

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 440th

MEETING

Friday, 7 November 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Freedom of information (<i>continued</i>): (a) Problems of freedom of information, including the study of the draft convention on freedom of information (A/AC.42/7, A/2172, chapter V, section VI, A/2181, A/C.3/L.239, A/C.3/L.242/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.243, A/C.3/L.244, A/C.3/L.262, A/C.3/L.263/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.266 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.281) (<i>continued</i>)	129

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

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

[Item 29 (a)]*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY AFGHANISTAN, CHILE, FRANCE, GUATEMALA, INDIA, LEBANON, PHILIPPINES AND YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.3/L.266 and Corr.1) (*concluded*)

1. Mr. TSAO (China) had some misgivings about the Indian proposal (439th meeting) to replace the word "strong" by the words "capable of expansion" in the first paragraph of the preamble of the joint resolution (A/C.3/L.266 and Corr.1). The question whether an enterprise was capable of expansion or not was controversial; it might be asked whether it was capable of expanding with or without outside assistance. Moreover, the purpose of the draft resolution was to assist under-developed countries in improving their information media and not to increase the number of the enterprises which already controlled information throughout the world.

2. He therefore hoped that the Indian representative would withdraw his amendment; if not, he would ask for a separate vote on it.

3. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for having approached the problem of freedom of information from a new and important angle. Since 1946, it had been dealt with in the United Nations as an abstract concept. Freedom of information

functioned through a vast network of interrelated industries and depended on financial and technical means. Peoples lacking such means were consequently deprived of freedom of information, which had become the prerogative of the few. That idea was clearly stated in the draft resolution.

4. She welcomed the Uruguayan proposal (439th meeting) to delete the words "strong and" from the first paragraph of the preamble. The word "independent" in the same paragraph should be either deleted or qualified because it was not clear what such independence implied.

5. Paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution was especially welcome, since it stressed that certain political rights could not be achieved unless economic rights were also secured. Application of the right to freedom of information depended on the elimination of certain financial obstacles. Although the draft resolution might be imperfect, it had the great advantage of stressing the point that most peoples were unable to exercise that right for financial reasons.

6. The Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.268/Rev.1) did not call for a substantive discussion of principle and did not involve a request to the Third Committee to draft the article it mentioned. It merely emphasized the fact that all information media were commodities in the economic sense and therefore subject to economic rules, unless they were subsidized. The main problem was that of transmitting the most objective information possible to the peoples of the world, independent of pressure from private enterprises or from governments. The idea expressed by the Afghan amendment was that certain countries might find it helpful at a given stage of their development to preserve their full sovereignty by nationalizing foreign enterprises in order that other countries might have an accurate perception of their problems and culture.

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

7. Her delegation would support the Afghan amendment.

8. Mr. MANI (India) withdrew the amendment he had submitted orally at the 439th meeting.

9. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) was aware that it was not the purpose of the Afghan amendment that the Third Committee or any other United Nations organ should be requested to draft an article on nationalization. Nevertheless, the wording of the last part tended to encourage governments to nationalize foreign information enterprises. Such enterprises were indeed economic and commercial. They were, however, distinguished from other enterprises by their other aspect, which related directly to the concept of freedom of information, and encouragement of nationalization could only serve to weaken that concept. The amendment should have been submitted as a separate draft resolution, since it contradicted the first paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266 and Corr.1), which referred to independent enterprises.

10. Moreover, the organ which was to study the desirability of including the article in the convention might be of the opinion that States should be encouraged not to nationalize foreign information enterprises, but voluntarily to accept a limitation of their sovereignty in the exceptional case of freedom of information.

11. The Lebanese delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the Afghan amendment.

12. Mr. YOACHAM (Chile) said that he would support the Uruguayan oral amendment for the deletion of the words "strong and" from the first paragraph of the preamble.

13. The CHAIRMAN declared the debate closed.

14. He put to the vote the Uruguayan oral amendment for the deletion of the words "strong and" from the first paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266 and Corr.1).

The amendment was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

15. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) asked for a roll-call vote on the first paragraph of the preamble of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266 and Corr.1).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia.

Abstaining: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, India, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Afghan amendment (A/C.3/L.268/Rev.1) to the operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266 and Corr.1).

17. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) asked for a roll-call vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Liberia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Israel.

Abstaining: Lebanon, Mexico, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Argentina, Burma, Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala.

The amendment was rejected by 26 votes to 13, with 13 abstentions.

18. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States oral amendment calling for the replacement of the word "eliminate" by the word "reduce" in paragraph 2 (a) of the operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266 and Corr.1).

