

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.105/PV.10
21 February 1963

ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 10 September 1962, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. MATSCH

(Austria)

Adoption of the Agenda

Opening statement by the Chairman

General Debate

63-01612

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The CHAIRMAN: The provisional agenda as contained in document A/AC.105/Agenda 3 has been distributed to the members of the Committee. The first item relates to the adoption of the agenda. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to adopt the agenda as set out in the document.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation, as before, does not voice any objection in view of the fact that the agenda does contain the questions outlined in the document. However -- and this is in keeping with the practice which has been followed in the United Nations for many years -- such acquiescence on our part does not necessarily mean that the Soviet delegation agrees with the order of the items that will prevail as the discussion unfolds in the Committee. Therefore the Soviet delegation, after the approval of the agenda, will reserve its right to propose a correct order of discussion either by changing around the items in the agenda -- for instance through a change of the order in the presentation of the items in the agenda as they appear in the document before us -- or by proposing the consolidation of a discussion that would take up several points at a time, or we might propose to carry out a general discussion of the items and questions which seem to us to be interrelated.

In order to clarify my remarks even further and in order to make it possible for you, Mr. Chairman, and for the representatives here fully to realize what I am talking about, I should like to say that items 3 and 4 are conditional items thus far because it has not yet been determined in what order we would take up these two items. These items happen to be completely interrelated because the scientific and technical aspects of international co-operation are only some of the aspects of this activity. The other aspect of this activity, which is related to the scientific and technical questions, is of course the juridical aspect of international co-operation. Therefore, it seems to us that it is impossible to discuss these two items separately.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

If this very reasonable proposal which we are submitting is not accepted for any reason and if the members of the Committee should wish to have indispensably separate discussions on items 3 and 4, then the Soviet delegation would reserve its right to submit a proposal that the discussion should begin with the report of the Legal Sub-Committee (A/AC.105/6) on the work of its first session; this is item 4 of the provisional agenda before us.

The consideration of the legal aspects concerning international co-operation seems to us to be one of the most important tasks to be handled by the present session of our Committee inasmuch as these particular legal principles of activities in space are determining factors; they create certain conditions or may create hindrances to the normal institution of co-operation in the scientific and technical fields. Therefore, before we start discussing provisions which are related to scientific co-operation, we should prefer to consider some of the general aspects which are related to the international legal regime which is to pervade this whole international co-operation effort. We are forced to do so - and this is not a secret to anyone.

In Geneva the Legal Sub-Committee arrived at a deadlock. The Legal Sub-Committee failed to submit any recommendations on the extremely important questions which were placed before it. And yet the solution of those problems is extremely important because the actual implementation of international co-operation in the scientific and technical fields depends on that solution. Since the Legal Sub-Committee failed to reach definite conclusions and since its work reached a deadlock, this indeed imposes upon us the obligation to devote the very limited time at the disposal of the Committee to the consideration of these very problems which have not been solved by that Sub-Committee.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

At the spring session we had a general discussion on the legal and technical aspects of this problem. This was indeed no hindrance at all to the fruitful work of the session. On the contrary, this interrelated discussion proved indeed to be a very valuable contribution which shed more and more light on the very important problems which were discussed at that time.

I repeat, the consideration of the legal aspects of international co-operation is an extremely important item. It is important because we should even now try to define some measures and steps which would be useful towards eliminating the different obstacles that have arisen. I do not want to be rigid from the very beginning. I do not want to impose upon the Committee something that seems to me to be very desirable and very correct. I repeat, from the point of view of the Soviet delegation the most correct procedure would be to begin with the discussion of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee on the work of its first session.

But I have already heard some objections against such an approach for solving the problem of the order of our discussions here. However, in a spirit of compromise and not wishing to involve the Committee in a lengthy procedural discussion on this point, as we do not wish to waste our very valuable time in this manner, I propose that we begin at the very outset the consideration of an order of discussion whereby items 3 and 4 could be discussed jointly so that delegations which would like to make statements related to items 3 and 4 simultaneously, should not be deprived of that right. Delegations which might wish to make separate statements and to discuss these points one by one, might very well use this procedure. I believe that it would be most logical and rational to decide here that we shall take up items 3 and 4 jointly. We shall proceed to an exchange of views on these two items and then we will go ahead and take separate decisions on the recommendations as they develop from the reports of the two Sub-Committees which have been working on these two items.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

In this case, and in a spirit of compromise, the delegations which do not wish to adopt this procedure and absolutely wish to discuss the items as they appear on the agenda, could then very well act as follows: it could take up item 4 and the recommendations related to item 4 before the recommendations on item 3 could be approved or before the recommendations on item 4. As you can see, the Soviet delegation is trying in every way to avoid a lengthy procedural discussion or any kind of dissension on that point because this would certainly be a very bad omen for the beginning of our work. I believe that the other side, which so far has not yet voiced any proposal in respect of the procedure which I am now submitting, will follow in the same spirit.

I am at the disposal of the Committee and I am ready to listen to any remarks related to the proposed procedure.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): I take it that the representative of the Soviet Union is formally proposing that the agenda be amended so as to combine in one item the discussion of items 3 and 4, and I would assume, Mr. Chairman, that you would consider that we are now discussing that proposal which of course is a change from the provisional agenda as it has been in our hands for over a month.

What we have to consider here are two very distinct reports; each of them is an inch thick, containing material which, in one case, is entirely scientific and technical, and in the other case is entirely legal -- and to some extent things other than legal. The preparation of the provisional agenda obviously took that into account: we have two separate reports. I submit that the drafter of the provisional agenda used very good sense in providing that we discuss first the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and then take up the report of the Legal Sub-Committee.

There are other comments that I would make. There is an added advantage in our discussing first the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. Fortunately, there was a very gratifying sense of unanimity in the deliberations of that Sub-Committee. There was a minimum of dissension and the report that comes before us is a non-controversial report which I think we are all gratified to have before us. It presents a forward looking programme looking toward the aim that this Committee exists for, peaceful co-operation in the use of outer space, and it seems to my delegation entirely proper, appropriate and useful to take up that report first. It sets our deliberation in the proper framework of non-controversial and dispassionate consideration of scientific and technical matters.

The second report, the report of the Legal Sub-Committee, I do not think can properly be characterized, as the representative of the Soviet Union did, as representing a "deadlock". In our view, the deliberations of the Legal Sub-Committee did develop progress; they did show that there was a real consensus of opinion in certain directions, and I do not think it is fair to that Sub-Committee to characterize it as a committee which did nothing except reach a "deadlock".

(Mr. Plimpton, United States)

I might point out that item 5 of the agenda, the "Report of the Committee to the General Assembly", does bring together in one place, if it is so desired, a discussion of the two reports together. We therefore feel that this provisional agenda should be adopted as the agenda, without amendment and without change. There are two separate subjects here; not only are they distinct and apart from each other, but also the advantage of considering the non-controversial report first should be evident to all of us. Needless to say, my delegation would be delighted naturally to comply with the majority opinion of this Committee, but I do submit that the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union is not in the interests of the orderly progress of this Committee or in the interests of our getting ahead with our work in the best possible way.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, the Soviet delegation must decisively reject and object to the final sentence of the representative of the United States when he took it upon himself to state that the Soviet proposal is not in the interests of the work of this Committee. I should like to ask the representative of the United States not to make any such evaluations or assessments at the very beginning of our work because he is very well aware that nothing good will come of this for the cause of co-operation in this Committee. In that respect the representative of the United States, acting as he did by making such unfounded statements, will have to shoulder all the responsibility for the statements that he made.

