

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.105/PV.163
16 July 1976

ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 25 June 1976, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria)

Consideration of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee and the report
of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee

This record is subject to corrections.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages,
preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They
should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated
in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date
of this document to the Chief of the Official Records Section, Department
of Conference Services, Room LX-2332.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will
be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE LEGAL SUB-COMMITTEE (A/AC.105/171) AND
THE REPORT OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE (A/AC.105/170)

Mr. CEAUSU (Romania) (interpretation from French): I should like to make a few comments on the report of this Committee. However, before I do so I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to indicate that my delegation greatly appreciates the contents of the statement which you, Mr. Chairman, made at the outset of this session. My delegation likewise wishes to thank you for the interest you have demonstrated in United Nations activities in outer space as well as for the leadership you have constantly provided in presiding over this Committee. My delegation's thanks go also to the Chairmen of the two Sub-Committees, Mr. Wyzner and Mr. Carver, as well as to all of the specialists and experts of the Outer Space Affairs Division under the most effective direction of Mr. Lubos Perek. Indeed, the work of that Division serves as a basis for all the positive developments in our Committee's studies.

As has already been emphasized by many speakers during the general debate, the past year has been marked by remarkable accomplishments of a scientific and technical nature as well as from the standpoint of the application of space techniques and various spheres of human activity. The historic example of the two space Powers has been followed by the Soyuz-Apollo joint mission, the Venus sounding and the Viking mission to Mars, on which we wish to extend our heartiest congratulations. Furthermore, other countries have carried out continuous activities, particularly with regard to the application of space techniques in the service of economic and social development. The information that has been conveyed to the Secretary-General by a considerable number of countries provides a convincing image of the progress that has been achieved and the interest of States in international co-operation in this field. As far as my own country is concerned, it likewise has conducted programmes designed to apply space techniques to enhance economic and social development.

(Mr. Ceausu, Romania)

My country has already expressed its concerns in this particular sphere, primarily during the deliberations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, and I do not intend to reiterate them at this juncture.

I have undertaken to recall the technological and scientific progress of the past year because I feel it is a good indication of the progress achieved in the implementation of the legal principles and rules affecting the behaviour of individual States, as well as co-operation among them. We feel that activity in the legal field has hardly kept pace with progress in the application of space technology or the conquest of outer space.

I come now to the report of the Legal Sub-Committee. The progress achieved in the course of the last session, while appreciable, was, to our way of thinking, not satisfactory. As an example, let us take the question of the elaboration of principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting. That item has been placed on the Committee's agenda, as it has been for some years now. In the course of the last session, the Working Group was able to formulate nine principles. However, it should be recognized that the Working Group has not yet taken up the essential issues -- namely, consent and participation, content of programmes, and unlawful broadcasts. In this regard, my delegation believes principles should be devised in such a way as to guarantee the sovereign rights of States covered by such broadcasts in order to promote friendship, understanding and co-operation among peoples.

(Mr. Ceausu, Romania)

There are some who think that there must be absolute freedom in regard to direct television broadcasting and that the only restrictions should be those laid down by the State authorizing the transmissions. In that way, there is an attempt to disregard the rights of the State whose territory is covered by such transmissions. We regard that State as the only one affected by the broadcasts transmitted by another State and, consequently, the one most concerned with safeguarding its national security, public order, and public health or morality ... a subject referred to in article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The State covered by such transmissions is the most concerned in the application of article 20 of that Covenant, which prohibits propaganda for war and any advocacy of national and racial hatred, as well as any incitement to discrimination. The transmissions in question could have an effect on the territory of that State. Why, then, give this right to the State from whose territory the broadcasts are transmitted and refuse to give it to the State affected by the transmissions?

We think that it must be recognized that the State covered by direct television broadcasts has the right to know the content of the programmes in advance and to refuse to receive them if it believes that the broadcasts could have harmful effects. I wish to make it clear that we do not regard that regulation as a restriction on the wide use of this technique; rather, we regard it as a way to safeguard the interests of all States and to encourage international co-operation, which will be beneficial to all States.

