

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTEENTH SESSION  
Official Records

**FIFTH COMMITTEE 693rd  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 25 November 1958,  
at 3.15 p.m.



**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 55: Public information activities of the United Nations: report of the Committee of Experts on United Nations Public Information, and comments and recommendations thereon by the Secretary-General (continued) . . . . .	237
Agenda item 44: Budget estimates for the financial year 1959 (con- tinued) Organization of the Secretariat: Department of Economic and Social Affairs and Technical As- sistance Administration (continued) . . . . .	240

**Chairman: Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon).**

**AGENDA ITEM 55**

**Public information activities of the United Nations:  
report of the Committee of Experts on United Nations  
Public Information, and comments and obser-  
vations thereon by the Secretary-General (A/3928,  
A/3945, A/C.5/757, A/C.5/764, A/C.5/L.539, A/  
C.5/L.540, A/C.5/L.541) (continued)**

1. Mr. GEORGIEV (Bulgaria) said that if it would make his first amendment (A/C.5/L.541) more acceptable to a large number of delegations, he would propose deleting only the word "any" from the English text of the fourth preambular paragraph of the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.539); the French text would read "par des moyens appropriés" instead of "par tout moyen approprié". It was important to discriminate between the media to be employed and to enable the Secretariat to choose, among the appropriate media, those which answered the requirements of the relevant resolutions. It had been said that the Office of Public Information had used certain media which did not comply with those resolutions; if the proposed change was made, it would have to reconcile the media which it regarded as technically appropriate with the general instructions laid down in the resolutions.

2. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) thought that the question of information was so important that the Committee ought to take a firm and as far as possible unanimous decision on it. Unfortunately, it could not arrive at the desired unanimity, but those who were in favour of the general recommendations of the Committee of Experts on United Nations Public Information and in particular those of paragraph 227 of its report (A/3928), would not worry unduly because clearly, far from being discarded, the report would inspire future activities in the information field.

3. In that connexion, the Burmese delegation wished again to draw attention to the desirability of setting up an information centre in Burma and thanked those delegations which had supported the idea; it hoped that

the Secretary-General would do his best to put it into effect, in the light of paragraph 227 (e) and (b). The second preambular paragraph of the joint draft resolution sounded a hopeful note in that respect, and the Burmese delegation was in favour of it, on the understanding that the Secretary-General would try to find means of establishing an information centre in Burma. Burma certainly endorsed all the recommendations in paragraph 227, all of which were excellent. The fourth preambular paragraph made no mention of a ceiling for the public information budget, but the Secretary-General would no doubt be guided by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and would not exclude the establishment of new information centres from his plans; in fact, it was essential to set up new centres. It would be possible to make substantial savings by closing the Information Centres in Washington, London and Paris. That would also be in accordance with the purpose of the fifth preambular paragraph, and he was prepared to vote in favour of that paragraph.

4. The joint draft resolution was a model of moderation. Many delegations would clearly have preferred a more forthright resolution, but the most important point was to take some action at last, as the United Kingdom representative had rightly pointed out. The Burmese delegation would abstain from voting on the Bulgarian and Romanian amendments (A/C.5/L.541, A/C.5/L.540).

5. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that if the last change proposed by the Bulgarian representative was intended to reduce the Secretary-General's freedom of action, the United States delegation could not accept it. Neither could it support the second Bulgarian amendment, since resolution 595 (VI) of 1952 upon which it was based was not the only resolution which the General Assembly had adopted requesting Governments to co-operate in the dissemination of information on the United Nations; for example, there were also resolutions 424 (V) and 137 (II). The Romanian amendment restored the reference to the figure of \$4.5 million; but the deletion of that figure had been one of the bases of the agreement entered into by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States; hence the United States delegation could not possibly agree to it.

6. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said he would vote in favour of the Romanian and Bulgarian amendments because their incorporation into the joint draft resolution would bring it closer to the ideas set forth in the report of the Committee of Experts. The first Bulgarian amendment was very important because it made for support of the methods proposed by the Committee of Experts. The second amendment embodied the wording of the report and the General Assembly resolutions, so that its adoption was definitely indicated. The Romanian amendment respected the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and

Budgetary Questions and the decisions of the General Assembly; it would be gross disregard of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the recommendations of the Committee of Experts not to mention the ceiling which had previously been fixed.

