

further intimated that on instructions from his government, he would abstain from voting.

The Swedish-Belgian amendment was defeated by 4 for, 14 against and 1 abstention (Mr. Chafee). Defeat of the amendment carried with it deletion of paragraph 3 of Article 17. Mr. Désy voted for the Swedish-Belgian amendment and therefore for retention of paragraph 3.

M. J. V. Evans (United Kingdom) proposed to replace sub-section (b) of Article 17 by the following:

"Expressions which are intended or likely to alter by violence the system of government."

Sub-section (b) as recommended by the U.N. Sub-commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press, read:

"Expressions which incite persons to alter by violence the system of government."

Mr. Désy opposed the proposed new text on the ground that the indefiniteness of the term "likely" would open the way to great abuse and to new restrictions on freedom.

Fernand Terrou (France) said his delegation could never agree to such an arbitrary interpretation which would put the Press at a disadvantage. It would be difficult, he held, to define what did constitute alteration by violence.

Mr. Evans, in reply, said the amendment was concerned only with seditious propaganda which incited people to violence. It was not reasonable, he argued, to give complete immunity to such propaganda until it had actually achieved its object.

The United Kingdom amendment was lost by 6 for, 14 against, and 5 abstentions. Mr. Désy voted against.

At another stage in Fourth Committee proceedings, Mr. Désy objected to the disproportion between the press freedoms enunciated in the opening paragraph of draft Article 17 and the restrictions on press freedom imposed in paragraph 2. Sub-paragraph (a) of para-



Members of the Canadian delegation to the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, which was recently held in Geneva, Switzerland, are shown as they prepared for one of the Conference meetings. Left to right: Campbell Moodie, information officer, Canada House, London, England, an adviser; Arthur Irwin, editor of Maclean's Magazine, Toronto, a delegate; L.A.D. Stephens, second secretary, Canadian Legation, Berne, Switzerland, and secretary of the delegation; Jean Désy, Canadian Ambassador in Italy, leader of the delegation; Lorenzo Paré, Ottawa parliamentary correspondent of L'Action Catholique, a delegate; A.R. Ford, editor-in-chief of The London Free Press, London, Ontario, a delegate and George Hambleton, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa, an adviser. (Photo by Gaston B. Vuarche).

graph 2 as submitted by the Sub-commission read:

"Matters which must remain secret in the vital interests of the State."

In the Fourth Committee's Drafting Committee, the wording was changed to:

"Matters which must remain secret in the interests of national safety."

Professor Dehousse, Chief Belgian delegate, criticized the tendency in the Conference to limit press freedom by an increasing number of restrictions couched in vague and general terms. What, Professor Dehousse asked, did "in the interests of national safety" mean? Under such a provision, a government could, if it wished, prohibit articles on the weather and even on fashions. Where did "national safety" begin and where did it end?

Mr. Désy supported this view. He took the ground that

the limitations imposed in paragraph 2 were incompatible with the principles expressed in paragraph 1. This was all the more important since the Committee had already deleted paragraph 3 which prohibited previous censorship. With prohibition of previous censorship deleted from the Draft Covenant, there might be peacetime censorship for half a century.

The Committee adopted the changes in paragraph 2 by 13 for, 5 against, and 8 abstentions. Mr. Désy abstained. The United Kingdom supported the new wording. The United States abstained.

AN INDIAN AMENDMENT

The Canadian delegation proposed an Indian amendment to the draft Article 17 of the Covenant on Human Rights which proposed to add as sub-paragraph (h) of paragraph 2 the