

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUB-COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND OF THE PRESS

Third Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,
on Tuesday, 14 June 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS: Draft resolution submitted by Mr. Azkoul concerning the encouragement of national information agencies (E/CN.4/Sub.1/92) (discussion continued)

Consideration of draft resolutions concerning documentation relative to the programme of work and priorities for the three-year period of the life of the Sub-Commission (E/CN.4/Sub.1/96, E/CN.4/Sub.1/100, E/CN.4/Sub.1/102, E/CN.4/Sub.1/99, E/CN.4/Sub.1/95)

Date and place of the following session (E/CN.4/Sub.1/101)

Report of the Sub-Commission to the Commission on Human Rights.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. LOPEZ	Philippines
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. AZKOUL	Lebanon
	Mr. AZMI	Egypt
	Mr. CHANG	China
	Mr. DEDIJER	Yugoslavia
	Mr. FONTAINE	Uruguay
	Mr. GANDHI	India
	Mr. GERAUD	France
	Mr. SILVA CARVALLO	Chile
	Mr. WILLIAMS	United Kingdom
	Mr. ZONOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in either of the working languages (English or French), and within two working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room F-852, Lake Success. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

Representative of a specialized agency:

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

Secretariat:

Mr. HOGAN Secretary of the Sub-Commission

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY MR. AZKOUL CONCERNING THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF
NATIONAL INFORMATION AGENCIES (E/CN.4/Sub.1/92) (discussion continued)

Mr. WILLIAMS stated that he had slightly misunderstood the true meaning of Mr. Azkoul's draft resolution. In point of fact, he had thought that by "national information agencies" governmental press services had been meant. It would have been unfortunate to use United Nations funds to subsidize such agencies. Mr. Azkoul really meant, by national information agencies, agencies active in a given country but not having absolute control of the gathering and dissemination of news.

Mr. Williams therefore withdrew the amendment which he had submitted at the previous meeting and stated that he was ready to accept Mr. Azkoul's draft resolution. He proposed that in the English text the word "national" be replaced by the word "domestic" and that the operative part of the draft resolution should be amended to read: "...to the encouragement and development of national information agencies by technical assistance, the provision of exchange fellowships and other such means..."

Mr. AZKOUL emphasized that, by "national information agencies", he did not mean governmental institutions but agencies active within a given country. In his draft resolution Mr. Azkoul referred only to agencies of information, because the United Nations was particularly concerned with that problem, the Conference on Freedom of Information had adopted three resolutions to that effect, and the General Assembly had also taken decisions in that field. His draft resolution was in keeping with those various resolutions and was an attempt to supplement them. It had previously been decided that States could legitimately subsidize information agencies if the latter were not already sufficiently developed. Technical assistance should be given to such information agencies; by so doing, any possibility of abuse by Governments would also be avoided. In a conciliatory spirit he accepted Mr. Williams' proposal.

Mr. FONTAINA did not share the view of Mr. Binder at the previous meeting. That difference of opinion showed that the virtually permanent agreement which existed between Mr. Fontaina and Mr. Binder was based only on the similarity of their views on the fundamental freedoms and democratic principles.

Mr. Binder had been guilty of a misinterpretation for which the Chairman had apparently been originally responsible when, in presenting Mr. Azkoul's draft resolution, he had referred to the fourth point of President Truman's programme.

Mr. Azkoul's draft resolution fell within the field of activities of the United Nations. There was no doubt that a very great portion of the expenses of the United Nations was borne by the United States; but it should be remembered that the United States was the richest country in the world and that was why the other States had agreed to let the United States contribute amount to as much as 39 per cent of the United Nations budget.

Mr. Binder had stated his opposition in principle to all subsidization of the press agencies. He had stated that no such system obtained in the United States. In point of fact, the Government of the United States was currently granting subsidies to a number of publications with a view to circulating abroad the greatest possible amount of information. The Government of the United States could take such action using its own resources, but the Governments of certain under-developed countries, to do that would have to have recourse to foreign resources.

Mr. Fontaina believed that mention should be made of the economic needs of countries which did not have at their disposal resources as large as those of the four great Powers. The under-developed countries were largely dependent on foreign information agencies for the circulation of news. It should be made possible for those countries to have their own information agencies thus enabling them to develop the free circulation of news.

