention on the right of correction would merely enable governments to reserve their positions on the other conventions and would serve no useful purpose.

32. Mr. SPRAGUE (United States of America) remarked that his delegation would be reluctantly compelled to oppose the joint draft resolution.

33. He had been impressed by the complaints of many countries of the frequent occurrence in the Press of errors in fact or interpretation concerning conditions in those countries, and of their inability to rectify such errors. While he was in full sympathy with the principle that the media of information should seek to publish the truth and to correct error, he was not convinced that the draft convention, which called on governments to perform a task that should be left to professionals, was a practical way to implement the right of correction.

34. He agreed with the representative of China that, if the draft Convention on the International Transmission of News and the Right of Correction were to be divided, it was the first part which deserved immediate attention, as it would facilitate the collection and transmission of news and would enable foreign correspondents to publish more accurate reports, thereby incidentally decreasing the need for the right of correction.

35. His delegation was, however, opposed to such a division, as it might result in the two conventions having different signatories, a situation which would inevitably lead to practical difficulties and conflicts.

36. Furthermore, the draft convention on the right of correction carried no sanctions and no assurance that corrections would actually be published. It would impose much additional work on governments, making them in effect messenger boys delivering communiqués to the publications concerned. It was to be expected that many such communiqués would be unfounded. In that connexion, he remarked that an error in the American Press to which a Soviet representative had recently drawn attention had in fact been made deliberately, for purposes of satire, in an article which was a parody on the issue of *Collier's* devoted to the description of a future war. If the convention were in force, that article would no doubt have been the subject of a communiqué. It was also to be feared that the convention might lead to abuses on the part of governments which would use the right of correction for propaganda purposes.

37. Lastly, in his view the best safeguard against errors lay in the sincere desire of information media to report the truth and in their readiness to publish corrections when they had been shown their errors. In his experience, responsible papers were always ready to do so; and, under the proposed convention, the irresponsible papers could not in any case be made to follow that example.

38. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) recalled that during the second part of its third session the General Assembly had decided to combine into one convention two of the three texts transmitted to it by the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information: the draft conventions on the transmission of news and on the right of correction. When it had become apparent that agreement could not be reached on the third draft convention, that on freedom of information, the Assembly had adopted resolution 277 A (III) providing that the combined convention, which had been approved, should not be opened for signature until the Assembly had taken definite action on the draft convention on freedom of information. Nothing in the decision, however, could be interpreted as preventing the Third Committee from dealing with the question of the right of correction in a separate convention; such a step would be only a partial solution of the problem, but she considered it the only constructive step the Committee could take at the moment.

39. Her delegation would therefore support both the amendment and the joint draft resolution.

40. Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom) reiterated her view that it would be unwise to adopt a separate convention on the right of correction, and associated herself with the view expressed by the representative of India.

41. Her delegation could not support the draft resolution.

42. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) pointed out that the objections raised by some representatives to the adoption of a separate convention on the right of correction were not entirely consistent with the positions taken by their delegations during the second part of the Assembly's third session. Some delegations were opposing any constructive action with regard to freedom of information; they objected to the proposals made without offering any alternative proposals, and contented themselves with asking for further postponement of the whole matter.

43. The right of correction had its roots in the basic principle of the right of every man to be fully and accurately informed; it was on that basis that a number of countries had already recognized the right of correction for their nationals. The text before the Committee had reconciled two equally legitimate but opposite views; under its terms, governments could not force any Press agency to publish a correction, but would merely release a communiqué which the Press would be free to publish or not, as it chose. Moreover, such communiqués would be made available to all Press agencies; it was therefore a moral certainty that a communiqué would be published by at least one agency. Even in the unlikely event that a communiqué was not published at all, it could nevertheless serve to guide correspondents in their future reporting on the subject in question.

44. A point in favour of having a separate convention on the right of correction opened for signature immediately was the possibility that some States, thus presented with a guarantee that any false or distorted information about them could be corrected, might be more inclined to relinquish the restrictive clauses which they had thus far maintained should be inserted in the draft convention on freedom of information.

45. The amended joint draft resolution before the Committee represented the Committee's last opportunity to take constructive action at the current session on one aspect of the problem of freedom of information which had not given rise to any serious or fundamental disagreement. If the Committee failed to take such action, the responsibility would rest with those States which opposed that action without offering any alternative whatever.

46. Mrs. HARMAN (Israel) reiterated her view that any decision in the matter of freedom of information should receive the maximum support in the Committee. She would have been willing to support the draft resolution had it received general endorsement; but in view of the objections which had been raised, further preparatory work on the question appeared necessary, particularly with regard to the practical difficulties mentioned by the representatives of India and the United States of America.

