

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



Thursday, 31 January 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Page

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter V) (A/1884, A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1) (continued)	417
---	-----

Chairman : Mrs. Ana FIGUEROA (Chile).

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter V)
(A/1884, A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1) (continued)

[Item 11]*

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. REYES (Philippines) said that although at its seventh session the General Assembly could not be committed to a given course of action regarding the priority of items on its agenda by decisions taken at its sixth session, the Philippine delegation nevertheless joined with the other sponsors of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1) in expressing the hope that at its seventh session the General Assembly would give priority to a study of the problems of freedom of information, and especially of the draft convention on freedom of information.

2. By so doing, the General Assembly would be helping to remedy serious difficulties in the entire work of the United Nations on the freedom of information. He used the word "entire" advisedly because recent developments in the Organization had endangered the whole movement towards greater freedom of information. Chief among those developments had been the decision of the Economic and Social Council at its thirteenth session not to convene a plenipotentiary conference (Council resolution 387 A (XIII)), as recommended by the General Assembly in its resolution 426 (V), for the purpose of adopting an international convention on freedom of information. Unless the General Assembly took appropriate action at its seventh session, there was thus no prospect of having such a convention ready for signature in the near future. The same decision of the Economic and Social Council had had a further serious effect in that it shelved indefinitely the entry into force of the Convention on the International Transmission of News and the Right of Correction, which had been approved by the General Assembly at its third session, on the basis of the drafts adopted by the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information at Geneva, in 1948¹.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

¹ See Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information (E/Conf.6/79), annex A.

3. The situation might oblige the General Assembly to consider revising the paragraph in its resolution 277 A (III) providing that the draft convention on the International Transmission of News and the Right of Correction and the convention on freedom of information should be opened for signature simultaneously, or to undertake the completion of the draft convention on freedom of information without the intermediary of the Economic and Social Council, which had been displaying a disquieting tendency to reverse General Assembly decisions in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

4. At its thirteenth session the Economic and Social Council had also decided to discontinue the very useful Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press² without providing adequate machinery to take over its functions and continue its important work. On that subject he proposed to make further comments when the item came up in a joint meeting of the Second and Third Committees. Later in the debate he also intended to present some observations on the attacks that were being made against freedom of information throughout the world in connexion with resolution 387 (XIII) of the Economic and Social Council.

5. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) said that his delegation supported the general purpose of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1), since the regrettably slow progress of proceedings at the sixth session of the General Assembly, and in particular in the Third Committee, had made any other course of action almost impossible.

6. In view of the fact that the Economic and Social Council had considered it necessary to adopt its resolution 387 B (XIII) expressing concern at governmental action aimed at placing restrictions upon the work of *bona fide* correspondents, he felt that he must add a few words about the attitude of certain States, Mem-

² See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirteenth Session, Supplement No. 1, Resolutions, p. 91, decision concerning the date of the final session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

bers and non-members of the United Nations, to the subject of freedom of information.

7. With regard to the case of Mr. William Oatis, which had been brought up at the 413th meeting, he would only say that a mere consideration of article 75 of the Czechoslovak penal code made it clear that in Czechoslovakia there could be no genuine freedom of information, and that a Press correspondent could transmit only officially sponsored information if he was to avoid the accusation of espionage. It had been claimed that the protests against the treatment of Mr. Oatis represented interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State; that claim was ill-founded, and as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights implied, the right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas must no longer be regarded as a purely domestic matter, but as one to be dealt with at the international level.

8. When the representatives of certain States informed the United Nations that freedom of information and of the Press existed in their respective countries, the depth of the cleavage between them and those countries which adhered to traditional views on the same question was particularly strongly emphasized. He was fully prepared to acknowledge that the representatives of the Eastern European countries made their statements in full sincerity, and it was highly regrettable that the two groups had reached a stage at which they ascribed diametrically opposite meanings to the same terms.

9. In conclusion, his delegation wished to stress its entire agreement with the Economic and Social Council resolution 387 B (XIII), and it earnestly appealed to all governments concerned to do everything in their power to safeguard the right of correspondents to go freely about their lawful business.

10. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) wished to pay a tribute to the representative of France for the excellent work he had done in connexion with freedom of information, particularly in the Committee on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information which had met in New York at the invitation of the General Assembly (Assembly resolution 426 (V)).

11. Freedom of information was an item which figured constantly on the General Assembly's agenda, and it was particularly important that it should not be permitted to become a dead letter but should receive, as it were, an infusion of new life at each session.

12. The United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information held at Geneva in 1948 had brought together both political and technical experts from the fifty-four countries which constituted the membership of the United Nations at that time. It had speedily produced a draft convention on the international transmission of news and the right of correction and had put forward many useful suggestions which were later incorporated in the appropriate section of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

13. The *ad hoc* committee designated by the General Assembly had drafted a convention on freedom of

information and had proposed that the Economic and Social Council should convene a conference of plenipotentiaries composed of diplomatic representatives, as opposed to representatives only of the United Nations, in order to bring together the maximum number of countries possible.

14. However, all that work was suspended because the Economic and Social Council had decided not to convene the conference, and because the failure to adopt a convention, resulting naturally from the failure to hold the conference intended for that purpose, had in its turn prevented the entry into force of the convention prepared by the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information held at Geneva in 1948.

15. It was therefore to be hoped that, before the seventh session of the General Assembly, the Council could be induced to reverse its decision. As an encouraging precedent to holding the kind of conference proposed, reference could be made to the conference which had led to the draft conventions approved in Geneva in 1948, a conference whose extremely wide representation had not prevented the achievement of concrete results. The overriding consideration was, of course, that progress in the field of freedom of information was intimately bound up with the general state of international relations, and thus an advance in that field could, in the last analysis, come about only as a result of an easing of international tension.

16. The two items, concerning human rights and freedom of information, had passed through many vicissitudes and had suffered numerous set-backs. Nevertheless, with regard to the latter, and indeed to the former, it was the duty of Member States to reaffirm their faith in the lofty principles involved, and in that connexion the draft resolution of which he was a co-sponsor, taking into consideration the somewhat difficult circumstances, was intended to secure the adoption of the procedure which appeared most likely to achieve the desired purpose.

17. Mrs. DE RIEMAECKER (Belgium) said that her country, in which freedom of information was an institution of long standing under the Constitution, had been able to lend its enthusiastic support to Economic and Social Council resolution 387 B (XIII), to which reference had already been made in the discussion.

18. The solemn appeal which that resolution had addressed to Member States had, unfortunately, not obtained such a sympathetic reception everywhere. In the case of Czechoslovakia, it had been categorically rejected, as was attested by the case of Mr. Oatis. The draconian punishment meted out to Mr. Oatis and also to three Czechoslovak employees of the Associated Press, guilty, like Mr. Oatis, only of having fulfilled their professional duties, was too well known to require emphasis. The case had also vital implications for all the Members of the United Nations, first, because it constituted a direct attack on the very principle of freedom of information, which was currently being discussed by the Third Committee, and secondly because all Press correspondents of free countries were liable to suffer the fate of Mr. Oatis.

19. The case also raised a question of universal interest since it opposed two radically different conceptions of the role of the Press correspondent: on the one hand that of a free informer, and on the other that of an informer entirely subjected to the orders of a totalitarian State and whose sole *raison d'être* was to transmit officially sponsored and edited information. In Czechoslovakia, as in all countries where similar régimes were in power, a Press correspondent, whether a national of the country in question or a foreigner, was obliged to place implicit belief in governmental statements and to obtain his information through administrative channels only, if he were to avoid the accusation of espionage. Under such a system there was no room for free journalism, and in the circumstances any convention on freedom of information would be entirely devoid of value.

20. Her delegation could only associate itself with those delegations which demanded respect for the freedom of information and the observance of Economic and Social Council resolution 387 B (XIII).

21. Mr. VAVRICKA (Czechoslovakia) felt bound to refute the allegations made by the United States representative, who, in the United Nations, had used the case of Mr. William Oatis as a platform for propaganda hostile to Czechoslovakia—a red herring to divert attention from the United States own illegal espionage activities in that country.

