

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.1870
25 October 1972

ENGLISH

Twenty-seventh Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 20 October 1972, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius)

Rapporteur: Mr. SANTISO-GALVEZ (Guatemala)

- International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space [28] (continued)
- Preparation of an international treaty concerning the Moon: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space [29] (continued)
- Preparation of an international convention on principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting [37] (continued)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days, to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 26 OCTOBER 1972, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 31 OCTOBER 1972.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

72-71061/A

AGENDA ITEMS 26, 29 AND 37 (continued)

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (A/3720; A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1, L.608 and L.610)

PREPARATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY CONCERNING THE MOON: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (A/3720; A/C.1/L.608 and L.610)

PREPARATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE USE BY STATES OF ARTIFICIAL EARTH SATELLITES FOR DIRECT TELEVISION BROADCASTING (A/3771, A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1, L.607/Rev.1, L.609 and L.612)

The CHAIRMAN: As I indicated yesterday, I hope that the Committee, in accordance with the time-table, will be able to conclude consideration of the three outer space items today. I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia contained in document A/C.1/L.612. I have been informed by the representative of Saudi Arabia that in view of his draft resolution he has withdrawn his amendments as contained in document A/C.1/L.607/Rev.1.

I should also like to announce that Czechoslovakia, Romania and Poland have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.608 and that Cuba, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria have become co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1.

Before I call on the first speaker inscribed on my list I shall call upon the Under-Secretary-General who wishes to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Mr. KUTAKOV (Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs): In a statement made at the 1864th meeting of the Committee, the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Colin Crowe, addressed a question to the Secretariat on the report of the Secretary-General concerning measures designed to enhance the effectiveness of the Outer Space Affairs Division. He asked when the report would be available, or whether the Secretariat could give some indication of the way the Secretary-General's thoughts are moving. I am pleased to make this statement on behalf of the Secretary-General in reply to that question.

(Mr. Kutakov, Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs)

The Secretary-General, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, has taken the following steps to enhance the effectiveness of the Outer Space Affairs Division. He has agreed to the establishment of two sections in the Division, dealing respectively with the servicing of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its subsidiary organs and with the implementation of the United Nations programme on practical applications. In doing this the Secretary-General will provide additional professional staff to the Division in order to meet the expanding responsibility of the Division and the increased activity of the Committee.

In addition, further steps are being taken through the Working Group on Outer Space of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and the Secretariat Panel on Space Applications to co-ordinate the related activities carried out by the specialized agencies concerned and by various Secretariat units in order to avoid unwarranted duplication and thus ensure that the Outer Space Affairs Division shall effectively serve the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space established by the General Assembly to be the "focal point" for international activities in this field.

I wish to assure the Committee that the Secretary-General, fully aware of the needs of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space will do everything within his power to enhance the effectiveness of its Secretariat in meeting the increasing responsibility of the United Nations in this field.

Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): Since it was my delegation that raised this question in the statement of my head of mission, may I just, on behalf of my delegation and I think on behalf of the Committee too thank the Under-Secretary-General for his useful statement which I am sure we shall all study and find very useful.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those speakers who wish to make any further comments on the draft resolutions and amendments which are before the Committee.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): It is a privilege for my delegation this morning to refer to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1, co-sponsored by Australia, Fiji, Iceland, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and the United States of America.

To facilitate the consideration of the draft resolution I wish to proceed by pointing out the revisions that have been made in the original draft contained in document A/C.1/L.606.

The first revision refers to the sixth preambular paragraph wherein the specific resolution adopted by the General Assembly is mentioned as resolution 2316 (XXVI) of 14 December 1971, replacing the reference to the measures adopted by the General Assembly.

(Mr. Yangco, Philippines)

Another change in this preambular paragraph is the addition of the words "and stressing the importance of pre-disaster planning" at the end of the paragraph.

The co-sponsors feel that with these changes that preambular paragraph has been clarified and improved.

The second revision is the addition of the last preambular paragraph, which is the seventh preambular paragraph of the revised draft, which reads as follows:

"Noting the on-going work of the Joint WMO/ECAFE Typhoon Committee and the large degree of collaboration between the World Meteorological Organization and other national, regional and international organizations in matters relating to tropical cyclones."

The WMO/ECAFE Typhoon Committee was established with the function of promoting and co-ordinating the planning and implementation of measures required for minimizing typhoon damage in the ECAFE region. That Committee, which in reality is an intergovernmental typhoon committee, has a secretariat now located in the central offices of the Philippine Weather Bureau in Manila.

The WMO Tropical Cyclone Project plan of action specifically mentions the large degree of collaboration between the WMO and other regional and international organizations in matters relating to tropical cyclones. The co-sponsors feel that the addition of this preambular paragraph gives due recognition to the efforts being exerted by the WMO at all levels in the field of tropical cyclones.

The third revision, which is of a purely editorial nature, consists of the insertion in operative paragraph 1, fourth line, of the word "in" between "(XXV)" and "which", and the addition of the words "the Assembly" before the word "requested" in that same line, so that operative paragraph 1 now reads as follows:

"Notes with appreciation the report of the World Meteorological Organization entitled 'Tropical cyclone project, plan of action', prepared by its Executive Committee Panel of Experts on Tropical Cyclones in response to General Assembly resolution 2733 D (XXV), in which the Assembly requested the World Meteorological Organization to find ways and means of mitigating the harmful effects of tropical storms."

