

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.4/Sub.1/SR.109  
1 April 1952  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS  
SUB-COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND OF THE PRESS  
Fifth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 19 March 1952, at 3.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Suggestions concerning the future work of the United Nations in the field of freedom of information (E/CN.4/Sub.1/157, E/CN.4/Sub.1/158, E/CN.4/Sub.1/164, E/CN.4/Sub.1/167, E/CN.4/Sub.1/168, E/CN.4/Sub.1/172, E/CN.4/Sub.1/173, E/CN.4/Sub.1/174, E/CN.4/Sub.1/175, E/CN.4/Sub.1/L.12, E/CN.4/Sub.1/L.14) (continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	AZMI Bey	(Egypt)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. AZKOUL	(Lebanon)
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BINDER	(United States of America)
	Mr. P. H. CHANG	(China)
	Mr. GERAUD	(France)
	Mr. LOPEZ	(Philippines)
	Mr. MOULIK	(India)
	Mr. PLEIC	(Yugoslavia)

Members (continued):

Mr. SILVA CARVALLO	(Chile)
Mr. WAITHMAN	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
Mr. ZONOV	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

Representative of a specialized agency:

Mr. CARNES	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
------------	--

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A:

Miss SENDER	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)
Miss KAHN	World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)

Secretariat:

Mr. REK	Secretary of the Sub-Commission
---------	---------------------------------

SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING THE FUTURE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE FIELD OF FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (E/CN.4/Sub.1/157, E/CN.4/Sub.1/158, E/CN.4/Sub.1/164, E/CN.4/Sub.1/168, E/CN.4/Sub.1/172, E/CN.4/Sub.1/173, E/CN.4/Sub.1/174, E/CN.4/Sub.1/175, E/CN.4/Sub.1/L.12, E/CN.4/Sub.1/L.14) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Sub-Commission that it had to decide two matters of principle connected with the powers of the permanent special organ, the establishment of which it had decided to recommend at the previous meeting.

The first was whether the investigations into freedom of information were to be conducted through the United Nations. If not, the matter would be settled; if so, it would then have to be decided whether the investigations would be a matter for the special organ or for a commission of investigation, as Mr. Waithman proposed (E/CN.4/Sub.1/168).

The second concerned the technical needs for paper and printing presses, which UNESCO already had under consideration. The Sub-Commission must decide whether it would be better to entrust UNESCO with such matters and for the United Nations to confine itself to political and economic subjects or to centralize those studies and entrust the United Nations with all of them.

/In that

In that connexion, it must be remembered that the Sub-Commission had at its fourth session recommended that the Council should invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations to consult with the Director-General of UNESCO and co-ordinate the work of both organizations. The Sub-Commission might decide to abide by that recommendation.

Mr. GERAUD explained with regard to the investigations that he had drawn on the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/CN.4/Sub.1/158) in drafting his resolution; paragraph 27 referred to a fact-finding commission on freedom of information whose function would be to make investigations of alleged violations which had been referred to it by the Council. That had been his idea in proposing a commission of investigation in his own draft, it being clearly understood that the investigations would be carried out only if a complaint was lodged and only if the government concerned agreed to them.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the vote on the principle should first be taken and that the draft resolutions should not be considered in detail until after that vote.

Mr. GERAUD did not think that he could vote on the principle unless he knew how it was going to be applied.

The CHAIRMAN believed that to vote on the principle of investigations into freedom of information did not in any way prejudice the kind of investigations to be carried out. He put that principle to the vote.

That principle was adopted by 4 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. ZONOV explained that he had not been able to vote for that principle, as he did not know how the proposed investigations would be conducted.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Sub-Commission must then decide whether the body entrusted with investigations would or would not be the special United Nations organ appointed to deal with freedom of information.

/Mr. ZONOV

Mr. ZONOV asked what that special organ was and how it was composed.

The CHAIRMAN explained that it was the permanent special organ, the establishment of which the Sub-Commission had recommended at the previous meeting.

Mr. GERAUD would agree to such powers to investigate being given to that special organ, with all the reservations he had already made.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal that the permanent special United Nations organ to deal with freedom of information should undertake investigations.

That proposal was adopted by 5 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN, taking up the technical questions, asked the Sub-Commission whether its view was that the matter should be left to UNESCO or that matters relating to freedom of information should in general be centralized and be dealt with by the special organ.