47. Accordingly, her delegation would abstain from voting on the proposal.

48. Mr. HUNEIDI (Syria) hoped that the Third Committee would take at least one constructive step at the current session towards solution of the problem of freedom of information. He would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution.

49. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had referred in his general statement to the task before the Third Committee, which was to draw up concrete recommendations designed to further the aims of the United Nations in the matter of freedom of information. Those aims included the dissemination of truthful factual information, free from the influence of monopolies, which could help to strengthen international peace and co-operation, and the adoption of measures to outlaw propaganda for the fascist ideology and incitement to war and inter-racial hostility. Concrete instances of such propaganda, taken from the Press of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France, had been cited. Referring to one of those instances, the United States representative had just explained that the text in question had been intended as satire, but had admitted that that fact had had to be clarified even for United States readers. The matter in question was not in any case an appropriate subject for satire and could be very damaging to friendly relations between States.

50. The joint draft resolution before the Committee did not meet the requirements of the United Nations Charter and of General Assembly resolution 110 (II) on the subject of false and distorted information and propaganda inciting to war, for, although it gave technical procedures for the implementation of the right of correction, it made no suggestions as to methods of combating the false and slanderous information in the Press of some countries. Moreover, the joint draft resolution contained no specific provision about the

extension of the right of correction to dependent territories; the text was vague and ambiguous in that respect and left the metropolitan countries free to extend that right to the peoples of the territories they administered or to withhold it.

51. The USSR delegation endorsed the principle set forth in the amendment to the joint draft resolution, and would therefore support that text; but it would vote against the draft resolution itself.

52. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that his delegation's position on the application of international covenants to dependent territories had been stated in the Third Committee at the fifth session of the General Assembly, in connexion with the debate on the application of the draft covenant on human rights. At that time the representative of Pakistan had deplored the existence of a situation in which, while millions of people throughout the world were barred from representation in the United Nations, the administering Powers were not required to adhere to human rights agreements in their behalf.

53. In accordance with that view of his delegation, he endorsed the amendment to the joint draft resolution before the Committee.

54. Unfortunately, he would have to vote against the joint draft resolution because paragraph 2, which recommended that the draft convention on the right of correction should be opened for signature at the end of the General Assembly's current session, contravened paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 277 A (III). He had supported the latter paragraph because he had felt that the rights granted to information agencies should be counterbalanced by certain responsibilities, and because he regarded the two draft conventions as a homogeneous whole.

55. Mr. VILLAMAR CONTRERAS (Guatemala) had been favourably impressed by the willingness of the representatives of some States to admit that journalists occasionally distorted facts and disseminated erroneous information. His own country had often been the victim of slanderous Press attacks in other countries, and often the corrections communicated had been entirely ignored. He agreed with the representative of Chile that there was no logical reason why a separate convention on the right of correction should not be adopted.

56. His delegation would support the joint draft resolution, which would help to improve the difficult situation of many of the smaller countries. He hoped that the Third Committee would not again decide to postpone the question, as it had done so many times in the past.

57. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) recalled that his delegation, during the second part of the General Assembly's third session, had voted in favour of combining the draft conventions on the transmission of news and the right of correction. He had not thus far favoured adopting a separate convention on the right of correction, since he felt that the three matters were closely linked and that all the conventions should be opened for signature simultaneously. Since that appeared impossible, however, his delegation would reconsider its position.

58. He saw no objection to the General Assembly's reconsidering its previous decision and restoring the situation which had existed at the end of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, when there had been three separate draft conventions. The arguments put forward by the United States delegation and others were persuasive; on the other hand, from the point of view of delegations which considered a convention on the right of correction undesirable it would logically be better to deal with that subject separately.

59. The Philippine delegation did not wish to stand in the way of governments which desired to conclude a convention on the right of correction; it would therefore support the revised joint draft resolution. It was to be understood that such support would in no way commit the Philippine Government to adhere to the convention if and when it was adopted.

60. Mrs. VAN DER MOLEN (Netherlands) said that for the reasons already put forward by the delegations of Canada, China, Indonesia, the United States and others, her delegation would vote against the joint draft resolution.

61. Mr. DUNLOP (New Zealand) said that the success of the United Nations programme in the matter of freedom of information would depend upon the adoption of texts which could command general support. The discussion had shown that there was no substantial agreement concerning either the adequacy of the text of the draft convention or even the advisability of adopting a separate convention.

62. He shared the views of the representatives who had questioned the wisdom of departing from the position taken by the General Assembly at its third session and could not, therefore, support the draft resolution.

