

UNITED NATIONS  
**ECONOMIC AND  
 SOCIAL COUNCIL**  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**



**ELEVENTH SESSION, 405th  
 MEETING**  
**WEDNESDAY, 9 AUGUST 1950, AT 4.45 P.M.**  
**PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA**

**C O N T E N T S**

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
Report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press (fourth session): report of the Social Committee (E/1785) . . . . .	265	Relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies: report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/1810 and E/1810/Corr.1) . . . . .	269
Report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/1800) . . . . .	267		

*President: Mr. Hernán SANTA CRUZ (Chile).*

*Present:* Representatives of the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, India, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization.

**Report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press (fourth session): report of the Social Committee (E/1785)**

1. The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on the report of the Social committee (E/1785) relating to the report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press (E/1672).
2. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada), speaking as the Chairman of the Social Committee, said that his committee had examined the report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press and was submitting six draft resolutions for the approval of the Council.
3. Paragraph 4 of the Social Committee's report stated that the Committee had examined draft resolutions C and D contained in the report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, on the circulation of newsreels and on a model agreement for future agreements concerning access for news personnel to meetings of the United Nations. Having considered those draft resolutions, the Committee had decided to recommend to the Council that it should take no action on them.
4. The Committee had also decided to recommend to the Council that it should take no action on paragraph 16 of the report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of

Information and of the Press concerning access of families of accredited news personnel to countries where meetings of the United Nations and its specialized agencies were held.

5. Referring to draft resolution F, he said that, as stated in paragraph 5 of the Social Committee's report, when considering draft resolution G as contained in the report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, the Committee had decided to postpone the discussion on the first operative paragraph of that resolution G, in view of its relationship with the question of the *Yearbook on Human Rights* which was to be discussed by the Committee at a later date. That paragraph had not been included in the draft resolution F adopted by the Committee. Consequently, draft resolution F contained only the last three operative paragraphs of draft resolution G of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press. When discussing the report of the Commission on Human Rights, the Committee had decided that there was no need to incorporate such a paragraph in the draft resolution of the Commission on Human Rights covering the *Yearbook*. Thus the Committee had taken no action, and the Council was also not asked to take any action.

6. The Committee had also agreed that it would be advisable to transmit the records of the relevant discussions in the Social Committee and in the Council to the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press.

7. The PRESIDENT said that the last point raised by the Chairman of the Social Committee could be met by adding a relevant provision to draft resolution A, which would then read:

*" The Economic and Social Council*

*" Takes note of the Report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press (fourth session); and*

"Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the Sub-Commission the records of the relevant discussions at the eleventh session of the Council."

8. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution A, as amended.

*The resolution, as amended, was adopted.*

9. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution B.

10. Mr. DESAI (India) pointed out that the words "all freedom" in the first paragraph of draft resolution B should read "all the freedoms".

11. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had proposed in the Social Committee the deletion of the third paragraph of draft resolution B, which referred to the International Telecommunication Convention. In the opinion of the delegation, the question of interpretation of that convention was a matter which fell within the competence of the International Telecommunication Union and should not be included in a Council resolution. He requested, therefore, that a separate vote should be taken on that particular paragraph.

12. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) emphasized the fact that the International Telecommunication Union had an agreement with the United Nations and that the Atlantic City Convention was an important instrument and basic to the orderly development of international telecommunications. To delete the paragraph in question would greatly weaken the draft resolution. In view of the international importance of the question, he could not agree that it should not be considered by the Council.

13. His delegation would vote for draft resolution B as a whole, although it entertained certain misgivings regarding the fourth paragraph, which stated that duly authorized radio operating agencies "in some countries" were deliberately interfering with the reception by the people of those countries of certain radio signals originating beyond their territories. It had been made quite clear in the Social Committee that that paragraph referred to one specific country—namely, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—since this was the one country which, in violation of its international obligations, engaged in "jamming" on a massive scale. His delegation had agreed that mention of that country by name should be omitted only in order to achieve unanimous approval for the draft resolution.

14. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the third paragraph of draft resolution B.

*The paragraph was adopted by 12 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

15. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution B as a whole.

*The resolution was adopted unanimously.*

16. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution C.

17. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) and Mr. KAYSER (France) said that they agreed with the substance of draft resolution C, but felt that, since the principles stated therein had already been approved by the General Assembly, there was no need to repeat them *ad infinitum*.

18. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution C to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted by 11 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*

19. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution D.

20. M. CABADA (Peru) said that his delegation, at the 137th meeting of the Social Committee,<sup>1</sup> had abstained from voting on draft resolution D because of its political connotations.