Mr. BINDER^{had} made his observations during the previous meeting because the statements of the Chairman and of some other members of the Sub-Commission had given him to believe that Mr. Azkoul, in presenting his draft resolution, had expected that item 4 of the programme of technical aid which President Truman had proposed to Congress would meet, in whole or in part, the requirement of his proposal. But the programme of technical assistance had not yet been adopted by Congress, and Mr. Binder had not wanted to give the members of the Sub-Commission a false impression regarding

the possibilities of using that programme in furthering the development of under-developed countries. He had, however, become convinced that Mr. Azkou himself had not visualized the problem from that angle.

Mr. Binder felt that technical aid to under-developed countries should not take the form of agencies set up in those countries for the dissemination of world news. He believed that such a solution would contribute nothing to the cultural development of under-developed countries. He was therefore only prepared to support Mr. Azkou's draft resolution as amended by Mr. Williams. He stated that United States journalists would be perfectly willing to open their schools to foreign students with scholarships and to permit them to do their training in United States press agencies.

In reply to Mr. Fontaina, Mr. Binder emphasized that no system of government subsidy existed in the United States. It had only been necessary to make certain arrangements concerning United States publications abroad. The New York Times and the European edition of The New York Herald Tribune, in particular, were unable to transfer to the United States the profits that they had earned in countries with weak currencies. Arrangements had therefore been made to permit these newspapers to circulate in Germany again payment in dollars. That was a temporary measure and permitted the people of certain European countries to read newspapers which they could not otherwise obtain. That measure had been criticized, particularly by the Chicago Tribune. Mr. Binder emphasized that no publication within the United States benefited from subsidies.

The CHAIRMAN stated that his reference to the fourth point of President Truman's programme had been perfectly in order. The United States representative in the Economic and Social Council had made clear what could be expected of that programme. It was a matter of technical aid only, excluding all gifts of capital or goods. It was in that respect that the programme in question differed from the Marshall Plan. Doubtless, President Truman's programme would facilitate in certain respects the implementation of the programme of technical assistance visualized by the United Nations. The United Nations programme so far contained no provision affecting the press and information. It was therefore for the Sub-Commission to submit recommendations along those lines to the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. AZKOUL recalled that he had not, in his proposal, defined the means whereby the Economic and Social Council could promote the development

of national information agencies. The choice of ways and means should be left to the Council. The Sub-Commission had only to emphasize the need for ensuring that information agencies were developed in under-developed countries.

Mr. Williams had endeavoured to find a compromise proposal by limiting technical aid to professional assistance, excluding all economic help. As certain members of the Commission objected to Mr. Williams' amendment, Mr. Azkoul requested that that amendment be put to the vote before the vote on his draft resolution.

Mr. ZCNOV supported Mr. Azkoul's draft resolution, which, in his opinion, was a minimum. Mr. Williams' amendment limited the scope of that draft in that it mentioned only secondary aspects of the problem and recommended only a few of the means of assuring the development of national information agencies. He was against Mr. Williams' amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS emphasized that, as the Sub-Commission was composed of experts, it was within its competence to submit the kind of recommendations concerning technical aid which seemed necessary. The matter was not, as Mr. Fontaina seemed to think, one of economic assistance, but of technical assistance to develop the professional capacities of the journalists of under-developed countries.

Mr. FARR (United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization) stated that UNESCO had prepared a document in conformity with the decisions mentioned in the recital of Mr. Azkoul's draft. That document drew the attention of the Economic and Social Council to the need for improving the information services of the masses in under-developed countries. That was a broader field than the one visualized in Mr. Azkoul's draft resolution.

He observed that a certain confusion seemed to have arisen concerning the methods of financing technical aid. According to the UNESCO documents, the financial backing was to be provided by the Member States as a whole, including the beneficiary State. UNESCO had submitted proposals to that effect.

Mr. Farr emphasized that UNESCO would be inclined to look favourably upon a resolution with a broader scope than Mr. Azkoul's draft.

Mr. WILLIAMS observed that Mr. Farr had had in mind all the problems connected with informing the people. The Sub-Commission should limit its activity to the questions within its competence. It should submit recommendations on the steps to be taken to develop information agencies. It was not its responsibility to say what assistance should be granted to improve the equipment of the under-developed countries.