63. Mr. GOROSTIZA (Mexico) felt that the right of correction was a valid right and should be guaranteed; he pointed out that it was already freely exercised in his country. Nevertheless, he shared the view that the three draft conventions adopted by the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information were closely linked; until the fate of the other two draft conventions was decided, he could not adopt a definite position regarding a separate convention on the right of correction.

64. He would therefore abstain from voting on the joint draft resolution.

65. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he would vote for the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.264) as he had consistently voted for the principle embodied therein, but would have to abstain from voting on the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.252/ Rev. 1).

66. He was not opposed to the principle, but he was still inclined to think that a convention on the right of correction would be of little use so long as the convention on freedom of information was pending. Indeed, once the international code of ethics for journalists and the convention on freedom of information had been adopted, there would be little need for a convention on the right of correction. A convention on freedom of information was the necessary corrective to the unlimited freedom given to correspondents under the Convention on the International Transmission of News.

If the Convention on the Right of Correction was opened for signature at the current session, there would be nothing to prevent a delegation from proposing the opening of the Convention on the International Transmission of News for signature before the draft convention on freedom of information had been completed. Furthermore, if the Convention on the Right of Correction alone was opened to signature, an enormous amount of paper work would be entailed both for government offices and for the information enterprises concerned. Like the draft covenants on human rights, the three conventions were interrelated and interdependent.

67. He would not vote against the draft resolution; but he hoped that at the eighth session of the General Assembly the Third Committee would be able to study the whole matter again with a completed draft convention on freedom of information before it.

68. Mr. SECADES (Cuba) said that the Committee should not reconsider the decision taken by the General Assembly in resolution 277 A (III). He was not, however, against the principle embodied in the joint draft resolution and would, accordingly, abstain.

69. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) asked permission to introduce a draft resolution, despite the expiry of the time limit fixed by the Committee. He had awaited the distribution of the addendum (A/C.3/L.249/Add.1) to the Secretariat's note on the documents referred to the seventh session in General Assembly resolution 541 A (VI) and had thus been unable to submit his proposal in time.

70. His draft resolution would be along the lines of an amendment (A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1) he had submitted at the sixth session and related to the encouragement and observation of the principle of the right of reply and correction in all countries.

71. Mr. KAYSER (France) proposed that the representative of Afghanistan should be authorized to submit his draft resolution as soon as possible, even though the time limit had expired.

The proposal was adopted by 39 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

72. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the amendment (A/C.3/L.264) submitted by Lebanon and Yugoslavia to the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.252/Rev.1).

73. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) asked for a vote by roll-call.

74. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan), explaining his vote, said that he would vote for the amendment, on the understanding that the phrase "shall extend to or be applicable" meant that the provisions of the convention should extend to and also be applicable to all territories administered or governed by a metropolitan State. That interpretation was essential, because it was sometimes said that certain rights had been extended to such territories, but could not be applied in them owing to the backwardness of the inhabitants.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentine, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, France, Greece, Israel, Nicaragua, Norway.

The amendment was adopted by 32 votes to 7, with 15 abstentions.

75. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) explained that, although he might more logically have abstained, since he was going to vote against the draft resolution, he had voted for the amendment because of the importance of the principle embodied in it and in view of precedents set in United Nations organs.

76. Mr. MANI (India) had always been in favour of the amendment, but had originally felt that to vote for it and against the draft resolution would be illogical. He had assumed that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution would accept the amendment, but they had not done so, and a clear-cut colonial issue had emerged. His Government's stand on that issue was consistent and he had voted for the amendment.

77. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) said, in explanation of his delegation's vote, that it had voted against the amendment because the United Kingdom Government considered that international conventions should contain provisions enabling governments to extend their application separately to territories for whose foreign relations they were responsible. The reason for that was that such a government should have an opportunity to consult such territories before applying a convention to them. Moreover it should not be placed in a position in which it might be obliged to deny the possible benefits of a convention to all the territories for whose international relations it was responsible because its provisions were not applicable to a particular territory.

78. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.252/Rev.1), as amended.

79. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) asked for a vote by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Peru, Philippines, Syria, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Lebanon, Nicaragua.

Against: Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Greece, India, Iraq, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Burma, Cuba, Denmark, Indonesia, Israel, Mexico, Norway.

The joint draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 25 votes to 19, with 10 abstentions.

80. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan), speaking on a point of order, said that the adoption of the amended

draft resolution had made it unnecessary for him to submit the draft resolution he had intended to submit.

81. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/C.3/L.266, which had just been circulated. It replaced documents A/C.3/L.258 and A/C.3/L.261 and that part of A/C.3/L.260 which dealt with technical assistance in connexion with freedom of information.

82. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.