Mr. Yango, Philippines

The last revision is in operative paragraph 6 and consists in mentioning also "the United Nations programme for the environment", and adding the elements of "preparedness for" and "detection" of natural disasters to those originally mentioned with respect to the field of United Nations natural disaster assistance. Operative paragraph 6 now reads as follows:

"Recommends integrated action through increased co-operation and co-ordination between the World Meteorological Organization, the United Nations Development Programme, and the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator and the United Nations programme for the environment in the field of United Nations natural disaster assistance, particularly the preparedness for, and the prediction, detection, prevention and control of, natural disasters".

These revisions were made after due consultation among the co-sponsors.

Having undertaken all the revisions made in the original draft resolution I beg the indulgence of the Committee with respect to a further revision as a result of consultations with some delegations, a revision agreed to by all the co-sponsors which I would now like to submit orally.

This refers to the sixth preambular paragraph. In the first line insert the word "various" between the words "the" and "recommendations", and delete the subsequent words "of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment". Thus that paragraph as revised in document A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1 and now amended orally would read as follows:

"Bearing in mind the various recommendations in the field of natural disaster prevention and the measures adopted in resolution 2816 (XXVI) of 14 December 1971 with a view to improving the co-ordination and effectiveness of international efforts to deal with natural disaster and stressing the importance of pre-disaster planning".

The co-sponsors believe that the new amendment to this preambular paragraph does not detract from the substance of the draft resolution inasmuch as the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment would still be deliberated upon by another Committee of the General Assembly.

Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that there is a specific mention in operative paragraph 6 of the United Nations programme for the environment.

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

Having indicated all the changes made, I commend the present 17-Power draft resolution to the Committee for unanimous approval.

Before I conclude may I be allowed to say, on behalf of my delegation that the modest projects being carried out by the Philippines on the lines suggested in the WMO plan of action are in varying degrees being undertaken also by our neighbouring countries in South-East Asia. Indeed, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) today has under consideration a plan of somewhat broader scope intended to encompass other forms of natural disasters of which the region is often the victim. The ASEAN plan is being forged in the spirit of mutual assistance and on humanitarian grounds, but its true basis is the recognition that natural disasters are an important factor in retarding economic and social progress in the region.

Significantly, however, the ASEAN proposal fits in very closely with the present draft resolution, which requests Member States to undertake or intensify research and operational projects leading to the mitigation of the harmful effects of natural disasters, in conformity with resolution 2733 B (XXV).

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

Similarly, the ASEAN proposal recognizes that the benefits of advanced scientific knowledge in the field of meteorology, specifically in the prevention and control of natural disasters, can be made universally available only through international collaboration.

It only remains for me now to put on record the deep gratitude of my delegation and my Government to those delegations who have expressed in the most felicitous manner their support for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1. I also take great pleasure in extending my delegation's gratitude to other delegations for their very warm and gracious words about the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, General Carlos P. Romulo, who introduced the draft resolution on 16 October. Their generosity is appreciated by General Romulo and by my delegation more than words can say.

Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): First we propose a small amendment to the resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.608 concerning agenda items 28 and 29. In that resolution paragraph 24 should be amended in the following way. Where various specialized agencies are mentioned, including the World Meteorological Organization, International Telecommunication Union and UNESCO, I would like to propose that the Food and Agriculture Organization also be mentioned.

I also want to make a statement concerning an amendment proposed yesterday by Austria and Sweden to the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1. As the representative of Sweden who proposed this amendment yesterday pointed out, I think, and as I would like to make clear, the idea of the delegations of Austria and Sweden in proposing that amendment was to reach a consensus on the question which seems to have created a certain amount of division in this Committee. It was exclusively in this spirit and after consultations with a great many delegations which led us to believe that this might be a worthwhile effort, that yesterday we proposed that amendment to the revised draft resolution. In the light of further consultations this morning it does not appear to form the basis for a consensus; a basis which would -- and this

(Mr. Jankowitsch, Austria)

was our primary concern in this matter -- spare this Committee a divisive vote on a question which we thought we were ready to tackle with united forces and not from different points of view. It is a matter of great regret to our delegations that this effort to achieve a consensus by proposing an amendment has apparently not been successful and we do not wish to provide further material for a continuation of controversy and divide the Committee further on this. Therefore, with the agreement of the delegation of Sweden, I regretfully withdraw this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Belgium on a point of order.

Mr. van USSEL (Belgium) (interpretation from French): After listening with great interest to the statement made by the representative of Austria who announced the withdrawal of the amendment which he submitted yesterday together with the Swedish delegation, the following countries, Australia, Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, have decided to take over the amendments which appear in document A/C.1/L.609 on their own account. We obviously regret very much that the amendments have been withdrawn by the representatives of Austria and Sweden. We think that these are exceedingly useful amendments which reflect the concerns of the First Committee as a whole, and that is why we have decided to sponsor the amendments ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Canada on a point of order.