We had a discussion in the spring on both items, on the scientific and technical questions and on the legal questions; we had a joint, consolidated discussion. The representative of the United States then spoke within that context, and at that time he did not state any intention of necessarily segregating the discussions of the two different sides of the same medal. However, this procedure today, this segregation, is apparently necessary.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Apparently the procedure which we had been following very well in the spring is detrimental to the interests of this Committee. The representative of the United States is now trying to present matters in such a light as to make it appear that the Soviet delegation is acting against and in conflict with the purposes and aims of this Committee.

The second distortion which was contained in the statement of the United States representative was that the Soviet delegation allegedly wanted to amend the agenda. The Soviet delegation does not suggest any addition to the agenda and everybody heard my statement. I said, (and I repeat), that I am perfectly in agreement that the items which appear on the provisional agenda be approved as items of our final, definitive agenda. But this does not mean, and of course all those who are participating in the work of the United Nations know it very well, that this necessarily calls for a decision as to what question should come before the Committee first. I could cite you dozens of precedents showing that after the approval of an agenda -- and this took place in the First Committee, in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, in the Economic and Social Council and in any United Nations Committee or Commission. It is well known that it often happens that the order of discussion of the items on the agenda or the consolidation of several items on the agenda have never been considered as an addition to the agenda. Accordingly, the argument which was presented here by the representative of the United States to the effect that the agenda had been before us for a month and that nobody had ever voiced any observations on that agenda is also not germane to the issue because even now we are not arguing about the contents of the agenda. It is perfectly clear that we will have to deal both with the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and with the report of the Legal Sub-Committee; this is obvious. I fail to understand this insistence of the United States delegation. Why does this delegation wish to avoid a joint discussion on these two points? Why is there so much insistence on not discussing the legal aspects of international

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

co-operation first? What does this actually mean? Does this mean that the United States delegation counts on continuing the deadlock which occurred in Geneva or is there any intention to create a businesslike atmosphere to get out of the deadlock and use our time sensibly so that we can solve this deadlock before the opening of the General Assembly. (We are not saying who is actually responsible for the deadlock.)

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

This is a knot which has to be untied, and we have to take steps in order to produce full-fledged recommendations for the General Assembly. We must not merely state that it was impossible to reach an agreement, as the Legal Sub-Committee did, when it had before it a proposed declaration on the main principles of co-operation and a projected international convention on the rescue of aircraft and vessels in distress.

Why was this problem not solved? Why is there so much insistence upon evading a discussion? There can be no political or logical motivation for this, and I do not see why we cannot immediately focus our attention on this aspect which is so important. In fact, the questions related to the scientific and technical fields perhaps can be dealt with very briefly, because there was not much dissension. On the other hand, why should we not use our time at the very outset to take care of this deadlock and to find out the reasons for it. This deadlock made it impossible to formulate any recommendations on the legal aspects of the question which are so important and which will also determine the future possibility of working on the scientific and technical aspects.

Cannot we get rid of this quite artificial legalistic argumentation of the United States representative? All this is immaterial, and we should deal with the substance of the matter. It will be clear that the United States delegation does not wish at the very start to take measures to remove the deadlock which was created in Geneva because some delegations objected to very definite proposals, based on the Charter and in international law, and these delegations were headed by the United States delegation. I do not want to refer to those objections now, but in Geneva the United States representative said that the very acceptance of that declaration on the basic principles of international law in respect of activities in outer space was directed against the interests of international co-operation, as such, in outer space. I did not want to refer to this in

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

my statement, but I am forced to do so because it is reflected in the records of the Geneva Sub-Committee. In those records we find this monstrous statement in print, and this was the objection made to the very sensible proposal of the Soviet Union. Is this not the reason why we are now witnessing a new effort to avoid starting with the discussion of this matter?

I repeat that the Soviet delegation is prepared to agree to any of the following procedures: We could begin with item 4 of our agenda and then proceed to take up item 3, or we could discuss items 3 and 4 jointly, and thus save time. After all, there are twenty-five delegations here, and if the two items were discussed jointly statements would be made twenty-five times, not fifty. Alternatively, we could agree that as we proceeded to discuss item 3 of the agenda delegations so desiring could make statements related to item 4, and would be entitled to do so.

If none of these versions can be accepted, if all three are rejected for some reason, and if we fail to reach some agreement with the United States delegation on one of the three, and if the United States insists upon the acceptance of its own version, namely, that item 3 should be taken first and then item 4, and if no representative can present items 3 and 4 as interrelated subjects, then we will be faced with a situation in which apparently an effort is being made not to conduct this session in the businesslike manner which was characteristic of our first session. That is a completely new attitude which we must reject. For this reason we shall insist on the acceptance of one of the three alternatives. I believe that this should be acceptable because account has been taken of all the views which have so far been expressed.

May I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Committee to fully realize that when we gathered here in the first place and set up this Committee to co-operate we did not feel that any given delegation would try to impose on all the other delegations a certain order of procedure which would be completely unacceptable to some delegations, or that any delegation would try to impose a procedure that was not even logical and would not be prepared to accept anything that might be acceptable to other delegations. If the United States delegation starts like this at the very outset of our work, it will be a very bad omen for this session of the Committee.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

At any rate, working in accordance with the rules, we must reach some agreement on the order of the discussion of this matter, and, unfortunately, this procedural discussion will take some time. But that is not the fault of the Soviet delegation, since we wanted to avoid such a discussion and that is why, when we made our proposal, we advanced two alternatives in case our first proposal was not adopted. We proposed that we begin with item 4, but if that proposal met with no support then we stated we would agree to either of the other two alternatives which I have outlined.

Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon): I do not think that this Committee should spend too much time on a procedural discussion; we could use our time much more profitably on the substantive issues which are before us. With regard to the order of discussion, and whether we should take item 3 before item 4 or item 4 before item 3, or whether we should take them together, my delegation has no particular preference. We do not see any reason why one or the other of the two reports should be discussed first. We do see that there is an inter-relationship between them.

The United States representative said that the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should be dealt with first since it was not controversial. On the other hand, that might also be quite a good reason for dealing with the controversial report first.

When this Committee set up the two Sub-Committees, we did not give any precedence to one over the other. If it is important for certain delegations that we should discuss these two reports jointly, so that those delegations would have a chance to make statements relating to both at the same time, and so that proposals or draft resolutions could be presented on one report or the other first, I do not see why we should deprive them of that right. We should try to reach a compromise on this procedural question, and it has frequently happened in the past in many Committees that certain items were merged together or discussed jointly and two items were made sub-divisions of one item. We could do that now, and I wish to put this forward as a suggestion, not as a

(Mr. Hakim, Lebanon)

formal proposal, if this is acceptable to the two delegations which have already made certain proposals. This compromise might be the way out. We could have one single item for a discussion of the substantive issues before this Committee, and in that item there could be two sub-divisions, (a) report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, and (b) report of the Legal Sub-Committee.

(Mr. Hakim, Lebanon)

In this manner, when they are discussed as two sub-divisions of one item, delegations can speak on the problems and issues that arise from the inter-relationship of the work of the two Sub-Committees.

Therefore, in order to avoid a long procedural discussion, I would like to suggest that items 3 and 4 be merged into item 3, with two sub-divisions: (a) Consideration of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, and (b) Consideration of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee.

Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): My delegation was among those which were very highly gratified last April to note a spirit of co-operation and conciliation on the part of all delegations present. We were gratified that at that time we were able to comply with the provisions of the declaration made by the Chairman to the effect that all decisions in this Committee and in the two Sub-Committees should be taken by unanimous decision. It is only natural, therefore, that today we should regret that this same spirit of conciliation and co-operation is not as much in evidence as it was last April. I believe that with some goodwill we could revert to the spirit and atmosphere that prevailed four or five months ago.

