

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.105/PV.12
21 February 1963

ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 12 September 1962, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. MATSCH

(Austria)

General Debate (continued)

63-01605

The CHAIRMAN: Before continuing with the general debate, the Chair would like to draw the attention of the Committee to two documents circulated today, documents A/AC.105/L.4 and L.5, the former containing the "Draft Proposal on Assistance and Return of Space Vehicles and Personnel" and the latter containing the "Draft Proposal on Liability for Space Vehicle Accidents". Both draft resolutions have been presented by the United States delegation.

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria)(interpretation from French): My delegation has come to this session of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space animated by the same desire that it felt at the first session of this Committee in March and April last, namely, the desire to see that our meetings are carried on in an atmosphere of co-operation and conciliation.

We would have hoped that the present session could strengthen and consolidate the results obtained last spring by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and make progress with its work so that we could submit to the General Assembly the fruits of these labours in a more advanced form. That was indeed the hope and desire of my delegation.

Unfortunately, the two days of debate that we have already had have not been very encouraging in this respect. We do not intend, of course, to underestimate the scope of the results obtained in the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, and we are gratified because no one proposes to undo what was done at Geneva on this point. We should, however, like to emphasize that this is only one half of the work that confronts us. If we see the same lack of progress that we have seen for the last forty-eight hours, we will be in a position of presenting to the General Assembly in a few weeks, figuratively speaking, a vehicle with only two of the four wheels that it really should have, a car having only two wheels, either on the right or on the left, instead of having four wheels, two on each side; such a car could not go very far.

(Mr. Tchobanov, Bulgaria)

In this connexion, my delegation fully shares the viewpoint expressed yesterday by the representative of the United Arab Republic that the scientific and technical aspects of the question, on the one hand, and the legal aspect, on the other, are only two sides of the same medal, and that we cannot make any real progress in one of these fields if we utterly ignore the other. We also had an opportunity to understand the views of the United States delegation during the procedural debate which took place earlier. The United States representative said that the task of the current session, from his delegation's viewpoint, was to endorse the specific recommendations made on the scientific and technical aspect, and then to decide when and how we could take up later the legal aspects of the problem.

I may add, as an aside, that I have not yet had an opportunity to examine the new proposals of the United States delegation contained in documents A/AC.105/L.4 and A/AC.105/L.5, and that everything that I am now about to say will be subject to the reservation that my delegation is not yet acquainted with the contents of these two documents.

As other delegations have pointed out before me, this attitude of the United States delegation is contradiction to the attitude that delegation took at our first session in March and April last. As will be recalled, at that time the United States delegation said it was ready to consider in a constructive way any proposal that might be made with a view to laying down the principles for an international legal arrangement to govern outer space research. In the face of this United States desire, the Soviet delegation at Geneva, and again here the day before yesterday, submitted a draft declaration and a draft covenant on this point. Mr. Morozov was able to show last Monday that his delegation was fully prepared to consider and discuss any amendments to these texts. In other words, the Soviet Union did not in any way consider that its draft proposals were final or not subject to any change, but rather the Soviet delegation sought the co-operation of all delegations in the drafting of the text in order to ensure that they were improved and discussed in a spirit of conciliation and compromise.

(Mr. Tchobanov, Bulgaria)

It might have been expected that the United States delegation would have introduced amendments to the Soviet texts so that the Committee could seek a compromise solution which would obtain the unanimous support of the Committee. This, it seems to us, would have been the only constructive approach to this problem, but, unfortunately, and I do not think that ours is the only delegation which regrets this, the United States delegation did not do anything of the kind. Instead of proposing amendments to particular points in the Soviet drafts which, for any reason, they thought were not suitable, or instead of submitting entirely new drafts on some point which could be considered together with the Soviet texts, the United States retreated to a purely negative attitude and invited the Committee to postpone discussion on the legal arrangements for space research until a later date. In March and April last, and, in fact, from the very beginning of 1960, the United States delegation was in agreement with the setting up, together with a scientific and technical sub-committee, of a legal sub-committee so that the two aspects of the problem could be tackled and settled in detail. Five months ago, the United States delegation was fully in agreement that the two Sub-Committees should be set up and should carry out their labours concurrently at Geneva. A legal delegation from the United States went to Geneva to participate in the work of the Legal Sub-Committee.

So far, everything was fine, and everyone was entitled to expect that the United States delegation would co-operate with the other delegations on the Legal Sub-Committee in drafting the broad, general lines of international regulations for the exploration and use of outer space. Everyone was entitled to expect that the United States delegation would take up a position, in a constructive spirit, on the proposals for governing these activities submitted by other delegations, would have drawn attention to their defects and imperfections, and would have helped to improve the texts. Had it preferred to do so, we would have expected the United States delegation to submit for discussion proposals of its own on the same point. But nothing of the kind occurred at Geneva. As we all know, the United States delegation on the Legal Sub-Committee at Geneva fell back, just as Mr. Plimpton is doing here in New York, on a negative attitude pure and simple, thus condemning the work of the Legal Sub-Committee to be entirely sterile.

(Mr. Tchobanov, Bulgaria)

At the present session of this Committee, the United States is doing nothing more than continuing to follow the line it followed at Geneva. I repeat that I reserve my right to take up a position on the two documents submitted by the United States delegation, which I have not yet had an opportunity to study. But the attitude of the United States can only be a source of surprise to us, and we are justified in seeking the motives behind this attitude. This attitude is particularly surprising since the United States is a country which has a large volume of theoretical research on problems in outer space, and many documents have been published in recent years by university circles, research institutes and associations, and these have testified to the deep interest taken in these problems. United States public opinion, consequently, is not indifferent to the legal aspects of the problems which arise in this new branch of human activity. The United States Government, however, and its delegation in the United Nations, by every possible means and in the most deliberate manner, are preventing any work being carried out on the basic principles of this new sub-division of international law.

This attitude, I repeat, must be explained, and the declarations made in recent years by United States representatives offer certain information to enable us to discern some of the reasons for this attitude.

The United States representative stated yesterday, inter alia, that paragraph 8 of the draft declaration of the basic principles governing the activities of States pertaining to the exploration and use of outer space, submitted by the Soviet Union and contained in document A/AC.105/L.2, was particularly unsatisfactory in his eyes. This paragraph states:

"The use of artificial satellites for the collection of intelligence information in the territory of foreign States is incompatible with the objectives of mankind in its conquest of outer space."

The United States representative went so far as to try to convince us that it was rather a good thing to engage in the collection of intelligence information by artificial satellites. It was our privilege to hear, for the thousandth time, the theory of the United States being an open society and

(Mr. Tchobanov, Bulgaria)

entitled to engage, rightly or wrongly, in espionage against countries which were not prepared to reveal the secrets of their national defence. It seems to me to be appropriate at this juncture to say a few words on the slogan of an open society, which has been referred to very often recently in the speeches of United States representatives in this form.