The CHAIRMAN noted that Mr. Williams' amendment bore on the possibility of granting professional assistance and that it made no reference to other means of technical assistance. Thus the danger was that the journalists of under-developed countries would improve their professional capacities but would still lack the material means of using them.

Mr. AZMI observed that three differing opinions had been expressed in the Sub-Commission. One related to all the various factors connected with informing the masses; that was a field beyond the competence of the Sub-Commission and was the concern of UNESCO. The second opinion was that independent national press agencies should be developed. Finally, other members believed that it was necessary to study the ways and means of providing those agencies with technical aid. Mr. Azmi thought that the Sub-Commission should either provide general technical aid to information agencies or limit it to professional assistance. Mr. Azkoul's draft resolution recommended the first of those two solutions.

The CHAIRMAN put Mr. Williams' amendment to the vote. In its final form, it had been phrased as follows: "and development of national information agencies in countries where these are under-developed by technical assistance, exchange fellowships and other means whereby the level of professional competence would be raised, in order that such national information agencies..."

Mr. Williams' amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. AZKOUL asked whether it was understood that the word "national" would be replaced by the word "domestic" in his draft resolution.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN replied in the affirmative.

The operative part of Mr. Azkoul's draft resolution was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with one abstention.

Mr. Azkoul's resolution was adopted as a whole by 9 votes to 2.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING DOCUMENTATION RELATIVE TO THE PROGRAMME OF WORK AND PRIORITIES FOR THE THREE-YEAR PERIOD OF THE LIFE OF THE SUB-COMMISSION (E/CN.4/Sub.1/96, E/CN.4/Sub.1/100, E/CN.4/102, E/CN.4/Sub.1/99, E/CN.4/Sub.1/95)

Mr. SILVA CARVALLO withdrew his proposal (E/CN.4/Sub.1/96) as the Secretariat's draft resolution seemed to aim at the same thing.

Mr. GERAUD, after comparing his draft resolution with the draft submitted by the Secretariat, concluded that the two proposals were in many ways inconsistent.

Paragraph 1 of his draft had the same objective as paragraph (a) of the Secretariat's draft; his draft however, seemed broader. Paragraph (a) of the Secretariat's draft mentioned items 6, 7, and 8 of the programme

which were rather vague; item 7 was covered by the Secretariat's text on item 8 which was a question of the Commission had to have at its disposal. The Commission's action affecting freedom of information would then have the useful documents to be discussed at the coming session. His proposal therefore

was in line with paragraph 2 of his draft resolution and was supported by UNESCO as well as the replies which had been received. The Section on Freedom of Information of the Secretariat should therefore obtain the necessary information, administrative, legislative and financial, by 1 January 1948.

The Commission had been conducted for cultural, educational and scientific purposes. The Sub-Commission was not bound to study questions arising out of its work. In addition it should not assign to UNESCO the task of ensuring the Section on Freedom of Information. The Commission should ensure co-ordination between that Section and the Secretariat. It should not be substituted for the Secretariat in submitting its draft the Secretariat should retain the initiative and a certain taste

The CHAIRMAN recalled that in a resolution adopted during the previous week the Sub-Commission had asked that Governments should be requested to provide information on the measures which they had taken since the previous questionnaire had been sent to them. The Chairman thought that co-ordination between the Secretariats of UNESCO and the United Nations should be ensured by means of consultations which was provided for in the Secretariat's draft.

Mr. AZMI recalled that the Secretariat's draft resolution limited the documentation to items 6, 7, and 8 of the work programme. Item 6, which the Sub-Commission had already begun to discuss, related to technical, political, social, economic and professional obstacles. During the discussion, the Sub-Commission had also touched on items 10, 11 and 12 which referred to professional questions in the field of information and of the press. Mr. Azmi thought that, in those circumstances the Secretariat's text should mention all those items and perhaps even include item 9.

Mr. Azmi supported Mr. Geraud's draft.

Mr. WILLIAMS said that Mr. Geraud's draft resolution to set the narrowest limits on the documentary work to be carried out by the Secretariat since it only requested the Secretary-General information on governmental action. The Secretariat's text, on the other hand, mentioned items 6, 7, and 8 and specifically stated that the documentation should be collated in the light of the discussions which had taken place on item 6 and with the material submitted by members. Thus the Secretariat's draft was in line with the programme of work submitted by Mr. Williams to the Sub-Commission and would therefore collate information on governmental action but also economic, political and professional questions.