22. The fact was that Mr. Oatis had, after being found guilty in a perfectly regular trial, received the sentence prescribed by Czechoslovak law for the crime of which he was convicted; his case came solely within the competence of the Czechoslovak authorities, and it was contrary both to the United Nations Charter and to the principles of international law to contest the legitimacy of a verdict passed by the court of a sovereign State.

23. Mr. Oatis had ostensibly gone to Czechoslovakia as a journalist, in charge of the Associated Press agency in Prague; yet the statements he himself had made at his trial indicated clearly that his real occupation was quite different. He admitted that he had received training at military espionage schools in the United States of America, organized by military intelligence officers; that, before coming to Czechoslovakia, his predecessor had told him that part of the work consisted of collecting non-official information; and that, on arrival in Prague, the United States Military Attaché, Colonel Attwood, with whom he had been acquainted at the military espionage school, and who, he was sure, was also engaged on espionage, had instructed him to obtain information on the building of new military installations in various parts of the country. Further, Mr. Oatis at his trial had described how he had organized a spy ring, and relayed the information obtained either to London or New York, or, when special precautions had to be taken, to the United States Embassy in Prague, and he had admitted how, with the help of the "Voice of America" he had given warning to a person who had already assassinated one Czechoslovak citizen, and was preparing to assassinate others, thereby helping that person to escape arrest by the police.

24. The United States representative had represented Mr. Oatis as a newspaper correspondent who had been arrested whilst carrying out his normal duties, but it was surely not the work of a journalist to collect information on the location of military objectives, to organize a spy ring, to help assassins to escape justice, or to transmit to foreign Powers detailed information on the discovery and character of new uranium mines. The profound interest evinced by the United States of America in the fate of Mr. Clementis were doubtless not unconnected with the aims of those who directed the activities of Mr. Oatis; the latter had in fact described how he had received from London and New York precise instructions on the Sling, Clementis and Svermova group.

25. The work of Mr. Oatis, moreover, was closely linked to that of other groups of terrorists and criminals sent into Czechoslovakia at the orders of the United States of America to hamper the peaceful progress of Czechoslovak democracy and to prepare for a third world war.

26. It was monstrous to assert that the conviction of Mr. Oatis constituted a violation of human rights, and in particular of the right to freedom of information. The Czech criminal code was not the only one to provide for the punishment of espionage: the United Kingdom, French, Swiss and United States criminal codes all provided for heavy sentences for espionage. All States had similar legislation; and it was unjust to accuse the Czechoslovak Government of acting with undue harshness.

27. The revolting element in the case concerning Mr. Oatis was the fact that the principle of freedom of information had been abused, that the right of a sovereign State to convict espionage agents was being contested, and that the case was being used as a pretext for flagrant violation of international obligations and for the exertion of economic pressure and discrimination. Moreover, it was not an isolated instance, but part of a campaign by the United States of America against Czechoslovakia.

28. The Czechoslovak delegation wished to take the opportunity to denounce the duplicity of the United States Government, which was interpreting the noble principles of freedom of the Press and information as freedom to carry on hostile propaganda and prepare for a new war, whilst at the same time quelling all demonstrations in favour of peace. That was in clear contradiction to the desire of peoples throughout the world for the maintenance of peace, the development of normal economic relations and the raising of the standard of living.

29. Nor was that all; the United States of America continued to violate Czechoslovak sovereignty by sending spies and assassins into countries to disrupt the peaceful life of the inhabitants; and members of the United States Embassy in Prague had been instrumental in organizing the escape of criminals fleeing from justice.

30. The Czechoslovak delegation, whilst appreciating the anger of the United States of America at losing

so valuable a link in its network of espionage directed against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, would oppose any attempt to exploit the case of Mr. Oatis as a pretext for slander against the truly democratic Government of Czechoslovakia; or to represent it as a violation of the principle of freedom of information. All efforts to provoke trouble in Czechoslovakia along the lines proposed by the United States Mutual Security Act of October 1951 would be resolutely resisted by Czechoslovakia and by all other peace-loving countries.