In order to achieve this spirit, all we need is some effort and goodwill on the part of the United States delegation. Last April we assigned tasks to the two Sub-Committees of this Committee. Questions dealing with scientific and technical problems were transferred to one Sub-Committee and legal questions were given to the other Sub-Committee. These are separate tasks, but this did not prevent us from holding one debate.

What is the situation today? It is just the reverse of the situation that obtained in April. We must now prepare a single report. Item 5 of the agenda reads: Report of the Committee to the General Assembly. In April when we assigned the tasks to two separate Sub-Committees we thought that it would be possible to have a single discussion on the scientific and technical aspects of the problem and on the legal aspects. Now when our task is to draft a single report to the General Assembly, we are confronted by certain delegations, for example the United States delegation, which state that it is essential to have two separate debates, one on the scientific and technical aspects of the problem and another on the legal aspects. I think that all of us will agree that there is some lack

of logic in this point of view. Why should we have two debates when we are to prepare only one report for submission to the General Assembly?

There is a further point. As the representative of the Soviet Union pointed out, agreement was reached in Geneva by one of these Sub-Committees, namely the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. The twenty-eight delegations that were present at Geneva and that are also present here, must now do nothing more than confirm the points agreed at Geneva. Some delegations feel that we should discuss that report first. It seems to me that the reverse procedure would be more logical. We should devote a good portion of our time to the discussion of the question on which it was not possible to reach agreement at Geneva. Let us try to reach agreement here on those points. May I remind members that we have only four days in which to do our work and that in one hour from now the Chairman will be compelled to adjourn this meeting. No meeting is scheduled for this afternoon. Twenty-eight delegations are members of this Committee, and if each delegation speaks for ten or fifteen minutes, the four days will pass very quickly and we shall find that we did not have sufficient time to discuss the essential issue, namely the one on which agreement was not reached at Geneva.

I would therefore express the hope -- perhaps I am deceiving myself in entertaining this hope -- that the representative of the United States might make a gesture of goodwill and agree to the very conciliatory proposal made by the delegation of the Soviet Union. The representative of the Soviet Union made three proposals, a main proposal and two subsidiary proposals. As the representative of Lebanon pointed out, it is impossible and quite artificial to try to separate the legal from the scientific and technical aspects of this problem. Let us assume that we approve the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. Can we put its recommendations into effect if we do not have agreement on the legal system under which collaboration in the scientific and technical field will take place? It would be impossible to do that. We have not agreed on the legal system which is to govern this collaboration. One cannot have co-operation unless agreement is reached on the legal points. We do want to achieve agreement.

Therefore, in conclusion I should like to address an appeal to the United States delegation to reconsider its position and to agree to the proposal put forward by Mr. Morozov. We shall then be able to begin our work and discuss these two reports.

Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic): I am deeply grateful to the representatives who preceded me for giving the delegation of the United Arab Republic an opportunity to comment very briefly on the agenda itself before it is adopted. In fact, before we came to this meeting, we had intended to make some comments on the agenda as it stands before us. From the very beginning, we have noticed that one item which normally appears on the agendas of all Committees does not appear on our agenda, namely, an item dealing with general debate, an item giving all delegations an opportunity to state their views on the work of the Committee, on the programme itself, without making specific comments on the detailed agenda which is before the Committee. The delegation of the United Arab Republic was going to ask the Chairman to indicate to us how we could express our general views, not alone our views on the specific items appearing on the agenda. As I have said, we are grateful to the delegations that preceded us, and now we would like to have a new item that might give all of us the opportunity to express our general views on both the scientific and the legal activities of this Committee. Those activities are interrelated: there is no doubt about that.

At the same time, we see the merits of the proposal to keep the agenda as it is, that is, to have items 3 and 4 remain as two distinct items to be discussed separately. This does not mean that delegations should be prevented from engaging in a general discussion which might cover both items.

If this proposal meets with the approval of the members of the Committee, I believe we can proceed to adopt the agenda, and this proposal itself may satisfy the wishes of the representative of the Soviet Union without impinging on the idea which was expressed by the representative of the United States, namely, that items 3 and 4 should be kept separate and that there should be a separate discussion on each item, so that delegations can deal in a proper way with the documents before us.

I hope that this proposal will help with the adoption of the agenda, and then we may be able to take up the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the order of the discussion, which is a completely separate matter. We can adopt the agenda and then take up the order of the discussion later.

Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia): The evaluation of our activities for the past year and the submission of a report to the forthcoming session of the General Assembly are no doubt our primary task. Our Committee is composed of only about one-fourth of the Member States of the United Nations, and the remaining Member States -- the General Assembly as a whole -- surely await with interest a report on the results of our activities. The Member States of the United Nations not only have a right to obtain some report; in my opinion, they are also entitled to have a report submitted to them which contains some positive results of international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of outer space. Their right emanates from the adoption of resolution 1721 (XVI), which was supported by all the Member States and which, through unanimous action, created a good basis for international co-operation in this field and for the activities of our Committee. The Member States of the United Nations are rightly of the opinion that outer space can and must be a place of peaceful international co-operation.

Our Committee meets with its present composition for the second series of negotiations after the meetings of its two Sub-Committees and of a number of working groups which were working for several weeks in Geneva. Since it is our duty to consider objectively the results of our work, I should like to note that great optimism and an absence of practical results were typical of our first session, whereas our current session begins with some positive results in the scientific and technical field but with decreased optimism. Unfortunately, this fact is far from being comforting. The diplomatic formula to the effect that the meeting afforded the possibility of a most useful exchange of views, but that no agreement has been reached on any of the proposals submitted to the Legal Sub-Committee, certainly affords no reason for celebration. However positive were certain results of the work of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, I will say forthrightly that my delegation is disappointed at the failure of the negotiations on the legal aspects of the question before us. Many legal problems arising from the ever more successful penetration of outer space and from the ever more intensive utilization of the needs of mankind may be approached from various angles. But it is hardly possible to concentrate on two partial questions and to sidestep the general programmes.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): Just to focus our attention a little bit more on what we are talking about, I should like to mention very briefly what the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee deals with. It deals with exchange of information; it deals with encouragement of international programmes, including the International Year of the Quiet Sun, the World Magnetic Survey, synoptic rocket and polar cap experiments, a programme for international co-operation in the field of space communications, satellite meteorology, and assistance, education and training; and it deals with equatorial sounding rocket launching facilities. Those are separate items which should be discussed, and can be discussed, as a single thing; it has nothing to do with the problems which were dealt with in the Legal Sub-Committee. I again submit that the orderly way for us to proceed is to take up this separate matter first and then come to the more controversial items involved in the report of the Legal Sub-Committee.

I regret, of course, that we are involved in this procedural discussion, and I am very sorry that the representative of the Soviet Union has brought up these procedural points. It would have been very much better, I think, if we could have just gone along in an orderly and businesslike way and taken up the agenda in the way in which it has been prepared, with these two separate items being dealt with separately.

Incidentally, I hope that the representative of the Soviet Union is not trying to prevent successful action on the scientific and technical recommendations by preoccupying us with unresolved legal matters. Here is an opportunity for this Committee to make some genuine progress in the field of the peaceful use of outer space through discussing and, we trust, approving at least in principle the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. I repeat that it seems to us that that is the orderly and simple way to proceed and that it will get us ahead very much faster.

Also, I am puzzled as to why the Soviet representative wants to turn first to controversial items. Is it really preferable to plunge us into controversy at the very beginning of our discussions? I would have thought that the best way for us to make progress was to deal with the non-controversial items first, get them out of the way, make that much progress, and then turn to the items on which unfortunately we do differ. I therefore submit that we should proceed with the agenda as it is drafted, and I hope we can reach some sort of decision here so that we can make some progress.