Mr. Williams thought that Mr. Geraud's draft, combined with the Secretariat paper. The Secretariat's text, with paragraph (a) of the Secretariat text, would cover the various paragraphs of Mr. Geraud's draft.

Mr. GERAUD explained that, by first requesting the Secretariat to provide the information with which it was not yet acquainted; in the second place, the Secretariat to produce fresh material.

Mr. GANDHI thought that Mr. Williams' proposal was a happy one but considered that the drafting could be simplified if, at the end of paragraph (a) of the Secretariat text, members would be willing merely to add the words: "bearing in mind the discussions which had taken place during the third session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press". In that way the Secretariat would be obliged to follow both the summary records of the meetings and the press releases and to study all the points of view expressed during the debate. The simpler wording of paragraph (b) in the Secretariat draft could also be retained by inserting after the words "to consult" the following sentence, taken from Mr. Geraud's text: "with the Director-General of UNESCO in order to obviate any unnecessary duplication of the researches and inquiries already carried out by UNESCO."

Mr. AZMI also thought that Mr. Williams' proposal should be retained. He thought, however, that the best way of attaining the objective was to keep paragraph (a) of the Secretariat draft as it was, and merely to delete the reference to the items in the programme of work. That would also satisfy Mr. Zonov since the last sentence said that the Secretariat should bear in mind the views expressed by members of the Sub-Commission during the discussion of item 6, and since all the aspects of the problem to which Mr. Zonov had drawn attention had been raised during that debate.

Mr. Azmi did not agree with Mr. Gandhi on paragraph (b) of the Secretariat draft; if Mr. Gandhi's suggestion were adopted, the purpose of Mr. Geraud's proposal, which was to limit the documentary work by excluding all data gathered prior to 1 January 1948, would not be fulfilled. He preferred therefore to support Mr. Williams' proposal on paragraph (b).

Mr. AZKOUL feared that the proposed alterations might cause some confusion. It would be better to specify the documentation which was required for each item of the programme of work.

Paragraph (a) of the Secretariat draft applied mainly to item 6 because it must be conceded that the Sub-Commission had expressed its opinion only on item 6 of the agenda. It would therefore

be advisable to delete from paragraph (a) the reference to items 7 and 8, to pass then to paragraph 3 of Mr. Geraud's proposal which dealt with item 7 of the programme of work, and to close with paragraphs 1 and 2 of the same proposal which referred to item 8. In that way the Secretariat could assemble the required documentation in logical order by first preparing item 6, and then continuing with the other items as the documentation on the preceding questions was collected.

Mr. AZMI supported Mr. Azkoul's views. The scope of the paragraph (a) should even be limited to the study of obstacles to the free flow of information. As far as the rest was concerned, Mr. Azmi accepted Mr. Azkoul's proposal without change.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that since Mr. Geraud's proposal had been submitted first, the Secretariat text should be considered as an amendment. He first put to the vote Mr. Williams' amendment to paragraph (a) of the Secretariat draft.

The amendment was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote Mr. Gandhi's proposal to amend the second part of the same paragraph to read: "being guided by the discussions which have taken place during the third session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press."

That amendment was adopted by 11 votes to none, with one abstention.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the recital of the draft resolution and paragraph (a) as amended as a whole.

The recital and paragraph (a) as amended were adopted by 11 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on the following paragraph.

Mr. FARR (UNESCO) pointed out that it was advisable to approach the problem in a positive manner, and not to start with the idea that the work would not be done in logical order.

There was no reason to believe that unnecessary duplication of the researches and inquiries carried out by UNESCO and the Secretariat of the Sub-Commission would occur. On the contrary the close collaboration which existed between the Secretariats of the two bodies was a reason for believing that there would be no overlapping.

The CHAIRMAN thought that it would be advisable to avoid any reference to the possibility of unnecessary duplication or overlapping. He proposed therefore wording paragraph (b) as follows:

"To apply himself principally to the collation of governmental, administrative, legislative and judicial measures enacted after 1 January 1948."