Mr. SILVA CARVALLO thought that that distinction was too sharp. Obviously, the United Nations organ would need the help of other organs and, in that particular instance, it would always be as well to consult UNESCO and to enjoy its support.

It would, in his opinion, be unwise to distribute the problems among several organs; the new special organ should rather centralize them and be competent to undertake investigations, but it could obviously consult other organs, in particular UNESCO.

Mr. BINDER agreed with Mr. Silva Carvalho and he too feared that the distinction was too sharp. Yet, as UNESCO was to be called upon to deal with those matters, he wondered if the work of the organ to be set up and UNESCO's work might not duplicate each other.

/Mr. PLEIC

Mr. PLEIC also hoped that the question would not be put in that way. To make a clear-cut distinction between technical matters and economic and political questions would be difficult. Too rigid a delimitation might well hamper collaboration between UNESCO and the United Nations.

Mr. MOULIK agreed with Mr. Silva Carvallo.

Mr. SILVA CARVALLO added that the Council at its session at Santiago in 1951 had considered the relations between the Sub-Commission and UNESCO. No final decisions had been reached, but one idea had emerged very clearly, that UNESCO was an agency with a general purpose dealing, as its name indicated, with education, science and culture, whereas the Sub-Commission was a special organ devoted to a single field, and neither could take the place of the other.

Mr. LOPEZ therefore wondered whether, if that were so, it was really necessary for the Sub-Commission to be asked to vote. If some procedure for consultation between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of UNESCO already existed, it was likely that the new organ would continue to function in a similar way.

Mr. AZKOUL agreed with Mr. Lopez and thought that in any case the vote on that point could be postponed.

Mr. CARNES (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) read two paragraphs of a recommendation made by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and of its Commissions after the meeting at Santiago and concluded therefrom that the Sub-Commission's opinion might not have to be asked.

The CHAIRMAN observed that he had in fact referred to a previous recommendation at the beginning of the meeting. He had become convinced that the Sub-Commission should refrain from dealing with that matter.

/He therefore

He therefore withdrew paragraph 2 of his draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.1/172) and considered that there was no need to put the question to the Sub-Commission, as it did not appear in any other draft resolution.

The Sub-Commission had taken all the decisions on principle that appeared under heading A in the ad hoc report. By deciding to recommend to the Council the establishment of a permanent organ, it had ipso facto set aside some of the proposals before it. Accordingly, the Sub-Commission might be taken to have adopted the draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.1/173) submitted jointly by Mr. Azkoul, Mr. Lopez and Mr. Moulik as the basis for discussion and should now consider it in detail.

Mr. LOPEZ proposed that the operative part should be discussed at once and the preamble be temporarily left aside. Certain changes would have to be made in the text to make it consistent with the decisions the Sub-Commission had taken. Thus, although there was a reference in the first paragraph of the operative part to a permanent body to study freedom of information, there was none to the investigations which the Sub-Commission had recommended. Mr. Geraud had raised some important points about such investigations.

Mr. MOULIK supported Mr. Lopez' view. He also proposed that the following should be substituted for the beginning of the first paragraph of the operative part:

"Expresses its conviction that an expert committee on freedom of information and of the press be created".

Mr. BINDER asked for some explanation of the words "the majority of whom are professionally active therein" in paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) of the recommendation.

Mr. AZKOUL accepted Mr. Moulik's proposal. It would be more intelligent and wiser to wipe out the past and not to ask the Council to continue the existing Sub-Commission. That would help the proposed organ.

/In reply

In reply to Mr. Binder's point, he said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had originally conceived of a commission composed exclusively of professional journalists. On thinking it over, they had felt that that would be going too far. Individuals outside journalism such as jurists or historians might well contribute usefully to the new organ's work; being above the arena, they would be able to take a more general view of freedom of information.

Mr. SILVA CARVALLO disagreed. All the members of the proposed commission should be professionally active in the press or other media of information. It was to be regretted that the sponsors should have given up their original idea.

Mr. BINDER observed that the sub-paragraph as it stood was rather dangerous. The non-professional experts proposed to the Secretary-General for selection might happen to include regularly accredited representatives of the governments concerned. There was a danger that by this expedient they might exercise an influence on the commission's work. On the other hand, the sub-paragraph was too restrictive in another direction, especially in the use of the expression "professionally active". It would be greatly to be regretted if the Sub-Commission were to be deprived by that proviso of the help of retired journalists who might give it the benefit of their great experience and who would have more time to devote to its work.