(Mr. Smid, Czechoslovakia)

Without wanting to downgrade other questions, I wish to state that it has not been necessary so far to solve in practice the questions of the return of astronauts and space vehicles after emergency landings in a foreign country; nor was it even necessary to solve, on an international level, the damage done by space vehicles. This is not so important; what is far more important is the fact that life compels us to solve the fundamental principles of the legal regime of outer space -- together with some partial legal programmes -- and that Member States have entrusted our Committee, a body of the United Nations, to consider these questions in all seriousness and with a maximum of goodwill, and to solve them.

It is the opinion of my delegation that this responsibility and confidence must not be shirked. We think that there is still time enough to try to overcome the difficulties and differences which have arisen and to achieve positive results also in the legal field. Since we can discuss here, probably in general terms, the results in the scientific and technical fields and then submit a report to the General Assembly, we should dedicate most of the time at our disposal to legal questions and we should try to achieve certain results at least here in New York.

From this point of view I fully support the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union to the effect that our results should not be dispersed and that we should discuss both spheres of our activities simultaneously, with particular attention to the legal question.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, in the interests only of saving time, I venture the suggestion that we now go ahead with your opening statement and that the afternoon be available for consultations as to this procedural problem in the hope that we can reach some resolution of it and we need not take up any more time with it.

The CHAIRMAN: I just had in mind the following statement to the Committee. None of the speakers has opposed the substance of the agenda as outlined in the document before the Committee and therefore items 1 and 2 are not controversial. What is controversial in the proposition of the representative of the Soviet Union, which was supported by several other representatives, is only the order of the items, the sequence of items 3 and 4; whether item 4 should be taken first or item 3 should be considered first, or whether there should be a general discussion on both items together.

Therefore, I shall proceed in the following way. We shall go on with our business and when we come to the consideration of item 3 -- and this has been repeatedly done in other Committees of the General Assembly -- we hope that the Committee will be able to agree in which way items 3 and 4 will be discussed.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): Mr. Chairman, the only reason I am taking the floor now is because I suppose that you, as Chairman of this Committee, would desire to make a statement to forecast the future of the work of this Committee, and to forecast it in the brightest colour possible. Therefore, I think that it would be very good if we as a Committee could facilitate your work and could facilitate your statement in solving, if I may be permitted to say so, this rather smaller procedural matter, because after hearing several delegations here I think that we should be able to come to a consensus.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that you would spare no effort to help the Committee reach this consensus. In this spirit only, I would suggest that before the Committee expresses itself on the procedure that you have just proposed, we agree on what, in the opinion of my delegation, seems to be a compromise proposal, which I believe even the representative of the United States would be able to accept after having heard numerous delegations speak about the need for organizing our work. I think that a number of the representatives who spoke pointed to the necessity of presenting to the General Assembly a unified report on the work of this Committee. They pointed to the question of the little time left; they pointed to the importance of the problem involved in the reports presented to us by the two Sub-Committees. I shall certainly not repeat those arguments, with which I wholeheartedly agree.

F
C
O
i
P
tl
or
tc
Tt

Furthermore, I would like to address myself to what I think is a very good proposal by the representative of Lebanon and to some remarks of the representative of the United Arab Republic. In combining their proposals and their attitudes, I would like to propose that we accept, as a solution of the procedural problems before us, the renumbering of the items on our agenda, namely to have the present item 5 appear as item 3 -- that is, the report of the Committee to the General Assembly -- because this is the main purpose of the work of this Committee. Then we would have a colon and make the present items 3 and 4 appear as sub-items (a) and (b).

This Committee, composed of very experienced members of the United Nations, knows full well that such procedure was applied many times in the work of different United Nations bodies. It is a very handy procedure when some controversies arise as far as the priority of specific items is concerned. I do not think that anybody can deny what was I believe, underlined by the representative of Bulgaria, that the main purpose of the work of this Committee is to submit a report to the General Assembly. The proposal that I am now making would take care of all the opinions and desires of the many delegations which spoke previously and would meet with the agreement of both the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States. I think it would also fully take into consideration the very wise and profitable remarks made before this Committee by the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Lebanon.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I cannot support the procedure which you outlined in your statement to the effect that we should first approve two items on the agenda, then start the work of the Committee, and then revert to the other items on the agenda. This is an impossible procedure which has never been practiced anywhere and there are no precedents of that kind.

We must begin with approving the agenda. We must find an agreed solution to this question and then we must start our work, because any delay or any postponement on the solution of this very simple and clearcut question will lead nowhere except to loss of time. After all, the delegation must get prepared for their statements. They must know what will be the order of the discussion of the main items.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Therefore, I must decisively object to this type of procedure which you have outlined, Mr. Chairman, and may I request you not to press this point, in the spirit which is traditional to us here, before we make any formal proposals.

S
S
r
c
o
L
S
P
W
P
i
a
i
v
S
I
S
r
U
t
a
b
o
m
a
p
s
s
f

(Mr. Morczov, USSR)

In addition, I would like to try to demonstrate the impossibility of a situation in which, according to the United States suggestion, a representative speaking on item 3 will not be able to say anything about item 4, while representatives speaking on item 4 will not be entitled to say anything about the contents of item 3. This is a kind of Procrustes' bed. It is a complete violation of any idea of democratic discussion in a committee of this kind or even in the United Nations as a whole. After all, we are not dealing here with completely separate questions which are not related to each other; we are dealing with two sides of the same coin -- we are dealing with international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space and one side of it is the international legal aspect, which is not a purpose in itself, but a means to develop space research for peaceful purposes and international co-operation in this field. After all, international legal provisions and agreements are designed to serve scientific and technical ends, and scientific and technical work will be successful only if the international legal aspect is properly worked out and agreed upon.

I must state very clearly that it will be impossible for me to express the viewpoints of my Government on the conclusions of the two Sub-Committees and on the general work of the Committee unless I am able to deal with both aspects together. I would ask the Chairman and my colleagues to ponder this issue (I am very grateful to those who have already shown their interest in the matter and who realize that we are being placed in a completely impossible situation if the United States proposal is adopted, because we shall not be able to say what we think in any form we choose.). I fully understand that there may be dissensions and differences of view, and in fact I hope that these dissensions and differences between the United States and the Soviet Union will decrease as we proceed with our discussions, but if I am faced with a situation in which not even a part of my view is accepted by the United States, the United States representative should at least listen to what I have to say, since I am in duty bound to state our position. But apparently I am not entitled even to do that. If we have reached such a point, if at the very outset we establish an order which places us in such a position, this should be a matter of concern to all and we should try to find a way of solving the problem.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