My delegation wishes to take note of the progress achieved by the Legal Sub-Committee in the preparation of the principles relating to remote sensing of the earth. Here again, as the Sub-Committee's report shows, that body has not yet reached the stage of drafting texts on some fundamental questions, such as prior consent and access to the data and information obtained, and, above all, in connexion with the State to be observed. We believe that any regulation of remote sensing must be based on respect for the principle of the sovereignty of States with regard, in particular, to their natural resources and the information concerning those resources. At the same time, this regulation should encourage international co-operation to promote the maximum exploitation of the technique of remote sensing so that all countries, and especially the developing countries, may benefit from it.

(Mr. Ceausu, Romania)

With regard to the draft treaty relating to the moon, we believe that the only way to encourage international co-operation is to proclaim that the moon and its natural resources are the common heritage of mankind and to establish an international system for the exploitation of those resources, when that becomes possible. Merely to proclaim the principle of the equality of States in the exploitation of the resources of the moon would amount to enshrining the supremacy of the space Powers. We believe that it is still possible to complete the preparation of the draft treaty relating to the moon. To that end, it is necessary to understand the position and bear in mind the interests of all States and to seek generally acceptable formulas in a spirit of constructive compromise.

My delegation holds the view that the working paper presented during the last session of the Sub-Committee by the delegation of Argentina and seven other delegations offers a reasonable basis for compromise.

I should like to refer now to the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee.

In that regard we believe that the Committee should adhere to the framework of the efforts to establish the new international economic order, based on the notion of equity and social justice and aimed at a more rational use of the resources available to mankind. The discussions at the two special sessions of the General Assembly once again emphasized that the disparities existing in the present level of the scientific and technical capabilities of various countries and the limited resources in that field available to the majority of States are obstacles to the effective use of the intellectual and material potential of mankind. On the other hand, the constant scientific and technical progress and the new phenomena in international relations confer on the United Nations and, by implication, this Committee new tasks and responsibilities.

In that connexion, Mr. Chairman, you have raised the question of the use of space techniques for the development of solar energy. Other applications of space technology, such as remote sensing, are in full swing. The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should increase their activities in connexion with the practical applications of space technology. In that regard we note that the work of the Scientific

(Mr. Ceausu, Romania)

and Technical Sub-Committee is marking time. In our opinion, a very good start was made in the consideration of this problem with the request for studies by the Secretariat and the working group that met a few years ago. But there is a tendency to exaggerate. As a result, for several years the Sub-Committee has been drowned in studies that are leading it nowhere.

We believe that the work of this Committee and its Sub-Committee will, in the final analysis, be judged not by the number of studies prepared or the length of the reports and resolutions adopted, but by the specific contribution to and the practical and material support of the economic and social development of countries.

My delegation feels that it is appropriate and necessary to proceed, in an international conference, to an over-all evaluation of the results obtained and the potentials in the field of the applications of space techniques, in order to prepare an integrated plan of international co-operation. We envisage that conference not as a meeting to hold a purely scientific debate but as an action-oriented meeting whose work will result in the adoption of concrete measures and recommendations addressed to States and to all the specialized agencies.

(Mr. Ceausu, Romania)

My delegation wishes to thank Mr. Murthy, the United Nations Expert, for his indefatigable efforts to develop and implement a programme on space applications. I wish particularly to congratulate him for having succeeded in so successfully organizing such a large number of activities whilst spending so little money.

We have commented in the past and I should like to repeat today that the United Nations programme for the application of space technology is not in keeping with current and future needs, particularly from the standpoint of developing countries. If it is hoped that Member States will benefit fully from the advantages offered by space technology, then there is a definite need to develop an over-all United Nations programme for such purposes, one including all the specialized agencies.

As is noted in the report prepared by the Expert, future programmes should be based on the actual needs of developing countries. Such programmes should be designed particularly to provide developing countries with technical assistance and with means for obtaining information in the field of the application of space technology, especially as regards remote sensing. It is obvious that, without more significant financial support, such goals cannot be attained. In this connexion it is noted that for several years budgetary allocations for the financing of the programme have remained practically unchanged, while there has been an increase of the general budget as a result of inflation. If the present situation persists, it is our belief that it might perhaps be more appropriate to remove this programme from the special régime utilized by the Committee to adopt decisions and to place it under the common régime for decision-making with respect to operational activities financed from the regular budget of our Organization; the consensus method should, however, be maintained in formulating treaties and other legal instruments governing space activities by States.