31. AZMI Bey (Egypt) noted that no action had been taken on the question of communications concerning human rights which had been received by the Commission on Human Rights earlier, and forwarded to the Economic and Social Council; the Council had confined itself (resolution 384 A (XIII)) to taking note of the communications. Nor had any steps been taken with regard to the last two lists of communications submitted: chapter V, section II, paragraphs 780 and 781, of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/1884) again spoke of "taking note" of those lists. As a member of the Commission on Human Rights, he wished to point out that the position was very unsatisfactory. There seemed to be a mistaken idea that implementation of human rights could be deferred until completion of the draft international covenant on human rights.

32. He reserved the right to submit, later in the debate on chapter V of the Economic and Social Council's report, a draft resolution calling on the Council to take measures with regard to the matter.

33. With regard to the question of freedom of information, he agreed with the French representative that the Economic and Social Council's attitude towards that vital problem was regrettable and he stressed the importance of giving priority to the consideration of that matter.

34. An argument for such priority was the interdependence of the two conventions, which the General Assembly had decided to open for signature simultaneously. The question with regard to which complaints had been raised in the Third Committee was dealt with in the first convention, but that instrument could not enter into force without the second convention. Such complaints of violations of freedom of information would never cease until both conventions had been signed.

35. In his first statement on the draft covenant on human rights (365th meeting), he had expressed serious doubts as to whether the Commission on Human Rights would be able to carry out its work if the task of drafting two covenants were imposed on it; the Third Committee's debates during the current session had done nothing to dispel those doubts. If an incomplete covenant or covenants were returned to the General Assembly at its seventh session, freedom of information would not be given priority and would be referred to the eighth session, although the question had been studied and debated thoroughly.

36. Moreover, the Economic and Social Council had not deemed it necessary to convene a session of the

Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press in 1951 and had convened that body for its final session. He thought that decision was regrettable, since the Sub-Commission had already begun the study of obstacles to freedom of information and could not be expected both to conclude that study and to undertake the examination of the draft international code of ethics for journalists^a in a single three weeks' session.

37. His delegation intended to submit a draft resolution on that matter, either to the Joint Second and Third Committee or to the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

38. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) considered that paragraphs 800 and 801 of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/1884) clearly showed the necessity of a permanent United Nations organ to supervise freedom of information, which was an essential human right. He had welcomed the *ad hoc* committee's recommendation to convene a conference of plenipotentiaries on the signature of a convention on freedom of information^b but wished to point out that a primary condition of respect for all human rights was the existence of a government which permitted a strong public opinion to exist.

39. The limitation of free expression was endangered by the existence of political systems which did not respect the human personality, and especially the right of a citizen to discuss his government, to criticize it and to send communications abroad. There was nothing to be feared from any national or foreign correspondents, and no government which based its States security on the free will of its people, and thus respected free discussion, had anything to hide. Although the free Press was steadily raising its standard of efficiency, many unfortunate violations of the principles stated in article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were taking place. More cases of the kind brought up by the United States representative were occurring, censorship was being extended, Press organs were being closed down and newsprint was being restricted.

40. The problem had been discussed by organs of the United Nations for four years. It had to be remembered that, although it was difficult to draw up a text on which all the parties concerned would agree, the danger of postponing the question and allowing violations to continue was extremely dangerous.

41. Public opinion was becoming increasingly aware of the important part played by journalists and of the abuses brought about by the limitation of freedom of the Press. Journalists themselves were best qualified to establish regulations for the Press; that was the basic principle of the draft international code of ethics for journalists, the preparation of which would constitute a step towards the confirmation of the convention on freedom of information.

42. Further progress would also be made if the General Assembly could reverse the Economic and Social

^a See document E/1672 (E/CN.4/Sub.1/138), annex A.

^b See document A/AC.42/7, chap. IV.

Council's decision to terminate the Sub-Commission, which he felt should be given wider terms of reference.

