

United Nations
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

Nations Unies
CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED
E/AC.7/SR.20
19 August 1947
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

FIFTH SESSION

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTIETH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Thursday, 7 August 1947 at 3:00 p.m.

Present:

Chairman:	Mr. Moe	
	Mr. Kaminsky	(Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
	Mr. Blais	(Canada)
	Mr. Larrain	(Chile)
	Mr. Sun	(China)
	Mr. Perez-Cisneros	(Cuba)
	Mr. Stolz	(Czechoslovakia)
	Mr. Boris	(France)
	Mr. Ahmad	(India)
	Mr. Malik	(Lebanon)
	Mr. Van der Mandele	(Netherlands)
	Miss Hampton	(New Zealand)
	Mr. Haarr	(Norway)
	Mr. Benavides	(Peru)
	Mr. Tarhan	(Turkey)
	Mr. Lomakin	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
	Mr. Mackenzie	(United Kingdom)
	Mr. Stinebower	(United States of America)
	Mr. Perez-Perozo	(Venezuela)

Representatives of Specialized Agencies:

Miss Maass (UNESCO)

Consultants of Non-Governmental Organizations:

Miss Minter (International Chamber of Commerce)
Miss Sender (American Federation of Labor)

Secretariat: Mr. Hogan (Division of Human Rights)
Mr. Messing

Consideration of the Provisional Agenda of the Conference on Freedom of Information (Document E/441).

Consideration of the Amendment to Paragraph 5 (b) Submitted by the Indian Delegation.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that this amendment had already been accepted in principle and that it now only remained to approve the new wording.

DECISION: The Indian Delegation's amendment to insert in paragraph 5 (b) a new item (iii), reading as follows:

"Considering the present unequal development of news agencies in certain countries, and recognizing the problem of the development of national news agencies through

/provisional

provisional measures until such time as these news agencies are capable of meeting international competition." was adopted by 14 votes.

Consideration of the New Zealand Amendment to Paragraph 6.

The new wording of the New Zealand amendment which was adopted in principle at the Committee's previous meeting reads as follows:

"Consideration of the advisability or necessity of establishing or maintaining an agency subject to the United Nations jurisdiction to carry out the above functions."

NOTE: When considering the advisability of placing the above item on the Conference's agenda, the Economic and Social Council observed that the Conference's terms of reference did not allow it to create an agency, but the Council felt that the Conference might report on this subject to the Council.

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) also proposed the deletion of the word "preferably" from the title of paragraph 6.

DECISION: The New Zealand amendment was adopted by 14 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions.

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) proposed omitting from the title of paragraph 6 the words "within the framework of the United Nations".

DECISION: The words "within the framework of the United Nations" were deleted by 15 votes to 2.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian delegation's amendment (document E/AC.7/35), the voting at the Social Committee's previous meeting having resulted in a tie.

DECISION: The Indian Delegation's amendment on the insertion of the new paragraph 6 in Chapter II (document E/441, page 17) was adopted by 9 votes to 6 with 3 abstentions. Former paragraph 6 becomes paragraph 7, etc.

Consideration of Paragraph 7.

"Consideration of the problems involved in the establishment of information services by governments, groups or persons in order to make information available in countries other than their own." (In the final version of the report, paragraph 7 becomes paragraph 8).

Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) proposed an amendment to paragraph 7 of document E/AC.7/33.

He stated that the purpose of his amendment was to facilitate the implementation of the Conference's future recommendation.

Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was in favour of the deletion of the whole of paragraph (a) keeping the title only, and adding the words: "by means of bilateral agreements".

/Mr. STINEBOWER

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) observed that if the United Kingdom amendment were adopted, paragraph 1 would have to be completely revised. He reserved the right, in this event, to propose a change in the title, but he preferred the Sub-Commission's phrasing of this paragraph.

The USSR proposal was put to the vote.

DECISION: The proposal was rejected by 8 votes to 3 with 4 abstentions.

The United Kingdom amendment was put to the vote.

DECISION: The amendment was adopted by 11 votes to 3 with 4 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (a) as amended was put to the vote.

DECISION: It was adopted by 12 votes to 0 with 5 abstentions.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) proposed an amendment to the title of paragraph 7.

DECISION: The United States amendment modifying the title of paragraph 7 to read as follows:

"Consideration of the problems involved in the establishment of governmental or semi-governmental information services in order to make information available in countries other than their own".

was adopted by 11 votes to 0 with 7 abstentions.

Consideration of Paragraph 8.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered it outside the Conference's competence to draw up model legislation.

Mr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia) observed that the Conference had no power to make recommendations to the Council. It was important not to create a bad precedent by relinquishing the authority which should belong to the Council.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) proposed the deletion of paragraph 8.

Mr. BORIS (France) remarked that in its resolution concerning the responsibilities of newspaper owners, the Committee had already requested the Conference to consider the possibility of recommending adequate legislation.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) thought that the Conference should discuss separately the principles and the possibility of applying them.

He felt that paragraph 8 gave, perhaps, too much authority to the Conference but he thought that this was a good thing.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) called the French representative's attention to the fact that in the resolution on the responsibilities of newspaper owners, the Conference was asked to recommend legislation, whereas in paragraph 8 the Conference was asked to draft a model legislation.

Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) proposed that the title of paragraph 8 be changed as follows:

"Consideration of the modes of action by which the Conference considers the recommendations and agreements of the Conference can best be put into effect."

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) said that by its very nature an international conference could not do more than make recommendations to governments.