Mr. STROM (Canada): Yesterday we commented on the report of the Legal Sub-Committee and we should now like to make a number of comments on the deliberations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee.

The item which received greatest attention at the thirteenth session in Geneva was that of remote sensing. My delegation was gratified to see the great interest in this subject and would suggest that this item remain as a high priority for future meetings of both Sub-Committees. There are a number of items which we feel are important in the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee report, and we hope that they will be reflected in our report. With regard to a possible United Nations conference on outer space matters, we agree with many other representatives that we should follow the recommendations of the report as outlined in paragraph 103 (A/AC.105/170).

With regard to remote sensing -- in our view the most important work of the Sub-Committee -- we should like first to point out a few of the more important points which perhaps could be included in the report of this Committee. These include excerpts from or paraphrases of the following paragraphs:

48. "The Sub-Committee noted that, although current activity in remote sensing was at present conducted as described above, the United Nations continued to play an active role in such areas as training and education, exchange of information and promotion of awareness."

50. "International co-operation is needed in order to provide the benefits of remote sensing to the majority of countries in a cost-effective manner."

52. "It was the view of the Sub-Committee that, in view of the high cost and technical difficulties, the United Nations could not be expected to own or operate either the ground or space segment of such a system in the foreseeable future."

59 and 61. "The Sub-Committee reaffirmed the view that a regional, international and national approach would be preferable for reception of remote sensing data from satellites. "The Sub-Committee was of the view that, most likely, ground facilities for receiving, pre-processing and disseminating data from remote sensing satellites would be financed, owned and operated by individual users or associations of users."

(Mr. Strom, Canada)

"It would not be as cost-effective to use satellite data relay and central pre-processing for all data."

60. "For the purposes of effecting economy and making data available to users as rapidly as possible, it would be desirable to co-locate the function of data distribution with those of reception and pre-processing at the receiving stations."

62. "The Sub-Committee also noted that, in order to realize maximum benefits from space technology, especially in developing countries, there was a need for wide dissemination of information on the technical characteristics of the present and future generations of remote sensing satellites as well as on the technical characteristics of the facilities needed for adequate reception of information from these satellites."

63. "The Sub-Committee was of the view that questions relating to dissemination of data from remote sensing satellites deserved the most careful attention because of their legal, organizational and technical implications involving the access of States to data pertaining to their own territories as well as the availability of such data to other States. It was noted that different legal, organizational and technical alternatives for future operational remote sensing activities might have different effects and implications with regard to data dissemination." It is our view that the above points need little more than confirmation by this Committee. However, one point which definitely requires full discussion by our Committee is paragraph 80. Many representatives have already made statements on this paragraph concerning the options to be considered by this parent Committee.

(Dr. Strom, Canada)

The resolution of remote sensing problems may have a most important impact on Canada, a country of large area, much of it of a forbidding and untouched nature, and of relatively small population. This is perhaps an ideal combination for cost-effective use of this challenging new technology. Thus, through formal statements, informal discussions and so on, we have continually supported proposals which, in our opinion, would assist in the advancement of debate in this Committee and our two Sub-Committees.

During yesterday's discussion of paragraph 80 of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee report, we heard a number of representatives support various options proposed by the Sub-Committee, and new ones offered. In our view, the various proposals were all interesting, and most could lead to increased progress in our work. There were many objections to the various proposals. It was suggested, for example, that there is already adequate co-ordination between the Committee and its Sub-Committees, and that we are making good progress. While we do not agree with that suggestion, we do feel that improvements are always possible.

We feel that this Committee now has four alternatives before it, all of which, in our opinion, would tend to assist us in our work in this most important area.

First, corresponding to paragraph 80 (a) -- that is, option (a) -- it could establish a working group on satellite remote sensing with terms of reference covering all aspects of the problem, including technical, economic, organizational and legal matters. We believe that this course of action would be useful, and we could support it despite the many valid objections which have been raised. However, we do recognize that there is little likelihood that we could achieve unanimous agreement to this proposal.