43. His delegation was in favour of the proposal made in the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1) that priority should be given to the question of freedom of information at the seventh session of the General Assembly, but thought that proposal should be strengthened by reaffirming the Assembly's wish that the exercise of the right to freedom of opinion and expression of thought should be strengthened in all countries. The Ecuadorean and Uruguayan delegations had therefore submitted a joint amendment (A/C.3/L.239), calling for the insertion of the following text as paragraph 1 of the operative part:

"1. Reaffirming its wish that the exercise of the right to freedom of opinion and expression of thought should be strengthened in all countries."

44. Mrs. DOMANSKA (Poland) regretted that the Third Committee did not have sufficient time to consider the sections of the Economic and Social Council's report which dealt with freedom of information, but pointed out that the United States representative had used the general debate on that subject to attempt to defend a self-avowed spy who was conducting subversive activities against a country to which he had been accredited as a journalist. Although the Polish delegation favoured the principle of freedom of information, it did not consider that that principle could be used to disguise actions against the interests of other States.

45. She was not surprised that the United States representative had raised a discussion which concerned espionage, since the unprecedented hysteria on that subject in his country was well known to all, especially with regard to the case of the United States Ambassador, Mr. Jessup. Nevertheless, she wondered at the United States representative's temerity in speaking on freedom of information. United States channels of information were notoriously corrupt and were subordinated to the interests of the trusts and monopolies which directed the wartime-like economy of that country. In that connexion, she quoted the names of businessmen who were members of an advisory committee responsible for drawing up official United States information programmes; no information programmes directed by war industrialists could fail to promote propaganda for a new war. The best instance of such propaganda was the well-known special issue of *Collier's* magazine of 27 October 1951, which could not by any standards be regarded as an attempt to educate and inform public opinion.

46. The Netherlands representative had stated in his defence of the United States attack against the peoples' democracies that freedom of information might have different connotations in the West and in the East: she asked whether the words "espionage", "sabotage" and "treason" were unknown in his country and whether persons carrying on such actions could do so under the cover of the noble principle of freedom of information. If that was so, the languages of the East and West were indeed different.

47. In reply to the Belgian representative, she pointed out that there was a great difference between the con-

cepts of "freedom of information" and "freedom of espionage" and regretted that that representative had allowed herself to be used as a tool of United States policy.

48. In conclusion, she pointed out that certain representatives would no doubt have wished to speak on various other points of chapter V of the Council's report and asked the Chairman to see to it that no further tendentious statements calling for a reply were made.

49. Mrs. COELHO LISBOA DE LARRAGOITI (Brazil) whole-heartedly supported the United States delegation's advocacy of Mr. Oatis. That delegation had allowed her to see its draft of the record of the trial. In it, the Czechoslovak court had not even mentioned the name of any persons whom, according to the accusation, Mr. Oatis had been instrumental in having murdered. Those persons were probably enjoying life precisely in the same way as the twenty-four inhabitants of Barcelona referred to in the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.203/Rev.1), submitted (391st meeting) and discarded (392nd meeting) previously, who had not in fact, according to her information, been threatened with capital punishment at all but with nothing worse than a few years in gaol. The fact had been stressed that Mr. Oatis had transmitted information through London and Paris. Even the Czechoslovak Government must be aware that all news agencies distributed their material through central offices. From observations about the incident, she had deduced that Mr. Oatis had been lured into Czechoslovakia, where he had been doomed before his arrival. It was the duty of any correspondent to gather and check information material at the source, as the Czechoslovak Government must have been well aware. Correspondents had always been eager to obtain the first news of facts; they could not rely solely on official releases. The news agencies, being international in scope, had brought to the dissemination of information material a feeling of international responsibility. That was what the Czechoslovak Government had resolved to stifle.

50. She resented accusations that her delegation obtained its instructions from another delegation. During the Second World War, she herself had proved her independence by opposing the attribution to the USSR of any share in the credit for the Allies' victory, as she had foreseen what would happen during the aftermath.

51. She would whole-heartedly support the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1).

52. Mr. D'SOUZA (India), speaking as one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1), explained that the proposal to defer the consideration of the problems of freedom of information to the General Assembly's seventh session should not be construed as indifference to the gravity of those problems. Precisely because the sponsors were so deeply impressed by the importance of the matter, they had felt that a really thorough discussion would be essential before the international convention on freedom of information could be properly drafted. Thus, they had laid particular emphasis on the priority to be given to that problem at the seventh session.