Mr. ZONOV wondered whether information enterprises or professional associations could nominate as candidates newspaper owners and editors, or only journalists in the narrow sense of the word. He also wished to know whether they could draw up the lists of candidates directly or would first have to consult their Governments.

Mr. MOULIK stated that recognized information enterprises and professional associations would nominate candidates directly, they would therefore be at liberty to select the experts from all branches of journalism or information regardless of their professional standing. If necessary, they could indicate the three or five candidates in order of preference. As they were to be experts, there was no need for Governments to interfere; they would merely transmit the lists to the Secretary-General. Mr. Moulik, like Mr. Binder, would also like the Sub-Commission to enlist the co-operation of former journalists who were no longer professionally active. The wording of the relevant paragraph should accordingly be altered.

Mr. BINDER noted with satisfaction that the authors of the draft resolution were determined to prevent any interference by governments.

Mr. LOPEZ did not see any point in proceeding to vote on the various paragraphs of the resolution at that stage of the discussion. The authors of the draft should first be allowed to prepare a final text in the light of the Sub-Commission's earlier votes and of the debate which had just taken place.

Mr. SILVA CARVALLO suggested that Mr. Azkoul, Mr. Lopez and Mr. Moulik, in redrafting their resolution, should take account of Mr. Binder's suggestions, in particular, the one calling for substitution of the word "majority" by the word "all" in sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 1.

Mr. AZKOUL supported Mr. Lopez' proposal. The authors of the draft resolution might submit a revised text to the Sub-Commission early the following morning.

Mr. MOULIK agreed. He recalled that the Sub-Commission still had to deal with section B of the ad hoc report (E/CN.4/Sub.1/175), dealing with the list of items to be recommended for inclusion in the agenda of the Economic and Social Council.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that, before taking a decision on the revised draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.1/173/Rev.1), the Sub-Commission still had to consider paragraph 4 of the proposal he had submitted (E/CN.4/Sub.1/172). As Mr. Azkoul had pointed out in his ad hoc report, that text, dealing with the terms of reference of the future commission, was actually an amendment to the draft resolution.

The Chairman also considered it advisable for those members of the Sub-Commission who had submitted proposals relating to section B of the ad hoc report, specifically Mr. Binder and Mr. Moulik, to meet to work out a final text on which the Sub-Commission might also decide at the following meeting.

/Mr. MOULIK



69

Mr. MOULIK would rather that the Sub-Commission should proceed immediately to consider those various proposals. In an effort to facilitate matters, he was ready to agree that Mr. Binder's proposal (E/CN.4/Sub.1/167) should be taken up first as being the best way to start.

In reply to questions from Mr. ZONOV and Mr. PLEIC, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Sub-Commission was entitled to decide first on Mr. Binder's proposal although it had not been submitted first, if it thought that procedure would help to simplify its work. It was understood that Mr. Moulik was not, however, withdrawing his proposal (E/CN.4/Sub.1/164). The Sub-Commission would consider it afterwards together with Mr. Zonov's amendment (E/CN.4/Sub.1/L.12), the new amendment Mr. Pleic was to submit the following day and certain parts of Mr. Geraud's draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.1/174).

Mr. BINDER remarked that as there was nothing new in his proposal, it should not give rise to lengthy discussion. He had merely summarized the points mentioned in the relevant documents prepared by the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN, in reply to a comment from Mr. LOPEZ, pointed out that when the Sub-Commission had taken a decision, the Secretariat, with the help of the Rapporteur, should draft the final text of the resolution concerning the list of items "to be recommended for inclusion in the Council's agenda". The Sub-Commission could adopt the resolution at a subsequent meeting.

To a comment from Mr. EEK (Secretary of the Sub-Commission), he replied that there was no reason why the Sub-Commission should not consider sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph (1) of Mr. Binder's proposal even though it had adopted a resolution dealing with a similar matter at the preceding meeting.

The Chairman accordingly asked the Sub-Commission to consider Mr. Binder's proposal (E/CN.4/Sub.1/167).

Mr. PLEIC felt that sub-paragraph (a) was not worded explicitly enough.