Secondly -- or option (b) -- it could form an ad hoc panel of experts. We believe this too is a valuable and useful suggestion, and we would be pleased to support it. But again, we suspect that there is not likely to be unanimous support from all our members.

Thirdly, the next meetings of our two Sub-Committees could be scheduled to overlap, with some joint meetings planned to discuss the remote sensing issues.

(Dr. Strom, Canada)

This most helpful proposal by the representative of Austria seems very attractive to us. Quite frankly, we find it difficult to understand the objections which have been raised to this proposal. It would, of course, be an experiment, and we could not be certain that it would work. But it seems to us that it would certainly be worth a try.

Fourth, the Committee could make more effective use of the existing machinery to improve our progress.

We found the arguments presented by the representative of the USSR to be logical. Indeed, this Committee should be able to provide improved co-ordination and advancement in the debate. Perhaps the two Sub-Committees could be asked to specifically point out areas of concern which cannot be completely resolved by them, and these should be placed on our agenda as specific items to be debated. Perhaps by doing this, more States would be encouraged to provide more support to their delegations. For example, perhaps more scientists would attend the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, and these scientists could be made available to assist the members of individual delegations to the Legal Sub-Committee and also to the parent Committee.

I should like to point out that my delegation came here fully prepared to try to make concrete progress at this meeting. We included scientific and legal advisers -- the same ones who attended the two Sub-Committee meetings. Of course, we recognize that this is not always possible for us or for others.

In conclusion, on this particular topic, I should like to reiterate Canada's view that any or all of these four suggestions could lead to improvements in our progress in the deliberations on remote sensing from space. We recognize that while we favour increased progress in these debates, perhaps other representatives do not share our view.

Now I should like to try to clarify some points, as suggested by Ambassador Rydbeck of Sweden during his opening statement. With regard to the question of the definition of data and information, I suggest that the clue lies in paragraph 23 of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee report, which lists the six basic elements of a remote sensing system: data acquisition, data reception, data pre-processing, data storage and dissemination,

(Dr. Strom, Canada)

data analysis and information utilization. We interpret "data" to be the output of the first four stages, up to and including data dissemination and storage. Information is extracted from the data analysis step. I hope this brief explanation will be helpful to the Committee.

Finally, I should like to mention briefly the informal working paper (A/AC.105/C.1/L.80) prepared by Canada for consideration by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, at the specific request of that Sub-Committee. It was an attempt to point out the technical, financial and organizational implications of a number of possible legal régimes governing data dissemination.

Mr. DALTON (United Kingdom): My delegation welcomes the discussion which began yesterday, and which is continuing today, on the details of the two reports of the Sub-Committees which are before us. I believe that we have covered some useful ground. In our statement today, my delegation would like to make some detailed remarks on the question of direct broadcasting from satellites, one brief point on remote sensing, and then some more detailed comments on the question of the way in which the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its subsidiary bodies organize their work.

First, in connexion with direct broadcasting from satellites, the United Kingdom is well aware, and has great sympathy with, the contention that States have the right to choose their own social systems and their own cultures, as well. However, we believe that this Committee should not lose sight of the fact that States and peoples are comprised of individuals, and that individuals also have a right of choice in the fields of information, social questions and of culture.

In connexion with the principle relating to consent and participation, therefore, my delegation does not consider that States enjoy absolute sovereign rights in respect of the information available in their territories. Such sovereign rights might have been enjoyed in the past, but at present a large number of international instruments proclaim freedom of information, regardless of frontiers. These instruments include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 19; the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 19; the European Convention on Human Rights, article 10; the

(Mr. Dalton, United Kingdom)

American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man, article 4; and the Declaration on Principles embodied in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

To illustrate the point that I am making, perhaps I might quote from this Principle 7:

"The participating States will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all; without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

This principle continues:

"They will promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms, all of which derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development."

My delegation would like to draw attention to the word "all" in the first sentence which I read out, which, I submit, relates to individuals.