If the United States does not press the proposal to begin with item 3, the Soviet delegation would be prepared, if the representative of the United States is, to accept the compromise proposed by the representatives of Lebanon, the United Arab Republic and Poland. We cannot even agree now on a very clear and simple matter, that of our working procedures and the agenda. We must not create the impression that we have started our work when in fact we have not even reached an agreement on how we shall deal with the agenda. Let us try to reach some agreement. We must pursue this discussion and reach a solution which is acceptable to all the delegations here.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): We are just as anxious as anybody else to make progress and in that spirit we shall be very glad to support what, in substance, is the suggestion of the United Arab Republic, namely that there should be a new item 3 which would be a brief general debate, followed by the present items 3, 4 and 5 in that order. That also takes care in a sense of the suggestion of the representative of Poland, since it provides an opportunity of presenting general ideas at the beginning of the debate. I hope this will be satisfactory to everybody. To sum up, the order would be, an opening statement by the Chairman, a brief general debate, and then consideration of the two reports in the order in which they are given here, as separate items. I hope this will be satisfactory to all members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the representative of the USSR willing to accept the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic and supported by several other representatives including the representative of the United States, namely that in the agenda we should insert a new item 3, "general debate", so that the present items 3, 4 and 5 will become items 4, 5 and 6.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should be the first to welcome any step tending to create at the very outset a businesslike and reasonable atmosphere in this Committee. The Soviet delegation agrees to any of the three versions proposed by Lebanon, Poland and the United Arab Republic. However, the representative of the United States, has formulated an addition to that proposal and qualifies the word "debate" by the adjective "brief". I have had much bitter experience and I must say that I wonder whether it really will be a brief debate or not. If Mr. Plimpton means that I and the other speakers will be restricted to five minutes, I must voice my apprehension. This looks to me like a Trojan horse and it will not solve very much. I do not particularly like debates to be very lengthy, we discuss things not because we like to talk but because we have to try to reach agreement. Therefore, if this qualification "brief" does not imply a certain limitation of the duration of speeches, I would be prepared to accept the proposal of the representative of the United Arab Republic as it was introduced and after that it will finally be possible to proceed with our work. In the general debate, and this follows from the statement of the representative of the United Arab Republic and the interpretation of that statement by its author, we shall be able to deal with both items 3 and 4 and in general with every possible aspect of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. If we so interpret it and if no one else wishes to speak, we can put an end to this procedural discussion and proceed to adopt the agenda with the amendment proposed by the United Arab Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the remark by the United States representative of a "brief" debate was not a formal proposal to be included. Item 3 will simply say "general debate". As the term "brief" is a relative term -- Mr. Menon, whom we have heard speak for eight hours probably thought his statement was brief -- the word "brief" can be left out.

If nobody objects, I declare that the agenda has been agreed to by the Committee as follows: 1. Adoption of the agenda. 2. Opening statement by the Chairman. 3. General debate, and the following three items be numbered 4, 5, and 6.

The agenda was adopted, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN: At the beginning of our last session the Committee agreed to invite the representatives of the Committee on Space Research of the International Council of Scientific Unions (COSPAR), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) as observers. In accordance with the practice of the Committees of the General Assembly, and the procedure followed at our previous session, if I hear no objection, I invite the representatives of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the World Health Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Committee on Space Research of the International Council of Scientific Unions to take a seat at the table. The two last mentioned specialized agencies have only recently requested to participate as observers in our work. They also participated in the work of the two sub-committees in Geneva.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 2

OPENING STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Since its last session at the end of March the Committee has received four reports: one from each of its two sub-committees (A./AC.105/5 and A./AC.105/6) a first report from ITU (E/3645) and a first report from WMO (E/3662).

The Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Martyn, has presented a unanimously agreed report containing recommendations to our Committee, some of which will have to be submitted also to the General Assembly. These recommendations fall under three main headings:

(a) The exchange of information, provided on a voluntary basis, relating to national, regional and international programmes of space research and exploration, and information relating to governmental and non-governmental international bodies active in this field. The recommendations under this heading also refer to the dissemination of available technical data.

(b) The encouragement of international programmes such as the programme for the International Year of the Quiet Sun to be undertaken during the period of minimum solar activity, the World Magnetic Survey, and the programmes for international co-operation in the field of space communications and in satellite meteorology, as well as a programme for scientific and technological assistance, education and training.

(c) International equatorial sounding rocket launching facilities.

The Sub-Committee recommends the creation of an equatorial sounding rocket launching facility or facilities in time for the International Year of the Quiet Sun (1964-65) as a first step in creating and using international sounding rocket facilities. It also suggests certain basic principles for the creation and operation of such facilities and recommends that our Committee take steps to prepare a charter on the lines of these principles.

(The Chairman)

May I in this connexion recall to the Committee document A/AC.105/4. It concerns a so-called mobile San Marco platform. The Italian Government has extended an open invitation to all interested Governments to use this platform for joint scientific programmes.

In order to facilitate the work of this Committee with regard to these unanimously agreed recommendations of the Scientific Sub-Committee, the Bureau has submitted a working paper to the Committee containing recommendations.

We note with satisfaction that scientists of United States and of the Soviet Union, in bilateral talks outside, but related to, the work of the Scientific Sub-Committee, agreed on recommendations to their governments:

- (1) on the possibilities of co-operation in meteorology -- exchange of data from weather satellites and eventual later co-ordinated launchings of such satellites;
- (2) on a joint effort to map the magnetic field of the earth in conjunction with the International Year of the Quiet Sun, eventually by co-ordinated launching of special satellites.

Further, some aspects of international co-operation with regard to communication satellites were discussed among the scientists.

The Legal Sub-Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Lachs, (Poland) has reported that its meetings offered the possibility for a useful exchange of views, but that no agreement was reached on any of the proposals which were submitted.

The proposals referred to basic principles governing the activities of States pertaining to the exploration and use of outer space, the rescue of astronauts and space ships making emergency landings, assistance to, and the return of, space vehicles and personnel, and liability for space vehicle accidents. Other legal problems were suggested for future study during the discussion.

It should now be the aim of the Committee to reach agreement on how the Legal Sub-Committee should proceed with its work at its next session.

The first ITU Report in response to General Assembly resolution 1721 -- part D -- is of an interim nature since many problems related to the use of telecommunications in space have yet to be solved. The report stresses the fact that telecommunication is not only involved and essential in practically

(The Chairman)

all uses of outer space, but that space systems will provide new telecommunication facilities for terrestrial requirements, new meteorological data to be used in improved weather forecasting and new navigational aid facilities for ships and aircraft. The report outlines the steps being taken by ITU to achieve the widest use of telecommunication in space for peaceful purposes in the interests of all countries. The ITU will convene an Extraordinary Radio Administrative Conference at Geneva on 7 October 1963 to examine technical progress in the use of radio communication for space research and the results of technical studies by the International Radio Consultative Committee on subjects such as telecommunication systems between earth stations using earth satellites as relays, direct broadcasting from earth satellites, satellite systems for navigation and meteorology, and radio astronomy.

(The Chairman)

An important task for this Conference will be the allocation of radio frequency bands for operational earth satellite systems, together with bands for telemetry, etc. The International Telecommunication Union report states that no difficulties are envisaged in connexion with organizing satisfactory co-ordination in the field of space, but that until space telecommunication systems are established as reliable and practical telecommunication media with known operating properties and cost structure, it would be too early to plan for their general integration into world-wide networks. I may add that only recently successful telecommunication experiments have been started, such as Telstar.

The ITU Report adds that an immediate task in the technical co-operation field would seem to be the survey of needs and the development of domestic facilities of Member countries. ITU is already active in this field of technical co-operation. The report states that at its next session in 1963 the ITU Administrative Council will take any further action which appears necessary and that in the meantime studies concerning space transmission will be carried out by ITU experts.

The Committee has also, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1721, part C, received a substantive first report of the World Meteorological Organization. WMO believes that the full exploitation of new meteorological data which can be provided now by weather satellites, including the collection of information from automatic terrestrial weather stations by satellites, necessitates an expansion and rearrangement of the present system of conventional meteorological observations through the gradual establishment of a network known as the "World Weather Watch". Organizational and financial arrangements with regard to the establishment of the WWN network are suggested in the WMO Report. The system would assist national services by making available to each country meteorological data best suited to its needs.

The report underlines the fact that now, with the introduction of earth orbiting satellites, meteorologists have for the first time a global platform from which to observe the entire earth's atmosphere and to take advantage of the syntheses performed by nature in organizing cloud systems as

(The Chairman)

indicators of air masses, fronts, jet streams, storms, etc. -- in short, for observing the processes of world weather events. Such research techniques will also permit further investigation of the causative factors in weather events, such as solar and other external influences, and the heat and radiation balance in relation to circulation in the upper atmosphere. Knowing the details of present weather is the first step in anticipating future weather. Therefore, the continued collection and immediate dissemination of global data as would be provided by the WWW network is a prerequisite to a better understanding of the atmospheric motions and to the ability to forecast the weather for periods in excess of a few days, which would bring substantial economic benefits.