The amendment was adopted by 24 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.

19. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.266 and Corr. 1) as a whole, as amended.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

20. Mr. PEREZ PEROZO (Venezuela) explained that he had voted for the joint draft resolution because it was one of the most beneficial measures the General Assembly could take in respect of freedom of information.

21. He had abstained from voting on the Afghan amendment because the right to nationalize foreign enterprises was inherent in the sovereignty of States and a declaration to that effect in a convention on a specific subject would tend to limit the general scope of the principle.

22. Begum LIAQUAT ALI KHAN (Pakistan), said that she had abstained from voting on the Afghan amendment. Although the right to nationalize foreign enterprises was undeniable, it fell within the domestic jurisdiction of States. The conflict between that right and international treaties and sources of international law could not be decided in an abstract manner, but only with reference to specific cases, when all the circumstances could be taken into account. Moreover, the amendment was not germane to the technical problems

referred to in the draft resolution and did not make it clear what foreign enterprises should be nationalized in order to protect national culture.

23. Mr. FRONTAURA ARGANDOÑA (Bolivia) pointed out that the discussion had related mainly to the Afghan amendment and had shown that the right to nationalization was indeed inalienable. The result of the vote in no way compromised the principle, which was valid in any given situation.

24. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) stated that she had voted for the draft resolution because it was one of the most constructive proposals ever submitted in discussions on freedom of information.

25. She had abstained from voting on the Afghan amendment because the subject of that amendment was already regulated by the legislation and constitutions of most States. In view of the fact that the right of nationalization was an inherent right, it seemed to be unnecessary to introduce an amendment which tended to limit the constitutional provisions of many countries.

26. Mr. WECKMANN (Mexico) said that he had voted for the joint draft resolution.

27. He had abstained from voting on the Afghan amendment because, although his delegation agreed with the principle that had prompted it, it considered that each country should maintain the greatest possible interchange of culture through national and international information enterprises and that, moreover, the inherent right of nationalization should be governed by domestic legislation, it being improper to recommend it, as it would be to limit it, from outside the national confines.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY CHILE, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, HONDURAS, INDONESIA, IRAQ, MEXICO, PAKISTAN, AND SAUDI ARABIA (A/C.3/L.262)

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Chile, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia (A/C.3/L.262).

29. Begum LIAQUAT ALI KHAN (Pakistan) observed that the draft resolution should be a resolution of the General Assembly rather than of the Third Committee.

30. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) agreed. A General Assembly resolution would carry more weight than a resolution of the Third Committee which was, after all, merely an organ of the Assembly.

31. The Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press had held five sessions, during which it had done constructive work and, as a body of experts, had attempted to resolve difficult problems referred to it by the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights.

32. The Economic and Social Council's decision to discontinue the Sub-Commission had come as a complete surprise to his delegation and the least the Committee could do was express its appreciation of the Sub-Commission's work.

33. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia) said that his delegation highly appreciated the quality and constructive

nature of the Sub-Commission's work. The activities of the United Nations had often been hampered by prejudice, and the Sub-Commission, bearing in mind the fact that co-operation in the United Nations should be based on goodwill, had devoted much of its work to an attempt to overcome that prejudice.

34. He hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution before it.

35. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that her delegation had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution because it felt that the Sub-Commission should receive the tribute it deserved for the work it had done.

36. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that, although the General Assembly had not as yet considered the Sub-Commission's report (E/2190), the Economic and Social Council had done so. It was interesting to note that a United Nations organ which had studied the report had not found it possible to take the view that the Sub-Commission's work had been constructive or that it had discharged its duties. That was obviously not the Council's opinion; otherwise it would not have discontinued the Sub-Commission. The USSR delegation concurred in the Council's decision. The Sub-Commission had done nothing to combat the propaganda in favour of war that was being disseminated throughout the world.

37. For the reasons given, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

38. Begum LIAQUAT ALI KHAN (Pakistan) wished to associate her delegation with the other sponsors in expressing appreciation of the Sub-Commission's work.

39. Mr. PERNOT (France) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, its vote should not be construed as a reflection on the Economic and Social Council's decision to discontinue the Sub-Commission.

40. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) feared that the USSR representative's statement might create doubt as to the effectiveness of the Sub-Commission's work. The fact was that the Economic and Social Council's decision to discontinue the Sub-Commission had been adopted as a result of the support for that decision from the Western Powers, the Soviet Union and the States associated with the latter. The other members of the Council had opposed it. The fact that both sides in the "cold war" had been responsible for the abolition of the Sub-Commission was the best proof that the Sub-Commission had attempted to discharge its duties objectively.