Secondly, we should like to call attention, in the second sentence, to the phrase "the inherent dignity of the human person".

(Mr. Dalton, United Kingdom)

If I may now turn to the Canadian-Swedish proposal, which has been put forward as one means of reconciling the difficulty in which this Committee finds itself over the principle of consent and participation, the United Kingdom is open to persuasion and argument on all aspects of this question, but even with the very useful clarifications which have been put forward in the course of yesterday's debate and today's we continue to have some misgivings. The representative of Sweden made an eloquent defence of their proposal on the grounds that it amounted to a system of licensing. My delegation wonders, however, whether, in putting forward the idea of licensing, we are not endorsing a distinction with little difference involved. I assume that in assessing an application for a licence the licensing State would need very detailed information about the way in which the State applying for such a licence intended to use the technique of direct broadcasting. It occurs to me -- but, as I said, my delegation is open to persuasion on this point -- that there is a degree of unilateral control involved here which it may not be the intention of the proponents of this proposal to put forward.

Next, if I might refer briefly to the remarks made yesterday by the representative of the USSR who suggested that we might get round some of the difficulties that remained in connexion with direct broadcasting by further efforts here and now, my delegation is not at all convinced that it would be possible and we would prefer to abide by the procedure recommended by the Legal Sub-Committee, namely, that the nine principles which were formulated last year should be looked at again and in effect given a second reading in order to improve their drafting where necessary, and that, in addition, further efforts should be made to resolve the problems in connexion with those principles on which no single text has been put forward.

One brief point in connexion with remote sensing --- at the meeting of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, there was not time to discuss adequately, with a view to making a reference in the report a suggestion by the United Kingdom representative that monitoring of the environment, using space techniques, be included in the future programme of work of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. I do not wish to go into the details of what my delegation had in mind in putting forward this proposal, but wish

(Mr. Dalton, United Kingdom)

simply to repeat it here in view of the fact that it was not possible to include a reference to this proposal in the report of the Sub-Committee.

Turning to the question of co-ordination between the two Sub-Committees and the main Committee and of the organization of our work, my delegation retains an open mind on the question of a joint meeting whereby the two Sub-Committees would get together to thrash out problems that they have in common. However, I should like to put forward one or two considerations which suggest that maybe a solution to the problem of communication between the two Sub-Committees is available given the tools which the main Committee and its two Sub-Committees already have at hand.

First of all, we sympathize with the views put forward yesterday by the delegations of France and the United States that co-ordination may be primarily a matter for individual delegations.

Secondly, it might be useful if the Legal Sub-Committee and the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee were to make further efforts to give precise formulation and detailed supporting arguments in the case of questions which they wish to address to each other. This might make it easier for each Sub-Committee to address itself to the problem problems of the other Sub-Committee.

Thirdly, both Sub-Committees -- and, indeed, the main Committee -- might make better use of the time they have available. For example, they could give a higher priority to the questions addressed to each other by other Sub-Committees or, indeed, by the main Committee. They could move them further up in the agenda and I have in mind here a similar proposal to that we have just heard from the delegation of Canada, that they might even be given a specific place on the agenda rather than be lost in the general discussion that takes place on the existing items on the agenda.

Another way in which we might improve the efficiency of the work of this body is for us to spend less time on general debate and in the enunciation of general statements. Much of the material that we hear expressed so eloquently can be found in the supporting documentation of our meetings, and, as we all know, the nuggets of detailed opinion on the matters which really need resolution can be lost in the course of general statements.

Mr. CHAHID-NOURAI (France) (interpretation from French): The two questions which we traditionally submit within the framework of the Committee are the following: Where are we and what can we do for the forthcoming year? It is in the light of these two questions that I should like briefly to deal with the a few questions which were brought up in both the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and the Legal Sub-Committee.