Mr. AHMAD (India) agreed with the United States representative and proposed the omission of the words "acceptance by States of model legislation drafted by the Conference".

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) felt that the Indian representative's proposal greatly reduced the force of the paragraph. He thought that the Conference should be free to examine the question of model legislation, and he proposed replacing the words "model legislation drafted by the Conference" by the words "model legislation suggested by the Conference".

Mr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia) proposed omitting the words "Resolutions of the General Assembly".

Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) opposed in principle the omission of any words from paragraph 8. However, if the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic accepted paragraph 8 after deletion of the words "drafted by the Conference", the United Kingdom delegation would accept this compromise solution.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the words "resolutions of the General Assembly" and "acceptance of model legislation drafted by the Conference" should be deleted.

Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Byelorussian proposal but suggested a compromise.

Mr. KAMINSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) withdrew his amendment in favour of the USSR representative's proposal.

Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) supported the Soviet amendment.

Mr. STOLZ (Czechoslovakia) and Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) withdrew their respective amendments.

The CHAIRMAN put the amended paragraph 8 to a vote.

DECISION: Paragraph 8 was unanimously accepted as follows:

"Consideration of the possible modes of action by which the Conference's recommendations can best be put into effect, whether by

Resolutions of the General Assembly, International Conventions, Bilateral Agreements, or acceptance by States of corresponding legislation or other means."

/Consideration

Consideration of the Soviet Amendments Contained in document E/AC.7/38

The CHAIRMAN said that although decisions had already been taken concerning the amended paragraph (a), he was ready, if the members of the Social Committee agreed, to open a discussion on the Soviet amendments.

Item 1

Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that the purpose of his amendment was to strengthen the sense of Chapter I, paragraph 2. He recalled that this paragraph was a Philippine amendment to an original Soviet proposal. He requested that his amendment be voted on item by item.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba) expressed doubts as to where this amendment should be placed.

These doubts were shared by Dr. VAN DER MANDELE (Netherlands) and Mr. STINEBOWER (United States).

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) pointed out that Item (g) of the amendment was already covered by Item (d), and the Item (e) was equivalent to Item (c) (1), page 16 of document E/441.

Mr. KAMINEKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) inquired whether the Committee's objections concerned the form of the Russian amendments. As to the substance, he pointed out that nowhere had the Report considered the question of "unmasking the vestiges of Fascism and plots against the freedom of the press", or of "the development of friendly relations between nations in the field of information."

Mr. BORIS (France) thought that the text of the amendment was ill-adapted to the original text, especially Item (e) which referred to the "organization of a campaign". He had not yet had time to study the amendment but he was inclined to agree, a priori, with certain ideas expressed by the Soviet delegation.

Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) inquired why this text could not be placed in Chapter I, page 12. Item (b) read as follows: "to facilitate the solution of the economic, social and humanitarian problems of the world as a whole through the free interchange of information bearing on such problems." The proposed wording for Items (e), (f), (g) was similar to this. He requested that the Committee vote on the amendment item by item.

Mr. VAN DER MANDELE (Netherlands) preferred the Sub-Commission's text, and considered the proposed Item (g) equivalent to Item (d), already adopted. He made an exception, however, as regards Item (f) which seemed to introduce a new point of view.

Mr. BORIS (France) said that if the new amendment were adopted it would be out of place here, and if it were not adopted certain good ideas might be lost.

/Mr. SEN (India)

Mr. SEN (India) felt that it would be pushing matters too far to speak of the "organization of a campaign".

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) suggested finding a more general formula to express the same ideas.

Mr. SEN (India) suggested changing Item (e) to read as follows:

"Organization of a campaign for democratic principles, for unmasking the vestiges of Fascism and for eradicating all forms of Fascist ideology".

The CHAIRMAN proposed proceeding to a vote on paragraph 1 of the Soviet amendment, considering each item separately.

Item (e)

DECISION: Item (e) was rejected by 9 votes to 5 with 4 abstentions.

Item (f)

DECISION: Item (f) was rejected by 9 votes to 4 with 5 abstentions.

Item (g)

DECISION: Item (g) was rejected by 8 votes to 5 with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 2

The CHAIRMAN said that here it was merely a question of adding the word "private" to the text already accepted. (Chapter II, paragraph 5, (b) (iv)).

Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the reason for adding this word was obvious. It was necessary to limit the activities of certain monopolies which, if not supervised, might spread slanderous or libellous reports. This limitation was necessary since monopolistic activity often hampered the work of other press agencies.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) proposed that the discussion be closed.

Mr. SEN (India) was of the same mind as the United States delegate and emphasized the fact that the addition of the word "private" contributed nothing, but might, on the contrary, tend to exempt government monopolies from supervision.

Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that a certain American newspaper had never even mentioned the great effort and work of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press. He stressed the fact that a distinction must be made between private monopolies where decisions were made by two or three persons only, and State monopolies wherein the people themselves made decisions.

The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 2 of the Soviet amendment to the vote.

DECISION: The amendment was rejected by 12 votes to 3 with 3 abstentions.

Mr. PEREZ-PEROZO (Venezuela) explained that he had abstained from voting, not because he disagreed with the Soviet amendment, but because
/he felt

he felt that the items proposed were embodied in texts which the Committee had already accepted.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) made this same observation.

The provisional agenda of the Conference was put to a vote.

DECISION: It was adopted by 15 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the result of the vote was regrettable, and he made several further observations on the ideas contained in the amendment presented by his delegation.

The meeting rose at 5:40 p.m.