That the United States is an open society, I am quite willing to accept, because the term is sufficiently vague that it can cover anything. But this open society, rightly or wrongly, sends to prison those suspected of engaging in military espionage. It is not satisfied with merely sending them to prison, it condemns them to the electric chair or other forms of execution, just the same as in a closed society. I regret to say that this open society not only sends men, but sends women, the mothers of children, to the electric chair. I refer to Mrs. Ethel Rosenberg and the fate meted out to her by the most chivalrous country in the world.

I must, of course, admit that the United States is an open society, because this has been affirmed to us so many times, but I would ask the representatives to agree with me that the United States is an open society in a special way, because, unlike certain members of closed societies, they do not hesitate to apply capital punishment to the weaker sex when they feel that a serious effort has been made to obtain their military secrets. This matter is very close to us, indeed, because the Committee will recall the macabre history of Mr. Soblen, and a society must really be an open society such as that of Mr. Plimpton's country for it to consider it possible to exercise its vindictiveness as it did on the body of a man on the verge of death.

(Mr. Tchobanov, Bulgaria)

I wonder whether Mr. Plimpton will tell us that these actions towards Mrs. Rosenberg and Dr. Soblen were justified from the strictly legal point of view. But then would it not have been better to spare us all this mythology about an open society? I believe that all societies are open just so long as nothing and no one threatens them, and that all societies are closed to the extent that they have a threat to their security hanging over them. With respect to the United States society in particular -- I am not referring to the whole United States population but rather to its leading circles -- I believe it is often much more closed than the societies of a good many other countries. It seems to be losing control of its nervous system in the light of real or imaginary cases of espionage; it is sentencing suspected persons to death without regard to their sex or age; it is even pursuing dying persons and performing the dance macabre around their almost dead bodies, which was certainly the case with respect to Dr. Soblen.

I think it would have been much wiser for the representative of the United States not to touch upon this problem of open or closed societies.

In reserving its right jealously to preserve its military secrets in the way it thinks best, the so-called open society still loudly demands that other States should have no secrets from this "open society" with respect to their own national defences. To come back to the subject matter under discussion, I believe that this is the reason why the United States delegation is trying by every possible means to prevent the establishment of an international space code. If such a code were established, it could not fail to describe as a crime in outer space those things which are a crime here on earth. It would be inconceivable and absurd to send to prison, to the gallows or to the electric chair any person engaging in certain activities on earth or in a U-2 craft and, at the same time, guarantee them immunity from punishment when they do the same thing in a cosmic or satellite aircraft. Any crime would have to be punished. However, this does not seem to be the view of the United States delegation. The representative of the United States told us this yesterday in such clear terms that we must pay tribute to him for his frankness. In addition,

(Mr. Tchobanov, Bulgaria)

we must also pay a tribute to certain newspapers, such as The New York Times, which yesterday wrote the following comment:

"In defense of the explosion, officials also point out that some harmful effects may be the price for obtaining military information. In this case, officials emphasize, the radiation presents at most a nuisance for space craft, but not a problem to the population on earth."

Let us note in passing in this connexion the frankness of this statement. The frankness displayed in this article was even greater than the frankness of the representative of the United States in this Committee. It is conceded here quite clearly that radiation from high altitude explosions certainly has harmful effects on the world. Mr. Plimpton tried to convince us yesterday that even if Nikolaev and Popovich had gone through the contaminated belt, they would not have felt it. He was even unwise enough to state as a matter of fact that they had gone through this belt, which was certainly not the case, as Mr. Morozov informed us.

I find it impossible to understand why the representative of the United States considered it appropriate to state that all United States satellite launching had been duly recorded with the United Nations that there were no secret launchings. The same The New York Times wrote: "There are also reports that the radiation has damaged some secret Air Force reconnaissance satellites." Since they were secret satellites, I doubt very much whether they have been recorded with the United Nations. One is sometimes really surprised by the audacity displayed by certain representatives of the United States.

What I have said shows why the United States Government and its delegation in this Committee do not want any international code to govern the use of outer space. They would rather have only the law of the jungle in outer space.

I apologize for speaking somewhat bitterly, but as my delegation has already said, we were very optimistic at the first session of this Committee and we sincerely hoped that the time had finally come for constructive and frank collaboration in such an important field of human activity. But the lack of goodwill manifested by the United States delegation in the Legal Sub-Committee at Geneva and the actions of the United States Government in the interval between

(Mr. Tchobanov, Bulgaria)

the Geneva session and this session in New York, as well as the atmosphere of the cold war which the United States delegation generated so insistently yesterday and the day before yesterday, have considerably lessened our optimism. Despite all this, my delegation will continue to support any constructive efforts made in this Committee.

Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom): I should at the outset like to make it clear that as of now I do not intend to speak again in the course of the present meeting. The time at our disposal is limited, and it is most desirable that we should as soon as possible direct our minds to the outcome of our present series of meetings, that is to the report we should present to the General Assembly. I shall, in the course of my speech indicate the lines which my Government believes we should follow in adopting the report.

When this Committee last met six months ago, I emphasized the importance which Her Majesty's Government attaches to effective international collaboration both in the United Nations and elsewhere in the exploration of outer space and its exploitation for peaceful uses.

It is therefore fitting that I should say, at the outset of my contribution to this general debate, that Her Majesty's Government welcomes the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. We think that it is of considerable value in showing that a group which represented all the main sections of world opinion was able to discuss for three weeks in a friendly atmosphere proposals for international co-operation in the technical and scientific fields of outer space. Even more important, as an augury for the future, are the constructive and forward looking recommendations on which the Technical and Scientific Sub-Committee were able to agree, and which the representative of the Soviet Union described last Monday as being "constructive steps in the right direction". It should now be our task to endorse and approve these recommendations and to take such steps as are necessary to put them into effect.

(Sir Patrick Dean, United Kingdom)

I do not propose, in the course of this general debate, to comment in great detail upon the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, but I should like to make a few short observations for the purposes of recording that these recommendations are, in general, acceptable to Her Majesty's Government.

Those recommendations of the Sub-Committee which relate to the exchange of information are all entirely acceptable to Her Majesty's Government, and we have already transmitted to the Secretary-General, at his request, details of United Kingdom space research activities and organizations. We also particularly welcome the fourth recommendation that COSPAR should make a study of the World Data Centre and the SPACE WARN communications network. Here I would add that the United Kingdom Government would welcome a review of its own Data Centre at Slough, and we will gladly co-operate with COSPAR in undertaking this.