The WMO Report states that the preparation of an internationally co-ordinated plan for meteorological satellites will be undertaken by WMO in consultation with the appropriate organizations. This aim would be a global observational coverage twice a day.

The truth is that there are still a great many unknowns in the atmospheric equation and its basic physical forces. Only when these gaps in man's knowledge are filled will it be possible to find a solution to many urgent problems associated with weather prediction, climate changes and large-scale weather modification. The report warns that the consequences of any large-scale interference with the atmosphere must be accurately evaluated in advance.

Finally, the report mentions with appreciation the assistance rendered in drafting the report by American and Soviet high level scientists as a fine example of goodwill and collaboration which cannot fail to give great satisfaction because very important matters are involved.

We have noted with deep regret the passing away of Dr. Wexler, the Director of the United States Weather Bureau, who was one of the principal authors of this WMO Report submitted to our Committee.

In its unanimously adopted resolution of 2 August 1962, The Economic and Social Council expressed its appreciation to WMO and ITU for their reports, the various suggestions of which merit careful study, and noted with approval that both specialized agencies will continue their activities in their respective fields pertaining to outer space. In addition, the organizations concerned were requested to develop educational and training

(The Chairman)

programmes in space, meteorological and telecommunication technique in response to resolution 1721 of the General Assembly. The Economic and Social Council has transmitted the two reports to the General Assembly.

This survey would not be complete without mentioning the recent achievement of a spectacular group flight of two Soviet astronauts which marked universally applauded and definite progress toward man's conquering space.

Lastly, I would like to recall that it was agreed on 19 March among the members of this Committee that it will be the aim of all members to conduct the Committee's work in such a way that the Committee will be able to reach agreement in its work without the need for voting.

I would also like to express the hope that the Committee will preserve the constructive atmosphere which marked the discussions at our first session and will thus avoid any cold war discussion.

Finally, I should like to quote from a telegram received two days ago from Dr. Martin:

"In commending the report" -- this means the report of the Scientific Sub-Committee -- "to your Committee's attention, may I humbly express the sincere hope that it will be considered in the same spirit of harmonious co-operation manifested at Geneva."

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Six months have elapsed from the day when the spring session of this Committee was terminated. At that session a very important step was taken in the development of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. Consistent with its policy of maintaining peace and ensuring the peaceful coexistence of all peoples, the Soviet Union for many years has advocated the development of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

It is well known that many obstacles had to be overcome on that path. In this room, we are again confronting representatives of countries which participated in the spring session, and they will remember the businesslike atmosphere in which that session was conducted. Let us voice the hope that, despite the regrettable statements which have just been made in a discussion which fortunately terminated in a spirit of co-operation and agreement, this session will inherit and continue with that amicable behaviour and co-operative spirit which was so characteristic of the spring session.

The members of the Committee will recall the messages of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, and of the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, of 21 February and 7 March of this year which were devoted to questions of international co-operation in the penetration of outer space. These messages built the platform on which the further activities of the Member States of the United Nations were to develop in that field. The importance of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space is something which is fully recognized by everyone today. It is impossible not to recall in this connexion the words of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union in his message to the President of the United States, in which he stated that if our countries should join their scientific and technical efforts in penetrating outer space, this would be extremely useful for the progress of science and would certainly be welcomed by all the peoples who wish to see scientific achievements placed at the service of mankind and not used for the purposes of the cold war and the armaments race.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

In his message of 20 March, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union noted with satisfaction that his February message to President Kennedy, to the effect that our efforts should be joined, had met with proper understanding on the part of the United States Government. In that same message, Mr. Khrushchev stated that he sincerely wished that the institution of international co-operation in the penetration of outer space should contribute to improved relations between the two countries, should bring about a lessening of tension and create an atmosphere which would be conducive to the solution of the problems of this planet.

At the beginning of 1958, the Soviet Government proposed the conclusion of an international agreement for the joint study of penetration of outer space, and the initiative in that was displayed by our country, which placed this matter before the United Nations.

At our spring session, you, Mr. Chairman, summarized the work that had been done and, with the approval of all the members of this Committee, stated that the Committee had noted with pleasure the atmosphere of sincerity and co-operation which had been so characteristic. You stated that the discussion had shown again the extreme importance of international co-operation in the peaceful penetration of outer space and that the Committee at that session had reached a unanimous agreement that such co-operation would certainly be a very important contribution to mutual understanding and the strengthening of friendly relations between nations. You stated at that time, and you did so again today, that many delegations in the Committee had expressed deep satisfaction at the exchange of messages between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States concerning international co-operation for the peaceful uses of outer space.

Further, it will be recalled that it was decided that individual recommendations and general views expressed during the discussion which were related to the scientific, technical and legal aspects of the question would be placed before the two Sub-Committees for their consideration. We now have the reports of those two Sub-Committees.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

In the six months which have just elapsed, very important events have taken place in the penetration into further realms of outer space. Only a year and a half has elapsed since the day when the first cosmonaut, Gagarin, made his first flight. After that, the world witnessed the achievements of the second Soviet cosmonaut, Titov. Flights into outer space were also carried out in the United States by Glenn and Carpenter, and, after a further brief period of time, in August 1962 two Soviet cosmonauts, Nikolaev and Popovitch, effected a group flight into space which was an astonishing achievement of science, a new triumph of reason. Vostok III in ninety-five hours orbited the earth more than sixty-four times and covered more than 2,600,000 kilometres. Vostok IV, in seventy-one hours, went around the world forty-eight times and covered almost 2,000,000 kilometres.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

This group flight of the Soviet cosmonauts was a very important new step towards interplanetary communications. It is impossible to over-estimate the unprecedented Soviet group flight for the penetration of outer space and for gaining control over nature in the attempt to use it for the benefit of mankind.

An important programme of scientific research was carried out during these flights. The flight of these two spaceships in closely related orbits has made it possible to acquire very important and valuable material on the influence of long flights on the psychological and physical condition of the human being. It should also be stressed that during this flight communication was established between both ships and the ground stations, both with respect to radio and television. It should be stressed that the television reflection was given directly to the centre, without any intermediary station, and was transferred through the so-called inter-television system to the Soviet television viewers and to those of Europe.

It is also very important to observe that every new step in penetrating outer space leads to new and even more dramatic possibilities. It opens new perspectives in research and, at the same time, techniques are more and more perfected. It is impossible not to stress the fact that this group flight of the two Soviet cosmonauts was effected with extreme precision. This precision was also demonstrated by the almost simultaneous landing of both cosmonauts, which demonstrates the extremely high level of Soviet technique in this field.

Step by step science is penetrating outer space. It is overcoming obstacle after obstacle. The mysteries of nature are being unfolded and disclosed. The group flight of the Soviet cosmonauts shows the possibility not only of penetrating outer space even further but of living in outer space for an extended period of time.

In August 1962, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, stressed again that the achievements in the penetration of outer space and outer space itself are things that belong to the whole of mankind. Therefore, the results of the knowledge obtained should serve the welfare of all the people of our planet.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Such are the new and grandiose achievements in the field of the penetration of outer space for peaceful uses.

We should like to express with all vigour that along with the active work of man in penetrating outer space, as we view the broad perspectives of the further penetration of outer space, the Soviet Union feels that the main task of this session of the Committee lies in considering the legal problems related to the peaceful use of outer space and in establishing legal provisions which would eliminate the possibility of using outer space for purposes which would be detrimental to or which would threaten the life or health of the cosmonauts, which would create obstacles to the further penetration of outer space for peaceful purposes, or which would intensify tension or weaken relations between countries.