Mr. WANG (Canada): I just want to say that Canada should be considered as among the co-sponsors of the resolution which the representative of Belgium has just introduced.

Mr. LECLERCQ (France) (interpretation from French): My remarks refer only to the translation of draft resolution A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1. In the fourth preambular paragraph of the French text, I read, "élargir l'échange de renseignements et de richesses culturelles". The English version has "information". Yesterday when I listened to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union I noticed that the interpreter said "information" rather than "renseignements". There is a significant difference and I should like to be reassured on this point.

The second point to which I would like to draw your attention concerns the first operative paragraph. As the representative of Belgium said, "necessary" in English is "nécessaire" in French, not "indispensable".

Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As this is the first time my delegation has spoken in the First Committee I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election as the Chairman of this Committee of the General Assembly. I also take this opportunity to extend the congratulations of my delegation to the other officers of the Committee, the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur.

The delegation of Afghanistan has asked to speak in order to state its views on the resolutions presented to the First Committee. With respect to the items so far under consideration, the delegation of Afghanistan fully supports the resolution presented by the representative of Austria and several other delegations and contained in document A/C.1/L.608, as revised this morning by the representative of Austria.

Once again, this year we have seen that significant progress has been achieved in the field of the law of outer space by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. With respect to legal matters considerable progress has been achieved by the Legal Sub-Committee in connexion with the draft convention relating to the moon and the draft convention on the registration of objects being launched into space.

With respect to the unresolved issues concerning the draft convention on the moon, my delegation is of the view that the draft convention relating to the moon should apply also to other celestial bodies until such time as other specific treaties come into force.

Regarding the issue of the natural resources of the moon, we are of the view that the draft convention relating to the moon should also envisage the legal régime concerning its natural resources and that the natural resources of the moon should form part of the common heritage of mankind.

The Afghan delegation fully supports the initiative of the delegations of Canada and France in preparing a draft convention on the registration of objects being launched into outer space. The Afghan delegation shares the view expressed by many representatives in this Committee that the completion of a draft convention on this issue is of significant importance for the implementation of the Agreement on the rescue of astronauts and the return of space objects, as well as the draft convention on liability for damage caused by objects being launched into space.

In the field of technical and scientific activities and the promotion of international co-operation with respect to the application of space technology, the Afghan delegation welcomes the successes achieved by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee in making possible the spread of knowledge about space applications. We fully share the view of the Sub-Committee that it should be concerned increasingly with the practical applications of space technology, particularly as regards its applicability to the development of the developing countries. In this respect the holding of panels in different parts of the world and the extension to the developing countries of fellowships and scholarships for study and training in the field of outer space, is worthy of mention.

The Afghan delegation would like to commend the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for its very timely initiative resulting in the inclusion in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly of the question of the elaboration of an international convention on principles governing the use by States of artificial satellites for direct television broadcasting. We support the revised draft resolution presented by the delegation of the Soviet Union,

(Mr. Siddiq, Afghanistan)

together with the delegations of Iraq and Mongolia, and contained in document A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1. However, we are of the view that the General Assembly should leave it to the Committee on Outer Space to study this matter in the manner it chooses.

The delegation of Afghanistan is well aware of the potentialities of direct television broadcasting by satellites in different fields. Indeed, the use of artificial satellites for direct television broadcasting is a promising method of utilizing the science and technology of outer space for the well-being of mankind, to promote friendly relations among the different nations of the world and to exchange cultural and educational values based on the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

In this regard, the sovereign rights of Member States should be taken into consideration. My delegation also fully supports the principle of freedom of the flow of information and ideas in conformity with the principles of international law and friendly relations among States.

Finally, my delegation supports the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1, as already revised this morning by the representative of the Philippines. Discussion of ways and means of mitigating the catastrophic effects of storms and typhoons will undoubtedly lead to the alleviation of the human suffering caused by such natural calamities.

These are the general comments which the delegation of Afghanistan wishes to make on the draft resolutions before the Committee, and my delegation will vote on the basis of these comments.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would like to express its gratitude to the many delegations which, during a lengthy, useful and constructive debate on matters relating to the problem of the use of space for peaceful purposes, devoted due attention, and did so constructively, to the proposal introduced by the Soviet Union that the General Assembly decide to ask the Committee on Outer Space to devote some thought to and to prepare a draft convention which would contain international rules that could be applied to

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

the new and unprecedented phenomenon represented by the possibility that in a very few years there will be direct television broadcasting with the use of artificial earth satellites. The problem is new and interesting. It is the result of the extraordinary scientific and technological revolution which we have been witnessing in recent times. This new international phenomenon, which is a very important and useful means of communication among peoples, can be used in two ways. International law and rules can be agreed upon or, on the contrary, it can go forward in conditions of illegality, disorder, anarchy and monopoly. This is the watershed between those two diametrically opposed approaches.

