

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



Saturday, 2 February 1952, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter V) (A/1884, A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.240, A/C.3/L.245, A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) (concluded)	439
Draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons (A/1913, A/C.3/L.241)	447
Completion of the Committee's work	447

Chairman : Mrs. Ana FIGUEROA (Chile).

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter V)
(A/1884, A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.240, A/C.3/L.245, A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) (concluded)

[Item 11]*

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN called upon those representatives who had asked to exercise their right of reply under rule 114 of the rules of procedure.

2. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered that the questions dealt with in chapter V of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/1884) were important enough to merit calm consideration. The United States representative had judged otherwise and had used the occasion to slander the USSR and the peoples' democracies. The United States of America always resorted to that underhand procedure when it needed to divert attention from its plans of aggression and to disguise the fact that it was interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries.

3. It was common knowledge that, after having failed in its attempts to secure mastery of Romania, Hungary and Bulgaria, the United States of America had engaged in organizing, within those countries, bands of terrorists and espionage networks whose aim it was to foment disorder and overthrow the governments. By the so-called Mutual Security Act of 10 October 1951 the United States Government had laid its cards upon the table. He referred the members of the Committee to the text of that law and to the official commentaries accompanying it.

4. It was true that the subversive activities of the United States of America had recently suffered serious

set-backs. That was why it had used agenda item 11, relating to freedom of information, to try to exonerate one of its spies arrested in Czechoslovakia. The United States representative had stated that William Oatis was an honest journalist and that he had only been seeking to collect accurate information. But the Ukrainian representative wondered what honest correspondent would be interested in the number of barracks in Czechoslovakia, would try to gain entry to aerodromes or would feel obliged to contact persons hostile to the regime. It was useless to deny the facts; Oatis had been caught red-handed and the trial had proved his guilt. To see that that was so, it was necessary to refer to the complete text of the proceedings not merely to certain passages of it, as the United States representative had done (413th meeting).

5. There was unrestricted freedom of information in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; but that freedom did not extend to those who, under the guise of journalism, engaged in espionage and sabotage. The United States representative had slandered the laws in force in the USSR and the peoples' democracies, quoting from documents which were quite irrelevant to the subject of freedom of information. Naturally, it was easier for him to slander than to justify the state of affairs which prevailed in his own country. He would have done better to comment on the discriminatory laws which affected 14 million Negroes in the United States of America. Instead of asserting (416th meeting) that there was no justice under the law in the Soviet Union, the Canadian representative would have been better advised to refer to the 4,715 lynchings which, according to statistics, had occurred in the United States of America between 1882 and 1946, and the 5 which had occurred between 1 January and 10 January 1950.

6. The United Kingdom representative had spoken (416th meeting) of various concepts of freedom of

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

information. The peoples' democracies were in favour of conscientious and honest freedom of information, freedom of information which did not consist of lies or slander and which built up friendship between peoples; others left the door open to fascist propaganda and confused the freedom of the journalist with that of the spy. In the text quoted by the United Kingdom representative, Rosa Luxembourg had been speaking of the bourgeois Press. It would have been better to quote Sir Hartley Shawcross, who had proposed that the front page of every newspaper should indicate the name of the proprietor and his aims. Those aims were usually to defend certain economic interests and to present the facts in a light which was favourable to such interests, without concern for the truth.

7. The Canadian representative had expressed surprise at the method of defence chosen by Oatis' counsel. But it was hard to see what other attitude an honest defence counsel could have adopted when the accused had confessed and the court had all the proofs before it. The Canadian representative would doubtless wish all lawyers to be like him and to call black white; fortunately that was not so in Czechoslovakia. He recalled the suggestion that had been made by a United States senator to the effect that Canada should be purchased; he personally saw no need for spending that money, since the purchase was already made.

8. He was sorry that the Chairman had not interrupted the United States representative when he had been speaking, not of freedom of information, but of the laws of Czechoslovakia. He regretted that consideration of the problem of freedom of information, which had been going on so long, had given no concrete result. The fault lay with those who were endeavouring to turn the Third Committee from its path. The Ukrainian delegation saw no reason why the draft convention on freedom of information should have precedence over the draft international covenant on human rights. It would support the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.243) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2).

9. Mr. TOBIAS (United States of America) did not think that it was interfering in other people's business to draw attention to the injustice suffered by an honest Press correspondent and to demand justice for a man who was being kept in prison for no good reason.

10. In reply to the Ukrainian representative's comments on the lot of Negroes in the United States of America, he acknowledged that arbitrary laws did still exist in his country and that the laws which were equitable were not always respected. However, in the United States of America, unlike Czechoslovakia, citizens, even Negroes, were entirely free to fight against injustice. He himself had gone with delegations of coloured people to see the President of the United States in order to bring his attention to certain facts. It was as a result of such action that a Committee on Civil Rights had been set up to investigate cases of racial discrimination.