41. The CHAIRMAN called attention to the proposal that had been made that in the text of the draft resolution the words "Third Committee" should be replaced by the words "General Assembly", and that in the second paragraph of the preamble the words "the General Assembly" should be replaced by the word "it".

42. He said that if there were no objection, he would consider that modification adopted.

It was so decided.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Chile, the Dominican Republic,

Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia (A/C.3/L.262), as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 41 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

44. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) said that he had abstained from voting because Egypt was represented on the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press. He pointed out that the decision to abolish the Sub-Commission would not take effect until 31 December 1952. The Egyptian expert, who had presided over the Sub-Commission at its previous session, would therefore remain in office until the end of the year.

45. The Committee's decision was a matter of great satisfaction to the Egyptian delegation, which was convinced that the Sub-Commission would eventually be revived on the recommendation of the rapporteur appointed by the Economic and Social Council when he submitted his progress report. Three members of the Third Committee, the representatives of Egypt, Lebanon and the Philippines, the last being the rapporteur appointed by the Council, had opposed the Council's decision to appoint a rapporteur but had voted in favour of prolonging the term of office of the Sub-Commission. Mr. López would no doubt request the Council to review its decision.

46. Mr. KHALATBARY (Iran) said that his abstention should not be construed to indicate a lack of appreciation of the Sub-Commission's work. The reason for his abstention was that the resolution might mistakenly be considered a reflection on the Economic and Social Council's decision.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY ECUADOR, INDIA, INDONESIA, IRAQ, PAKISTAN, PHILIPPINES, SAUDI ARABIA AND YUGOSLAVIA (A/C.3/L.263/Rev.1)

47. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the revised joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia and Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.263/Rev.1) on the draft international code of ethics adopted by the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

48. Mr. Finn MOE (Norway) did not consider that the adoption of a resolution which was drafted in substantially the same terms as a previous resolution by the Economic and Social Council would serve a useful purpose. It would be more logical for the Third Committee to indicate its agreement or disagreement with the Council's resolution. For the Committee to request the Secretary-General to do what he had already been requested to do by the Council might suggest that the Council's resolution had not come to the Committee's attention.

49. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) asked the Secretariat to inform the Committee as to the action taken so far with respect to the code of ethics. He understood that the code had already been submitted to the international professional associations concerned.

50. Mr. MANI (India), commenting on the Norwegian representative's statement, drew attention to Economic and Social Council resolution 442 B (XIV), in which the Council merely took note of the revised text of the code of ethics. The draft resolution before

the Committee went further by commending the code to the consideration of "all those engaged in gathering, transmitting, disseminating and commenting on information and opinions . . .".

51. The United Nations had spent time and money on the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, and the Sub-Commission had drafted a code of ethics which the Indian delegation considered to be most useful. Its acceptance was, however, a matter for the professional journalists concerned. The code was merely being commended to their consideration. It would be wrong for the Committee simply to take note of the results achieved by the Sub-Commission.

52. Moreover, the Economic and Social Council had requested the Secretary-General to inform national and international professional associations and information enterprises that the United Nations might co-operate with them in organizing an international conference for the purpose of drawing up an international code of ethics if they considered such a conference to be desirable. The joint draft resolution, on the other hand, indicated that the code to be discussed at that conference would be the one drafted by the Sub-Commission. Moreover, it stated the readiness of the United Nations to offer its assistance in holding the conference, with the United Nations defraying some of the expenses.

53. While it was true that journalists throughout the world observed codes of ethics which varied from country to country, there was no reason why a code acceptable to all countries could not be drafted. However, the initiative for that should come from the professional associations themselves. So far, they had not taken any initiative in the matter and the United Nations might therefore bring the code drafted by the Sub-Commission to their attention.

54. Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat), replying to the Australian representative, said that the draft international code had been sent to six hundred national and international professional associations and information enterprises. So far, only twelve replies had been received.

55. The financial implications of an international conference of journalists were considered in the final paragraph of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/C.3/L.273).

56. Mr. EDBERG (Sweden) observed that, as a professional journalist, he was fully aware that journalists should be required to live up to a code of ethics. There would inevitably be some deviation from that code and it was for the Press itself to deal with such cases. That was done in Sweden, where the laws on the freedom of the Press were among the most liberal in the world. The Swedish Press Club, of which he was the chairman, had for decades considered it to be one of its most important tasks to establish certain rules, which had been brought together in a code of ethics; offences against the code could be reported to a sort of tribunal of the Press, the members of which were appointed by the organizations of the Press.