The Soviet Union and the other sponsors of our draft resolution, as well as many delegations which took part in consideration of the matter, have expressed their view that in this matter it is essential to establish a set of rules and order so as to avoid illegality, disorder, chaos and the monopoly of the strong, who could make use of their scientific and technological advantages to impose their ideas, their culture, their tastes, their morality and many of their own elements which are not necessarily indispensable to the culture, civilization, history, characteristics or moral values of many other peoples of the world. That is what makes it an acute problem, and that is also the key to the understanding of the situation which obtains in the First Committee as a result of a very detailed discussion of the Soviet proposal that the Committee on Outer Space should, without undue delay and in the near future, take up this important international problem and prepare an international convention which would be acceptable to all States and would then be transmitted to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

Every State Member of the United Nations would have an opportunity to express its views on such a draft and the General Assembly could then take a decision to adopt, reject or amend it.

A most important part of the problem is the following. Are we going to have an international convention or not? Two approaches have been clearly evident in this Committee: on the one hand, that of the United States and its allies -- and let it be said in passing that most of the United States allies are NATO members -- and, on the other, that of the Soviet Union and many other countries which consider that in connexion with this new and important international problem it is necessary to establish certain international rules by which nations would abide and which would protect peoples and States from a condition of chaos, illegality, violence, monopolies and the imposition of alien ideas and ways of life through the use of this very great scientific and technical achievement of our time. That is the way things stand on this problem; that is the meaning of the proposals made by those who adhere to one or other of these views and groups.

The First Committee and every representative are, therefore, confronted with a choice. Should we choose international law and order in this new phenomenon so important for the whole of mankind; or should we leave this untouched and free in the hands of those who have the technical and scientific capability of using this great achievement for their own selfish interests? We have said officially in the General Assembly and in the First Committee that we are in favour of the first approach. It is necessary to establish rules of international law to regulate this very important new means of communication. We want order to be set up, rules to be established, for all elements which are of interest to the whole of mankind -- all peoples and nations -- especially in such an important field of mass information as direct television broadcasting by means of earth satellites.

Several drafts have been submitted on this problem. First, I should like to speak on the general draft introduced by the permanent representative of Austria. This draft is all-encompassing and we express our gratitude for the very important work done by the Austrian delegation and the permanent representative of Austria. We are grateful to him, as Chairman of the Committee on

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

Outer Space, for the tremendous work done by that Committee. We consider that this draft takes care of almost all the main problems which have been debated in the Committee; we consider this draft acceptable, and the Soviet delegation is ready to co-sponsor, support and vote in favour of it. We want thus to stress our spirit of compromise in our approach to the study of this very important new international problem, the use of space in the interest of the whole of mankind and the strengthening of peace and security in the world, and not in the interest of wars, aggression, military conflicts and tension among States.

The second draft was introduced by the representative of the Philippines on behalf of its sponsors and deals with the fight against storms and other natural calamities. We intended to act in the same way as regards this draft and that is why we drew the attention of the delegation of the Philippines and the other sponsors to the fact that the Soviet Union could not support the draft because it contained a reference to the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment.

The Soviet Union, as all representatives know, did not take part in the work of the Stockholm Conference or in the work of the United Nations Preparatory Committee during its second stage. We took part in the first session; we did not take part in the second for reasons which are well known. We objected strenuously to the discrimination which, fully in keeping with the tenets of the cold war, was still being practised by some Western Powers against a peace-loving State, a sovereign German State, the German Democratic Republic. This dogmatic cold-war position taken by certain Western Powers is utterly absurd nowadays. It is ludicrous not to allow a State like the German Democratic Republic to take part in international activities, under the aegis of the United Nations, on a most important problem of our day -- the protection of the human environment. This is the policy of the absurd; it is simply shutting one's eyes to realities.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

We all know that the German Democratic Republic is among the 10 most highly developed industrialized countries; it is in the very heartland of Europe; its factories produce if not millions at least hundreds of thousands of units of pollutants -- dust, poisons and everything that pollutes the atmosphere. Therefore, how can we deprive such a State of the possibility of taking part in the common efforts in the fight for clean air, clean earth, clean space, clean seas, clean oceans and clean rivers? It is strange, monstrous. It suffices to raise the matter in this light to understand the absurdity of the discriminatory position taken on this matter against a sovereign State in the heart of Europe, one of the 10 most highly industrialized countries of the world. The absurdity of the position of the Western Powers on this is quite clear.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

They continue the old policy of the cold war, discriminating against the German Democratic Republic. Because of that the Soviet Union did not take part in the Stockholm Conference and sent a protest against such an absurd approach on the part of some Western countries. Unfortunately, some other countries followed their lead. Operative paragraph 6 of this draft resolution on storms refers to "the United Nations programme for the environment". Now, since the Soviet Union did not take part in preparing and adopting that programme, my delegation cannot vote in favour of operative paragraph 6. Therefore, the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics intends to abstain on this paragraph and on the draft resolution as a whole. That is the position with respect to that draft resolution.

We consider that the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1) introduced by the Soviet delegation, which now has several co-sponsors -- Iraq, Mongolia, Czechoslovakia and Poland, to whom we are grateful for co-sponsoring it -- is the most logical, the most legitimate and the most timely. We draw the attention of the General Assembly and Member States to this important international problem of direct television broadcasting through satellites so that an international convention be prepared in order that this new, remarkable scientific achievement be used exclusively in the interests of mankind and not be prejudicial to it.