We are also able unreservedly to endorse the approval given by the Sub-Committee to the various programmes which COSPAR is co-ordinating and in each of which the United Kingdom is playing a full part, and in particular the programme for the International Year of the Quiet Sun. We approve, in general, those recommendations of the Sub-Committee which relate to the activities of the specialized agencies, although we do so on the understanding that these activities will be conducted within limitations of the normal budget of the specialized agencies and will be so planned as to meet scientific needs. We shall study, as recommended by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, the reports prepared by the International Telecommunications Union and by the World Meteorological Organization in response to General Assembly resolution 1721 (XVI).

We look forward to the establishment of world centres, for the distribution of information, at Washington and Moscow, and we believe that the suggestions which are made in the WMO report for organizing regional centres form a sound basis for future action. But we are not certain that it will be necessary to set up a separate world weather fund. As the WMO report suggests, there already exist sources of finance, both national and international, of which use could be made for the purposes contemplated, and we think that it is necessary to be certain that these sources cannot meet requirements before embarking on proposals to establish a new and separate fund.

(Sir Patrick Dean, United Kingdom)

Her Majesty's Government also welcomes the recommendation of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee that there should be United Nations sponsorship for sounding rocket facilities in the equatorial region and the Southern Hemisphere. We believe that this project will be of great benefit not only to the international scientific community, but also to those States on whose territory it will be sited and those other States which will use it.

I now turn to the report of the Legal Sub-Committee. While my Government regrets that the Legal Sub-Committee was unable, at its first session, to reach agreement on any of the proposals which were before it, we think that to speak of this Sub-Committee having reached a deadlock is both misleading and defeatist. As the report of the Legal Sub-Committee itself states, it was "the consensus of all delegations ...-that the meetings offered the possibility for a most useful exchange of views" (A/AC.105/6, page 9), and it is the hope of Her Majesty's Government that this exchange of views will continue and will result, as the exchange of views in the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee has already resulted, in agreed proposals of a constructive nature. Four of the proposals which were before the Legal Sub-Committee have now been tabled in this Committee.

Her Majesty's Government does not, however, consider that either this Committee or the General Assembly itself is an appropriate forum for the continuation of exchanges of views on legal matters. In particular, we do not believe that the objective of constructing a firm basis for the law of outer space is likely to be achieved by the hasty adoption of a set of basic principles which contain elements of a highly political and controversial nature, and to which a number of delegations represented in the Legal Sub-Committee saw serious objections.

It is our belief that the objective of effective international co-operation in the development of the legal aspects of outer space can best be achieved if we recommend to the General Assembly that the Legal Sub-Committee should continue its work next year. It can then give further consideration to those proposals on which it was unable to reach agreement this year and which have now been placed before this Committee. Further discussions of these proposals in an atmosphere which, we urge, should be kept free from polemics, is likely to afford a better chance of success than any substantive discussion of their merits or demerits either in this Committee or in the General Assembly itself.

(Sir Patrick Dean, United Kingdom)

We have the work of the Technical Sub-Committee to show us how the benefit of space exploration and research can be made available to all countries, through the sponsorship of the United Nations.

Our task is twofold. First, let us, as I have already proposed, do our part in putting the recommendations of the Technical Sub-Committee into effect by the adoption of a report to the General Assembly.

Secondly, rather than removing from the competence of the Legal Sub-Committee proposals which had already been tabled there and discussing them in an atmosphere which is not, it seems, free from polemics, let us agree in this Committee that the Legal Sub-Committee shall continue its work, and endeavour to reach agreement on those matters which it discussed this summer. We must hope that it will reach decisions as fruitful as those of its technical counterpart.

It is of the greatest importance to all nations, whether they have any direct share in space exploration or not, that both the legal and technical aspects of this new field of endeavour should become an example of international co-operation, and not a reflexion of the tensions of a troubled world.

Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada): The Canadian Government has been actively interested in outer space development since it was first apparent what extraordinary new opportunities would result from man's penetration of this new and challenging world. This is why we attach such importance to expanding by every feasible means the opportunities and the possibilities for co-operation in outer space. Canada's own activities in outer space are based on the very principle of international co-operation. Initially, this co-operation has been with the United States and the United Kingdom. We are, for example, hoping to launch a satellite soon in close co-operation with the United States. It is against this background of practical experience that we advocate and look forward to the broadening and intensification of practical international co-operation.

According to the resolution which established it, our Committee has been assigned the positive goal of developing means for international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. Yet, in the course of this debate

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

considerable emphasis has been placed on the need for presenting the use of outer space for warlike purposes. Some of the speeches made here seemed to imply that this essentially negative goal should be the prime concern of the Committee. As much as any nation, Canada desires the limitation of outer space to peaceful activities. However, we consider that the appropriate forum for achieving this goal is the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

Let me give an example. There has been comment concerning the undesirable effects of nuclear explosions in high altitudes. If an agreement to suspend nuclear tests were to be signed, that problem -- and many others -- would be solved.

Another example relates to the proposal for banning the use of artificial satellites for transmitting war propaganda. If the USSR had not changed its mind in Geneva and rejected the very agreement which its representatives had helped to draft, there would have been no need to treat this as a special problem, as the proposed declaration covered the transmission of war propaganda by all means.

As evidence of the strength of the Canadian conviction that disarmament issues relating to outer space should be dealt with in the eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee, I should like to recall that the Canadian Minister of External Affairs, speaking at the eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee, proposed a declaration the acceptance of which would have banned from outer space all weapons of mass destruction. The following day, this proposal was rejected by the Soviet representative.

The basic Canadian philosophy toward the problem of achieving co-operation in the use of outer space is to accept the largest common denominator of agreement in the hope that initial successes will encourage the enlargement of the area of co-operation. On the scientific side, this principle appears to have been accepted by all the members of the Sub-Committee. Certainly, the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee indicates a satisfying degree of progress, although surely much more can be done in the future. The Canadian delegation is particularly pleased to note the unanimous acceptance of the interesting new proposal for the establishment of a sounding rocket range in the equatorial region. Success in this scheme, which we fully endorse, will undoubtedly encourage the elaboration of further practical measures for co-operation.