Allow me, in the light of what has just been said, to approach the assessment of the activities of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and the Legal Sub-Committee, which did their work in Geneva in May and June of this year. We must say at once that while the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee did not exhaust the subject matter, nevertheless they constitute a very constructive step in the right direction. They did receive the unanimous approval of the Sub-Committee.

Mr. Chairman, you have greatly facilitated this part of my task by the statement you made in dealing in detail with the main aspects of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. I shall take the liberty later to dwell in some detail on the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to speak positively of the results of the work of the Legal Sub-Committee. In paragraph 16 of the report we find the statement that "...it is the consensus of all delegations who participated in this session that the meetings offered the possibility for a most useful exchange of views". However, it is regrettable indeed that in this same paragraph we find this statement: "No agreement has been reached on any of the proposals submitted to the Sub-Committee."

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

If we disclose the true significance of this formulation, we shall see that the Sub-Committee was not in a position to submit to this Committee any recommendations whatsoever related to the basic principles governing the activities of the countries involved in the penetration of outer space. Thus, the Legal Sub-Committee did not produce any recommendations on the extremely important questions which were before it.

One automatically asks how this happened. Perhaps the Legal Sub-Committee did not have proposals, documents or other material which could have been used as a good basis for recommendations in these matters. No, this was not the case at all! Let us see what paragraph 11 of the report states. We find that the Soviet Union had submitted a proposal: "Declaration of the basic principles governing the activities of States pertaining to the exploration and use of outer space". Secondly, there was the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union: "International agreement on the rescue of astronauts and spaceships making emergency landings". There were other proposals as well.

We are not now faced with the task of examining in detail the fate of the proposals before the Sub-Committee. It is not our intention to do this in this statement for two reasons. First, all the members of this Committee are fully cognizant of the work of the Sub-Committee. Secondly -- and this is the main reason -- we do not want to prejudge anything at this point, because we hope that the United States position, which has led to a deadlock in the work of the Sub-Committee, will be changed in this Committee so that we may arrive at a speedy solution of the important international legal problems which are directly linked to the grandiose task of the peaceful uses of outer space.

The solution of these problems becomes extremely important, bearing in mind the very regrettable fact of the high altitude atomic explosion recently conducted by the United States. This constitutes a great obstacle to the penetration of outer space and indeed threatens the security and the very life of astronauts. It is well known that a special warning against high altitude explosions was submitted to the President of the United States. A protest was made by outstanding scientists of the United States, such as Dr. Sendierdi, a Nobel prize winner in medicine; Dr. Shepley, the well known astronomer;

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Dr. Livingstone, Professor of Physics at MIT; Dr. Mather, Professor of Geology at Harvard University and former President of the American Association for Science and Development. There were also the well known British scientist, Dr. Bernard Lovell, Director of the Observatory at Jodrell Bank, as well as many other scientists who protested against these high altitude tests. At the meeting of the International Union of Astronomers a special decision was adopted to the effect that no one was entitled to change the environment of the earth without international approval and without a thorough international study of the question. The decision stated that any such action would have very serious moral and material implications.

Reflecting the concern felt by the American people, we note a statement in The New York Times to the effect that no suitable explanation has been given for the unilateral implementation of a high altitude test which could indeed change the environment of the earth. It went on to say that our obligation to the international community should have called upon us to consult with others before any such test was conducted.

On 11 August 1962, the Government of the Soviet Union sent a special message to the Government of the United States related to the launching of the spaceship, Vostok III. That statement said that all countries were interested in the exploration of outer space, which involves definite obligations to be shouldered by all countries. This means, in particular, that Governments must abstain from taking any measures which can in any way hinder or obstruct the penetration of outer space for peaceful uses or create dangerous conditions which could threaten the lives of cosmonauts.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Research work of the Soviet scientists on the earth and elsewhere has shown that such tests as the one carried out on 9 July at high altitude do create conditions which are detrimental and dangerous to the life and the health of astronauts. The radio-activity in the environment which was the result of that blast has interrupted the work of the **radio-astronomers of the whole world.** The creation of this radio-active belt has impeded the work of **several satellites** launched in the United States, one of them **created by British scientists.**

All these facts show that life itself dictates the necessity of solving immediately important legal matters pertaining to the international peaceful penetration of outer space. In any case in which discussion of international co-operation in any field takes place, it immediately becomes necessary to regulate the co-operation of the parties. Therefore, how is it possible to speak of international co-operation in space research if the foundation is not laid, if those principles are not established which are basic to this co-operation? It is only when such a foundation is laid that practical measures can be contemplated, and this would eliminate the possibility of mutual destruction and would also protect the interests of all parties.

In that respect, it is particularly important, in the view of the Soviet delegation, to adopt a declaration pertaining to the basic principles governing the activities of countries in the peaceful penetration of outer space. Adoption of such a declaration would be an important contribution to the creation of a legal basis for further space research and would also contribute to the strengthening of international co-operation in that immense field.

The Soviet delegation, in its wish to make yet another effort to reach agreement on these important problems, would like to place officially before the Committee a draft declaration on the basic principles governing the activities of States involved in space research and also a draft international covenant on the rescue of astronauts and damaged space ships. We are transferring consideration of these basic documents from the Sub-Committee to **this session of the Committee.**

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

The delegation of the Soviet Union would like, first of all, to express its gratitude to the delegations of many countries represented here whose representatives in the Legal Sub-Committee in Geneva supported in principle the idea of the necessity of establishing these basic documents and also approved many of the important provisions of principle contained in those drafts.

The delegation of the Soviet Union hopes that the members of this Committee, in the light of the facts and circumstances which have characterized the six months that have passed since the end of our spring session, will fully realize the responsibility they bear before the United Nations in the task of preparing for the General Assembly the recommendations that are so necessary for the solution of these important questions.

May I be allowed to indicate the main purpose of the declaration on the principles governing the activities of countries involved in space research. As has been pointed out by the representatives of the Soviet Union in the Legal Sub-Committee -- this may be found in the records of the work of that Sub-Committee -- the main purpose is that all Member States of the United Nations, and of course in the first instance the Soviet Union and the United States, should assume definite legal obligations in respect of international co-operation in outer space. We wish to stress this wording: legal obligations, based on the Charter of the United Nations, based on provisions which have been unanimously adopted by the General Assembly and incorporated in resolution 1721 (XVI), and also on the other main principles of international law.

It is not really necessary to show here that the assumption of such juridical obligations, the solemn declaration of such principles, the signing of such a declaration by representatives of Member States would represent a new and important and, I would say, a determining step which would indeed ensure the further development of this international co-operation.

That is why, when our representatives on the Sub-Committee were told that it was difficult to oppose the principles that had been enunciated but that there was no need of a declaration, since there was already resolution 1721 (XVI) of the General Assembly, these arguments were really unfounded. The fact is that the international declaration which we are proposing would be a binding international instrument, while a resolution of the General Assembly, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, is merely a recommendation. Besides, the scope of the

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

questions contemplated in the declaration is much greater and more detailed than the scope of the questions covered in resolution 1721 (XVI).

We are of the view that the main task of this Committee is to consider the legal aspects related to the peaceful penetration of outer space. It is impossible to delay these matters any longer.

Therefore, may we be allowed to state in summary the main provisions of this document which we are placing before the Committee as a formal proposal.

The declaration that we are proposing is based on the premise that the exploration of outer space should serve the interests and the welfare of the whole of mankind. Who can oppose this key provision, which determines all the perspectives of international co-operation in the field of peaceful penetration of outer space?

Based on this key principle, we propose that a solemn declaration be made that outer space is open to research and exploration by all countries and that the sovereignty of any State may not be extended to outer space or any celestial body.

Further, we propose that the activities of States involved in space research should be consistent with the main principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and should serve the interests of all peoples and of the maintenance of peace and security.