11. In reply to a statement made by the USSR representative (415th meeting), he stressed the fact that the democratic party had remained in power twenty

years when 75 per cent of the newspapers in the United States were in the hands of the republican party. He pointed out, moreover, that President Truman had been re-elected despite the fact that 95 per cent of the radio commentators had spoken against him.

12. *Collier's* magazine was not an official publication; the Government of the United States of America did not control it and did not censor it. It would be inconceivable in the United States of America for the Government to decide to suppress a medium of information on the ground that it did not advance orthodox political views. Everyone was free to criticize what he read, and magazines and newspapers had special columns in which readers expressed their support for or their opposition to the views expressed by the editor.

13. It was true that a newspaperman had been arrested in the United States of America, but he had soon been released, because he was accredited to the United Nations, where he had worked for two years as a Press correspondent for communist newspapers.

14. He felt himself honoured to have been compared (413th meeting): in the matter of his speech on the Oatis case, to the workers in the slaughter-houses of Chicago. He knew them; they were honest, industrious and intelligent people, and he was amazed that the representative of a country which posed as the workers' champion should refer to them slightly.

15. Despite the view he had expressed opposing the President of the United States decision with regard to censorship, Mr. D. Lawrence still wrote his articles regularly. There were good and bad journalists in the United States, as in the whole world, but they all enjoyed one advantage, that of being free.

16. Reverting to agenda item 11, which was under discussion, he said that the United States was in favour of postponing consideration of the problem of freedom of information, but not for the reasons which some had not failed, and would not fail, to impute to it. He recalled that one question had remained unanswered: the world still did not know what had happened to Mr. Clementis.

17. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the United States representative's first statement (413th meeting) had been wholly unprovoked, that his criticisms of conditions in certain countries were uncalled for, and that his alleged information was derived from doubtful sources. Although warned that he would meet with the rebuff he deserved, the United States representative had repeated his attempt. It was to be regretted that the Third Committee had wasted valuable time by allowing him to comment on the Oatis case, as though it were connected with the agenda item on freedom of information.

18. He was a careful reader of the United States Press and was well aware of the freedom it enjoyed. He referred to an article published in the *Daily Compass* in August 1951, which had emphasized that the great newspapers provided data concerning the Korean armistice conditions laid down by the Communists, together with a number of useless details but appeared

to know nothing about the conditions laid down by the other side. He also recalled the arrest of twelve Californian journalists under the fascist law known as the *Smith Act*. The United States Attorney-General, McGrath, had admitted that those arrests had been designed to intimidate the independent journalists and to prevent publication of the *Daily Worker*, the Communist newspaper, by methods in no way inferior to those of Hitler. Some time previously Congress had adopted a censorship law which had provoked the protests of twenty-five senators who could not be suspected of subversive tendencies; they had nevertheless found that certain circles were intolerant of criticism and had stopped at nothing in their efforts to silence it.

19. He wondered why the American champions of freedom of information concealed the anxiety and misgivings of their compatriots. The Third Committee would recall the experiment made by a newspaper in Madison, Wisconsin: it had printed a pamphlet consisting of extracts from the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights and had succeeded in getting only 1 of the 112 persons canvassed to sign it. A similar experiment carried out by the *New York Post* on 31 July 1951 in New York, the greatest City of the United States and the headquarters of the United Nations, had had a similar result. Only 16 of the 161 persons asked to sign had dared to do so.

20. Those facts showed the extent to which not only freedom of information, which the United States representative invoked in favour of the spy Oatis, but also freedom of thought, were stifled in the United States of America. Freedom of expression existed only for the representatives of the trusts and monopolies and for such organizations as the Klu Klux Klan, one of the leaders of which had stated in the presence of conniving policemen that blood would flow in South Carolina if the Negroes dared to claim the right to attend the same schools as white people.

21. The United States representative had said that his country had laws, some of which were good and some bad, but that every citizen could fight to defend his rights and combat injustice. He had forgotten to mention the terror that prevailed and to say that lynching was the most certain result of any intervention in favour of rights which were denied and against acts of injustice. To demonstrate the freedom of the Press, he had also said that at the presidential elections of 1948 more than 70 per cent of the newspapers had been Republican and had campaigned against President Truman, who had nevertheless been elected. That constituted still further proof that the American Press represented, not the people, but only the monopolies which ruled the country. Moreover, there was no more difference between republicans and democrats in the United States of America than between conservatives and socialists in the United Kingdom. Whatever party was in power, the dollar was king and the "sixty families" were all-powerful.