In the Legal Sub-Committee there was an exchange of views which served to clarify the respective positions of Governments but which unfortunately did not produce agreement. The United States has taken the view, which is close to the view of my delegation, that problems relating to the disarmament of or the exclusion of arms from outer space should be dealt with in the eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee. The Soviet Union, however, appears to believe that certain measures of a disarmament character can be secured through our Committee. I say

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

only "certain measures of a disarmament character" because, when the issue was raised directly in the Legal Sub-Committee in Geneva, the Soviet delegation maintained that substantial disarmament measures in outer space were the responsibility of the eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee. I quote from the summary records of the meeting of the Legal Sub-Committee held in Geneva on 7 June 1962 (A/AC.105/C.2/SR.7), from page 4 of the English version. According to that summary record, Professor Tunkin, the Soviet representative, stated that "a crucial international problem would be prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes"; acknowledged that "outer space had not yet been declared neutral"; referred to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference, which was studying a Soviet draft treaty on disarmament that provided for "the demilitarization of outer space"; and commended the United States representative, who "had said realistically that a decision on that matter could be reached only as part of controlled disarmament". He concluded by expressing agreement "that prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes did not come within the competence of the Sub-Committee, which should concentrate on other important matters".

I take it that the USSR puts observation satellites, high-altitude nuclear explosions and war propaganda in a separate category and considers our Committee competent to take a position. The difference of opinion on the competence of our Committee is, as I understand it, the underlying reason for the lack of progress in the Legal Sub-Committee. I might mention that, even on this residual category of activities in outer space, Soviet opinion is a little ambiguous. Mr. Zorin, the Soviet representative at the eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee, in the very speech in which he rejected the Canadian proposal for a declaration banning weapons of mass destruction from outer space, stated -- and I quote from document ENDC/C.1/PU.1:

"But if, I repeat, it is a question of the launching of missiles, military space devices or anything of that kind, this question cannot be studied separately from the question of the study of the question of all means of delivery of nuclear weapons".

(Mr. Tremblay, Canada)

This difference may possibly come from a different turn of mind, a different approach to this problem. However, I will not dwell on this subject.

I do not need to remind the Committee that the Canadian delegation to the Legal Sub-Committee put forward during the last meetings a compromise proposal -- what seemed to us to be the minimum area of common ground -- in the hope that this would permit the Sub-Committee to record some progress. It was unfortunately impossible to reach any agreement. However, we believe that, when the Legal Sub-Committee next meets, it will be able to start from positions already known, which should enhance the prospects for agreement.

We think it unlikely, given the differing opinions of the two major space Powers regarding the Committee's competence, that agreement can be achieved this week on legal questions relating to outer space. We feel, however, that the agreement which has been unanimously reached in the Technical and Scientific Sub-Committee is of such importance that the Committee should approve it in its report to the General Assembly. The Committee should also note that a useful exposition of legal positions has taken place, and the report should make it clear that the Legal Sub-Committee will renew its efforts to reach agreement at its next meetings.

We are concerned that the Committee has already exhausted three of the five days which it had tentatively allocated for its work and that we have not yet completed the first substantial item of the agenda. The Canadian delegation wishes to indicate that it is ready to attend as many meetings as may be necessary to complete the agenda by the end of the week, and it assumes that other delegations share with it the desire to complete the report by the end of this week.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the USSR, who would like to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I apologize to the speakers who are on the list, but I have asked for the floor in order to say a few words in reply to the remarks just made by the Canadian representative. I hope this may facilitate the task of the next speakers.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

One cannot say that the Canadian representative is inattentive to Soviet documents. He quoted our representatives in Geneva. **But, I do not know for what reason, there were a number of inaccuracies in his statement which must be corrected immediately.**

The Canadian representative quoted Professor Tunkin's speech in Geneva and attempted to show that there was a contradiction between the Soviet draft declaration and what Professor Tunkin had said. As a matter of fact, there is no contradiction, because the Soviet draft declaration contains nothing that would intrude on the functions of the eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva.

(Mr. Morozov. USSR)

I am forced to quote paragraph 6 of the Soviet declaration (A/AC.105/L.2) once again, because evidently the Canadian representative who studied all the Soviet documents has not studied this document sufficiently. I proceed from the fact that he was studying it on the basis of goodwill despite the fact that the points of view of the opposing sides were not acceptable. Paragraph 6 of the draft declaration reads as follows:

"Co-operation and mutual assistance in the conquest of outer space shall be a duty incumbent upon all States; the implementation of any measures that might in any way hinder the exploration or use of outer space for peaceful purposes by other countries shall be permitted only after prior discussion of and agreement upon such measures between the countries concerned."

In other words, when we speak about high altitude tests or about sending millions or billions of needles into outer space -- the delegation of the United States may count the number of these needles better than myself -- and tests of the same sort which might complicate peaceful co-operation in outer space, it means that such experiments would be impossible without prior discussion and agreement of other countries.

This is not at all the theme which is being discussed by the Committee in Geneva, which is entitled "The banning of the use of outer space for military purposes". As the Committee knows, there are a number of complicated problems which arise concerning, for example, the existence of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries.

I am not going to quote in detail the position of my delegation because this would lead us far away from the present topic of discussion, but I must say that we as a Committee must realize the necessity for co-operation in the field of peaceful uses of outer space and must feel concerned about the situation in which these peaceful uses of outer space is complicated by various tests and experiments such as those that I quoted and by other measures. Knowledge

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

in science is advancing and we cannot enumerate now all the bad things which could be done in outer space and which could really be an obstacle to the peaceful uses of outer space. That is why paragraph 6 of our draft declaration proposes to state that if any country intends to do something that can be a hindrance, an obstacle, to the tasks which we are called upon to discuss here and which have been dictated by the General Assembly, such experiments should be discussed with other countries whose interests may be sort of violated, and these experiments can be carried out only after there is an agreement.

This is a reasonable principle which does not concern the principles of general and complete disarmament and does not concern the problem of banning nuclear tests. No matter how much we want to conclude that agreement, this is a problem which does not touch upon it. This is only an element. It is a task which may be reduced to the fact that while discussions are taking place on a number of international problems, we must not put any difficulties in the way of achieving the task for which we twenty-six representatives are here gathered.

Therefore, the attempt to present this whole matter in such a way as if to impose upon the Committee a rejection of the position of principle that was taken up by the Soviet delegation in Geneva, which was expressed by our representative in Geneva, this attempt is quite inconsistent. This attempt was made yesterday by Mr. Plimpton. Now the Canadian representative is repeating it again. I wanted to say that if there is no agreement with our point of view, there should not be misrepresentation of it by way of wrong quotations from speeches that were really made in Geneva, and that on this basis there should not be an attempt to misrepresent our position, as was done by the Canadian representative.

The last point, to make a long story short, is that the Canadian representative just passed by my reply to the speech of the representative of the United States concerning the provision on the banning of military propaganda, propaganda of war and propaganda of racial and national hatred in outer space. The representative of Canada repeated the same thing that had been said by the representative of the United States to the effect that the provisions in our declaration should not be considered now because in Geneva the Soviet delegation allegedly rejected the acceptance of a declaration

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

on the banning of war propaganda. But yesterday I quoted provisions which the Soviet delegate in Geneva proposed for inclusion in this document and which were not supported by the United States, Canada and a few other States.