We are being accused that this kind of proposal, this kind of regulation, this preparation of a new law for this new, unprecedented scientific phenomenon is an infringement upon freedom of information. This is absolutely unfounded in truth and we categorically reject such allegations no matter who makes them. On the contrary, we are in favour of wide international communications, wide freedom of information. We are against violent, unilateral imposition of this information. We want this great achievement of science to be used in the interests of the whole of mankind, for the strengthening of peace, security, mutual understanding, friendship among peoples and not for incitements and conflicts.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

Well, this is understandable. This group of Western Powers is made up of close allied of the United States, and it has decided to support its ally. But we draw a conclusion from that: we were right when we decisively objected to these amendments, although they were presented by our good friends, the representatives of Austria and Sweden. We saw the basic element of these proposals. We saw that they would do away with the idea of preparing an international convention on direct television broadcasting through satellites, and the formulation of principles would be delayed indefinitely, in other words, there would be a repetition of what happened, unfortunately, in the matter of the definition of aggression. For about 20 years the United Nations has been dealing with the definition of aggression, but it is still unable to do anything about it for well-known reasons on which I shall not expound.

We have the sorry experience of the preparation of a draft convention on freedom of information. That has also been going on for about 20 years. Our friend and colleague, the representative of Saudi Arabia, refreshed our minds about this problem.

Therefore, because of their contents and regardless of the sincere intentions of our colleagues, the representatives of Austria and Sweden, to find a compromise, these amendments would in fact do away with the idea of the preparation of a convention and delay the preparation of rules and principles indefinitely. That is why we objected to these amendments when they were introduced by Austria and Sweden, and we object even more categorically to the amendments now introduced by a group of Western countries.

The fact that a group of Western Powers picked up these amendments in mid-air, so to speak, and now introduces them on its own behalf, is alone enough to convince us that we were right from the very beginning when we objected to these proposals.

Such is our attitude towards these amendments. We shall vote against them and, should they happen to be included in our draft, I think that we shall be compelled to vote against that draft. That is what we think of these amendments. In our view they reflect a position directly opposite to ours and therefore incompatible with it.

To conclude -- and I apologize for having spoken at some length -- I should like to say that as concerns the draft of my friend, the representative of Saudi Arabia, I reserve my right to speak on it somewhat later.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I wish to inform the Committee that Japan has become a co-sponsor of the draft amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.609.

Mr. CUDJOE (Ghana): As Ghana was one of the delegations that in the course of the general debate on the items on outer space made specific mention in its statement of the active role that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is playing in the promotion of international co-operation in the practical applications of space technology, my delegation wishes to support the proposal of the representative of Austria that FAO be added to the number of specialized agencies mentioned in operative paragraph 24 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.608.

Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I think I can comment very briefly on the amendments that we have just introduced, but I should not like to pass over in silence some of the somewhat unfair comments that the representative of the Soviet Union has just addressed to the co-sponsors of these amendments.

I should like to say, first of all, that it should be very clear to the Committee as a whole that the purpose of these amendments is certainly not to combat the initiative taken by the Soviet Union -- I repeat, this is certainly not the purpose of the sponsors of the amendments. What we are trying to achieve is a draft resolution which will make it possible to reach unanimity and which calls for action by the world community on the problem which concerns all States.

In this connexion I should like to remind members that it was the rule in this Committee -- as, indeed, it was in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space -- to settle our problems by consensus. For example, I remember last year when the Soviet delegation proposed the inclusion on the agenda of the item on the treaty concerning the moon, it was careful -- and we congratulated it -- to consult various delegations members of the First Committee and we came up with a joint draft which included socialist, western, African and Asian countries. We regret quite sincerely that, in a matter so important which should not lend itself to controversy, the Soviet Union this year has not followed the course it initiated last year.

(Mr. Van Ussel, Belgium)

With respect to the amendments, I think that they speak for themselves. The first amendment is designed to replace the fifth preambular paragraph by another text, and it is, I think, in accordance with the concerns of the majority of the members who have spoken in the course of the debate since Monday last. Obviously, all delegations here want a balance between the need for certain rules and regulations, on the one hand, and protection of the principle of freedom of information and the free flow of information, on the other. I think that on the first amendment there can be no possible controversy.

With respect to the second amendment dealing with the operative paragraphs, I should merely like to explain that the concern of the sponsors was not to prejudge at this juncture the legal form that a set of principles governing the use by States of earth satellites for direct television broadcasting should take. I think it is logical that we must first of all work out principles and then, in terms of those principles, take a decision on the international instrument that we should prepare. It may well be that, after having worked out principles, the Committee might recommend the conclusion of a convention. It may well be also that the Committee might recommend the conclusion of several conventions -- for example, regional conventions and bilateral treaties. But in my opinion it is still much too early to take decision on the need to conclude a single convention.

(Mr. Van Ussel, Belgium)

For that matter I might venture to draw a slight analogy with the Committee on the sea-bed and the ocean floor where the Committee had decided that it would be necessary to have a régime to be established by one or more conventions. I say this to show that when we look at this problem, the Committee on the sea-bed and ocean floor did not seek immediately to confront the Assembly with a fait accompli.