22. As it was pointless to reply to the statements made by other delegations at the dictation of the United States of America, he would proceed to discuss the texts before the Committee. The vote on the USSR amend-

ment (A/C.3/L.243) would show who was in favour of peace and who in favour of provocation and aggression; who sought to bring about harmony in the world and who to sow hatred.

23. The USSR delegation would vote in favour of the amendment submitted by Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239), the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1) and the seven-Power amendment (A/C.3/L.244), and called on all delegations which supported peace to vote, for the USSR amendment. The joint draft resolution of which the United States was a co-sponsor (A/C.3/L.245) was an unacceptable manoeuvre designed to delay action.

24. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) replied to the two objections voiced by the Canadian representative (416th meeting) in regard to the various amendments. The first objection had been that as the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2) was a procedural motion, the amendments to it were inadmissible, since they related to the substance of the question. The purpose of the joint draft resolution was, however, to give a directive to the General Assembly, and a number of delegations had quite properly seen fit to add other valuable directives.

25. The second objection had been that the General Assembly was not competent to give priority to any particular item on its agenda. But the General Assembly had already taken such action in the past: the Third Committee had itself postponed to the seventh session the priority discussion of the question of the right of self-determination of peoples. There was moreover nothing in the General Assembly's rules of procedure to preclude the General Assembly from giving priority to questions in which it had a particular interest. Those were, however, merely pretexts. The real problem was that the amendments submitted included one from the USSR delegation and another referring to Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, which were taboo not open for discussion in a Committee which had a particular liking for procedural motions.

26. A study of the amendments showed that the seven-Power amendment merely applied the provisions of the United Nations Charter relating to Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories to freedom of information, which was a fundamental human right. The Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1) was designed to combat false information, which was generally agreed to be an evil requiring urgent action and which had been the subject of an agreement drawn up at Geneva¹. Lastly, the USSR amendment combated discrimination, the subject of a resolution (A/C.3/L.237) recently submitted (413th meeting) by the delegation of Haiti and adopted by the Joint Second and Third Committee by a substantial majority.² If it approved the various amendments which had been submitted, the Third Committee would merely be

¹ See *Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information*, Geneva, 1948 (E/Conf.6/79).

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Joint Second and Third Committee, 66th meeting, and Annexes, item 11, documents A/C.2 and 3/L.56 and A/C.2 and 3/L.56/Rev.1.*

drawing the General Assembly's attention to the need to give special attention to those particular items at its seventh session. It was therefore a question of priority and hence of procedure.

27. The Syrian delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution and for the various amendments, but would vote against the draft resolution of the United States and the six other Powers (A/C.3/L.245), considering that a draft resolution submitted at the last minute should not be permitted to overrule two amendments submitted in accordance with the regular procedure.

28. Mr. WAMBERG (Denmark) said that his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2), but not for the amendments which were concerned with the substance of the problem and should be studied at a later stage. Danish public opinion set great store by freedom of information, which the Constitution and the laws of Denmark vied in protecting. That protective wall had never been breached in his country and all attacks, both direct and indirect, had called forth unanimous protests. The Economic and Social Council resolution on the protection of correspondents (resolution 387 B (XIII)) was in complete accordance with the views of the Danish delegation, which was convinced of the persuasive powers of truth, but also unfortunately of falsehood. He was proud to have taken part in the conference of chiefs of Press agencies in Geneva in 1931, which had declared a war on false information, a war which was still in progress. His delegation would support all efforts to secure genuine freedom of information and the triumph of truth.

29. The CHAIRMAN announced that, subject to the Committee's agreement, she would put to the vote the draft resolution on procedure (A/C.3/L.245), and then, if necessary, the joint draft resolution and amendments in the following order: the amendments to the amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239), then that amendment itself (A/C.3/L.239) and lastly the joint draft resolution itself (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2).

30. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that the draft resolution on procedure (A/C.3/L.245) had no preamble and therefore set forth a decision without stating the arguments. He thought the sponsors of the joint draft resolution should indicate the reasons for the submission of their proposal. The sponsors of the two amendments mentioned in that proposal should also be given an opportunity of expressing their views.

31. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) said that all the amendments had in them constructive ideas and should therefore be retained. But some of them related to the substance of the problem, whereas the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2) was of a procedural nature. The amendments referred to in the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245) were especially important and deserved to be considered in detail, but the Committee was unable to give them that careful consideration for lack of time. It would therefore be better to postpone them until the seventh session of the General Assembly.