57. The Swedish Government unreservedly supported the view that a code of journalistic ethics was a matter for the Press itself. While there might be room for an international code of ethics, it should be confined to generally accepted principles. In that connexion, he

had no objection to the main principles in the code drafted by the Sub-Commission. However, adoption or rejection of it should be left exclusively to members of the journalistic profession. La Fédération internationale des éditeurs de journaux had expressed its interest in the underlying principles of the code, but had stressed that the preparation of such a code was a task for the international Press only, and not for governments or States. Moreover, it had stated that, in its view, it would be a waste of time and effort to hold a world-wide conference at the current stage.

58. The Swedish delegation considered that the draft resolution before the Committee might be construed as constituting interference in the activities of the Press. Furthermore, the Economic and Social Council had adopted a resolution on the code and the United Nations therefore had no further decision to take in the matter.

59. For the reasons given, the Swedish delegation would vote against the joint draft resolution.

60. Mr. AZMI (Egypt) could not agree with the Swedish representative that the United Nations should take no further action with regard to the draft international code of ethics after the Economic and Social Council had adopted resolution 442 B (XIV) because the General Assembly was composed of representatives of governments, and governments should not interfere with the work of professional associations. The Council was also composed of representatives of governments and its action would logically have been open to a similar objection. The Council resolution, like the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.263/Rev.1), made it quite clear that there was not the slightest intention of permitting governments to interfere in the affairs of the professional associations and information enterprises. The Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, upon whose recommendations the Council resolution had been based, had been the first to deprecate any such interference.

61. In any case, the General Assembly, in accordance with normal procedure, would have to discuss and to endorse the Council resolution, if it agreed with it. That procedure in no way implied any attempt at governmental interference with the free decision to be taken under the draft resolution by the professional associations.

62. In order to reflect the actual situation more accurately, the words "the Secretary-General" should be substituted for "the Economic and Social Council" after the word "Requests" in paragraph 2 of the operative part, and paragraph 3 of the operative part should be deleted. The Council had already completed all the action it could take, and the Secretary-General had already entered into communication with the information enterprises and national and international professional associations concerned.

63. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia) said that the adoption of an international code of ethics by the professional associations would contribute greatly to raising the moral standards of journalism and would thereby largely prevent governments from placing restrictions upon freedom of information on the pretext that it was being abused. Adoption of the code would also contribute to the protection of smaller countries against

false and distorted reporting by foreign information agencies. The proposed conference to be held for the purpose of preparing and adopting an international code of ethics would be a first step in that direction, and, if the code was unanimously adopted, the right to freedom of information would be correspondingly strengthened.

64. Begum LIAQUAT ALI KHAN (Pakistan) said that the General Assembly had long been concerned with the adoption of a code of moral obligations for journalists to counterbalance the protection of their freedom to gather and disseminate news. Adoption of an international code of ethics would go far towards breaking the dead-lock caused by the failure to reach agreement on the draft convention on freedom of information. Some of the principal obstacles to the drafting of that convention had been the nature and number of the limitations which must inevitably be placed on freedom of information, as currently exercised, and the attempt to embody in the convention a statement of the ethical principles of good journalism. The adoption of the code of ethics would automatically settle those controversial points and make it unnecessary to argue them over again before they were embodied in the convention.

65. She could see no great objection to paragraph 1 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution. The General Assembly might properly commend to the consideration of journalists a document drafted by individual experts after careful study of similar codes of ethics and of the comments from professional associations and information enterprises. Most of the bodies consulted had been of the opinion that the code would serve a useful purpose, but the dissentients had formed an influential minority. The latter had contended that a responsible and experienced journalist did not need to be told what he ought or ought not to do and that accordingly the code of ethics would be unnecessary. There were, however, many journalists and information enterprises that unfortunately needed such prompting. Even in the United Kingdom, where the Press was generally reputable, the Royal Commission on the Press had found that inaccurate, subjective and deliberately biased news was not wholly unknown.¹ If such professions as the bar, engineering and medicine in most countries had set up machinery to regulate the conduct of their own members, there seemed to be good reason for doing the same for journalism. Moreover, article IV of the draft code (E/2190, annex A) would greatly contribute to the maintenance of friendly relations between nations.

66. With regard to the proposed conference, the Pakistani delegation agreed whole-heartedly with the Sub-Commission's recommendation that the further development of the code was entirely a professional matter, to be carried out without governmental interference on either the national or the international plane. The joint draft resolution called simply for an ordinary non-governmental conference in accordance with General Assembly resolution 479 (V).

67. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that the Lebanese expert on the Sub-Commission on Freedom of

¹ See *Report of the Royal Commission on the Press, 1947-1949*, June 1949, London, H.M.S.O., Command Paper 7700, chap. 15, para. 553.

Information and of the Press had been the first to propose the drafting of an international code of ethics for journalists, and the Lebanese delegation entirely agreed with him that governments should be precluded from any interference with the professional associations and information enterprises. He was glad to find that many other delegations concurred in that view.

68. The Lebanese delegation entirely agreed with the Swedish representative that governments should not be permitted to exercise even moral pressure upon the professional associations, but the joint draft resolution gave no grounds for his misgivings. Under it, the General Assembly would not make any recommendations with regard to the text of the code nor would it press journalists to adopt it; it would merely commend it to their consideration.

69. Although governments could not exercise any pressure, the United Nations could and should do so. Although composed of governments, the Organization was not a government and was not invested with any of the powers of government; under the Charter it represented rather the peoples. But it did possess a certain moral influence through the Charter and thus could properly commend a document to the consideration of individuals or organizations.

70. Mr. HESSEL (France) welcomed the revised text (A/C.3/L.263/Rev.1) of the joint draft resolution, since it dispelled all grounds for misgivings such as those expressed by the Swedish representative. The professional associations were given complete discretion to accept the draft code of ethics or not. There might be some doubt whether a draft resolution demanding so little was of any use; but the General Assembly should carry further the resolution already adopted by the Economic and Social Council, if only in compliance with the normal procedure. Council resolutions were generally technical, whereas Assembly resolutions were administrative.

71. The French delegation would accordingly vote for the joint draft resolution.

72. Mr. SECADES (Cuba) said that his delegation in the *Ad Hoc* Committee and in the Council had always contended that everything pertaining to the code of ethics should be left entirely to the professional associations. Like most countries, Cuba had laws against such abuses of the Press as libel and defamation but in practice left it to professional associations with official, but not governmental, status to deal with professional abuses and to impose their own penalties. The joint draft resolution was therefore entirely satisfactory.

73. He would support the Egyptian oral amendment to paragraph 2 of the operative part.

74. Mr. J. F. GREEN (United States of America) agreed that the code of ethics should be dealt with by the professional associations rather than by governments or by inter-governmental organizations such as the United Nations. Paragraph 1 of the operative part was not happily worded. In his opinion, the word "commends" had something of a laudatory connotation, and implied that the General Assembly had reviewed the text and approved it. The words "calls the draft international

code of ethics to the attention of all those engaged" would be better.

75. Mrs. BERGER (Canada) agreed that the United Nations should not interfere with the professional associations. If the majority of those consulted wished for a code of ethics, the Canadian delegation would naturally not object. The joint draft resolution was therefore acceptable in general, but paragraph 2 of the operative part might be regarded as premature, in view of the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General, and paragraph 3 might be considered superfluous, since the information had already been circulated and, in any case, the matter was no longer within the sphere of United Nations responsibility. Those two paragraphs should be voted on separately.

76. She would support the Egyptian representative's oral amendments.

77. Mr. LAMBROS (Greece) welcomed the Canadian representative's proposal for a vote by division, as he had thought that the paragraphs concerned prejudged a situation which could not be verified until all the replies had been received.

78. He would also support the oral amendments proposed by the United States and Egyptian representatives.

79. Mr. AZMI (Egypt), supported by Mr. HUNEIDI (Syria), proposed that the sponsors and any other interested delegations should endeavour to submit a final revised text at the next meeting, incorporating any of the amendments they were willing to accept and bearing in mind the suggestions and criticisms made during the debate.

80. A number of doubtful points remained to be cleared up informally, such as the precise meaning of the word "generally" in paragraph 2 of the operative part; it might well be asked how the Secretary-General could decide what proportion of favourable replies might constitute a "general" desire for an international professional conference.

81. The CHAIRMAN put the Egyptian representative's proposal to the vote.

The proposal was adopted.

82. Mr. Finn MOE (Norway) speaking on a point of order, observed that, contrary to all precedent, an amendment (A/C.3/L.247) had been submitted to an Economic and Social Council resolution (442 D (XIV)), in connexion with agenda item 29 (b), but no draft resolutions. True, the General Assembly could disagree, and frequently had disagreed, with a Council decision, but never, to his knowledge, by such a procedure. He was not in any way attempting to prevent the expression of views or the discussion and voting of amendments on that subject, either in the Third Committee or in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly, but he doubted whether the procedure was correct and he was most anxious that orderly procedure should always be observed.

83. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that Council resolution 442 D (XIV) had been in the form of a recommendation to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.