I think that with the respect to the second amendment, namely, the second paragraph of the operative part, it also reflects the concern expressed here in the First Committee. I have a feeling that the Committee shares the feeling expressed in the course of our debates. We should strengthen and revitalize the role of the Outer Space Committee whose work has been guided with so much authority and dynamism by its excellent Chairman, the Ambassador of Austria. I think that it would be a good thing if the important question raised by the Soviet delegation could be referred first to the Committee; the latter would consider it and then a decision should be taken by the Outer Space Committee to refer the matter for further consideration either to the Legal Sub-Committee or to the Working Group for direct radio broadcasting, perhaps to both sub-committees, the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and the Legal Sub-Committee so that the two could look at the problem and make recommendations. What I am trying to say is that at this time it is still much too soon to take a decision about the direct referral of this matter to a sub-committee.

With respect to certain comments that were made by the representative of the Soviet Union I should like to affirm here that our amendments are therefore not designed in any way to stifle the idea of a convention. What we want is for the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to have its hands free so that it can determine and appraise what legal formula should be used to settle the problems that may arise in connexion with the use by States of artificial television broadcasting satellites.

My second point is in response to the unfair comment made by Ambassador Malik. I should like to assert here that the authors are certainly not United States satellites -- by no means. We are all representatives of free and independent countries who are proud to be able to build their societies on the basis of the principles of freedom.

(Mr. Van Ussel, Belgium)

I hope that these few comments on the amendments that we had the honour of introducing this morning will enable this Committee unanimously to support a revised text which will be completed in this way.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that the Committee would wish to note the fact that Australia, Belgium, Canada, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom are not satellites of the United States.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): I should like to address myself to the draft resolution already revised by the Soviet Union and other co-sponsors and to the amendments presented yesterday by the delegation of Sweden and reintroduced today by the delegation of Belgium. Before doing so, I should like to refer to the lively exchange of views that occurred in our meeting yesterday in which the statement made by my delegation was subject to quotations and interpretations, and I should like to state very clearly the position of my delegation for the record.

I should like to say that it is very easy to sum up the position we have taken on this issue. We are in favour of a convention on direct broadcasts from satellites and we hope that it will be based on two very clear principles. One is the free flow of information and the second is that this free flow of information should be based on strict respect for the sovereign rights of States. On the basis of those principles, we have said in our statement that in principle we support the Soviet draft for a convention on direct broadcast satellites. Coming to the text we think that the Soviet text could and should be improved in certain ways. Mainly, we note that it lacks the first principle, which is a clear statement of the acceptance of the principle of the free flow of information. In that respect we welcome the amendment proposed by Belgium in its preambular paragraph. But at the same time I think that this preambular paragraph proposed by Belgium and other delegations causes us some difficulty and could also be improved. I refer to the words of this preambular paragraph. It is said that there is a need to balance legitimate sovereign interests. In the first place we consider that the sovereign interests of States are always legitimate interests, and I do not think that we should stress here this qualification of legitimacy. It becomes a superfluous word, which should not be introduced in this context.

(Mr. Souza e Silva, Brazil)

In the second place, reference is made to sovereign interests and I think that it would be more appropriate to speak of rights rather than interests.

In the third place, it strikes a sort of balance between sovereign rights or interests and the importance of the free flow of information. We do not consider that sovereignty should be put in a balance but that it should stand by itself. With these considerations I should like to present an amendment to the wording of this preambular paragraph which I shall read out to the Committee. The wording that we propose to this draft presented by Belgium in document A/C.1/L.609, would read as follows, starting with the third line:

"... connected with the need to ensure the free flow of communications on the basis of strict respect for the sovereign rights of States."

The wording I have just submitted to the Committee I think could meet not only the concerns expressed by the delegation of Belgium, but could also meet the concerns expressed by the author of the Soviet draft resolution himself. I think if I clearly understood his statement, he said that he should not be accused of being against the free flow of information and he also said that the sovereign rights of States should be properly preserved.

(Mr. Souza e Silva, Brazil)

So I strongly recommend the inclusion of those amendments and the acceptance by the co-sponsors of both the original and revised Soviet draft resolution of the amendments proposed by Belgium.

Concerning the operative paragraphs presented by the Belgian delegation, my delegation would not be in a position to support either of them. We think that he should agree that in dealing with the convention or agreement. Those matters should be related and referred to the Legal Sub-Committee and should not be left in open to be decided by the Committee itself, because the Committee works on the basis of a consensus and past experience has shown that when guidelines are not given to the Committee some questions remain unresolved for years, as was the case with the Convention on liability. For this reason we prefer the wording of the Soviet proposal in operative paragraph 2.

I would now just refer to the draft resolution introduced by the representative of the Philippines and say that my delegation will be happy to give its full support to that proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to announce that Ghana and Hungary are now co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.608.

Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): I think it is always a good rule in any forum of the United Nations to try and stress what unites us rather than what divides us, and I think this is all the more necessary in the present case -- and I am dealing now with the question of direct broadcast satellites -- because in fact what divides us here is minimal. I must share the regret of my colleague from Belgium at what I can only call the cold-war reaction of the Soviet Union to the amendments that have been proposed.