Gentlemen, you are in a better position to judge why the simple provisions which I quoted yesterday turned out to be unacceptable for Canada and the United States. Therefore, instead of trying to put the blame on us for the fact that they have not accepted the simple and clear proposals, which should be acceptable to every unbiased man, it would have been much better to say why those of our ideas are unacceptable. In fact, they simply object to the prohibition of outer-space-launched propaganda of racial and national hatred and oppose propaganda in favour of granting independence to all peoples that are now under colonial rule. This is the essence of the objections that are made here. Our objections, on the other hand, are made against revisionist propaganda. It is much better to say why these provisions are unacceptable instead of trying to put all the blame on us.

I understand that nothing can be imposed on any representative, or on the United States or Canada, except by the force of conviction. One cannot impose the text which we are proposing here. That is why we are trying to clarify our position. But when the answer to our position is given we ask that there be no misrepresentation of our position in the eyes of other representatives, with regard to what the Canadian representative has just said.

We are not trying to reach what the Canadian representative has said. We are trying to bring about what we mentioned in our introductory speech, what we mentioned in replying yesterday to the representative of the United States; we are just trying to reach agreement on what is written down in the text of the document that is on the table. All comments -- more or less to the point -- are of course of secondary significance compared with the text of the proposed document itself.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

I invite the representatives of Canada and the United States to follow the text from paragraph 1 to paragraph 9 and tell us why certain provisions are unacceptable and why they do not agree even to discuss those provisions that were contained in their own speeches, in the speech of President Kennedy, in the speech of the United States representative to the General Assembly, in the discussion in the Legal Committee this spring, and even in the speeches that were partially made now in order to produce the impression that the Western representatives, headed by the United States, are not against the discussion of legal problems. But there is allegedly no time, and so on.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

This declaration has been before us for over half a year. How long are we still to wait? We want to have these comments step by step. Let us take these simple nine provisions step by step. Let us say, "This is not good; this is good; this may be improved." Maybe nothing must be improved. It may be that this declaration must be accepted. In view of the clearness of its language, perhaps it should be presented to the General Assembly now.

There are all sorts of very cunning ways and methods invented in order to try to delay the discussion of these questions. We do not object to the rights of any delegation to have its own point of view. But let us agree on having a frank discussion and not having any misrepresentation of the arguments of each other. Then we will be able to advance. If we are not going uselessly to waste our time, we can still discuss the Soviet declaration, paragraph by paragraph.

Once again, I must apologize to the next speaker on the list.

Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan): Since our Committee met here last March, there have been further spectacular achievements in the exploration and use of outer space by human beings. The greatest feats of these achievements, of course, are the successful orbiting and return of Vostoks III and IV and the deep penetration into outer space towards the planet Venus which is currently being made by Mariner II. Recent achievements are not confined to the exploration of outer space; in the field of the practical application of space science and technology also, the successful operation of Telstar has opened up new vistas for world-wide communication by means of artificial satellites. These and many other examples of progress in space activities have made the need for international co-operation in the peaceful use of outer space ever more pressing, and the responsibility of our Committee to organize such international co-operation becomes correspondingly ever greater and more urgent.

The meeting of our Committee last March ended in a most friendly atmosphere and a most co-operative spirit, which seemed to assure our success in keeping up with anticipated developments. The exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev also gave to the Committee a most happy augury for the important work which then lay ahead of it.

(Mr. Okazaki, Japan)

It is gratifying that this expectation of Committee members was fulfilled when the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee in Geneva, with relatively little difficulty, agreed last June upon a number of specific recommendations in the fields of exchange of information, encouragement of international programmes, and the establishment of international equatorial sounding rocket launching facilities. As these recommendations are all conducive to the promotion of international co-operation in the field of space research and exploration, and are ready at hand for our consideration, the Committee should spare no effort to take them up promptly, examine them fully and agree upon a report to the General Assembly. When this is done, it will be the first accomplishment of this Committee to meet the heavy task entrusted to it.

It is very regrettable, however, that the harmonious spirit which prevailed during our March meeting did not culminate in any concrete result during the meetings of the Legal Sub-Committee at Geneva although, as its report states, "the meetings offered the possibility for a most useful exchange of views." More regrettable is the fact that the Legal Committee could not reach any agreement even on a few practical legal problems of relatively non-controversial character. In these and other problems in the legal field, the principal objective to which every effort must be directed is to secure the exploration and use of outer space only for the betterment of mankind and to the benefit of all States, whether or not participating in space activities, and to preserve the use of outer space for peaceful purposes only. This objective must take precedence over all other considerations, and should in particular be rigorously divorced from the earthly conflict of the cold war.

This is especially true with regard to the question of establishing the basic principles necessary to regulate outer space activities. Japan, in the Legal Sub-Committee and elsewhere, has repeatedly stressed on every occasion the need of developing at an early stage certain basic principles to ensure that outer space activities should be conducted peacefully, openly, and in an orderly manner for the welfare of all mankind, and such a need appears to have won general recognition. But, we will get nowhere, so long as any attempt is made to inject extraneous elements into our deliberation of these principles. The

(Mr. Okazaki, Japan)

question requires further study in a calm and objective atmosphere, and my delegation earnestly hopes that the spirit of co-operation with which we conducted our meeting in March will prevail.

Before I conclude my statement, I should like to join the representative of Canada in reminding the members of the Committee that the time available to this Committee before the opening of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly is very limited. Unless we proceed with our business with reasonable speed and take constructive steps on one item after another, we may not be able to finish our work before the General Assembly session begins. Therefore, I respectfully suggest to you Mr. Chairman, that you schedule as many meetings as you consider necessary in order that the Committee may successfully terminate its work and draw up its report to the General Assembly not later than Friday of this week.

Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): My delegation is honoured indeed to participate in the general debate of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space during its present session. The Hungarian delegation wishes to deal with, and carefully consider several problems in view of the work accomplished up to this point by this Committee and its Sub-Committee, and in view of recent achievements in exploring and conquering space by man. Since our Committee was established not only in its name for the peaceful use of outer space, but with the hopes and expectations that all these activities will be carried out for the benefit of all mankind, we see with deep appreciation the efforts that such high ideals be promoted in our work by mutual consent of all delegations, by unanimous decisions on every issue.