32. AZMI Bey (Egypt) endorsed the Mexican representative's statement.

33. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) appreciated the fact that the Third Committee no longer had the time to give his amendment the consideration it deserved. He therefore agreed to its postponement until the seventh session of the General Assembly, but asked for note to be taken of the Mexican representative's statement, with which the Egyptian representative had associated himself, so that the delegations at the seventh session would know the importance which the Third Committee attached to the problem. He requested the sponsors of the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245) to add another paragraph to the recital or, if they preferred, to accept the one which he would submit.

34. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) accepted the Afghanistan representative's proposal on behalf of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution.

35. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) proposed the following additions to the recital:

"Recognizing that, for lack of time, the consideration that they deserve cannot be given to the contents of documents A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1,

"Considering the great importance of the above amendment..."

36. Mr. D'SOUZA (India) suggested that the meeting should be suspended in order to enable the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.245) to study the text proposed by Mr. Pazhwak.

37. AZMI Bey (Egypt) supported the Indian representative's suggestion.

The meeting was suspended at 5.25 p.m. and was resumed at 5.55 p.m.

38. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) announced that the sponsors of the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245) and he had agreed on the wording of a recital to the draft resolution which incorporated, with certain amendments, the text submitted by the Afghan delegation. The joint draft procedural resolution, as amended, appeared in document A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1.

39. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to have a clarification of the exact meaning of the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1). He asked whether, under that draft resolution, it was intended to refer the points raised in the Afghan (A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1) and the USSR (A/C.3/L.243) amendments to the General Assembly for study at its seventh session. That would be understandable since those points fell within the scope of the more general problem of the freedom of information which the General Assembly would have to take up at the seventh session. But that must not prevent the Third Committee from studying the amendments themselves and from taking a decision on them during the sixth session. The USSR delegation therefore felt that the Third Committee should first dispose of the various amendments and then take up the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1).

40. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that the Ecuadorean delegation which, together with the Uruguayan delegation, had submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.239) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2), was prepared to support the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1). The two positions were not in any way contradictory. The joint Ecuadorean and Uruguayan amendment, although relating to the substance of the matter, merely reaffirmed the principle already set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and did not therefore require detailed study before a decision was taken on it. The USSR (A/C.3/L.243) and Afghan (A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1) amendments were different. The former raised a very controversial issue.

41. It was well known that a similar text had already been submitted to the Committee on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information which had studied it and rejected it by 9 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions, as indicated in the report of that body^a. The least that could be said was that the amendment dealt with a matter which, in view of its importance, would be better left pending until the seventh session of the General Assembly. The Ecuadorean delegation wished, however, to make it clear that it was opposed to the substance of the amendment which defended a principle that, if put into practice, would mean the establishment of a system of censorship which it regarded as unacceptable. The Afghan amendment also implied a certain limitation of the freedom of information. The question which it raised was brought up in article 4 of the draft convention prepared by the aforesaid Committee, which provided that "a Contracting State may establish the right of reply or a similar corrective remedy", and was still under consideration.

42. The Ecuadorean delegation thought therefore that it would be preferable to postpone to the seventh session of the General Assembly the consideration of the matters raised by the two amendments, on condition that the Third Committee accepted immediately the general principle set forth in the joint amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239).

43. The CHAIRMAN, replying to the question asked by the representative of the USSR, said that the draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1), as she understood it, was intended to refer the actual text of the USSR and Afghan amendments to the seventh session of the General Assembly. In other words, those amendments would not be discussed by the Third Committee at the sixth session of the General Assembly, if the draft resolution was adopted. That was why it would seem logical to vote first on the draft resolution.

44. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that, in that case, the draft resolution on procedure (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1), submitted at the instigation of the United States of America and certain other delegations, discriminated against the amendments of the USSR and Afghanistan. In point of fact there was no reference to the other amendments to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2) submitted to the

Committee. If the Committee thought it had enough time to discuss and vote upon the joint amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239) for example, there was no reason why it could not also vote on the USSR amendment (A/C.3/L.243). The representative of Ecuador had recalled that a similar proposal had been studied and rejected by the Committee on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information. However that body had had only a small number of members, whereas there were sixty on the Third Committee. Moreover, such a preliminary examination of the matter by a subsidiary organ of the United Nations should help the Third Committee to make up its mind on the amendment.

45. The most elementary sense of justice required that all the amendments put forward should be given the same treatment and that it should be decided either to examine them all at the sixth session or to refer them all to the seventh session of the General Assembly. The joint draft resolution, a so-called procedural resolution, concerned on the contrary only two of the amendments put forward, those put forward by the USSR and Afghanistan. Such discrimination was obviously explained by the desire of certain delegations not to be compelled openly to take a stand on the substance of the USSR proposal, and it was particularly out of place in a body such as the Third Committee.

46. The USSR delegation therefore objected categorically to the procedure proposed in the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1).

47. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) explained that the joint draft resolution on procedure (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) proposed to give special treatment to the USSR and Afghan amendments because they raised questions of very great importance and therefore required a longer and more detailed examination than the Third Committee could give them at the current stage of its work. The Afghan delegation, which was anxious to see its amendment given all the attention it deserved, would therefore not insist on its being voted upon at the sixth session of the General Assembly.

48. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) emphasized that it had not been in any way the intention of the authors of the joint draft resolution on procedure (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) to discriminate against the amendments of Afghanistan and the USSR. The delegations of the Dominican Republic, Egypt, India, Mexico, the Philippines, the United States of America and Venezuela had simply considered that those two amendments raised important questions of substance which should be given detailed consideration and could not be decided upon hastily. On the other hand they had not thought it necessary to propose the postponement of the joint amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239), since it merely emphasized in general terms the importance of freedom of information and of the Press.

49. It was to be remembered, moreover, that the procedure proposed in the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) was by no means an innovation, and that it had been decided at the sixth session of the General Assembly to postpone also consideration of proposals

^a See document A/AC.42/7, para. 92.

on measures of implementation of the international covenant on human rights.

50. To avoid any difficulty a decision could be taken to postpone until the seventh session consideration of all the amendments to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2) submitted to the Committee.

51. Mr. REYES (Philippines) associated himself with the remarks of the Mexican representative, and thanked the Afghan representative for the co-operative spirit he had shown.

52. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the precedent mentioned by the Mexican representative did not apply in the case in question. The decision to postpone consideration of proposals on measures of implementation applied to all such proposals without exception, whereas the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) applied to only two amendments. It was against that discrimination that his delegation was protesting.

53. The sponsors and supporters of the joint draft procedural resolution had said that the Afghan and USSR amendments were important and on that account required thorough study. That appeared to imply that the joint amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239) did not deserve the same attention and that the Committee had reached a point at which it could hardly take a decision on anything except superficial proposals that did not require serious study.

54. In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) said that he formally proposed, as an amendment to the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1), the addition of the amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239), and the joint amendment (A/C.3/L.244) to that amendment, to the amendments consideration of which would be postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly. His delegation's proposal was thus for the addition of the symbols of those documents, namely A/C.3/L.239, and A/C.3/L.244, to the first paragraph of the joint draft resolution.

55. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) observed that the effect of the Mexican amendment, should it be adopted, would be to postpone to the seventh session of the General Assembly the consideration of and decision on questions which had already been discussed and voted upon. He wondered, in particular, what there was for the General Assembly to consider in the joint amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay, which merely repeated a passage from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

56. Such being the case his delegation requested that the Committee should take a separate decision upon postponement, to the seventh session of the General Assembly, of each of the amendments and amendments to amendments.

57. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the Third Committee ought either to confine itself to adopting a mere procedural draft resolution, or, if it decided to deal with the substance of the problem, to study all the proposals and amend-

ments relating to it. In other words, if the Committee considered the joint amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239), it had also to discuss the other amendments which were before it. Otherwise it would be discriminating against those amendments.

58. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) felt that it was not necessary to postpone till the seventh session of the General Assembly consideration of all the amendments and amendments to amendments to the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2) submitted to the Committee. Some of them related to matters which could quite well be dealt with at the sixth session of the General Assembly; that applied to the amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239), which restated an already recognized principle and could be put to the vote forthwith.

59. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) asked for a vote by roll-call on the inclusion of each of the amendments and amendments to amendments in the list of documents consideration of which would be postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly.

60. Mr. KAYSER (France) pointed out that if the Third Committee decided against including all or some of the amendments in the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1), that would mean that the Committee felt that it could still give them all the attention they required at the sixth session of the General Assembly.

61. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that if consideration of all the amendments were postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly, the resolution would lose its discriminatory character. In that event, his delegation would not vote against the joint draft procedural resolution, although it would prefer all the amendments to be considered and voted upon at the sixth session.

62. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Mexican amendment to the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) for the addition of document A/C.3/L.239 to the list of documents, consideration of which would be postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, India.

Against: Philippines, Syria, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Greece, Honduras.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Indonesia.

The amendment was adopted by 29 votes to 12, with 9 abstentions.

63. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Mexican amendment to the joint draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) for the addition of document A/C.3/L.244 to the list of documents consideration of which would be postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly.

64. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) pointed out that, since the Committee had decided to include the joint amendment of Ecuador and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.239) in the list of documents consideration of which would be postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly, it followed that document A/C.3/L.244, as an amendment to that amendment, was included in the list automatically.

