



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Procedural proposals by the Rapporteur.....	345
Agenda item 28:	
Freedom of information: report of the Economic and Social Council (<i>continued</i>).....	345

Chairman: Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Núñez (Costa Rica), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

Procedural proposals by the Rapporteur

1. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece), Rapporteur, wished to inform the members of the Committee of her misgivings. When the Committee completed its consideration of freedom of information, there would still be three items left on its agenda. The reports would then have to be drawn up and submitted to the General Assembly which was due to close shortly. As, moreover, some representatives had announced that they would have to leave before the end of the session and others that they would, on 14 and 15 December, have to attend the meetings of the United Nations Children's Fund, she proposed that there should be no general debate on the remaining agenda items. The members of the Committee could express their views during the discussion of the draft resolutions. She also proposed that a very short time-limit should be fixed for the presentation of draft resolutions and amendments.
2. The CHAIRMAN said that the Rapporteur's suggestions would be taken into consideration.

AGENDA ITEM 28

Freedom of information: report of the Economic and Social Council (A/2705, A/2686, chapter V, section VI, A/C.3/L.447, A/C.3/L.449, A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1) (*continued*)

DRAFT CONVENTION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
(A/C.3/L.449, A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1) (*continued*)

Eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1)
(concluded)

3. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee to continue the discussion of the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1) and the amendments to it (A/C.3/L.454).
4. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that while he was not unaware of the importance of the question, he was doubtful concerning the usefulness of the joint draft resolution at the current stage in view of the profound

differences of opinion on the very concept of freedom of information that had come to light during the discussion. In addition, he had the impression that the draft resolution did not sufficiently take into account the relevant decisions of the Economic and Social Council in that connexion, and in particular Council resolution 522 A (XVII), which provided for a precise and well-balanced programme of reports and studies. There was also room for doubt whether the Economic and Social Council, which at its nineteenth session would have to examine the Secretary-General's reports, would have time to discuss the draft convention on freedom of information.

5. His delegation would vote against the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1).

6. Mr. KUEHN (France) felt, as he had already stated during the general debate (602nd meeting), that the paramount consideration was to take account of realities and actual possibilities and adopt moderate, well-balanced and practical solutions. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution, however, wished—without waiting for the results of the work entrusted to the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies—to leap forward once again with a haste that was regrettable because haste made waste. He also felt that the Economic and Social Council should not be placed in a difficult situation by criticism, for that would not contribute to better relations between two organs set up under the Charter of the United Nations.

7. The French delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

8. Mr. DUNLOP (New Zealand) said that New Zealand was always opposed to the proliferation of either bodies or documents unless some practical result could be expected in the near future. The 1936 International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace,¹ which the Soviet Union was seeking to revitalize, was a horrid warning. His delegation was not opposed to the idea of a convention on freedom of information as such and understood the difficulties of the under-developed countries. It was not convinced, however, that an instrument of that kind would be of any immediate practical value, if only because it would not command sufficiently wide support. As he did not think that the question was really pressing, he preferred the Scandinavian amendments. He would vote for point 6 of the amendments, because if the Convention was to be referred to the Council, he preferred that that should be done at the twenty-first rather than at the nineteenth session of the Council.

9. In his opinion, the most important thing that could be done at that time was to strengthen the information media in the under-developed countries; he would

¹ See *League of Nations Treaty Series*, vol. CLXXXVI, p. 3011.

therefore vote in favour of point 7 of the amendments. He pointed out that the New Zealand delegation had in addition voted (608th meeting) for the draft resolution authorizing the Secretary-General to render services which did not fall within the scope and objectives of existing technical assistance programmes (A/C.3/L.448 and Add.1). He agreed with the representative of Australia that by emphasizing the technical aspect and adopting a programme of precise reports and studies (Council resolution 522 (XVII)), the Council had acted wisely. Both the Secretary-General's report on the encouragement and development of independent domestic information enterprises (E/2534)² and Mr. López's report (E/2426)³ seemed to him to be useful documents. If operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution, under which the draft convention again would be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly irrespective of what the Council did, were voted on separately, by the Committee, he would vote against it.

10. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) explained why the Scandinavian countries had submitted their amendments (A/C.3/L.454). The existing differences of opinion were very wide, and it was pointless to discuss a convention so long as there had been no reconciliation of views nor any agreement on the meaning of words. It was necessary, so to speak, to make haste slowly and return to the problem when circumstances were more favourable. The Economic and Social Council had been criticized for having laid too much stress on the technical aspects of the problem at its seventeenth session. Since, however, the technical aspects were perhaps the paramount consideration, the sponsors of the amendments had thought that an invitation to that effect should be addressed to the Council.

11. He recognized the cogency of the USSR representative's observations on point 7 of the amendments and accepted his suggestion. Item 7 should therefore be amended to read as follows: "Delete operative paragraph 2". That would be followed by point 8, worded as follows: "Add the following paragraph: 'Requests the Economic and Social Council to continue its efforts on the technical level to promote freedom of information'".

12. U MAUNG MAUNG GYEE (Burma), commenting on the joint draft resolution, recalled that the Burmese Constitution guaranteed freedom of expression, that the newspapers could freely criticize the Government, that although there were no private broadcasting stations the opposition parties could use the State broadcasting facilities and that foreign correspondents in the country were given complete freedom. It was therefore evident that Burma was devoted to the cause of freedom of information, which it regarded as a fundamental human right, and would therefore have no difficulty in voting for the joint draft resolution.

13. With regard to paragraph 1 of the operative part, he wished to express his delegation's views on the draft convention on freedom of information.⁴ According to that paragraph, the General Assembly would request the Economic and Social Council to discuss

the draft resolution, taking into account the views expressed and the proposals made on that subject at the ninth session of the General Assembly. As Burma had not taken part in the general debate and was not a member of the Council, it wished to state its views on various important aspects of the draft convention.

14. Articles 1 and 5 set forth the principle of freedom of information. Articles 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 11 dealt with restrictions on the application of that principle. As the two series of articles, the one providing privileges and the other imposing restrictions, were incompatible, the draft convention should be made as explicit as possible so that all errors of interpretation could be avoided.

15. Burma could not, for instance, admit that the right of collecting information should be open to abuse, and that would be the main consideration determining its attitude when the draft convention was submitted to the General Assembly. True freedom of information certainly required that certain advantages should be granted to those who were entrusted with collecting information, but care should be taken not to allow such persons to become a privileged class.

16. Subject to those observations, the delegation of Burma would vote for the joint draft resolution.

17. Mr. LUCIO (Mexico) said that he was desirous of seeing a convention drawn up and would therefore vote in favour of the joint draft resolution.

18. He would vote for points 3, 4 and 5 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454), which suitably rounded off the draft resolution, but would have to vote against points 6 and 7, which would further delay the preparation of the convention. He regretted that the countries which had extensive experience in the field of freedom of information and considerable resources did not seem to share his desire for haste, but he hoped that they would give their assistance so that the convention could become a reality in 1956.

19. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) said that she had listened with great interest to the Indian representative's explanation of the reasons why the eight Powers had submitted the draft resolution. She would vote for the draft resolution, for she considered that the convention would safeguard respect for human rights. She could not accept point 1 of the amendments because there had in fact been a delay and note had to be taken of that circumstance. She was also unable to accept points 6 and 7, which would only further delay consideration of the question. To meet the concern of those who had insisted that the action should not be hastened and who wished to await the development of a more favourable atmosphere, the authors of the draft resolution had replaced the words "tenth session" by the words "eleventh session" in operative paragraph 2. The General Assembly would therefore have ample time to consider what the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies had done.

20. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America) said that he could not support the joint draft resolution. His Government too had originally believed that the convention would promote the cause of freedom of information, but it had changed its mind and come to the view that the convention would, on the contrary, be detrimental to that freedom. Additional limitations had been added at each new revision. The fate of the Convention on the International Right of Correction (Gen-

² *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Seventeenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 12 (c).