In keeping with these principles, we propose that the Committee should approve provisions to the effect that there should be a cessation of all attempts to obstruct or render more difficult the exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes. We suggest that it be recognized that co-operation and mutual assistance in this field is a duty which all States should assume and that the implementation of any measures or steps which would obstruct exploration by other countries should be possible only after consultation and agreement with the countries involved. In particular, a provision should be established to the effect that the existence of satellites of any State for the purpose of gathering intelligence is completely incompatible with the peaceful exploration of outer space.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

We believe that it is necessary to have provisions under which the admirable achievements in space should not be used for war propaganda or for racial hatred and enmity. It is inadmissible that the brilliant achievements of mankind should be used in any manner detrimental to human beings, whose mind activates the greatest technical progress, which is the pride of our time.

In order to ensure that countries should bear full responsibility for any activities they undertake in outer space, in order to eliminate any possibility of harming mankind by any operation undertaken in outer space, we propose that all activities to be undertaken for the peaceful exploration of outer space should be undertaken exclusively by States, and of course the sovereignty of the States will be extended to the objects that they launch into space.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

The important provision is that all countries should consider astronauts as ambassadors of mankind and should therefore tender all assistance to spaceships and to astronauts who may be forced to land. A provision is also contemplated to the effect that any containers or any parts of satellites should be returned to the countries which originally launched them. These are the basic provisions of the declaration which the Soviet Union wishes to submit for the consideration of this Committee. Of course, we are perfectly prepared to listen to any observations and to consider any amendments to our draft which may be introduced, so that in the course of this present session we may be able to reach the agreement which is so necessary. May we appeal to all delegations represented here that are interested in establishing genuine international co-operation in this important field to approve this draft proposal and submit it for the consideration and approval of the General Assembly.

We have already noted that one of the provisions of this declaration must be a clause to the effect that all countries should render assistance to astronauts and to damaged spaceships in case of necessity. We believe that this is a humanitarian and extremely important task and we should not therefore be confined to the provisions of the declaration as it stands now. It would be very desirable to prepare and conclude a special international convention on the rescue of astronauts and the help to be given to damaged spaceships. Indeed, all countries would wish to do whatever they can to provide such assistance if spaceships are in difficulty. The draft of the international convention to that effect is now transmitted to this Committee for consideration. There are already several bilateral and multilateral agreements on salvage on sea and on land, and therefore it is not easy to understand the arguments of those who in Geneva opposed the idea of such an agreement. The fact that there are already several agreements which enable countries to render assistance to damaged spaceships or to those who are in need on sea or on land is an added argument, because if such agreements already exist in certain areas they should certainly also be valid everywhere for the benefit of the astronauts who risk their lives in spaceships in the attempt to carry out the boldest dreams of mankind as a whole and to conquer the uncharted reaches of space.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

The draft in the text which is submitted to the Committee will therefore, in accordance with this proposal, be completed by several proposals which will outline in detail the type of help to be rendered to astronauts and to damaged spaceships and the assistance to be given to astronauts who may be forced to land. States would have to act on such occasions as they would if their own astronauts were forced down in a damaged ship. Astronauts belonging to other countries would have to be restored as soon as possible to their homeland and the parts of satellites which could be recovered would also have to be restored immediately to the country which originally launched them if they bore any markings indicating their national origin and if the State which launched them had officially announced the launching. The only exceptions to this rule would be made in the case of finding ships or parts of ships containing apparatus which could be used for espionage purposes over the territory of another country. This exception, I believe, is completely in keeping with the general theme which pervades the whole, namely that space research should not be used for any purpose inconsistent with the Charter or which would violate the sovereignty or territorial integrity of any State. Spying over another country would certainly be such a violation, even if it were carried out from space.

The Soviet Delegation would like to express the hope that representatives of all countries in this Committee will show a spirit of co-operation and thus create the proper atmosphere for the speedy approval of this declaration of the main principles and activities of countries involved in space research and in the salvaging of damaged spaceships and the rescue of their crewmen.

May I now proceed to make some observations on the work of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. We have to point out that there are some definite and positive results. One of them was that in the work of the Sub-Committee a group of scientists took part who had been directly engaged in outer space research. This had a very favourable effect on the whole work of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. It is well known also that observers took part in the work of the Sub-Committee, among them representatives of the World Meteorological Organization, COSPAR, the International Telecommunications Union and other organizations which are already dealing in a practical way with the task of international co-operation in the exploration of outer space.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

It is very pleasing to note in this connexion that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee paid due attention in the course of its work to the questions of international co-operation which had been raised in the messages exchanged between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Khrushchev and the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, which were most important contributions to the further work of organizing international co-operation. Among the proposals was the use of satellites for meteorological purposes, for telecommunications, the measurement of the earth's magnetic field and other technical matters. Another important item referred to by the Committee was the International Year of the Quiet Sun. The Sub-Committee found that a good example of international co-operation was the highly successful International Geophysical Year, and we hope that the International Year of the Quiet Sun and its programme of research will also give an example of the further development of co-operation among scientists.

The Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee also paid considerable attention to the question of organizing further exchanges of scientific information on the results of outer space exploration and research, and to a study of the experience acquired by scientists in that field. It is well known that the Soviet Union has always favoured the development of the exchange of views and experience acquired in the exploration of outer space. I must inform the Committee that in order to further develop the exchange of information on one of the important aspects of outer space exploration the Soviet Union is setting up a world meteorological centre in Moscow which will provide great possibilities for the acquisition of experience in the peaceful use of satellites for meteorological research. At the present stage of cosmic research the existence of **world centres to process the information** obtained from satellites and rockets is very useful and serves the interests of the exchange of information, and does not require any other organization.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

We believe that it would not be desirable to transfer such functions to the United Nations Secretariat. Furthermore, the Sub-Committee has also considered the question of setting up in the equatorial regions platforms for sounding rockets, and the Sub-Committee has proposed and agreed to recommendations on the setting up of such stations and the principles of their functioning.

I believe that these general provisions should indeed become the premise for the organization of such launching areas, and we believe that the creation of such launching areas under the aegis of the United Nations should not in any way limit the sovereign rights of States on whose territories such launching areas would be established. All the questions of administration and direction of these launching areas should not be so determined as to enable any country, or even the international organization, to interfere into the domestic affairs of countries where those areas will be located.

The creation of such areas in the equatorial regions will be extremely useful for the further progress of research in the ionosphere and also in the study of the magnetic field and solar activity. Especially interesting will be the tests to be carried out at altitudes between 30 and 200 kilometres. This is the region which cannot be reached by aerostats, but which is lower than the altitude of the orbit of the satellites.

We should like to state further that despite some dissension in differences of views and in different points, the result of the work of the Scientific Sub-Committee was that it was possible to issue definite recommendations on several scientific items. This shows again that there is indeed a very broad possibility of ensuring international co-operation if goodwill is there. The Soviet delegation desires to state that in principle it wishes to support the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee which are before the Committee now. The Soviet Union attaches the greatest importance to the development of international co-operation in the peaceful exploration of outer space and it is well known that the initiative in this field belongs indeed to the Soviet Union itself.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

We realize full-well that many aspects of this question are related, and especially related to the global preparation of research, and this work embraces all latitudes. This problem of course, since it involves considerable expense, has been approached only by most economically developed countries. The possibility of having less developed countries participate in this work will doubtless contribute to even greater progress in the exploration and conquest of outer space for the benefit of the whole of mankind. However, such co-operation can fully unfold itself only in a disarmed world. And of course the exploration of outer space in such a world will indeed then serve the purpose of establishing firm peace on earth. Reaching these noble and lofty aims certainly deserves every effort on the part of this Committee at its present session.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, may I request those representatives who wish to participate in the general debate to inscribe their name with the Secretary of the Committee. The next meeting will be held at 10.30 tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.