65. The CHAIRMAN agreed that since the Committee had decided to include document A/C.3/L.239 among the documents consideration of which would be postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly, it could not consider at the current session document A/C.3/L.244, which was an amendment to it. For the sake of clarity, however, it would be better also to vote on the Mexican amendment for the addition of document A/C.3/L.244 to the list of documents.

66. She consequently called for a vote on that amendment.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Yemen, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Against: Australia.

Abstaining: Yugoslavia, Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, New Zealand, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

The amendment was adopted by 35 votes to 1, with 14 abstentions.

67. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the inclusion of document A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1 in the list of documents consideration of which would be postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia.

Abstaining: Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Australia, Belgium, Denmark.

It was decided by 38 votes to none, with 12 abstentions, to include document A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1.

68. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the inclusion of document A/C.3/L.243 in the list of documents consideration of which would be postponed until the seventh session of the General Assembly.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: France, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia.

Abstaining: Lebanon, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Australia, Belgium, Denmark.

It was decided, by 36 votes to none, with 14 abstentions, to include document A/C.3/L.243.

69. The CHAIRMAN put the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1), as a whole, as amended, to the vote.

The joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1), as a whole, as amended, was approved by 37 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

70. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) wanted to explain his vote on the draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1). He had voted against the proposal to include document A/C.3/L.239 in the list of documents to be mentioned in the draft resolution, and thus to defer the matter until the seventh session of the General Assembly, but as the majority had decided that the document should be included in the list of documents to be deferred until the seventh session, he had voted to have document A/C.3/L.244 included also, since it was an amendment referring to document A/C.3/L.239. The representative of Afghanistan had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole.

71. He wished to emphasize the fact that, owing to an unexpected procedural situation, the Third Committee had decided to postpone until the seventh session of the General Assembly a draft resolution (A/C.3/L.239) which merely reaffirmed the wish that the exercise of the right of freedom of opinion and expression of thought should be strengthened in all countries and a draft resolution (A/C.3/L.244) expressing the same wish with regard to all Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. He knew that the Committee, in taking that decision, had not intended it thus and that it was the wish of all Members of the General Assembly that the right of freedom of opinion and expression of

thought should be respected throughout the world. He regretted, however, that a procedural difficulty had led to such a deadlock.

72. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) had not voted for the draft procedural resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1), since for fairly obvious reasons, he would have liked the Committee to proceed immediately to consideration of the USSR amendment which admitted freedom of speech and of the Press provided that they were not exploited for war propaganda, for the incitement of hatred among the peoples, for racial discrimination and for the dissemination of slanderous rumours.

73. Mr. YU Tsune-Chi (China) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) deferring consideration of certain documents until the seventh session of the General Assembly because it was a proposal referring exclusively to procedure, but it should not be concluded that his delegation approved the contents of the documents in question.

74. He regretted that the Committee had not had time to examine the draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons, which was of no less importance than the others. It was a fact that in many countries stateless persons did not enjoy all the fundamental human freedoms. Holders of diplomatic passports did not always realize that freedom of movement was merely an empty phrase to those who had no passports at all.

75. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.245/Rev.1) because he considered that it was preferable to examine all the amendments forthwith.

76. The CHAIRMAN observed with regard to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2) that the seventh session of the General Assembly would be master of its agenda and that consequently the word "provisional" should be added before the word "agenda" in the operative part of that draft resolution.

77. Mr. KAYSER (France) suggested that, as the words "and of this situation" in the operative paragraph referred to a sentence that had been deleted from the preamble, they should be omitted.

78. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that the second part of the preamble, beginning with the words "and especially", should be voted upon separately. His delegation, moreover, could not accept the word "regretting"; by saying that is regretted, the Third Committee would be acting like the parricide who pleaded extenuating circumstances on the grounds that he was an orphan. The USSR representative also requested that the operative paragraph should be voted upon in two parts: the first, down to the words "seventh regular session"; the second comprising the remainder of the paragraph.

79. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) considered that the words "to give it priority" must not cause the draft convention on freedom of information to be considered before the draft covenants on human rights.

80. Mr. KAYSER (France) replied that only a wish was being expressed and that the General Assembly naturally remained master of its agenda. There was no implication that the draft convention on freedom of information should be taken as the first item of the agenda but only as one of the first items. All delegations were convinced of the importance of the question and that should be made quite clear to the General Assembly.

81. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2) to the vote in parts in accordance with the proposal made by the representative of the USSR.

The second part of the preamble reading "and especially to the study of the draft convention on freedom of information" was adopted by 26 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

The first part of the operative paragraph up to the words "seventh regular session" was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The remainder of the operative paragraph was adopted by 26 votes to 11, with 12 abstentions.