Mr. AZKOUL pointed out that, since the paragraph (a) had been accepted, the Secretariat was already obliged to refer to the programme of work adopted by the Sub-Commission, which assigned to it all the duties mentioned in the first paragraph of Mr. Geraud's draft resolution. The only difference was that Mr. Geraud's draft limited the period for which information should be supplied.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the purpose of the paragraph under discussion was to give the Secretariat clearer instructions authorizing it, if necessary, to supplement by inquiries and research carried out under its responsibility, the inquiries and research of UNESCO, as paragraph 2 of Mr. Geraud's proposal indicated.

Mr. AZKOUL thought that the first two paragraphs of Mr. Geraud's draft would tend to restrict the activities of the Secretariat. He would like to have the word "principally" in the first paragraph replaced by the word "particularly."

Mr. BINDER preferred the Secretariat's draft of paragraph (b) which satisfied Mr. Geraud's objections.

Mr. WILLIAMS was of the same opinion. He would like the Secretariat's draft of paragraph (b) to be retained and paragraph 1 of Mr. Geraud's draft resolution added.

Mr. GERAUD remarked that, in making his proposal, Mr. Williams did not take into account the fact that a difference existed between the competence of UNESCO and that of the Secretariat. He would prefer paragraph 2 of his draft resolution to be retained, to which the following sentence could be added: "To study any possibility of duplication, consultations would continuously be held between UNESCO and the Secretariat."

Mr. ZONOV thought that since paragraph (a) had been adopted in its amended form, any other explanation was superfluous.

The CHAIRMAN announced that he would put Mr. Geraud's proposal to the vote, phrased so that it could become paragraph (b). So that it could follow paragraph (a) which had already been adopted, he proposed the following wording: "With regard to the documentation on items 7 and 8, it shall apply itself principally to the collation of governmental measures, administrative, legislative, and judicial, affecting freedom of the press and information and enacted subsequent to 1 January 1948;" those words should be inserted before the following phrase, which appeared in paragraph 3 with a slight modification: "undertake a detailed study of existing treaties relating to information and the press and shall collect full data concerning the eventual application of the two conventions which may be approved by the General Assembly."

The Chairman explained that he was not retaining paragraph 2 of Mr. Geraud's proposal because the text was conceived in such a way that it only applied to items 7 and 8 of the programme of work.

The Chairman put the paragraph to the vote as he had just outlined it; it would become paragraph (b) of the resolution.

That text was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote paragraph (b) of the Secretariat's text which would become paragraph (c) of the resolution.

Paragraph (b) was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

/Mr. GERAUD

Mr. GERAUD stated that he had not voted for the proposal because he thought that that paragraph should have been supplemented by paragraph 2 of his proposal, so that the Secretariat could take certain initiatives on its own responsibility. After a brief discussion, however, Mr. Geraud said that he would not press for the addition of his text.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

The resolution as a whole was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN opened the debate on the draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.1/99) and requested the originator to introduce it.

Mr. AZMI explained that, in submitting his draft resolution, he had merely wished to ensure that the United Nations Information Centres would make the necessary documentation available to the members of the Sub-Commission, who, like Mr. Gandhi and himself, had indicated their intention of conducting personal enquiries on the principles and practices relating to freedom of information and of the press in the countries with which they were particularly well acquainted.

Mr. HOGAN (Secretariat) explained that United Nations Information Centres would, as a matter of course, provide the members of the Sub-Commission with the data they might need, if it was within their competence. If they could not supply the desired information, they would advise the Secretariat at Lake Success, which would request the proper officials to supply them.

Mr. AZMI thanked the Secretariat for its reply, but, since he did not know what was within the competence of the Information Centres, he thought it would be wise to adopt his draft resolution to enable the Information Centres to supply the kind of data which were of interest to the members of the Sub-Commission.

Mr. GANDHI proposed that the first paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted and that the end of the second paragraph should be changed so as to read: "to members engaged in studies and inquiries relevant to the objects of the Sub-Commission". In that way

/the impression

the impression would not be conveyed that the Sub-Commission had instructed some of its members to carry out specific studies, and it would be clear that the studies in question were to be made privately.

Mr. AZMI stated that in his view it was a question of purely private studies, and that he had wished to assist the work of the Sub-Commission by avoiding the budgetary implications of an official decision. He accepted the amendments proposed by Mr. Gandhi.

On the proposal of Mr. GANDHI, the beginning of the second paragraph was amended to read: "Requests the Secretary-General...".