(Mr. Gaborozsy, Hungary)

The example of the last two days' deliberations clearly marks the importance of this method which, if maintained -- as you, Mr. Chairman, stated in your address, -- hopefully provides for constructive solutions to our common problems of promoting mutual understanding and true international co-operation in this important field of our activity. At this stage of the general debate my delegation wishes to focus its attention on the general and fundamental problems in order to indicate its position on the main outstanding issues rather than on the more detailed questions of a technical character which will come up at later discussions as separate items. In our dynamic world of today, one can witness a general scientific and technical progress which is capable of solving many actual problems even in the field of the exploration of outer space. Only a very short period after the first space flights of Gagarin, Titov, followed by Glenn and Carpenter, we watched on the television screens with admiration the recent orbital group flight of two Soviet cosmonauts in the space ships Vostok III and Vostok IV, representing a tremendous new advance undertaken by the Soviet Union for the peaceful uses of outer space, an achievement worthy of being followed by any other nation seeking to explore space. These new achievements have far-reaching effects on further space research and create favourable conditions for international co-operation. The elaboration and adoption of general principles on the activities in outer space becomes a first-rate type of necessity because of these achievements, if not for any other reason. The failure to achieve an agreement in Geneva on this item forces us to deal with it here and now, and we should spare no effort here in finding a solution for the regulation of outer space activities.

The use of outer space raises many legal as well as political problems. Some of these may seem remote but some are not only practical, but also immediate problems. They are immediate and urgent in the sense of the necessity to draw up principles of general guidance for all States on the basis of the actual technical achievements and the main principles of international law to meet the requirements of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. Such an international instrument would facilitate the creation of an air of confidence and better understanding among nations; it would enhance co-operative efforts on an international scale and eliminate the obstacles hindering and curbing the development of space research.

(Mr. Csatorday, Hungary)

My delegation has noted with satisfaction the results of the session of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee as it is contained in its report to the present session of our Committee. These recommendations comply properly with the actual stage, level and tasks of the co-operating efforts of the community of nations.

The unanimously recommended practical measures to be implemented by the common efforts of the participating States and several international organizations such as the WMO, ITU, COSPAR and other scientific and technical institutions, clearly indicate the wide range of opportunities for constructive international co-operation in the field of peaceful exploration and uses of outer space. Because of achievements in this field and because of the many possibilities inherent in this Sub-Committee, we are in urgent need of drafting and working out the proper legal norms for all kinds of outer space activities in the interests of all of mankind and world peace.

The main features of the law of outer space are outlined in document A/AC.105/L.2, presented by the USSR on the "Basic Principles Governing the Activities of States Pertaining to the Exploration and Use of Outer Space".

It is well known that the United States Government has many times declared itself to be in favour of applying international law to outer space. I trust that I am not wrong when I think that this spirit was expressed in the lecture of the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, on the occasion of International Law Day at the Seattle World's Fair on 25 May 1962, when he said, among other things:

"First, we think that outer space should be free for use by all nations as long as the use is consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

"Second, we think that the regime of law obtaining among the nations on earth must be extended and improved as it pertains to outer space".

Having quoted this, my delegation cannot help expressing its concern over the present situation and the manner in which, shortly after this declaration was made, the United States Army exploded a nuclear bomb in the high atmosphere, provoking righteous indignation all over the world. The far-reaching consequences of this reckless act are still to be evaluated, but everybody knows how it has already affected scientific space exploration work harmfully.

(Mr. Csatorday, Hungary)

One can mention here the so-called American "satellites of unknown destination" too, which in fact are espionage satellites orbiting around the globe, as well as the efforts of American private enterprise directed at the commercialization of space which, for the sake of profit, completely ignores international interests, that is, to make a common effort and to get common benefits from the exploration of outer space.

With such a background and having similar projects for the future in mind, it can hardly be expected that the United States enthusiastically supports the draft Basic Principles which envisage exclusively the peaceful uses of outer space. It artificially exaggerates the value of unimportant problems in order to delay the adoption of the above-mentioned Basic Principles.

We can establish that the words and deeds of the United States Government contradict each other. It is really difficult to find logic in the difference between the statement I quoted from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the facts which have been numerated and cited and the position of the United States delegation in the Legal Sub-Committee -- and even here in the course of our general debate.

In the opinion of my delegation the draft declaration on the Basic Principles of the exploration and use of outer space submitted for the consideration of this Committee by the USSR is of great importance from at least two points of view. First, the draft articles define outer space as a res communis omnium, that is, belonging to all States. Consequently, any benefit from its use should serve the interests of the whole of mankind, the community of nations, the members of which have an equal right to explore and to use it. These provisions are generally recognized principles consistent with the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter, as well as with the principles of international law.

Secondly, the declaration before us is worthy of deep interest from the juridical point of view also. It deserves the careful attention of those interested in the codification and further development of international law.

My delegation is gratified that the draft declaration in question is before our Committee and, fully endorsing it, it takes the opportunity of offering its efforts in favour of its elaboration and adoption as general legal guidance for the activities of States in the peaceful uses of outer space.

(Mr. Csatorday, Hungary)

The Hungarian Government has given careful consideration to the arguments put forward, mainly by the United States delegation but also by other delegations, opposing or not supporting approval of the basic principles. Some delegations at the Geneva meetings of the Sub-Committees also expressed the view that the prevailing situation was not ripe enough for the adoption of those principles. It is to be regretted that this view has not been supported by any arguments. Who can challenge the indisputable though very regrettable fact that the scientific and technical conditions are given for hostile activities, propaganda and espionage, disturbing not only the peaceful life of other nations and the international atmosphere, but endangering even international scientific outer space research itself?

In the opinion of the Hungarian delegation, the assumption that the present situation is not ripe for the drafting of a complete space code, because of the lack of definite scientific and technical, as well as legal, conditions is unfounded. On the contrary, it is difficult, if not impossible, to develop international co-operation in the absence of very definite and clear rules. From the juridical point of view, the maturity of the situation for adjustment is confirmed by numerous precedents in international law. It does not need any argument to prove that international law condemns propaganda for war, espionage activities against other countries, the disturbance of legal activities of other subjects of international law, and so on. Furthermore, it is a very essential argument that the General Assembly in its resolution 1721 (XVI) declared the first principles of the uses and exploration of outer space, and stated:

"International law, including the Charter of the United Nations, applies to outer space and celestial bodies."

My delegation cannot accept the position according to which some questions drafted in the basic principles, as, for example, the matter of espionage and war propaganda activities in space, allegedly belong exclusively to the terms of reference of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference. Without any doubt, the Legal Sub-Committee, as well as this Committee and the General Assembly, is also entitled to deal with the juridical aspect of the exploration of outer space. These bodies inevitably have to take a stand on any question relating to this exploration, especially if we take into consideration that their position may

(Mr. Csatorday, Hungary)

positively influence the solution of other international problems such as, for example, the question of general and complete disarmament, as was pointed out by some delegations during the work of the Legal Sub-Committee.