/Mr. BINDER

Mr. BINDER reminded him that it reproduced the terms of the Sub-Commission's agenda. The Council should have a certain amount of freedom of action and there was no reason to clarify any further the meaning of the expression "adequacy of international news".

Mr. PLEIC asserted that in its context the phrase incontestably lacked clarity. It was not clear whether the Council was to confine itself to theoretical studies or, on the contrary, to undertake practical investigations which might possibly require it to take certain concrete measures.

Mr. BINDER said that his proposal had been intended to restate more completely proposal I contained in paragraphs 16 to 22 inclusive of the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/CN.4/Sub.1/158).

In reply to a question from Mr. MOULIK, Mr. LOPEZ noted that in view of earlier decisions taken by the Sub-Commission, the investigations should be carried out under the auspices of the commission of experts, on the understanding that the Secretariat would place itself at the disposal of that body.

Mr. ZONOV pointed out that the Sub-Commission had devoted a great deal of time in the past to the question of the "adequacy of international news" without any tangible result. It would therefore be better to drop the matter. Mr. Zonov requested a separate vote on each sub-paragraph of Mr. Binder's proposal.

Mr. MOULIK observed that paragraph 2 did not go far enough. Mr. Binder simply suggested a survey of news facilities while the Council was supposed to take concrete decisions on the question. The Sub-Commission should make a recommendation on the subject as suggested by Mr. Moulik in his draft resolution.

Mr. BINDER emphasized that the Sub-Commission could only draw attention to the questions which the Council was to consider. The work and the research were naturally the task of the Secretariat. Moreover, the question of newsprint had been dealt with in Council resolution 374 (XIII) and in a resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 26 January 1952. What was required was to implement two existing resolutions and not to adopt still another.

/Mr. SILVA CARVALLO

Mr. SILVA CARVALLO could not agree with Mr. Moulik. Mr. Moulik would actually like the Sub-Commission, through the Council, to give directives to the organ which was to replace it. Mr. Silva Carvalho, like Mr. Binder, thought that it should merely draw attention to the questions to be considered.

The CHAIRMAN noted that Mr. Moulik's proposal recommended that the Council should place a certain number of items on the agenda of its future sessions. Mr. Binder, on the other hand, did not use the word "recommendation". Neither text, however, referred to the future commission of experts. It was for the Council to decide whether it wished to consider those items itself or to refer them to one of its subsidiary organs. The Sub-Commission had only a limited function: to indicate to the Council the items it would like it to discuss.

Mr. PLEIC did not agree that the Sub-Commission's function should be thus limited. As the items were very complex, it was fully entitled to give certain directives to the body which was to succeed it. From that point of view, Mr. Binder's proposals were highly theoretical and what was required was concrete action. If Mr. Binder's text were reduced to a mere enumeration of items, with the headings and sub-headings defining the nature of the action contemplated deleted, Mr. Pleic would be prepared to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Pleic's proposals could not be considered as amendments to Mr. Moulik's draft resolution which, like Mr. Binder's proposal, merely consisted of a list of items it might be advisable to include in the Council's agenda. Mr. Pleic's proposals were a series of positive recommendations to the Council. They should therefore be considered as separate proposals and not as amendments to Mr. Moulik's draft resolution.

At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. ZONOV explained that his proposal was an amendment to paragraph (5) of Mr. Moulik's proposal.

Mr. PLEIC pointed out that Mr. Moulik's draft resolution was also drafted in the form of a series of recommendations to the Council. Its paragraph (3), for example, contained a very concrete recommendation.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph (1) of Mr. Binder's proposal (E/CN.4/Sub.1/167), sub-paragraph by sub-paragraph.

Sub-paragraph (a) was adopted by 7 votes to 1.

Sub-paragraph (b) was adopted by 8 votes to 1.

Sub-paragraph (c) was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Sub-paragraph (d) was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on paragraph (1) of Mr. Binder's proposal as a whole.

Paragraph (1) was adopted by 8 votes to 1.

The CHAIRMAN then asked the Sub-Commission to decide on paragraph (2).

Mr. LOPEZ asked whether there should be included in the news facilities listed in the paragraph radio and motion picture materiel such as transmitters, cameras, etc.

