

rights and obligations of Governments in this respect; the second establishes the right of correction and the conditions under which it is to be exercised; while the third contains miscellaneous provisions.

On a subject so controversial yet so fundamental to free society as freedom of information, there were naturally many divergent views among the members of the Committee. Undoubtedly the approach furthest removed from views generally held by members of the Committee was that of the *Eastern European* countries, who considered that dissemination of information should conform to the interests of the community as determined by the Government of the State. Thus one *Soviet* amendment read :—

“ The contracting States shall evolve measures to ensure increasingly wide dissemination of genuinely honest and objective information.”

Such a clause would place upon a contracting State the obligation of perusing news material to determine whether its contents conformed to what that State regarded as “ genuinely honest and objective.” While preambular sentences in the Convention recognize the moral obligation upon correspondents not to disseminate false or distorted reports, the view of the majority of the Committee was that inclusion in the Convention itself of explicit provisions along the lines of the Soviet proposal could be exploited in a manner prejudicial to freedom of information.

Members of the Committee differed as to whether or not the Convention should be so drafted as to afford protection to nationals of a contracting State who were employed by a foreign information agency operating in that State. In the *New Zealand* delegation's view (which was shared by the majority of the Committee), a Convention which was concerned to facilitate the full flow of information should confer advantages on and subject to its requirements all employees of an information agency regardless of their nationality. It seemed undesirable that any rights or privileges accorded by the Convention should be available to foreigners but denied to nationals employed by the agency. On the other hand, some delegations, chiefly those of *India* and *China*, feared that the inclusion of nationals could have the effect of securing to those nationals extra-territorial rights. The situation might arise in which a foreign Government would intervene on their behalf with their own Government.

This difference of approach continued throughout the meetings of the Committee, and it was only at the final plenary session that the United States delegation introduced a text which secured general acceptance :—

“ Nothing in the present Convention shall oblige a contracting State to consider one of its own nationals employed by a foreign information agency operating in its territory as a correspondent, except when he is functioning on behalf of that information agency and then only to the extent required to enable that information agency fully to enjoy the benefits of this Convention : Provided, however,