My delegation, together with many others, is deeply interested in the adoption of the basic principles as an international instrument. This position is supported by the tremendous interest and expectations of all the countries in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

In the absence of legal instruments and regulations, there is a further danger that devices will be sent irresponsibly into space. The Hungarian Peoples Republic does not wish to use, and could only very hardly afford, sufficient technical and material means to prevent the harmful consequences of such hazardous actions. Neither can it spend millions for preventive measures against hostile war propaganda and espionage activities from space. It is my belief that my country cannot stand alone with regard to this kind of problem. On the contrary, the Hungarian Peoples Republic deems it necessary to make good use of all those economic advantages which eventually can be obtained from the exploration of outer space. It is the firm belief of my delegation that this desire of my country is shared by the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world.

This Committee must remember what has been and what could be the consequences of U-2 espionage flights before and now. The political consequences were, and could be, gravely harmful by seriously poisoning and deteriorating the whole complex of the present international situation. Who can assure the world that no new events will take place, endangering international peace and security, if activities in space detrimental to the security of nations are not prohibited by an effective international instrument, for which the draft declaration on the basic principles proposed by the Soviet Union is an excellent document.

In conclusion, my delegation notes with satisfaction that this Committee applies the principle of unanimity with regard to the adoption of reports and resolutions. It is earnestly hoped that the usual spirit of co-operation will again prevail in the presentation of the report and the declaration of basic principles to the General Assembly. This new field of human activities should be kept out of military use and exploration for the purposes of war; it should serve only the peaceful coexistence and co-operation of nations.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): I would like to make a few brief comments on some of what I can only call the cold war blasts which have been chilling what we had hoped would be calm and co-operative deliberations leading to constructive achievements by the Committee.

I certainly do not intend to repeat statements that I made yesterday. It is possible that the earphones of some of the representatives were not working at the time. I will, however, call the attention of some of those representatives to the very precise, accurate and true statement that I made as to the registration by the United States of launchings of objects into outer space, whatever the orbit and whatever the success of the launching. Those who wish to see this verbatim can read yesterday's record.

The earphones of some of the representatives apparently were not working when I read into the record the position of the United States with respect to general legal principles applicable to the use of outer space that was stated very concretely at the final meeting of the Legal Sub-Committee in Geneva by my colleague, Mr. Meeker, and I urge the representatives who referred to the United States attitude in this matter to re-read that statement.

I would comment very briefly on one or two other statements. The statement made by the Soviet representative this morning as to experiments in outer space clearly indicated that what was contemplated was a veto on such experiments, since his draft declaration specifically requires prior agreement as to experiments which have been reported for consultation.

I might also point out that the Soviet declaration would forbid the presence in the sky of Telstar, which is a mechanism which should make possible increased co-operation and increased spread of knowledge and of information around the world. I am sure that there are few members in this Committee who feel that an operation such as Telstar, created by independent private enterprise in this country under government regulations, should not be permitted in the space above us.

(Mr. Plimpton, United States)

As to war propaganda, I sympathize with the obvious embarrassment of my Soviet colleague on this matter. I should like to read a statement made by the Soviet representative, Mr. Zorin, at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, on 25 May this year:

"The Conference has received from the Committee of the Whole a Declaration against war propaganda which has been adopted unanimously by the Committee of the Whole. Definitive action will be taken by the Conference on Tuesday, 29 May 1962, after consultation with Governments." At the same meeting -- I may be wrong as to the date of that meeting, but it was in May 1962 -- Ambassador Zorin said:

"As for the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the United States, these two Governments, if I understand the situation correctly, have already approved this proposal. Therefore, in our case, there is no need for further instructions."

When this Declaration against war propaganda was reported to the plenary meeting of the Disarmament Conference on 29 May 1962 for final action, Ambassador Zorin, acting on instructions from his Government, read out a statement repudiating Soviet agreement to the Declaration.

As I say, I appreciate the embarrassment of my Soviet colleague on this matter. However, I wanted to set the record straight. I wanted also again to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the question of war propaganda is being dealt with at the Disarmament Conference. We hope that at some point in the future, the Soviet attitude in the Disarmament Conference will permit successful treatment of the question of war propaganda where it belongs, namely in the Disarmament Committee.

There have been further references to nuclear explosions. I repeat that the United States has proposed to the Soviet Union an immediate moratorium beginning today on all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater and in outer space, the only nuclear tests that can harm human beings or interfere with future progress in science or otherwise. That is to be an uncontrolled moratorium.

(Mr. Plimpton, United States)

We are willing to go along with the obsessive desire for secrecy on the part of the Soviet Union and forget about inspection and control. I again call on the Soviet delegation to express agreement, subject to approval by its Government, with such a moratorium. There could be no greater contribution toward the peace of the world and the health of human beings than Soviet agreement to this reasonable proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. ICBOZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like first to put a very simple question to the representative of the United States. Does the Government of the United States allow launchings of spy satellites into outer space? This question simply calls for a yes or no answer. If the answer is in the affirmative, then my second question is the following: How can one reconcile these launchings with the tasks of our Committee and how can they be reconciled with President Kennedy's statement about peaceful co-operation in the use of outer space? But my principal question is: Do you launch spy satellites or not? Or is this just a bluff on the part of your generals, politicians and Press, who claim that this does take place? If the question is answered, there will be no doubt as to whether or not all satellite launchings are registered. The United States registers a satellite launching in a manner which does not give the purpose of the launching. My question is a very simple one, and a yes or no answer will clarify the whole situation.

With respect to the cold war, it is futile for you to blame us, because we have offered you a declaration which sets high and noble principles which could and should be adopted. All members have a copy of it. If you refer to this as the cold war, then what would you call a desire to promote peaceful co-operation in outer space? This is the desire which prompted our draft declaration.

(Mr. Morozov. USSR)

My respected friend, Ambassador Plimpton, shed a lot of tears about the embarrassed situation in which he said I found myself. He was in quite a hurry to feel pity for me. The point of the matter is that Mr. Plimpton ended the quote from Mr. Zorin's statement where he felt it appropriate to do so, and said that Mr. Zorin rejected the Declaration after it had been agreed to. But neither Mr. Plimpton, nor Mr. Stevenson, nor Mr. Morozov represents his own affairs. They all represent their Government and, of course, they act on the instructions of their Government. The real point of the matter is that he ended the quotation of Mr. Zorin's statement at the point where Mr. Zorin said that without improvements the Declaration was not acceptable. Mr. Plimpton says nothing about the improvements -- he makes a full stop after the word "unacceptable". The point is that the United States does not want to accept the provisions that I quoted yesterday. Why do you think the Declaration remains unacceptable? If the United States had accepted these provisions, we would have been able at Geneva to adopt an official text of the Declaration.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Why are these simple provisions not acceptable? You evade this question. I am not going to prejudge events, but you are evading an answer to the question. Irrespective of what happened in Geneva, I feel I must remind you the text of our draft declaration.