³ *Ibid.*, Sixteenth Session, Supplement No. 12.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Annexes*, agenda item 29, document A/AC.42/7 and Corr.1, annex.

eral Assembly resolution 630 (VII), annex), which had been referred to by the Chinese representative (610th meeting) as an example, was significant, for there had been only seven signatures and one ratification in two years. There were better ways of serving the cause of freedom of information, and the Economic and Social Council was attending to that matter.

21. The United States delegation would vote against the joint draft resolution as it stood but would vote in favour of the amendments, which improved the text greatly.

22. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) wished to take up some of the arguments adduced by the opponents of the joint draft resolution. Reference had been made to regrettable haste, but that was rather ironical as the question had been on the agenda since 1948 and virtually nothing had been accomplished. The Third Committee had also been advised to make haste slowly, but such advice was hardly necessary. At previous sessions it had been advised to wait until the situation improved, but today even those who had made such a suggestion wished to wait still longer. However, even if the Committee adopted the draft resolution, it would not have to prepare the convention immediately. The assertion had also been made that there was no real urgency. Those who said that had praised the report submitted by Mr. López (E/2426), but he had emphasized the urgency of the matter both in his report and in his statement (599th meeting). The representative of China had referred to different ideologies, but if the Committee allowed itself to be hindered by such considerations, there would no longer be any hope of reaching even the slightest agreement in the United Nations. As to the part played by technical assistance, he pointed out that the Committee had already adopted a draft resolution (A/C.3/L.448 and Add.1) on that question (608th meeting), and he felt that an amendment on the same subject was out of place in the joint draft resolution. He also thought that it was unwise to supply technical assistance in places where freedom of information was still insecure. Some members had said that freedom would have no meaning without information, but in his view if there was no freedom, it would be better if there was no information. Countries like England and France, which had great resources did not perhaps need a convention, but they should not oppose measures to assist countries whose resources were small. It had also been said that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had objected to the Council's decisions and had criticized the Council. Such an affirmation was justified neither by the wording of the draft resolution nor by the statement of the Indian representative (610th meeting).

23. The joint draft resolution had been amply discussed and should therefore be put to the vote.

24. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of COSTA RICA, said that his delegation had refrained from taking part in the general debate in order to gain time. It had, however, listened with the greatest interest to the various observations and gave its support in particular to the Netherlands representative's remark concerning the existence of absolute truth.

25. The delegation of Costa Rica supported the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1). Freedom of information, considered as the dual right to inform and to be informed, was a fundamental human right and the measures for giving it effect should be defined

as soon as possible in an international instrument. Such an important task obviously could not be carried out hastily, but the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had fixed no time-limit for such work, and while the difficulties involved should be fully realized, they should not be exaggerated. Such difficulties and the means for overcoming them would be clearly revealed only as work progressed.

26. Mr. LEYNEN (Belgium) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the amendments proposed by the Scandinavian delegations (A/C.3/L.454). If they were adopted, it would not vote against the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1), but in the opposite case, and especially if points 6 and 7 of the amendments were rejected, the Belgian delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

27. Mr. MENESES PALLARES (Ecuador) said that he attached the greatest importance to freedom of information, which was a reality in his country. His delegation would support the draft resolution and the Scandinavian amendments (A/C.3/L.454). Those amendments had the merit of upholding the authority of the Economic and Social Council, which, after taking note of what the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies had done, could make recommendations to the General Assembly. His delegation's attitude did not, of course, mean that it already accepted the draft convention.

28. Mr. DE BARROS (Brazil) stated that in his opinion the priority given to the draft covenants on human rights in accordance with the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.410/Rev.4) adopted by the Third Committee (585th meeting) in no way authorized the Committee to defer once again its consideration of the draft convention on freedom of information but should, on the contrary, prompt the Committee to expedite its work with a view to ensuring world-wide respect for a freedom that was one of the most powerful weapons available to man for the defence of his rights. Even when the draft convention in its final form was before the Committee, the examination of the text might still take much time. As two years had already been lost, there could be no question of excessive haste.

29. The Brazilian delegation would therefore vote in favour of the joint draft resolution and the amendments submitted by Denmark, Norway and Sweden (A/C.3/L.454).