The draft resolution (A/C.3/L.227/Rev.2), as a whole, was approved by 38 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY EGYPT (A/C.3/L.240)

82. The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the Egyptian draft resolution on communications concerning human rights (A/C.3/L.240).

83. AZMI Bey (Egypt) recalled the Economic and Social Council's resolution 275 B (X) which requested the Secretary-General to compile and distribute to members of the Commission on Human Rights, first, a non-confidential list containing a brief indication of the substance of each communication which dealt with the principles involved in the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights, and secondly, a confidential list containing a brief indication of the substance of other communications concerning human rights. The Secretary-General distributed such lists annually, but the Commission confined itself to taking note of them. He had therefore submitted his draft resolution, so that the communications would no longer serve only to swell the archives and that the Commission on Human Rights might consider them.

84. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought it preferable to deal with the question in the same way as that of measures of implementation; that is to say, by referring it directly to the Commission on Human Rights. As it stood, the Egyptian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.240) gave the Economic and Social Council too much freedom; he would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution.

85. AZMI Bey (Egypt) replied that there was a vast difference between the question of implementation and that of communications. Communications had been the subject of a special Economic and Social Council resolution (275(X)) and had no connexion with the covenant.

There was no risk in requesting the Economic and Social Council to give the Commission instructions for its ninth session and to request it to formulate its recommendations because the seventh session of the General Assembly would take place long before the Commission's ninth session and the General Assembly could consider the Council's report and see what instructions had been given.

86. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) asked that the last part of the operative clause beginning with the words "and to request..." should be put to the vote separately. He thought it illogical that the Economic and Social Council should be invited to give instructions to the Commission on Human Rights and at the same time be told what instructions it should give.

87. AZMI Bey (Egypt) said that there was no question of telling the Economic and Social Council what instructions it should give, and that the Commission on Human Rights was quite competent to formulate recommendations. In that connexion he recalled the Council resolutions of 16 February 1946⁴ and 21 June 1946⁵ on the Commission's terms of reference.

88. The CHAIRMAN put the Egyptian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.240) to the vote.

89. She put to the vote first the last part of the operative paragraph, beginning with the words "and to request...".

That part was adopted by 18 votes to 12, with 13 abstentions.

90. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Egypt (A/C.3/L.240), as a whole.

The draft resolution (A/C.3/L.240), as a whole, was approved by 20 votes to 6, with 17 abstentions.

91. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Joint Second and Third Committee had already considered part B of chapter V of the Economic and Social Council's report and approved it. Thus, if there was no objection, chapter V, as a whole, would be considered as approved by the Third Committee.

Draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons (A/1913, A/C.3/L.241)

[Item 58]*

92. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up the last item of its agenda (item 58 of the General Assembly agenda), concerning the draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons, in connexion with which a joint draft resolution had been submitted by Brazil, Pakistan, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (A/C.3/L.241).

93. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), introducing the joint draft resolution on behalf of the co-sponsors, said that, while the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees had been finally adopted and

signed,⁶ the same was not true of the draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons. The convention relating to the status of Refugees was not applicable to all stateless persons, although many of them were actually refugees. While recognizing that they were less numerous than the refugees, as defined in the convention, and that their situation was less tragic, the United Kingdom Government would like to see provision made for them. The laws of the United Kingdom enabled the Government to extend the benefits of the convention on the status of refugees to stateless persons, and his Government in fact did so. He was not, however, unaware of the fact that for certain States such procedure would involve difficulties. The General Assembly, having no time to deal with that complex question adequately for the moment, should defer it till its seventh session; he thought that before the seventh session of the General Assembly the States interested might consult together and perhaps put forward proposals for that session if progress proved possible.

94. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) thought that the United Kingdom representative's suggestion was very valuable, because it would enable the States concerned to go on to the seventh session of the General Assembly better prepared, and would enable the General Assembly itself to consider the draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons to better purpose; his delegation would collaborate in the work to the best of its ability.

95. The CHAIRMAN put the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.241) to the vote.

The draft resolution (A/C.3/L.241) was approved by 39 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

96. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) regretted that she had not been present when the Third Committee had concluded its examination of chapter V of the Economic and Social Council's report. She wished to express her congratulations and her thanks to the Commission on the Status of Women, and also her gratitude to the delegations which had on the preceding day voted in favour of a resolution strengthening the authority of that organ. She thanked the Secretariat and particularly the Division to which the section on the status of women belonged, for the magnificent work they had been doing.

97. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution on the draft protocol relating to the status of stateless persons because he held that that was a matter which came wholly within the domestic jurisdiction of each State.