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

23/8/jf

With regard to the remote sensing of earth resources by means of satellites, I should first like to say that, while we support what the delegation of Canada said a few moments ago, as far as we are concerned there is no doubt with regard to the respective definitions of the concepts of data and information. We believe that most delegations have no doubts regarding that distinction because it is contained in paragraph 8 of Annex III of the Legal Sub-Committee's report. That paragraph indicates that the Working Group on Remote Sensing stated that for the purposes of the report, the term "data" meant raw products emanating from a remote sensing satellite as well as the pre-processed but non-analysed products obtained from these raw products, and that the term "information" meant the results of the analysis of the above-mentioned pre-processed data, in whatever format. And this paragraph 8 adds, and this is what is important:

In this connexion, the view was expressed that, with reference to paragraph 23 of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee on its thirteenth session, points (1) to (4) in paragraph 23 concerned "data", and points (5) and (6) concerned "information".

My delegation believes that the distinction between data and information is relatively clear in the minds of most delegations present here.

Now I should like briefly to speak of the work of the Legal Sub-Committee and of what we can do next year.

As my delegation pointed out in its general statement on Wednesday afternoon, we believe that the Legal Sub-Committee has carried out significant work on this item. At this time last year it would have been hard to believe so much could have been achieved. If there is a small problem of co-ordination, a problem denied by certain delegations, this problem, as my delegation pointed out yesterday afternoon, can undoubtedly be resolved by this Committee.

In the immediate future, and as far as next year is concerned, my delegation believes that the subject should obviously continue to be accorded high priority, and, because the method we used last year proved effective, we also believe that it should continue to be used and that we should on the one hand continue to draft the principles on the basis of common points of view that have been arrived at and, on the other, try to obtain new points of agreement.

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

As to substance, my delegation believes that the distinction mentioned a few moments ago with regard to information and data could be absolutely central in trying to determine what relates to national sovereignty over resources and what relates to the other principle involved, which could generally be called the principle of participation. Indeed, it seems to us that only what is directly usable to determine the nature or evolution of resources relates to the concept of national sovereignty over resources, and therefore what is important here is information. Data -- which cannot be used directly because, even if they have been pre-processed, they have not been analysed -- do not, in our opinion, fall within the concept of national sovereignty over resources.

With regard to direct television broadcasting, there again we believe that last year the Legal Sub-Committee carried out significant work thanks to its prudent approach of leaving pending the more difficult problem and concentrating upon improving the principles already drafted, deleting the square brackets in the principles contained in the adopted drafts. Next year, as the representative of the United Kingdom has pointed out, two series of undertakings will have to be carried out. The first is quite minor: a slight improvement in the texts which, I must acknowledge, have certain deficiencies of drafting and form. We should perhaps point out that such improvement of the text could be postponed until the final stage of drafting the declaration. Thus, if we do not complete the final stage next year, this initial task could perhaps be postponed until the following year.

On the other hand, the problem which was not studied this year and is to be studied next year is what has been referred to thus far as prior consent and participation. How are we to settle this problem? Here again there are two possible approaches. The first is to draft principles and the second is to try to obtain common points of view on some of the items. My delegation would like to state what it believes these common points of view could be. First, we believe that the system to be set up should be as simple and as effective as possible. Furthermore, this system must guarantee a balance of rights and guarantees -- with regard to States to which direct television broadcasts will be directed, there are certain rights we cannot ignore. First, there is the right of granting, and therefore the right of withdrawing, authority to broadcast. The Canadian

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

and Swedish delegations have referred to licences or permits, but it is obvious they have not given those words very precise legal definitions, as Ambassador Cocca pointed out the other day. What we must bear in mind from their statement is the general idea of a system of authorizations comparable to those existing in a number of countries. Nevertheless there is a slight ambiguity, which my delegation would like to clear up, with regard to the possibility of withdrawing authorization. We have been told that the only possible method is not to renew an authorization, and that it apparently could not be stipulated that the licence or authorization to broadcast could be withdrawn. Indeed, if we consider the principal systems already in existence, particularly those of the larger States, we note that in a very limited number of cases there does exist this possibility of withdrawing licences -- for instance, when stations do not comply with the rules laid down by the bodies regulating communications, and, to be more precise, when respect for equity in the treatment of opinions is not observed. Together with this right to grant authorization, which in our opinion implies the right to withdraw it, within certain limits naturally, there is also the right of participation in programmes, and we believe that the experience of India, however experimental or special in nature, merits consideration. In the course of this experiment, the programmes were defined in large measure by the Indian Government. Of course, we cannot say that at the operational stage and for general programmes, that necessarily should be the case. It is simply a matter of pointing out that States which receive such broadcasts do have the right to participate in defining the programmes should they ask to do so.