7. Mr. SAHNI (India) wondered whether it might not be as well to delete the words "in the opinion of the Secretary-General" from operative paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution. The Secretary-General had said in his last statement (689th meeting) that if the Committee approved paragraph 227, he would not be very clear as to the General Assembly's intentions. Obviously, if the phrase in question was omitted, the Secretary-General would have adequate guidance. Moreover, the paragraph did not say that the Secretary-General should take into account the views expressed by the Committee; the suggested change would leave the initiative to the Secretary-General, but it would be understood that he would also take into account the opinions expressed during the discussion.

8. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that the United States delegation regarded the words in question as the key phrase, and would not have accepted the United Kingdom amendment if they had not been included. It had always maintained that the Secretary-General should be told what principles he should take as guidance, and at the same time he should be left a certain amount of latitude; the phrase "in the opinion of the Secretary-General" gave him that latitude.

9. Mr. LONGDEN (United Kingdom) thought that the difference between "appropriate media" and "any appropriate media" was not significant enough to warrant the Committee dwelling upon it. The whole phrase could equally well be deleted, since the next paragraph defined clearly the media which were appropriate. However, if the United States delegation was against deleting it, the United Kingdom delegation would adopt the same position. He urged the Bulgarian representative not to press his second amendment because it repeated what was implicit in the third preambular paragraph, which referred to General Assembly resolution 595 (VI). Moreover, since the draft resolution related to the report of the Committee of Experts, it was more appropriate to use the terms employed by the experts, as the United Kingdom and the United States had done in their joint draft.

10. The United Kingdom delegation was actually not averse to accepting the Romanian amendment but would nevertheless vote against it because the omission of any reference to a ceiling was one of the conditions of the agreement reached by the United Kingdom and United States delegations. His delegation was very much in favour of the Indian representative's suggestion; the words which it was proposed should be deleted had been left in the paragraph inadvertently, and the United Kingdom delegation would be quite willing to abide by the Committee's decision on that point.

11. Mr. SAHNI (India) said that he would not press his suggestion in the face of the United States delegation's opposition. He would simply ask for a separate vote on the words "in the opinion of the Secretary-General".

12. After an exchange of views in which Mr. ALLENDE (Chile), Mr. ARNOTT (Australia), Mr. BENDER (United States of America), Mr. JEAN-LOUIS (Haiti) and the CHAIRMAN took part, Mr. GEORGIEV (Bul-

garia) withdrew his amendments on the understanding that the Rapporteur would state in his report that, in the general opinion of the Committee, full account should be taken of the resolutions mentioned in the third preambular paragraph in interpreting the considerations in the fourth and sixth preambular paragraphs.

13. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) noted that the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the joint draft resolution contained two important restrictions quite alien to the principle of freedom of information: a financial restriction ("within the budgetary limitations imposed by the General Assembly") and a practical restriction ("through any appropriate media"). Concern for the same considerations was revealed even more clearly in the succeeding paragraph. In a matter as important as information, the United Nations could not prescribe budgetary limitations without endangering the very essence of its activities. It should be in a position to disseminate information on its work everywhere, without restriction.

14. The operative part also contained limitations of the same kind and, what was even more serious, it made no reference to the principle of freedom of information. What was the meaning of the expression "at the lowest possible cost"? For instance would the re-broadcasting of the General Assembly debates be abolished, and replaced by some more inexpensive information medium which would be less consistent with the principles previously adopted? His delegation thought that such broadcasts should be continued in as many languages as possible without the consent of Governments being required. He regretted that the operative part of the draft resolution, which was otherwise very valuable, made no mention of the very principles upon which United Nations public information activities should be based, and he would prefer a text in which budgetary matters yielded precedence to concern for affirming the fundamental human right of freedom of information.