I want to assure the representative of the Soviet Union and all members of the Committee that the motives of my delegation -- and, I believe, of the other delegations concerned -- in taking over the parentage of the orphaned amendments are precisely the same as the motives of the delegations of Austria and Sweden in originally putting them forward.

(Mr. Jamieson, United Kingdom)

Now let us see where the area of agreement lies. I believe that we all agree that the exciting possibilities of direct television broadcasting by satellite pose the problem of balancing out and reconciling two concepts: the need to ensure the free flow of communications and the need to preserve strict respect for the sovereign rights of nations. I was interested and gratified to hear that the representative of the Soviet Union follows closely what goes on in a parliamentary democracy. This question of balance between the free flow of information and other requirements, including the requirements of social sense and taste, political issues and so on, is a matter which affects us in connexion with our national television. It is also quite clearly a matter which is of importance internationally.

The second thing on which I think we are all agreed is that this is a problem that the Outer Space Committee must get down to considering.

The third matter on which I believe we are all agreed is that some form of mutual understanding on this matter, international understanding, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the Declaration on principles concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States, is absolutely essential.

I believe that the Soviet draft resolution -- albeit my delegation would perhaps have drafted some of the preambular paragraphs in a slightly different way if we had been the authors of it -- with the amendments which my delegation and others have co-sponsored fully reflects those three points on which we are all, I believe, in agreement. I would go further and say that contrary to what Mr. Malik said many delegations, and certainly my own, by no means exclude the possibility that an international convention may turn out to be the right way to set about achieving mutual international understanding on this matter. My ambassador made it very clear in his statement in this Committee a few days ago that we certainly do not exclude that possibility, and he said specifically that it is one of the possibilities that we should bear constantly in mind.

(Mr. Jamieson, United Kingdom)

It seems to me that acceptance of the amendments which we have co-sponsored does not compromise anyone's position on the desirability of a convention. There is no question, as was suggested by Mr. Malik, of our trying to kill the idea of a convention. Still less is there any question of our wanting to impose an indefinite delay in achieving agreed principles to govern this serious, complicated and difficult matter.

I conclude therefore by saying that there is no stark division between the delegations on this matter. There is no great cleavage of opinion. On the contrary, I believe that the possibility exists of a very wide, perhaps even unanimous, measure of agreement in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to correct a slip of the tongue I made a moment ago when I said that the Committee would take note that Australia, Belgium, Canada, Italy, Japan, Netherlands and the United Kingdom were not satellites of the United States. What I meant to say of course was "according to the statement of the representative of Belgium", and so on. I hope there will be no misunderstanding about this.

I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the remarks of the representative of Belgium, I should like to be quite clear. He alleged that I had said that the intention of the sponsors of the Western amendment was to kill the initiative of the USSR. No, that is not so; I did not say that. No one can kill the initiative. It is there. It has been discussed and debated. What I said was that the objective of the amendment was to kill the idea of concluding an international convention on direct television broadcasting by earth satellite. I confirm again that the objective of that amendment is to kill the idea of the need to conclude such a convention and to delay consideration of the principles indefinitely. That is the formula used. Therefore we consider that this amendment is unacceptable.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

The representative of Belgium referred to the consensus in the Committee. I fully agree with him. We are happy that on matters of the moon we succeeded in reaching a consensus in the Committee. But after the decision of the General Assembly, when we started talking about working out a draft, we met with such a barrage that between the twenty-sixth and the twenty-seventh sessions of the General Assembly it was impossible to overcome this obstacle because of the position of the western Powers, especially the United States. In the Committee there was agreement I think on 21 articles and the preamble. But there is now a barrage and the Committee was unable to transmit a draft convention to the General Assembly.

Now, in the light of this dire experience, we would like there to be no such obstacle here, and we would like the General Assembly to consider this new important problem of direct television broadcasting through the use of artificial earth satellites. We would like it to express a firm view and to take a decision that it is necessary to conclude a convention, rather than delay matters as has happened in the examples I have already given: definition of aggression, a convention on freedom of information, and a convention on the moon. It has now been blocked despite the fact that there is a consensus on the preamble and on 21 articles. This is the way things are in fact.

Further, the representative of Belgium spoke of the free flow of information. But a question arises, whose flow? A clean flow, a creative flow in the interests of peace and mankind? Or is it to be polluted by sex, violence, propaganda, misinformation, slander, interference in international affairs, against the culture and civilization of every single nation? This is what we are talking about. Do you think that we are not interested in these problems? Who is going to be at the source of this flow of information, responsible Government officials or irresponsible private firms and companies which are ready to stoop to anything for profit? Any filthy flow of information would be disseminated by them. We do not intend to call that kind of flow "free flow of information". Will it be directed at the country itself? Fine. Go ahead. Nobody is going to interfere. This is your own internal affair. If you like that kind of information, go ahead, take it.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

But nobody has the right to direct these polluted flows and streams at other countries, to instil them in the minds of other peoples to whom these new "ethical values" are completely alien. What for? Freedom of information for what?