21. M. NORIEGA (Mexico) referred the Council to the reservations which he had already made on that draft resolution at the 137th meeting of the Social Committee.<sup>1</sup>

22. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution D to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

23. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution E.

24. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) proposed that the opening words of the first paragraph of draft resolution E—namely "To transmit"—should be amended to read: "To communicate through the services and information centres of the United Nations". The reasons for his proposal were purely technical in character. Indeed, he wished to encourage the practical dissemination of information on the draft international code of ethics formulated by the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press. Under the draft resolution as it stood, the Secretary-General would have to send out countless communications to various information enterprises and national and international professional associations. In his opinion, that could best be done by the services and information centres of the United Nations.

25. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) pointed out that, under Council resolution 240 B (IX), the Secretary-General had been asked to request governments to submit lists of legally constituted official and non-official national Press, information, broadcasting or newsreel enterprises or associations from which information or opinion relevant to the aims and objects of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press could be elicited. It was only natural, therefore, to suppose that the Secretary-General had at his disposal a full list of the various national professional associations concerned. There was no reason to doubt that he also had full information on the various international associations. There was no reason, therefore, why he should not communicate with them directly. In any case, he would like to have further information on the subject from the Secretariat.

26. Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) emphasized the fact that only twenty-four governments had so far

<sup>1</sup> See document E/AC.7/SR.137.

replied to the request mentioned by the United Kingdom representative. Furthermore, not all of them had interpreted that request in the same way. Indeed, some of them had interpreted the word "enterprises" as covering a multitude of associations, including publishing enterprises, so that one country had forwarded a list of 800 names. It would be difficult for the Secretary-General to act on the information received from such an ill-balanced number of associations. Moreover, since only a few countries had supplied any names, his field of action would be greatly restricted and he would be unable to communicate with enterprises in those countries which had supplied no information on the subject.

27. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) said that the information services at United Nations Headquarters might supply the necessary data to its various information centres, which would then distribute as many copies of the draft international code of ethics as necessary. United Nations Headquarters would thus be spared a great deal of irrelevant and unnecessary correspondence.

28. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) agreed with the representative of the Secretariat that the Secretary-General should not be restricted to a limited number of countries and that he should be able to communicate with enterprises other than those of which he had been informed by the governments which had complied with his request for information. In the case of the countries which had answered his request, however, due notice should be taken of their replies and he should communicate with the enterprises indicated to him.

29. Mr. KAYSER (France) supported the United Kingdom representative's observations. It was important to allow the Secretary-General sufficient freedom to enable him not only to put the documents concerning the draft code of ethics directly before the Press associations with which he was already in contact, but also to bring them to the notice of other associations in other countries.

30. The PRESIDENT proposed that the words "to transmit" should merely be amended to read "to communicate". That would leave the Secretary-General free to communicate with information enterprises and national and international professional associations in the way that he considered most appropriate, taking into consideration the views expressed in the Council.

31. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) agreed with the proposal made by the President.

32. Mr. BALLARD (Australia) said that his delegation would abstain from voting on draft resolution E.

33. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution E, as amended.

*The resolution, as amended, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

34. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution F.

35. Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) said that draft resolution F was based on draft resolution G of

the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, which included a reference to the *Yearbook on Human Rights*. The United Kingdom delegation had already pointed out at the 138th meeting of the Social Committee<sup>2</sup> that that question was closely related with and, indeed, dependent on the action to be taken by the Council on the *Yearbook on Human Rights*. The Council had at its previous meeting adopted resolution I contained in the report of the Social Committee (E/1808) relating to the report of the Commission on Human Rights. That resolution invited governments to supply information to the Secretary-General on all matters concerning human rights for inclusion in the *Yearbook on Human Rights*. It seemed superfluous, therefore, to adopt the provision contained in the first paragraph of draft resolution F requesting governments to supply information to the Secretary-General on one specific right—namely, freedom of information and of the Press—since ample information on that point would already be supplied under the resolution he had mentioned.

36. In conclusion, and without going into further details, he emphasized the point that the draft resolution as a whole had been very badly drafted, and he formally requested that a separate vote should be taken on the first paragraph, to which he had referred.

37. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first paragraph of draft resolution F.

*The paragraph was adopted by 7 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.*

38. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution F as a whole.

*The resolution was adopted by 7 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.*

39. The PRESIDENT said that the Social Committee had recommended that the Council should take no action on draft resolutions C and D contained in the report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, on the circulation of newsreels and on a model agreement for future agreements concerning access for news personnel to meetings of the United Nations, and also that it should take no action on paragraph 16 of the report of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, concerning access of families of accredited news personnel to countries where meetings of the United Nations and its specialized agencies were held. Unless there were any objections, he would consider that the Council agreed with the recommendation of the Social Committee that it should take no action on those matters.

