

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 Moroc-
can 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.