Mr. MOULIK thought that the elaboration of a technical assistance programme enabling countries to make available to their inhabitants powerful media of information, mentioned in paragraph (3) of his draft, was not clearly enough stated in paragraph (2) of Mr. Binder's text. He therefore suggested the addition of a sub-paragraph (d) restating paragraph (3) of his own draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN stated that Mr. Moulik's draft resolution would be taken up in due course after the vote on Mr. Binder's proposal. The Sub-Commission could then take any decisions which it deemed advisable on the points raised in that draft.

Mr. LOPEZ pointed out that Mr. Moulik was perfectly entitled to submit an amendment to Mr. Binder's proposal. He also requested a separate vote on sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph (2) under discussion.

Mr. ZONOV stressed that it was contrary to the rules of procedure to submit amendments during the voting.

/Mr. MOULIK

Mr. MOULIK withdrew his proposal.

The CHAIRMAN called for separate votes on sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph (2) of Mr. Binder's text.

Sub-paragraph (a) was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Sub-paragraph (b) was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (c) was adopted, as amended by Mr. Lopez, by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put paragraph (2) thus amended to the vote as a whole.

Paragraph (2), thus amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN finally put paragraph (3) of Mr. Binder's proposal to the vote.

Paragraph (3) was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Sub-Commission to come to a decision on the fourth and final paragraph of Mr. Binder's text. He would be unable to vote for the paragraph as he was not sure that the International Press Institute, to which Mr. Binder referred in that paragraph, was the International Institute of Press and Information mentioned in paragraph 3 of the operative part of his own draft resolution.

Mr. BINDER explained that he had thought it useful to mention specifically an organization which had been established by the journalists of a very large number of States and whose activities seemed to him to be of great interest to the Council.

He requested the members of the Sub-Commission to refer to the explanations on the matter in the report submitted by the Director-General of UNESCO on the activities of that organization in the field of freedom of information (E/CN.4/Sub.1/142, paragraphs 48 and 49).

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN asked the UNESCO representative whether the organization mentioned in Mr. Binder's proposal actually was the one whose establishment he had advocated in his draft resolution, or whether it was a separate organization.

Mr. CARNES (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) replied that it was the same organization. But he added that the International Press Institute, to which Mr. Binder referred, had not been set up entirely in accordance with UNESCO's original recommendations.

Mr. FLEIC was astonished that Mr. Binder was recommending that the Council should study the activities of organizations representing "the free journalists"; on the contrary, it seemed to him that the activities of press organizations which did not enjoy freedom of expression should be studied. He therefore wished to have the word "free" deleted from the text.

The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Binder whether he would agree to the deletion of the word "free" and of the words "such as International Press Institute" because of the controversy which that organization had raised.

Mr. BINDER accepted the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amended text of paragraph (4) of Mr. Binder's proposal.

Paragraph (4), as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote Mr. Binder's amended proposal as a whole.

The proposal, as amended, was adopted as a whole by 8 votes to 1.

Mr. ZONOV stated that he had voted against Mr. Binder's proposal, because, in his opinion, a new series of surveys would not in any way further the cause of freedom of information. He felt that the United Nations had sufficient data on the subject and that it was time to start taking practical steps.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN called for a discussion of Mr. Moulik's draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.1/164).

Mr. LOPEZ asked Mr. Moulik if he would agree to having the parts of his draft which were adopted by the Sub-Commission added to Mr. Binder's text as an integral part. He also proposed that paragraphs (1), (2), (4) and (6) of Mr. Moulik's draft, dealing with questions already appearing in Mr. Binder's text, should be deleted.

Mr. MOULIK agreed with Mr. Lopez's proposal.

The CHAIRMAN did not see the point of the proposal in paragraph (1) of Mr. Moulik's draft resolution, since there were at the moment two draft conventions as yet unsigned. He therefore considered it superfluous to recommend that the Council should frame a new convention.

Mr. MOULIK remarked that he had merely wished to raise the question in the hope that it would thus attract attention to the fact that the signing of the existing conventions should be expedited.

Mr. BINDER stated that he was unable to support that part of Mr. Moulik's draft resolution since, as the Chairman had just pointed out, two draft conventions already existed and were on the General Assembly's agenda.

Mr. MOULIK agreed to the deletion of paragraph (1) of his draft.