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the definition of the word "information" which had been submitted by Mr. Azmi (E/CN.4/Sub.1/95).

Mr. AZMI explained that he had proposed the definition as a reply to the question raised by Mr. Zonov regarding the kind of information the dissemination of which the Sub-Commission should facilitate. In view, however, of the general wish to finish the work of the session with the current meeting, it would not be possible to discuss the definition in the calm atmosphere necessary. He therefore suggested that consideration of the matter should be postponed to the following session of the Sub-Commission.

It was so decided.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE FOLLOWING SESSION

The CHAIRMAN called attention to the draft resolution (E/CN.4/Sub.1/101) which he had submitted in his capacity as a member of the Sub-Commission, and which dealt with the invitation to the Sub-Commission from the Government of Uruguay for the fourth session to be held at Montevideo. The draft resolution stated that the Government of Uruguay would contribute all extra expenses involved in holding the session away from Lake Success.

/He pointed out

He pointed out that Mr. Fontaina's proposal would enable the Sub-Commission to make its work better known in another part of the world. He recalled that several members of the Sub-Commission had thought that meetings should be held as often as possible in different countries.

Mr. GANDHI proposed that the word "directly" in the first paragraph should be replaced by the words "more closely", and to include as a reason for the decision the phrase: "to interest the maximum number of people in the work of the Sub-Commission".

Mr. LOPEZ accepted those amendments.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution, as amended.
The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN requested Mr. Fontaina to be kind enough to transmit the thanks of the Sub-Commission to his Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS explained that he had abstained from voting for purely personal reasons.

The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Sub-Commission whether they wished to reconsider the provisional decision already taken regarding the date of the following session, as they knew which items had been postponed to that session. He recalled that the Sub-Commission's following session had been provisionally fixed for April 1950.

Mr. BINDER reminded the Sub-Commission that he had previously proposed that the following session should be held in January 1950; he had not changed his mind on the question.

Mr. FONTAINA asked the Secretariat representative whether the Sub-Commission would be able to obtain the same Secretariat services in January as in April.

Mr. AZKOUL pointed out to the Secretariat representative that the Sub-Commission would need to extend its following session beyond the two weeks provided for, if it held only one session in 1950; if, however, two sessions were approved, two weeks would suffice for each.

Mr. HOGAN (Secretariat) explained that the meetings of other organs would have to be considered when the final decision was taken. If the General Assembly decided to meet early the following year, or in spring of that year, the recent difficulties might arise again. The Secretariat hoped that the Commission on Human Rights and its two Sub-Commissions might avoid meeting simultaneously, as the same Secretariat staff, to a great extent, dealt with each of the three bodies. The final decision regarding the date of the following session would be taken by the Economic and Social Council. That decision would certainly be known about the middle of August. Members of the Sub-Commission would immediately be informed of it by the Secretariat.

Mr. ZONOV thought that there was no purpose in reopening discussion on the date of the following session; a decision had already been taken. A two-thirds majority was necessary for the discussion to be reopened. Moreover, in his view the Sub-Commission should adhere to its previous decision.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMISSION TO THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The CHAIRMAN announced that the last part of the report, which dealt with the decisions taken during the meetings, was in course of preparation. The Sub-Commission could, therefore, choose between two alternatives: either it could approve that part of the report which had already been submitted and leave the Rapporteur to complete it and submit it to the Economic and Social Council, or it could wait until the report was complete, in order to consider and vote on it as a whole.

Mr. GERAUD asked the Secretariat to make a point of including in the report a statement to the effect that the Sub-Commission had decided to arrange for the distribution to its members of a monthly bulletin of news relating to freedom of information.

/Mr. HOGAN

Mr. HOGAN (Secretariat) said that the request would be complied with.

The last part of the report was distributed and time was allowed for members to read it.

Mr. BINDER formally proposed the adoption of the report of the Sub-Commission to the Commission on Human Rights.

Following a remark by Mr. WILLIAMS, paragraph 20 on page 7 of the report was omitted as superfluous.

The report was adopted by 9 votes to 2.

On behalf of the members of the Sub-Commission, Mr. BINDER thanked the Chairman for his conduct of debates.

On behalf of the Sub-Commission, the CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Secretariat for their assistance. He then declared the third session of the Sub-Commission closed.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