15. He attached great importance to the suggestion made by the representative of India. Not merely the opinion of the Secretary-General, but also the views expressed during the debates in the Fifth Committee, should be taken into account. He would accordingly support the proposal of the representative of India.

16. The CHAIRMAN put the Romanian amendment (A/C.5/L.540) to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Japan, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Hungary.

Against: Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti.

Abstaining: Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Philippines, Portugal, Tuni-

sia, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, China, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran.

The amendment was rejected by 27 votes to 14, with 28 abstentions.

17. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "in the opinion of the Secretary-General" in operative paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution on which the representative of India had asked for a separate vote.

The phrase was adopted by 34 votes to 16, with 17 abstentions.

18. Mr. ANDONI (Albania) requested that the vote on the joint draft resolution be taken paragraph by paragraph.

19. Mr. REINA (Honduras) asked for a roll-call vote on the words "with the maximum of effectiveness at the lowest possible cost", in operative paragraph 1, since the same idea was already expressed in the fifth paragraph of the preamble.

20. The CHAIRMAN proceeded to put the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.539) to the vote, paragraph by paragraph.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 58 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 66 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The fifth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The sixth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The seventh paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 58 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

A roll-call vote was taken to decide whether the words "with the maximum of effectiveness at the lowest possible cost" in operative paragraph 1 should be retained.

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

In favour: Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan.

Against: Panama, Uruguay, Venezuela, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras.

Abstaining: Liberia, Morocco, Tunisia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Federation of Malaya, Haiti, Israel.

The words "with the maximum of effectiveness at the lowest possible cost" were adopted by 49 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The joint draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

21. Mr. LEVYCHKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had stated its readiness to support any draft resolution requiring the Secretary-General to put into execution the recommendations in paragraph 227 of the report of the Committee of Experts and referring to the need for setting a ceiling on information expenditure.

22. After hearing the just criticisms concerning the United Nations public information programme, the United States delegation had changed its attitude and gone back on the opinions set forth in its original draft resolution, which had been entirely unacceptable to many delegations. In that respect, the text on which the Committee had just voted represented a definite step forward in relation to the original United States draft resolution; he saw in that an admission by the United States delegation that an abnormal situation did exist with regard to the organization of the United Nations Office of Public Information. The United Kingdom delegation, on the other hand, had departed from its original attitude to an appreciable extent and had withdrawn precisely those clauses in its draft resolution which the USSR would have been able to support. His delegation accordingly could not vote in favour of the United Kingdom proposals as set forth in the joint draft resolution.

23. The Soviet delegation had therefore abstained from voting on the joint draft resolution as a whole, although it contained points which seemed satisfactory. It wanted no share in the responsibility for setting aside certain very important recommendations made by the Committee of Experts and before making up its mind, it would wait and see how the Secretary-General discharged the minimum obligations laid upon him by the draft resolution adopted. He hoped incidentally that the Secretary-General would be able to take into account not only the draft resolution, but also the opinions expressed by many delegations in connexion with the United Nations Office of Public Information, which needed considerable improvement.

24. Mr. KEATING (Ireland) said he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution on the basis of the objections he had previously raised to the second paragraph and still more to the last paragraph of the preamble. Ireland had voted to retain the words "with the maximum of effectiveness at the lowest possible cost"; it felt that the emphasis could just as well be laid on the first part of the phrase as on the second—which would make it mean that the Secretary-General should attach just as much importance to the need for ensuring the maximum of effectiveness as to his concern for saving expense.

25. Mr. AHANEEN (Iran) said he had voted for the draft resolution as one that seemed to him to make a

most realistic and practical approach to the problem of the application of the basic principles. The preamble upheld most of those principles, which apparently had the approval of all delegations, and it gave the Secretary-General enough latitude to ensure the implementation of those principles with the maximum of effectiveness at the lowest possible cost. He sincerely hoped that the Secretary-General would take into account the comments made during the general debate, since they might help him to take measures to ensure full implementation of the basic principles—in particular the remarks made concerning the problem of broadcasts, to which his delegation attached special importance.

26. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that his delegation did not accept the Soviet representative's interpretation of the position of the United States.