30. Mr. KUEHN (France) felt there was some contradiction in the statements of the representatives of Mexico and Afghanistan, who, in referring to the tradition and experience of certain Member States in the field of freedom of information, had expressed regret that those States had not gone to the aid of less-favoured countries, in particular by supporting the joint draft resolution. It was precisely because of their experience that the delegations of those countries had recommended caution, but their advice had been disregarded. He also believed that there was no justification for saying that nothing had been done to promote freedom of information, and he recalled the resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council with a view to solving a considerable number of practical problems in that field.

31. As for the amendments (A/C.3/L.454), he had listened attentively to the discussion, but had not heard any argument that would cause him to vote against those amendments. On the other hand, some excellent

reasons had been given, in particular by the United Kingdom delegation, why they should be supported.

32. Mrs. MARZUKI (Indonesia) recalled that her delegation had always attached the greatest importance to the adoption of the convention on the freedom of information. It was for that reason that she had been one of the sponsors of the draft resolution proposed at the General Assembly's seventh session⁵ and that she was also one of the sponsors of the eight-Power draft resolution before the Committee. She regretted that the Council had not yet taken any step to set up standards in a field where they were especially necessary. Freedom of information was a fundamental human right, and a convention ensuring respect for such a right should be adopted. Only by discussing the matter was there any possibility of ascertaining whether agreement could be reached on how to do so.

33. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) said that he had intended no criticism in saying, in connexion with a statement made by one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, that if the Economic and Social Council had been incapable of reaching a decision on the draft convention on freedom of information, there was little point in referring the matter back to it. Under paragraph 1 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution the General Assembly would request "the Economic and Social Council to discuss, at its nineteenth session, the draft convention". Although no mention was made of the exact form the discussion would take, he supposed that the draft convention would be examined article by article. If, however, the Council had been unable to reach a decision on the question in general, it was difficult to see what purpose would be served by asking the Council to undertake a detailed examination.

34. Furthermore, operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution appeared to suggest that some doubts were felt about the possible attitude of the Economic and Social Council, for mention was made of recommendations which the Council "may make". The sponsors of the draft resolution had thus anticipated the possibility that the Council might make no recommendations and had provided that the General Assembly should discuss the draft convention in any case. That being so, he failed all the more to see why the Assembly should again refer the matter to the Economic and Social Council.

35. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Scandinavian delegations for taking his observations into consideration. His delegation would consequently be able to vote in favour of the proposal for the introduction of a new paragraph into the operative part of the joint draft resolution, although it could not agree to the deletion of paragraph 2.

36. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that he would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution, because he believed that the efforts of the United Nations in the field of freedom of information should be continued and that the adoption of an international convention would be one of the best ways of ensuring the free circulation of information.

37. He also thought that when the Economic and Social Council discussed the draft convention, it should likewise consider the question of the right of correction.

He had already spoken of the harmful activities of certain monopolies and had said that in Uruguay their effect was neutralized by the right of correction.

38. The new paragraph proposed in point 7 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454) met with the approval of his delegation, which considered that the activity of the United Nations in favour of freedom of information should be exercised at all levels.

39. Mr. MATTHEW (India) said that he had not been present at the previous meeting and did not have a copy of Mr. Rajan's statement. Referring, however, to the observations made by the representative of Turkey, he said that the word "unable" which had no doubt been used did not mean exactly the same thing as "incapable". The authors of the joint draft resolution had no doubt simply noted, without implying any judgment of the issue, that the Economic and Social Council had been unable to take a decision on the draft convention on freedom of information. It was impossible to forecast the Council's future attitude, but operative paragraph 2 of the eight-Power draft resolution provided that with or without recommendations from the Council the Assembly would discuss the draft convention not later than at its eleventh regular session. That paragraph was the most important part of the draft resolution, and the Indian delegation could not accept point 7 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454), calling for its deletion.

40. Some representatives had spoken of a sense of reality. No one could predict what the world situation would be in 1955 or 1956, but he felt confident that the General Assembly would take account of realities at all times. Other representatives had said that the draft resolution was imperfect and limited in scope. It was in the nature of human endeavours to be limited, but the overriding consideration was that they should be useful, and his delegation felt that it would be useful for the General Assembly to discuss the draft convention on freedom of information not later than at its eleventh regular session and believed that any amendment for the deletion of that proposal thwarted the main object of the draft resolution.

41. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said that he had not taken part in the general debate. Nevertheless, in order to save time, he would confine himself to indicating his delegation's position with regard to the eight-Power draft resolution and the amendments to it. To that end, it would be enough for him to say that the reasons put forward by other delegations against the draft resolution and in favour of the Scandinavian amendments were precisely those which would persuade the Haitian delegation to vote against the Scandinavian amendments and in favour of the joint draft resolution.

42. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that he had referred to the observations made by the Indian representative at the previous meeting only because that delegation had spoken on behalf of all the sponsors of the joint draft resolution. In reply to the Turkish representative's remarks, he wished to point out that the authors of the joint draft resolution had never intended to suggest any doubts concerning the attitude of the Economic and Social Council. To express disagreement with a certain attitude or to criticize it frankly could not be interpreted as a sign of distrust. On the contrary, the sponsors of the draft resolution, in requesting the Economic and Social Council to discuss the draft convention in the hope that it would

⁵ *Ibid.*, document A/C.3/L.256.

on that occasion take action in conformity with the directives of the General Assembly as embodied in the draft in question, clearly showed that they were in no way seeking to circumvent the Council. Moreover, the procedure provided for in operative paragraph 1 was perfectly normal and in accordance with the practice.

43. With regard to the expression "may make" in paragraph 2, he thought that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution would be quite willing to replace it by the expression "shall make" if that amendment would cause the Turkish representative to change his position with regard to that paragraph.

44. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) considered that the representative of India had very clearly explained the intentions of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but he felt that some further details were necessary to dispel certain misunderstandings. The representative of Brazil had reminded the Committee that it would be required at its next session to examine the draft international covenants on human rights and that that would require a great deal of time. It was precisely for that reason that the eight Powers had amended their resolution and replaced the words "at its tenth regular session" by the words "not later than at its eleventh regular session".

45. Furthermore, paragraph 2 of the operative part had not been drafted with the intention of ignoring the Economic and Social Council but appeared to be in conformity with Article 66 of the United Nations Charter. The Council undoubtedly had the right to take any decision it wished, but the General Assembly was always free to take a similar or a contrary decision. Although geographical representation was observed in the membership of the Council, that body did not necessarily have the same attitude as the Assembly. In the matter of freedom of information, for example, the majority of the General Assembly had for some years favoured the adoption of the convention while the Economic and Social Council had appeared to be of the opposite opinion. It was simply a matter of calling its attention once again to the wishes of the Assembly. Without undue pessimism, there was reason to believe that the Council would not have the time to discuss the draft convention at its next session; in that case, under the terms of operative paragraph 2, the question would nevertheless come before the Assembly. Some delegations had spoken of an improvement in the international climate, but he cautioned against any unwarranted expectations in that regard. Tensions might once again unexpectedly arise, but the work of the United Nations should not be made to depend upon contingencies. The eight Powers had never intended to criticize the members of the Council for their opinions, but the Assembly did have the right to express its views and to request the Council to take them into account. Operative paragraph 2 was the most important part of the draft resolution, which without it would be pointless.

46. He regretted that Denmark, Norway and Sweden had felt it necessary to put forward in the form of amendments proposals which should have been the subject of a separate draft resolution on the technical assistance aspect of freedom of information.

47. The proponents of the draft convention were prepared to show a spirit of conciliation and accept amendments to articles 2 and 5 of the text, but some proposal should be formulated. There appeared to be general

agreement on the harmful effect of some abuses of the freedom of the Press. In that connexion, the situation had grown steadily worse since 1946 and there seemed to be no grounds for hope in the immediate future; propaganda was being intensified and was deepening misunderstanding amongst peoples. Some machinery had to be found to remedy those evils. Those who objected to the existing provisions of the draft convention ought to propose something in their place. If the United Nations did not conclude draft covenants on human rights or a convention on freedom of information, its entire action would be confined to declarations with no practical effect. In the absence of a convention, the existing situation would continue, information services would be left unregulated and journalistic quacks would continue to fish in troubled waters. Even recently a New York daily newspaper with a large circulation had come out with the unadorned statement that a certain country had abolished democracy. People should be made to reflect before publishing statements of that kind, which certainly did not promote understanding among nations. The Third Committee should adopt the eight-Power draft resolution.

48. Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) said that the representative of India had accurately expressed the view of the sponsors of the draft resolution. He had referred to the possible "inability" of the Economic and Social Council only in a conditional sense. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was, moreover, merely intended to ensure that even though the Council did not succeed in discussing the draft convention, the matter would still be considered. Furthermore, there was no provision compelling the Council to examine the draft convention article by article; it could choose any procedure which suited it, and the eight Powers had in no way sought to undermine its authority.

49. Mr. DE BARROS (Brazil) wished to point out that he had not accused the sponsors of the draft resolution of being unduly hasty. On the contrary, in reply to representatives who had spoken of excessive haste, he had said that, as several years had already been wasted, the time had come when something should be done about the draft convention.

50. That was why the Brazilian delegation supported the eight-Power draft resolution.

51. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) was concerned at the length of the debate, as some delegations had pressing engagements.

52. The CHAIRMAN declared the debate on the eight-Power draft resolution and on the three-Power amendments closed.

53. Mr. PINTO (Chile) suggested that the meeting should be adjourned and the vote postponed until the next meeting. He intended to ask for a roll-call vote on several points and that would take time.

54. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) and Mr. ROY (Haiti) thought that it would be better to vote at once.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Chilean representative's proposal for adjournment.

The proposal was rejected by 18 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN announced that he would first put to the vote one by one the amendments submitted by Denmark, Norway and Sweden (A/C.3/L.454).

57. Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) recalled that the USSR representative had asked that point 1 of the amendments should be voted on paragraph by paragraph, as it referred to the first two paragraphs of the preamble of the draft resolution.

58. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of point 1 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454).

The first part of point 1 was rejected by 23 votes to 16, with 8 abstentions.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of point 1 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454).

The second part of point 1 was not adopted, 22 votes being cast in favour and 22 against, with 5 abstentions.

60. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said that as point 1 had been rejected, there was no further reason for point 2, and the sponsors accordingly withdrew it.

61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 3 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454).

Point 3 was adopted by 24 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 4 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454).

Point 4 was rejected by 22 votes to 17, with 11 abstentions.

63. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 5 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454).

Point 5 was adopted by 28 votes to 17, with 6 abstentions.

64. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 6 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454).

At the request of the representative of Chile, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Uruguay, Yemen.

Abstaining: Argentina, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Honduras, Iran, Peru, Poland, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Point 6 was rejected by 23 votes to 15, with 14 abstentions.

65. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 7 of the amendments (A/C.3/L.454), as orally amended by the sponsors.

At the request of the representative of Chile, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru,

Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba.

Against: Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: Turkey.

Point 7, as amended, was rejected by 34 votes to 17, with 1 abstention.

66. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the three Powers had orally proposed, as an eighth amendment, that the text which had originally appeared as point 7 should be added to the operative part of the draft resolution as a new paragraph.

67. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) inquired at what point in the operative part the new paragraph was to be inserted.

68. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) said the new paragraph should come immediately before the existing paragraph 1, since, like that paragraph, it contained an invitation to the Council while the existing paragraph 2 recorded a decision of the General Assembly.

69. Mr. OBERG (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments, agreed that the proposed text should be regarded as a new operative paragraph 1.

70. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the new operative paragraph 1 proposed by Denmark, Norway and Sweden (A/C.3/L.454).

The new paragraph 1 was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

71. The CHAIRMAN announced that he would put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Egypt, India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia and Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1), as amended.

72. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the third paragraph of the preamble.

73. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third paragraph of the preamble of the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1).

The paragraph was adopted by 30 votes to 7, with 15 abstentions.

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.451/Rev.1) as a whole, as amended.

At the request of the representative of Chile, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico.

Against: New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, China, Denmark, France.

Abstaining: Netherlands, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

The draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 31 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.