*It was so decided.*

#### **Report of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/1800)**

40. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/1800) on the report

<sup>2</sup> See document E/AC.7/SR.138.

of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (E/1688), and to the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Chile, Iran, Mexico and Peru (E/L.86).

41. Mr. TERENCE (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the Director-General regretted that he was unable to attend the Council's plenary meeting, but had asked him to say that he would personally see to it that his organization paid the greatest attention to the resolutions voted by the Council and the opinions expressed in the debates.

42. The Director-General greatly appreciated the mark of esteem paid by the Co-ordination Committee in the second paragraph of draft resolution A (E/1800), though he felt that it would be preferable to eliminate the personal reference.

43. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that, as the representative who had proposed that part of the text of draft resolution A to which the representative of UNESCO had referred, he appreciated the sentiments of the Director-General of that organization. Although it was the Director-General's wish that the second paragraph should be changed, Mr. Kotschnig felt that the idea that UNESCO was making a serious effort to establish priorities should be retained, and therefore suggested that the second paragraph of resolution A should be amended as follows:

*"Commends the efforts of UNESCO to establish priorities in its work programme."*

44. Mr. KAYSER (France) appreciated the disinterested attitude of the Director-General of UNESCO, and supported the amendment proposed by the United States representative. The well-deserved tribute paid to the Director-General in the original text would thus be paid to UNESCO generally.

45. Mr. WALKER (Australia) supported the United States amendment. His delegation had felt obliged to abstain from voting on the original second paragraph of draft resolution A on the grounds that it considered that the Council should not address itself in that way to the executive head of an organization which was responsible to its own governing body. He wished to add, however, how much the Australian delegation appreciated the initiative taken by the Director-General in connexion with the establishment of priorities in UNESCO's work programme. Everyone who had been closely connected with UNESCO's work recognized the great contribution made by its Director-General in urging the establishment of those priorities.

46. Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation supported the United States amendment, which removed a constitutional difficulty which had also been sensed by the Australian delegation and which had been the reason why his delegation had felt obliged to vote against the second paragraph of draft resolution A and had abstained from voting on the whole of that resolution. The United Kingdom delegation felt that the paragraph in question brought the Council too closely into the internal affairs of another organization. It still

felt that the resolution went a little too far in that direction, particularly in the fourth paragraph. His delegation appreciated, however, the efforts made by the Director-General of UNESCO in connexion with the establishment of priorities in that organization's work programme.

47. Mr. SEN (India) said that the Indian delegation had supported the second paragraph of draft resolution A when it had been put to the vote in the Co-ordination Committee, as it felt that the paragraph reflected the opinion of members as regards the efforts made by the Director-General of UNESCO. If, however, that paragraph had caused the Director-General any embarrassment, his delegation would support the United States amendment.

48. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) supported the remarks of the French and Indian representatives.

49. Mr. CABADA (Peru) said he would abstain from voting on the United States amendment.

50. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the United States amendment to the second paragraph of draft resolution A.

*The amendment was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

51. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution A, as amended.

*The resolution, as amended, was adopted.*

52. The PRESIDENT, referring to draft resolution B, pointed out that the words "including a comparison" in the second paragraph should be replaced by the words "in particular comparing". The French text remained unchanged.

53. He put to the vote draft resolution B.

*The resolution was adopted unanimously.*

54. The PRESIDENT invited comments on the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Chile, Iran, Mexico and Peru (E/L.86).

55. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) said that the intention of the joint draft resolution was simply to emphasize the importance of the agreement on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural materials adopted at the fifth session of the General Conference of UNESCO.

56. Mr. SEN (India) suggested that in the second paragraph of the joint draft resolution the word "such" should be replaced by the word "this", and the word "the" should be inserted before "Member States".

*It was so decided.*

57. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Chile, Iran, Mexico and Peru, as amended.

*The resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

**Relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies: report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/1810 and E/1810/Corr.1)**

58. The PRESIDENT, after drawing attention to the report of the Co-ordination Committee on relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies (E/1810 and E/1810/Corr.1), asked the Chairman of that Committee to introduce the report.

59. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico), Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee, said that he wished to thank all members of the Co-ordination Committee, and especially the Vice-Chairman, for their co-operation in the Committee's arduous work. In submitting its report to the Council, the Co-ordination Committee hoped that that document would serve as a basis for future work of the United Nations in matters relating to co-ordination.