53. During the years of debate on the subject, his delegation had become more and more impressed by the fact that many of the differences of opinion, genuine though they were and based upon divergent ideologies, were at bottom due mainly to ignorance and a misinterpretation of facts. Even the ideologies themselves were in large part founded on the results of such misinterpretations. If the United Nations were to work for international peace, it must do so on the basis of satisfactory information. If agreement could be reached with regard to the nature, purpose and scope of the freedom of information, the United Nations would have advanced a long way towards settling the differences that kept its Members divided.

54. The mechanical gathering and presentation of facts and the freedom to do so were not nearly as vital as the proper assessment of fact by a free, objective and judicious mind. If too much stress was laid on the convention guaranteeing the freedom to gather and mechanically to transmit information material, those who believed in the convention as a whole would be doomed to disappointment.

55. India was a country in which the search for truth rather than mere facts, and thereby for mutual tolerance, had been carried on steadily for thousands of years. The idea that the East was fossilized was completely untrue; history had shown that its spiritual and intellectual leaders had always pursued truth to its inexorable conclusion. India had benefited from United Kingdom rule by successfully using the tradition of the United Kingdom to appeal against India's former ruler. India had taken to itself the great French tradition of the liberty of thought and expression; and it was inappropriate that the French delegation had been foremost in the fight for freedom of information in the United Nations. In that spirit, the Indian delegation had done its best to assist in drafting the convention on freedom of information and regretted that no greater progress had been made.

56. It therefore supported the phrase in the original text (A/C.3/L.227), which had been withdrawn by the French delegation in order to obtain wider general agreement.

57. Two reservations to the unfettered freedom of information must, however, be duly made. First, in times of real national emergency some limitations would be necessary; but with the proviso that such a state of emergency would not be prolonged indefinitely or unnecessarily. Secondly the difference between freedom of information in the interest of truth and such freedom perverted to satisfy prurient curiosity or to serve unsavoury purposes should be clearly established. The draft international code of ethics for journalists would be a most important part of the convention; it would lay down that some limits, if only those of common decency, must be observed to prevent liberty from degenerating into licence.

58. With those two reservations, he would strongly support the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1).

59. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that nothing tangible had emerged from the Third Committee's discussions on the draft convention on freedom of information because the Economic and Social Council had failed to comply with the General Assembly's explicit intention that a conference of plenipotentiaries should be convened. Paragraphs 792 and 797 of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/1884) showed the cavalier manner in which the whole matter had been treated by a majority in the Economic and Social Council. It had, partly, been the General Assembly's own fault; it should have transmitted a mandatory request to the Council rather than a mere recommendation.

60. The French delegation, to which he wished to pay a well-merited tribute, had done its best; the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1), in the drafting of which it had played a leading part, was an earnest of its admirable intentions.

61. Obviously, information material was composed of two elements: news and views. Of the two, the freedom to interpret facts was the more open to discussion. Fact was becoming subservient to opinion owing to the spread of propaganda. It was the warped interpretation of fact rather than the mere dissemination of news that was exercising such a mischievous influence upon international relations.

62. It had been asked who was to distinguish propaganda from genuine news; undoubtedly, that was hard, but all that was really needed was the exercise of the moral sense. It was, of course, almost equally difficult to define the moral sense or morality, particularly as propaganda was only too often disguised as an innocent presentation of facts; but it was perfectly possible. Such propaganda might either be positive, in the form of dramatization or exaggeration, or negative, as a conspiracy of silence. The right of correction might be invoked; but it could rarely remedy the harm already done.

63. Furthermore, great caution should be exercised to see that foreign correspondents were bona fide journalists; many such correspondents had subsequently disclosed in their own reminiscences that they had in fact been acting as foreign agents. The adoption of an international code of ethics, drafted not by the governments but by the information agencies themselves, would establish a corporation from which the black sheep would be expelled by their own colleagues. That code could be set up only if the convention was drafted.

64. He therefore supported the idea embodied in the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.1) that the problems of freedom of information should receive priority at the seventh session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.