

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1640th  
MEETING**

Friday, 13 December 1968,  
at 3.30 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

Agenda Item 62:

*International Year for Human Rights (con-  
tinued)*

(a) *Measures and activities undertaken in con-  
nexion with the International Year for  
Human Rights: report of the Secretary-  
General;*

(b) *International Conference on Human Rights  
Consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/  
L.1640/Rev.2 (continued). . . . .*

Page

1

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

AGENDA ITEM 62

International Year for Human Rights (continued)  
(A/7194, A/7195, A/7195/Add.1 and Add.3-9, A/  
CONF.32/41, A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1641/  
Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1642/Rev.3, A/C.3/L.1654-1656):

(a) Measures and activities undertaken in connexion  
with the International Year for Human Rights:  
report of the Secretary-General;

(b) International Conference on Human Rights

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION  
A/C.3/L.1640/REV.2 (continued)

1. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) introduced on behalf  
of the sponsors a further revised version on the six-  
Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2), which  
took into account suggestions made at the preceding  
meeting.

2. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) said his delegation was  
gratified that the substance of its amendments (A/  
C.3/L.1656) had been accepted, and it would conse-  
quently vote for draft resolution A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2.

3. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile) said that although the changes  
introduced by the sponsors made it easier for his  
delegation to support the draft resolution, it regretted  
that the phrase suggested by Morocco had not been  
accepted. He proposed the addition of a preambular  
paragraph reading "Recognizing that the existence of  
monopolies in the media of information is an obstacle  
to economic and social progress and prevents the  
full achievement of freedom of information".

4. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said her delegation  
was pleased that its suggestion that the word "fairly"  
in operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by "ob-  
jectively" had been accepted. However, it proposed  
that the paragraph should be amended to read "... to  
gather and impart freely and responsibly objective  
and accurate information".

5. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said that his delega-  
tion would have no difficulty in supporting the revised  
draft resolution, and it could also agree to the Moroccan  
oral amendments. As only recommendations were  
involved, there was no reason for delegations to op-  
pose any of the proposals that had been made.

6. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) supported the Chilean  
and Moroccan amendments. As only recommendations were  
involved, there was no reason for delegations  
to oppose any of the proposals that had been made.

7. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist  
Republic) introduced his delegation's amendments  
(A/C.3/L.1655), which now applied to the new text  
of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2).

8. Mr. MEHIRI (Tunisia) thanked the sponsors of  
the draft resolution for incorporating the suggestions  
that had been made. However, his delegation attached  
importance to the idea of responsibility in gathering  
and imparting information, and it hoped that the  
Moroccan amendment would be adopted. It reserved  
its position on the Ukrainian amendments.

9. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) expressed appreciation  
of the changes which the sponsors had made in the  
draft resolution. Her delegation would support the  
new version. It reserved its position on the Ukrainian  
amendments until it had had an opportunity to study  
them.

10. Mr. OGURTSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist  
Republic) said that the draft resolution under con-  
sideration was far from perfect, particularly as it  
failed to say anything about revanchisme or war-  
mongering. He proposed that the words "combating  
propaganda ..." in operative paragraph 3 should  
be replaced by "prohibiting propaganda for re-  
vanchisme, ...".

11. Mr. CHENG (China) said that, although, in view  
of the pressure of time, he would not insist that the  
Committee should be allowed twenty-four hours in  
which to consider the amendments, he felt that all  
representatives should have a clear understanding of  
the purport of those proposals before voting on them.  
He would like in any case to emphasize that it was  
important not to insert in a draft resolution which  
was intended to be impartial and objective and which  
would specifically call for combating various kinds of  
propaganda any provision that might itself be regarded  
as propagandistic.

12. Mr. AL-JABIRI (Iraq) suggested a brief suspen-  
sion of the meeting to allow the sponsors of the new  
amendments to confer with the sponsors of the draft  
resolution in an effort to reach agreement on a final  
text.

13. Mr. NAÑAGAS (Philippines) said that the sponsors had already accepted as many amendments as they could and regretted that, in view of the pressure of time and the fact that the draft resolution was essentially a procedural one, they must stand by the text as it appeared in document A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2. The remaining proposals would therefore have to be dealt with as amendments. The purpose of the sponsors was not to embody in the draft resolution all the principles of freedom of information but simply to ensure that the General Assembly would discuss at its twenty-fourth session the item relating to freedom of information, with particular reference to the preparation of a draft Declaration.

14. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) said that she would support the draft resolution, because the subject of freedom of information had been neglected for too long and the Committee should make every effort to move forward. She was in favour of the Moroccan oral amendment, which would not affect the ideas expressed in the draft resolution but would improve it stylistically. However, she could not support the Chilean amendment. It was not clear what the word "monopolies", as used in that amendment, signified; if it meant State monopolies few delegations were likely to support it, and even if it meant private monopolies the amendment did not indicate why the existence of such monopolies was objectionable. It might well be that a given country would prefer to have one good locally owned newspaper instead of several foreign ones.

15. She could not comment on the Ukrainian and Byelorussian amendments without having more time to study them. She was inclined to agree with the Philippine representative that substantive considerations, however valid, should not be dealt with until the subject was discussed at the following session.

16. Mr. PAOLINI (France) expressed surprise at the submission of amendments relating to points which had not been raised during the general debate at the preceding meeting. He wondered whether, in view of the decision to limit the number of times each delegation might speak, the amendments were in order. As it was important for the Committee to expedite its work, he appealed to the sponsors of the new proposals not to press them.

17. Mr. FRACKIEWICZ (Poland) said that he was surprised at the Philippine representative's statement that the draft resolution was a procedural one. In his view, the text embodied a number of statements of principle, and the Committee's debate on the subject had had decidedly ideological overtones.

18. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) objected to the references to nazism and revanchisme in the Ukrainian and Byelorussian amendments respectively, as those two terms referred to specific situations in the past. The draft resolution should be concerned not with such specific situations but only with principles.

19. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that he too was surprised at the flood of new amendments, and did not see how the proposed references to nazism and revanchisme could be included in the draft resolution without altering its character.

20. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) proposed that, if the draft resolution was intended as a procedural one, the Committee should vote only on the preamble and operative paragraph 6, deleting operative paragraphs 1 to 5.

21. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) said it seemed to him that, if the sponsors of the new amendments had felt strongly about their proposals, they would have submitted them earlier. If they were put to the vote at the current meeting, he would be obliged to abstain on them, as he had not had time to consider their implications.

22. Mr. GAIFFIER D'HESTROY (Belgium) moved the closure of the debate.

23. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) and Mr. GUIRANDOU N'DIAYE (Ivory Coast) opposed the motion, because they wished to have more time to consider the text of the draft resolution as it appeared in document A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2.

*The motion was rejected by 26 votes to 21, with 32 abstentions.*

24. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, if the three new paragraphs which would be added to the preamble if the Ukrainian amendments (A/C.3/L.1655) were adopted, the first would be inserted after the first preambular paragraph of the text now before the Committee (A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2) and the other two would be inserted after the second preambular paragraph of that text.

25. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that, in his view, most of the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution were substantive in character, as were the new amendments. He therefore supported the Ugandan representative's proposal that operative paragraphs 1 to 5 should be deleted.

26. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that, in view of the fact that the draft resolution was not merely procedural in nature, but covered points of substance which had given rise to considerable discussion, his delegation also supported the Ugandan proposal.

27. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had previously drawn attention to the complex and controversial nature of the subject dealt with in the draft resolution and had said that it should be studied in all its aspects by the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session. It still maintained that view, in the belief that the draft resolution, far from being procedural, included elements of both a convention and a declaration. The text, together with the amendments which had been submitted and perhaps even the summary records of the relevant meetings, should be submitted to the Assembly at its next session for a comprehensive study leading to the drafting of the Convention which the Assembly, by its own resolutions, was called upon to adopt. Alternatively, the proposal of the representative of Uganda, which would have the effect of making the draft resolution purely procedural in nature, would be acceptable. His delegation supported the Ukrainian amendment (A/C.3/L.1655, para. 4), to operative paragraph 6, aimed at giving priority to the draft Convention rather than the draft Declaration.

28. The  
on the  
and the

*The  
votes to*

*The  
new se  
para. 1  
absent*

*The  
adopted*

29. Mr.  
Republi  
new fo  
delegati  
replacem

*At the  
vote on  
of new  
orally r*

*Franco  
was call*

*In favo  
Indonesi  
Liberia,  
Mongolia  
Romania  
Tunisia,  
Republic  
Arab Rej  
Zambia,  
Byelorus  
Central*

*Against  
Japan, Ne  
Portugal,  
and Nort  
Australia*

*Abstain  
Leone, S  
Austria,  
Costa Ric*

*The am  
49 votes t*

*The orig  
were adop*

*The Chi  
new prear  
to 17, with*

30. The  
vote separ

*The prear  
by 57 votes*

*The Uga  
graphs 1  
votes to 33*

*The Mor  
graph 1 w  
abstentions*

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2) and the amendments thereto.

The first preambular paragraph was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Ukrainian amendment for the insertion of a new fourth preambular paragraph (A/C.3/L.1655, para. 1 (a)) was adopted by 39 votes to 19, with 25 abstentions.

The original second preambular paragraph was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

29. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the word "intolerance" in the new fourth preambular paragraph proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.1655, para. 1 (b)) should be replaced by the word "discrimination".

At the request of the Ukrainian representative, the vote on the Ukrainian amendment for the insertion of new fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs, as orally revised, was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia.

Against: France, Gabon, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland.

Abstaining: Jamaica, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador.

The amendment, as orally revised, was adopted by 49 votes to 20, with 17 abstentions.

The original third and fourth preambular paragraphs were adopted unanimously.

The Chilean oral amendment for the addition of a new preambular paragraph was adopted by 36 votes to 17, with 32 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that there was no need to vote separately on the last preambular paragraph.

The preamble as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

The Ugandan oral proposal that operative paragraphs 1 to 5 should be deleted was rejected by 39 votes to 33, with 15 abstentions.

The Moroccan oral amendment to operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 66 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted by 80 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

At the request of the Ukrainian representative, the vote on the Ukrainian amendment for the insertion of a new operative paragraph 3 (A/C.3/L.1655, para. 2) was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Algeria.

Against: Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: Burma, Gabon, Greece, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina.

The amendment was adopted by 41 votes to 28, with 16 abstentions.

The Byelorussian oral amendment to the original operative paragraph 3 was rejected by 41 votes to 18, with 28 abstentions.

The original operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The original operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

31. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in view of the further revision of the draft resolution as indicated in document A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2, the Ukrainian amendment (A/C.3/L.1655, para. 3) to the original operative paragraph 5, if adopted, would mean the deletion of everything after the words "human rights".

The amendment was rejected by 43 votes to 15, with 21 abstentions.

The original operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 58 votes to 8, with 15 abstentions.

The Ukrainian amendment (A/C.3/L.1655, para. 4) to the original operative paragraph 6 was rejected by 37 votes to 18, with 25 abstentions.

The original operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 66 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions.

The revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1640/Rev.2) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 64 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.