What is proposed in this document? It is said that outer space should not be used in the interests of racial hatred or war propaganda. Why do you not agree to this? You say that this is a question to be decided by the Eighteen Nation Committee. But let me say that in Geneva both the United States and the Soviet Union -- despite the fact that certain questions in these fields touched upon this point -- agreed that an agreement should be reached. I refer to the Antarctic Area, in connexion with which both your representatives and ours agreed that we must not allow our contradictions to intrude. But the Antarctic is on the earth. Why do you want to project into outer space the troubles which we encounter on this planet?

Again, you mention the veto. Why do you, Mr. Plimpton, take it upon yourself unilaterally to decide what can and what cannot be done where all peoples are concerned?

Other countries must be convinced of the fact that what you do in outer space will not be harmful and must agree to it.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

On this third day of our discussions, ideas have become more crystallized and I am convinced that the anxiety of the United States about peaceful co-operation in outer space contradicts its acts because the areas cannot be separated. Let us say that in science we can co-operate, but in law we cannot. There is a Russian proverb, concerning legal situations, which says: "He wants to do whatever his left foot wants." Someone wants to produce another Van Allen Belt as a result of high altitude tests. But you are not alone on this planet. The United States is no longer the only powerful State. Times are different now. You say that this declaration is an instrument of the "cold war", while, in fact, it is an instrument of peace. You must see that there is no time for such language nowadays. If you continue to use such language concerning the legal problems in the use of outer space, then we are right in denouncing you and in proving that your deeds contradict your words. Thus you negate the powers of this activity. The statements by the United States with regard to principles about the use of outer space cannot convince anyone. It is a waste of time to try to produce such an impression.

Let us consider together this brief document which can make a contribution to international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. Actually, you have not considered any paragraph in essence. You are trying to quote speeches which your representative in Geneva was forced to make because the negative position of his delegation produced a bad impression even on the neutral countries. The United States representative in Geneva was forced to speak in general terms in order to erase the impression. I do not wish to say anything derogatory about your representative -- it would be neither polite nor appropriate -- but what we need is not a quotation from his speeches which, to a great extent were a cover-up; we want to know what your objections are to the provisions contained in our declaration. You have submitted your objections -- not very clearly -- to two paragraphs, and with these objections we do not agree. Other delegations may have something to say in this connexion also. With regard to other paragraphs, however, you have said nothing. Are they acceptable, or are they not? You just say you do not want to consider them. But we want to consider them, and there are other delegations which are ready to make their contributions.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

In other words, what are we to do? We must take a decision on co-ordination in this Committee. But today you are trying to block not only the acceptance, but even the consideration -- step by step, point by point -- of this declaration. Unfortunately, of course, that is your right. We do not think that you should use that right -- but it is your right. But at least we have the right to put on record that the United States, in the Committee on the Use of Outer Space, today blocked the point-by-point consideration of the draft declaration which has been before the Committee for six months. You cannot say that this is unexpected for you have studied this document; you have certain ideas about it. If nothing else happens, it is quite obvious that the Committee will have to put on record that because of the position of the United States, which did not desire to consider this step by step, point by point, this draft declaration will be introduced at the General Assembly for discussion. That is what will happen. And any hope of having a sort of intermediate resolution to cover up the position that you are taking in this matter is doomed to failure. This will not do. Let us discuss this declaration. Let us have night meetings. We still have time available. Let us work during the beginning of the General Assembly session. We still have one week before us. But let us act, and not just exchange arguments about who begins and who ends the cold war here, and what is the excellence of your proposals introduced in Geneva about the banning of nuclear tests. We hope that the eight neutral countries in Geneva, which have introduced the proposals that we are ready to accept as a basis, know the real value of your statements. They know that the Soviet Union sincerely wants all nuclear tests to be stopped and that it does not want to have any loopholes left which will allow new tests to be carried out anywhere.

You know very well that we are not going to accept your **espionage** system under the guise of control and inspection. You want to have the possibility of underground tests: this is the essence of your position. I am not going to quote your representatives, because it is now almost one o'clock, and evidently it is time to adjourn. But, if the Committee would like to devote one **meeting** to this matter, I am quite prepared to argue with you on this matter, too.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

However, I think that our position in Geneva and your position are well known. Let us not mix up the comparatively narrow field which is the field of our Committee with the functions of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva. Once again, I say that I base my position also on all the statements made by Soviet representatives in Geneva. There is no contradiction between the position of our delegation in Geneva and our position here. The contradiction which you would like to invent does not exist.

I appeal to my fellow representatives to consider the essence of the situation, which resides in the attempts by the United States delegation -- despite its words -- to block consideration of the declaration in our Committee. This was clear from the very beginning, because it was only after pressure on the part of neutral States that the United States agreed to have general debate and, so to say, allowed us to speak.

In the interests of peaceful co-operation, I am forced to make this declaration now, even though it may not be to the liking of the United States delegation.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other representative wishes to take part now in the general debate, I should like to reply to the remarks made by the representatives of Canada and Japan with regard to the future work of our Committee. The Chair spared no effort to obtain two meetings a day for our Committee. As the sixteenth session of the General Assembly terminated only at the end of June, the vacations of Secretariat members started later than usual. Therefore the Secretariat was able to grant only one meeting a day to the Committee of Seventeen and to our Committee. In addition, the Security Council is meeting this afternoon and again tomorrow, and therefore we cannot have any meetings at that time.

As to the future development of our work, the Chair wishes to announce that we have eight speakers for tomorrow morning's meeting. The Bureau has contacted the delegations which have not yet spoken and which have not indicated their intention to speak, and the result is that three delegations have indicated that they do not intend to speak and five delegations are still undecided as to whether or not they will take part in the general debate.

(The Chairman)

With the eight speakers who are scheduled for tomorrow, twenty delegations will have spoken by the end of tomorrow morning's meeting. As I said, three delegations do not intend to speak and five are still undecided. Therefore, it may be that the general debate will continue on Friday if the five undecided delegations wish to take the floor on Friday.

If we cannot finish our work on Friday -- and it is unlikely that we can -- there remains only the possibility of meeting on Monday morning and Tuesday, because the Secretariat is unable to grant any additional meetings this week.

Our next meeting will take place tomorrow morning at 10.30.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.