60. The French text of the report would need to be revised, as the translation was not satisfactory.<sup>3</sup>

61. He suggested that the last sentence of the introduction before section I should be amended to read as follows: "The Committee has adopted the following report unanimously and recommends the adoption of draft resolution A."

62. He suggested that the report and resolutions adopted should be put to the vote as a whole unless any member of the Council wished for a separate vote on any of the resolutions.

63. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), supporting the proposal that the report and resolutions should be put to the vote as a whole, said that he wished to express his gratitude to the Chairman and members of that committee for the report which had been placed before the Council. It was one of the best reports received from the Co-ordination Committee and would greatly advance the cause of co-ordination throughout the whole pattern of United Nations activities in the economic and social field.

64. Mr. YU (China) said that his delegation supported the remarks of the United States representative regarding the work done by the Co-ordination Committee under its very able Chairman.

65. He referred briefly to the fact that, at the 62nd meeting of the Co-ordination Committee,<sup>4</sup> the Chinese representative had referred to the seventh report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (E/1682) in which mention had been made of the universality of membership in the United Nations, and had stated that the Chinese representative would refer again to the matter at a plenary meeting of the Council.

66. The Chinese delegation wished to have universality of membership in the United Nations, but considered that such universality should be strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. The term "universality" must in no way be employed as a cloak to

cover a political move to remove China's legitimate representative and to give a seat to the Communist regime of Peiping.

67. As the Chinese delegation's views had been fully expressed at the 384th plenary meeting of the Council and also at the sixty-second meeting of the Co-ordination Committee,<sup>4</sup> he wished the statements made by the Chinese delegation at those meetings to become part of the records of the 405th meeting of the Council.

68. He reserved the right of his delegation to communicate to the President, for transmission to the Secretary-General, its views on the correct meaning of universality of membership in the United Nations, as well as to the related subject as a whole.

69. Mr. SEN (India), supporting the report of the Co-ordination Committee, praised the work done by the Committee, its Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

70. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada) added his congratulations to those of the previous speakers on the work done by the Co-ordination Committee under its very able Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

71. The report was a constructive attempt on the part of the Co-ordination Committee to bring into compact compass some of the fundamental principles that should govern the attitude of the Council towards problems that arose in the economic and social field. It would serve as a lasting and useful document both within the United Nations itself and in its application to the specialized agencies and other organs.

72. Referring to the suggestion that the report and resolutions should be adopted as a whole, he felt that, if the Council established such a precedent, it might meet with difficulties in the future in connexion with other reports. He suggested, therefore, that a formal vote should be taken on each resolution adopted by the Co-ordination Committee. The point raised by the Chairman of the Committee would be met if, in approving draft resolution A, the Council also included approval of the report.

73. Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico), Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee, agreed to the Canadian representative's suggestion.

74. The PRESIDENT agreed with the Canadian representative that the Council would be establishing a precedent if it voted for the report of the Co-ordination Committee and the resolutions as a whole. He pointed out that by approving draft resolution A the Council would *ipso facto* be approving the report of the Co-ordination Committee, since the resolution referred to the specific recommendations and suggestions made in the report.

75. Mr. PÉRIER (France) said that the French delegation would give its approval to the report of the Co-ordination Committee (E/1810), provided the mistakes in the French translation were corrected.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> See footnote to paragraph 75 below.

<sup>4</sup> See document E/AC.24/SR.62.

<sup>5</sup> A corrected French text was issued subsequently as document E/1810/Rev.1.

76. The PRESIDENT replied that the French delegation could of course make the necessary corrections to the French text, in consultation with the Secretariat.

77. Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada), referring to the President's remarks, requested that draft resolution A should be put to the vote after the other resolutions submitted by the Co-ordination Committee.

78. The PRESIDENT declared closed the general debate on the report of the Co-ordination Committee on relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies.

79. He put draft resolution B to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted unanimously.*

80. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution C.

81. Mr. PÉRIER (France) repeated the comment which he had made in the Co-ordination Committee: namely, that he could not bind his Government to presenting its observations within the time-limit fixed in resolution C, without knowing how soon the French translation of the Catalogue—a most important document—would be ready. Hence the French delegation would be obliged to abstain from voting on that resolution.

82. Baron DE KERCHOVE D'EXAERDE (Belgium) supported the French representative's remarks, and said that his delegation would be obliged to abstain for the same reasons.

83. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the position was even more difficult for Spanish-speaking members, who had to vote on the texts before the Council although they had not been translated into Spanish.

84. He put draft resolution C to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

85. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution D to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted unanimously.*

86. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution E to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted unanimously.*

87. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution A to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted unanimously.*

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.