27. Mr. Cecil KING (Liberia) pointed out that the Information Centre opened in Monrovia in 1950, to which the Liberian Government had always given its cooperation, had never used the national broadcasting networks and programmes to disseminate information on the United Nations. Not only that, but early in 1958, the Office of Public Information had deprived the centre of its Director, a large part of its staff and most of its installations. The Liberian Government regarded the matter as indicating indifference and a lack of consideration for the Liberian people on the part of the Office of Public Information, and his delegation had therefore felt obliged to abstain in all the votes.

28. Mr. URABE (Japan) said he had been a trifle disappointed by the rejection of the Romanian amendment. On the other hand, he was glad that the Committee had decided in favour of the words "with the maximum of effectiveness at the lowest possible cost". In that connexion, he thought that if the emphasis was placed on the first part of the phrase, as the representative of Ireland seemed to suggest doing, the impression given was that the Office of Public Information had not obtained the best possible results within the budgetary limitations imposed on it. His delegation thought that the stress should be laid on the second part of the phrase.

#### AGENDA ITEM 44

##### Budget estimates for the financial year 1959 (A/C.5/752, A/C.5/767) (continued)\*

##### Organization of the Secretariat: Department of Economic and Social Affairs and Technical Assistance Administration (A/C.5/752, A/C.5/767) (continued)\*

29. Mr. KWEEDJIEHOO (Indonesia) thought that the Committee should take a decision on the proposal by representative of India (681st meeting) that the Advisory Committee should be asked to submit a report to the Fifth Committee, so that the examination of the question need not be postponed any longer.

30. Mr. NUÑEZ (Panama) did not underrate the importance of the Advisory Committee's views on the matter, but he did not see why the Fifth Committee need wait to ascertain those views before it discussed the question.

31. Mr. MANGASHA (Ethiopia) felt that it would be quite possible to ask the Advisory Committee for the

report which most delegations wanted, without holding up the discussion in the meantime. The two things were not in any way incompatible.

32. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he had not consulted the members of the Advisory Committee and would like, at that stage of the debate, to state his personal views.

33. The internal organization of the Secretariat was a question falling within the competence of the Secretary-General acting as chief administrative officer of the Organization and in accordance with the general directives of the Assembly. The Secretary-General was in the best position to decide what steps should be taken to carry out the Organization's responsibilities in a particular field. The Secretary-General had already stated the reasons for his belief that the time had come to amalgamate the Technical Assistance Administration with the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. The Advisory Committee had always recommended such an amalgamation on logical, technical and administrative grounds.

34. As already pointed out, even when amalgamation had been officially accomplished, much would remain to be done to co-ordinate the programme of operations with the Organization's current activities in the economic and social fields. The detailed planning would undoubtedly take some time, and the Secretary-General had proposed that it should be done in consultation with the Advisory Committee. He agreed with the Secretary-General that it would be unrealistic to expect the details of re-organization at the base to be worked out prior to the unification of the Department at the top. Once the General Assembly had approved the broad features of the proposed organization, the Secretary-General should be left to settle the details of internal procedure and structure. There was no doubt that in a matter of such importance the Secretary-General would seek to ascertain the views of the Advisory Committee on the administrative and financial aspects of the steps he proposed to take.

35. The Fifth Committee might therefore be well-advised to accept the statement by the Secretary-General at the 690th meeting and give its general approval to the Secretary-General's proposal. It should be reiterated that that was only a personal opinion, although there was good reason to believe that it coincided with the views of the Advisory Committee as a whole. The Advisory Committee would certainly submit a report to the Fifth Committee if desired but, at the present stage, such a report might not be of great use.

36. Mr. GREZ (Chile) proposed that the meeting should be adjourned and the discussion of the question, which was important, resumed on the following day.

37. Mr. URQUIDI (Mexico) felt that in view of the differing opinions that had been expressed and the comments just made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, the Committee could not take any decision without discussing the question further. He therefore supported the suggestion made by the representative of Chile.

The motion for adjournment of the meeting was adopted.

\*Resumed from the 690th meeting.