Mr. PLEIC objected to the deletion of paragraph (6) of Mr. Moulik's draft resolution, because he had submitted an amendment to that paragraph which would no longer apply if the paragraph was deleted. The same was true of his first amendment which would also be meaningless if paragraph (1) of Mr. Moulik's draft was deleted. In any case, if paragraph 6 of Mr. Moulik's draft was deleted, he would re-introduce it and submit it at the same time as his other proposals.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN preferred that Mr. Pleic should revise his text on the basis of the amendments incorporated in Mr. Moulik's draft and that he should submit it as an original draft and not as an amendment to Mr. Moulik's text.

Mr. PLEIC agreed to that procedure, pointing out that the effect would be to weaken his proposals somewhat, since, in submitting them as amendments to Mr. Moulik's text, he had had a good chance of having them accepted by Mr. Moulik.

Mr. BINDER announced that he would vote against paragraph (1) of Mr. Moulik's draft, because it seemed to imply that the technical assistance programme would also include the provision of various information facilities, which could not be the case.

Mr. MOULIK explained that he had been thinking mainly of an exchange of technical knowledge and not of supplying information. Furthermore, the technical assistance programme was a dynamic one which might in the future make provision for supplying information properly speaking.

Mr. PLEIC pointed out that the members of the Sub-Commission were experts and should not be bound, in that connexion, by any scruples which official government representatives might feel.

Mr. WAITEMAN proposed that paragraph (3) of Mr. Moulik's draft should be amended thus:

"Elaboration of technical assistance programmes helping countries to acquire and to operate information facilities which would afford them media of information for the use of their own nationals and national machinery for disseminating domestic information from their own territories".

Mr. MOULIK accepted the wording proposed by Mr. Waithman.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text proposed by Mr. Waithman  
/which had



which had become paragraph (1) of Mr. Moulik's draft.

The text was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN called for a discussion of paragraph (5) of Mr. Moulik's draft. He recalled that there was an amendment to that paragraph by Mr. Zonov in document E/CN.4/Sub.1/L.12.

Mr. MOULIK stated that he would be pleased to accept Mr. Zonov's amendment if he omitted the last part beginning with the words "to expose fascism..."

Mr. ZONOV regretted that he could not comply with the request of Mr. Moulik who was entitled to request a vote paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. MOULIK withdrew his proposal and accepted Mr. Zonov's amendment in its entirety.

Mr. SILVA CARVALLO asked for separate votes on the two parts of the amendment.

Mr. LOPEZ wished the second sentence of Mr. Zonov's amendment to be voted on by division, the first vote referring to the words "to expose fascism and fascist ideology in all its forms" and the second to the remainder of the sentence.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of Mr. Zonov's amendment up to and including the word "aggression".

That part of the amendment was adopted by 5 votes to 4.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the second sentence of Mr. Zonov's amendment.

That part was rejected by 5 votes to 4.

Mr. LOPEZ stated that he would have voted for that part of the amendment if it had been worded to read "to expose fascism, nazism and any other form of totalitarian ideology".

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second part of Mr. Zonov's amendment reading "to develop friendly relations among peoples".

That part was adopted by 6 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph (5) (new paragraph (2)) of Mr. Moulik's draft thus amended.

The paragraph was adopted by 5 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

Mr. BINDER objected to the procedure of presenting an amendment contrary to the principles already adopted by the Sub-Commission, which forced some members of the Sub-Commission to vote against the amendment and which gave the impression that they were voting against the principle of developing friendly relations among peoples. Such methods were out of order.

Mr. WAITMAN said that he had voted against the amendment because, in his opinion, journalists should not be given any directives whatsoever.

Mr. ZONOV was glad that the Sub-Commission had adopted his amendment which expressed a very clear and undeniably just idea.

The CHAIRMAN called for a discussion of paragraph (7) (new paragraph (3)) of Mr. Moulik's draft.

Mr. BINDER requested clarification of the words "Organization and promotion of the exchange of members of the press".

Mr. MOULIK explained that he had merely wished to stress the need for a reach exchange of news personnel among countries, since there had so far never been an exchange properly speaking but rather a flow of foreign journalists to the United States.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph (7) (new paragraph (3)) of Mr. Moulik's draft.

The paragraph was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote Mr. Moulik's amended draft as a whole.

Mr. Moulik's draft resolution, as amended, was adopted as a whole by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

1/4 a.m.