Completion of the Committee's work

98. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) wished to make a statement about the summary records of the Committee, with special reference to the records of the 413th and 414th meetings. Members of the Third Committee would recall that he had already had occa-

⁴ See *Journal of the Economic and Social Council, First Year*, No. 12, resolution 5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 29, resolution 9.

⁶ See *United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Status of Refugees and Stateless Persons, Final Act and Convention relating to the Status of Refugees* (Geneva, 1951).

sion to point out that the statements of representatives of the various Member States did not seem to be summarized on a proportionate basis; some were given more space than others in the summary records, although their time of delivery was not any longer or their contents did not justify such unequal treatment.

99. Thus, in the record of the 413th meeting, seven pages were allotted to the statement made by the representative of one Member State, a statement which had lasted one hour and which had dealt only with one question concerning chapter V of the report of the Economic and Social Council, whereas the statement made by the representative of Saudi Arabia at the 414th meeting was given only one page in the record of that meeting. He had spoken for about half an hour and had given the Third Committee as many facts and as much information as he could on the matter under discussion. The disparity was so obvious that it was difficult not to conclude that there was discrimination—involuntary, it was to be hoped—against the representatives of small Powers. Moreover, Saudi Arabia apart, the delegations of other small countries had noted the same thing. No doubt the situation had improved since the last intervention on the subject by the representative of Saudi Arabia (394th meeting). He considered none the less that it was necessary to stress the point again in order that in future no discrimination should be practised, in the drafting of the summary records, against the small nations which, being Members of the United Nations, had exactly the same rights as the major Powers and which, moreover, having no Press services of their own, must rely on the United Nations to make their views and opinions known.

100. Furthermore, some delegations spoke from notes instead of reading out statements prepared in advance; if the précis-writers could not follow they had the possibility of checking with the sound recordings.

101. Mr. ROIGT (Secretariat) said that he could without any hesitation assert that no discrimination had ever been practised in preparing the summary records and that they had never before called forth such a comment from any delegation. Error or involuntary omission could occur, but not discrimination. In the case of error or omission, delegates had all facilities to make the necessary changes in the summary records.

102. The Saudi Arabian representative had said that the small Powers were discriminated against. As Director of the Languages Services Division, Mr. Roigt could assure him that from the point of view of the Secretariat there were no small or great Powers, but sovereign States which were all equal, and that the records of all statements, whatever the delegation which made them, were drawn up with the same care. The Saudi Arabian representative had said that the rendering of his statement in the summary record of the 414th meeting took up only little more than one page, whereas in the preceding summary record a statement which was twice as long ran to seven pages. The length of a speech did not necessarily determine the length of the record; certain statements could be summarized

more briefly than others. It was usual in the summary records to avoid the repetition of one and the same idea in different forms. The best proof that there was no discrimination against anyone lay in the fact that in the summary record of the 398th meeting the statement of the representative of Saudi Arabia took up four pages.

103. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) emphasized how difficult it was to preside over the work of the Third Committee, both because of the number and range of questions submitted to it and because of the intensity of the opposition and the differences of opinion manifested in that body. The Committee consequently owed a debt of gratitude to the Chairman, whose moderating influence had had a most salutary effect on the discussions and whose competence had allowed the Committee to make progress in carrying out its work.

104. Mr. KAYSER (France) said that his delegation wished to convey its thanks and congratulations to all the Secretariat officials who had assisted the Third Committee in its work. It also desired to express its admiration and gratitude to the Chairman, whose authority, patience and skill had enabled the Committee successfully to complete its task in spite of all difficulties.

105. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico), speaking on behalf of all the Latin-American delegations, paid a tribute to the Chairman, whose impartiality and tolerance had always succeeded in re-establishing harmony, even during the liveliest discussions, and whose wisdom had always enabled the Committee to return to the solid ground of reality when it had gone astray in procedural discussions. The Chairman had indeed manifested the highest feminine qualities. She had shown what a woman of Latin America was able to accomplish and had thus rendered a great service to all the Latin-American countries. Thanks to her high qualities she had emerged victorious from a very severe test.

106. He thanked the Secretariat officials who had serviced the Committee.

107. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) was grateful to the Chairman for the great patience which she had continually shown. It would have been desirable for the members of the Third Committee to have followed the Chairman's example more closely. However, it was to be hoped that the time would come when the most sincere friendship would reign in United Nations bodies, and then the office of Chairman would be less onerous than at present.

108. She thanked all the officials who had contributed to the efficient progress of the Committee's work.

109. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) was deeply grateful to the Chairman for the patience and impartiality with which she had guided the Third Committee's work, without ever restricting the rights of any delegation.

110. She also desired to thank the Secretariat officials who had joined their efforts to those of the members of the Committee in order to achieve the same objectives and in the same desire, namely to work for the strengthening of peace. She also wished to express