



Chairman: Mr. Carlos GIAMBRUNO  
(Uruguay).

AGENDA ITEM 49

Human rights in armed conflicts (*continued*):

- (b) Protection of journalists engaged in dangerous missions in areas of armed conflict: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8703, chap. XIV, sect. B; A/8777 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.1950-1963, E/CN.4/1096)

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON  
THE PROTECTION OF JOURNALISTS EN-  
GAGED IN DANGEROUS PROFESSIONAL  
MISSIONS IN AREAS OF ARMED CONFLICT  
(*continued*)

1. Mr. VAURS (France) informed the Committee that, thanks to the deliberations of the working group, there was now a new version (A/C.3/L.1963) of the draft articles of the convention on the protection of journalists engaged in dangerous missions, in which account had been taken of a large number of the amendments and suggestions put forward by various representatives. Also, as a result of consultations with the delegations of Egypt, the Philippines and Spain, a new paragraph 2 was to be inserted in article 5 of the draft. The following paragraphs of article 5 would thus have to be renumbered and article 13, paragraph 2, would have to be changed accordingly.
2. With regard to the final clauses (A/C.3/L.1950), he said that the sponsors of the draft had agreed to raise to 30 the number of ratifications required to enable the convention to enter into force, although that figure seemed to them excessively high. Similarly, they had agreed to the deletion of article 18, despite some reservations on that score. In article 20, the two paragraphs appearing under the heading "Revision" had been deleted.
3. He stressed that the card to be issued to journalists under the convention would not be the equivalent of a safe-conduct, much less a privileged passport: possession of the card would not permit journalists to violate the laws of the receiving country. Considering that the members of the Committee had before them a greatly improved text of the draft articles, he hoped that a vote could be taken immediately.
4. Mr. PARDOS (Spain) congratulated the members of the Committee on the excellent results obtained

through the efforts of the working group. Since a compromise solution had been reached, he would withdraw the subamendment he had proposed (1938th meeting) to the first of the amendments submitted by the delegation of the Philippines (A/C.3/L.1951). He too hoped that the Committee could proceed to a vote on the draft convention, article by article.

5. Mr. LOPÉZ (Colombia), supported by Mrs. GEORGE (Trinidad and Tobago) and Mr. LEHTIHET (Algeria), said he thought it was essential that the delegations and the various regional groups should have time to study the new text, which was clearly very different from that adopted by the Commission on Human Rights. He therefore wished to make a formal proposal that the meeting should be suspended.

6. Mr. BEEBY (New Zealand) said that he too thought it would be useful to suspend the meeting, although it would be desirable if the sponsors of the amendments first indicated whether they intended to maintain them. He would not press for a vote on the amendments submitted by his delegation (A/C.3/L.1962).

7. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) and Mr. KABORÉ (Upper Volta) agreed that the sponsors of amendments which had not been accepted should be asked to indicate whether they intended to press them to a vote.

8. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) announced that he was withdrawing his amendments (A/C.3/L.1957).

9. Mr. KETRZYNSKI (Poland) said that he thought it would be necessary to have the definitive version of the final clauses of the draft convention before a position could be taken on the matter.

10. Mr. VAURS (France) said that the definitive text of the final clauses would be circulated shortly.

11. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba) and Mr. McGOUGH (Argentina) expressed the view that the discussion should be suspended indefinitely and that the members of the Committee should be allowed time to inform their Governments and receive instructions.

12. Lady ELLES (United Kingdom) said that, of the amendments which had not been accepted by the sponsors, she would withdraw all those in document A/C.3/L.1959. As to those appearing in document A/C.3/L.1960, she would retain the second part of the first amendment, regarding article 6, and all of the second amendment through paragraph 8, but she would

withdraw the last part of that amendment. With regard to document A/C.3/L.1961, she would withdraw the first amendment but would maintain the last paragraph of the second amendment, beginning with the words "The card shall be valid".

13. Mrs. CABALLERO (Mexico) noted that her delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1953) had no longer to be considered since it had been accepted by the sponsors of the draft articles.

14. Miss LAPOINTE (Canada) said that her delegation's amendments in document A/C.3/L.1954 were no longer before the Committee.

15. Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the sponsors of the draft articles for accepting some of his amendments (A/C.3/L.1952) but said that he would press for a vote on the remaining amendments because they were aimed at strengthening the sovereignty of States.

16. Mr. MANI (India) thanked the sponsors of the draft articles for accepting the majority of the amendments submitted by the Indian and Spanish delegations (A/C.3/L.1958). However, the third amendment did not appear in the new text even though it was his understanding that it had been accepted. Also, his sixth amendment had not been accepted. If the French representative could give him a satisfactory explanation regarding the third amendment, he would not press

it to a vote; however, he would insist that a vote should be taken on the sixth.

17. Mr. VAURS (France) said that he had no objection to including the third of those amendments (A/C.3/L.1958) in the draft articles. With regard to the sixth of those amendments, it was his understanding that a compromise had been reached, but he would be willing to hold further consultations if necessary.

18. Mr. MANI (India) agreed that further consultations should be held with the sponsors of the draft convention on article 6 of that text.

19. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) drew the Indian representative's attention to the fact that the new text of the draft convention included two possible formulations of article 6, which meant that some of the sponsors had been in favour of the first while others had preferred the second; in the circumstances, it would be for the Committee to take a decision.

20. Mrs. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) suggested that the meeting should be adjourned and that consideration of the draft articles and amendments thereto should be resumed in the afternoon.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, the meeting would be adjourned and the Committee would meet again in the afternoon.

*The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.*