Many questions arise. I fully agree with the representative of Brazil who was quite right in saying that freedom of information must also entail respect for the sovereignty of States. We fully agree with this principle. Therefore, if these problems do not interest the sponsors of the amendment, the Western countries, we can only express our regret.

Finally, I accept the amendment of our distinguished Chairman. I do not know what caused his remark about satellites. I did not use the word "satellite" when speaking of the sponsors of the amendments in my speech. I never had any such idea in mind to call the sponsors of the amendments satellites of the United States. If somebody claims that I said that, I categorically reject it. I said the "allies" of the United States who wanted to help the United States, and that is what I said and that is what I repeat -- allies. Nobody is going to deny that. But allies are not always satellites. It is quite obvious. Therefore, let us be quite clear about that.

Finally, on the Philippine draft concerning storms. I address an appeal to the representative of the Philippines: If he deleted from operative paragraph 6 the words "United Nations programme for the environment in the field of the United Nations..." etc., and if he replaced that with the words "future United Nations programmes in the field of environment" -- future -- those are to be worked out with the participation of all States, then we could vote in favour of the Philippine draft.

Now, two words to the representative of the United Kingdom. If you do not intend to kill the idea of the conclusion of a convention, vote in favour of paragraph 1 of our draft and we will find a basis for a compromise and mutual understanding. But, in my first statement, I stressed that the idea of the amendment was to kill this idea of concluding a convention. I repeat that. If I understood the interpretation correctly, you do not intend to do away with the idea of a convention. That is what you said. Well, then, let us

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

vote in favour of the Soviet draft resolution. Or, rather, not the Soviet, but the draft of the several co-sponsors. Vote in favour of this idea that the convention is necessary, and I think that this is where we will find a consensus. Although I note again that the consensus is mandatory in the Committee on Outer Space, but not in the First Committee. It is sometimes difficult to reach a consensus among 132 delegations. Consensus caused the death of the League of Nations, and I would not wish our idea which is so widely supported -- the conclusion of an international convention on this important and promising field -- be killed just as the League of Nations was killed by consensus.

Mr. VALLARTA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Forgive me for speaking at this late hour, but my delegation would like to support the sub-amendment of the representative of Brazil. My delegation had some doubts about this paragraph introduced by Belgium and other States (A/C.1/L.613). We had the following doubts. Some delegations, as well as the text of Belgium and other States, claim that there are two contradictory principles in international law: the sovereignty of States, and the free flow of communications. This is not the opinion of my delegation. We consider that there is only one fundamental principle, that of the sovereignty of States. The free flow of information is not a principle which can be opposed to that of the sovereignty of States. It is merely a matter of agreement among the international community, which must respect the sovereignty of States.

I wanted to draw the attention of the Committee to the relevant nature of the Brazilian sub-amendment which dealt with things in their correct order when it says "connected with the need to ensure the free flow of communications on the basis of strict respect for the sovereignty of States". I would like to thank the representative of Brazil for having made things quite clear.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): Due to the lateness of the hour, I will be very brief. The purpose of my statement at this time is to refer to the amendment just proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union when he referred to operative paragraph 6 of our draft resolution. If I understood him correctly, his proposal is to amend this paragraph to read as follows:

"Recommends integrated action through increased co-operation and co-ordination between the World Meteorological Organization, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator in the future environmental programmes of the United Nations, with the participation of all States, particularly the preparedness for and the prediction, detection, prevention and control of natural disasters."

If this is the proposed amendment, on behalf of my delegation I should like to say that we will accept it. We have consulted with a number of our co-sponsors and they say that they also will be able to go along with this amendment; with regard to those with whom we have not been able to consult at this late hour, we hope that they also can accept this proposed amendment of the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN : I thank the representative of the Philippines who has spoken on behalf of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1, of which Mauritius is also a co-sponsor.

Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): I am sorry to take the floor now, but it is just for further clarification. As I understood it, the representative of the Soviet Union did make a proposal for amending operative paragraph 6 and, as I recall, he did read out the words "future environmental programmes of the United Nations". But when the representative of the Philippines read out the amendment, I understood that a few more words were added to the amendment, to the effect that the following expression would replace the existing lines 3 and 4 of operative paragraph 6. He said: "... future environmental programmes of the United Nations, with the participation of all States... ". I am not sure as to which is the correct amendment proposed by the Soviet Union, so I should like to ask for clarification on this point.

The CHAIRMAN : Is the delegation of the Philippines ready to clarify the position?

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): I am now informed that the correct amendment proposed by the Soviet Union does not refer to the participation of all States, in other words, the amendment merely refers to "future environmental programmes of the United Nations" without -- I repeat, without -- the words: "with the participation of all States".

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Philippines. Do I take it that the representative of Thailand is satisfied with this clarification? It appears that he is.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to make the following remarks. Of course the Soviet Union would not object if those words "with the participation of all States" were added. We do not insist on that in this specific case, but generally speaking of course we want the environmental programmes of the United Nations to have the participation of all States without any exception or discrimination. This is our firm position, and I declare it. But it is not in this draft resolution that we are going to settle that matter.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.