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

It seems to us necessary to agree that the State to which the broadcasts are transmitted has a third right; that is, to ensure that the broadcasts are in conformity with its legislation -- on condition, of course, that there is no discriminatory treatment vis-à-vis the State that is broadcasting from space. All, or almost all, of our States have some restrictive regulations which do not infringe on freedom of information. As an example, there are the regulations concerning advertising, which no country regards as being covered by the principle of freedom of information. I have in mind also the right to equal time to make a reply. There are also some controls connected with equal treatment of various parties in election campaigns, for instance.

That list is obviously not exhaustive. I have merely mentioned some rights which my delegation regards as inherent in the very idea of sovereignty, but which do not basically affect the principle of freedom of information.

Alongside these rights of the State receiving the broadcasts there are, in my delegation's opinion, a number of guarantees which it must be agreed that the State wishing to engage in direct television broadcasting has. It would be particularly dangerous if in the system of consultations that will most probably be adopted exaggerated conclusions were to be drawn from the possible silence of the State that is to receive the direct television broadcasts. In that connexion the problem arises of the meaning that must be given to the silence of a State that has been requested to receive direct television broadcasts and that does not answer. In the law of our respective States, silence can always have two effects: a positive effect and a negative effect. It would be extremely dangerous, for the development both of freedom of information and of science and technology, to draw the conclusion from the State's silence that its reply is in fact negative.

A second type of guarantee could be constituted by the amount of time granted to the State to reply to the proposal that it receive broadcasts in its territory.

Here again, the list is not exhaustive. I wished very briefly to mention some points on which my delegation believes that common views could be established. Then, on the basis of those common views, principles could be drafted.

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

To conclude on that question, my delegation believes that the highest priority should continue to be given to the problems relating to direct television broadcasting. We believe that the method that was followed last year with regard to remote sensing could be used to delimit this delicate problem -- much more delicate than those examined last year -- of prior consent. We propose that the problem be approached from the two points of view involved -- that is, the point of view of the transmitting State and the point of view of the receiving State.

Furthermore, my delegation proposes that if the ITU Conference has produced some results before the session of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, that Sub-Committee should make a preliminary judgement of the implications of that ITU Conference for the work of the Outer Space Committee and its Sub-Committees -- even if the reports are not available. If that work cannot be done by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, it should be done at the very beginning of the Legal Sub-Committee's session.

With regard to the definition of space, my delegation has already indicated its regret that sufficient attention was not devoted to that question last year or, indeed, in previous years. Nevertheless, we are pleased to note that this year some delegations have spoken on the question and indicated their interest in it and the importance they attach to it. We note also that during this session of the Committee the representative of Nigeria has set forth his concerns in this field.

My delegation, as it has often pointed out, believes that there are two basic problems involved, two problems that revolve around two questions. The first is this: Is it really necessary to deal with this matter? Although the item has been on the agenda for a number of years, several delegations believe that it is not really a very urgent or very important question. My delegation feels that that is perhaps no longer the case.

In the legal sphere, it should be noted that the four instruments which at present govern the activities of States in outer space refer to a number of concepts that are not made explicit. As everyone knows, those concepts are: outer space, space objects or vehicles, and space activities.

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

The Convention on liability, for example, defines space objects only by indicating that the term includes also component parts of a space object. That is a strange definition. We shall be having an increasing number of space instruments. Perhaps we shall have instruments which concern activities in space and which relate to space in a less definite way than, for example, activities that now relate to satellites, which obviously are placed in outer space.

We thus come to the practical problems that arise. More and more States are becoming interested in space activities, either actively or passively. More and more activities are being undertaken in space, and those activities will progressively take on a mixed nature -- that is, they will be undertaken both in national space and in international space. Now, we all know that air law and space law are contradictory on many points. Hence, there will be an acute problem relating to the field of application of the two types of law. That means that a political problem will arise.

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

Thus we are likely to see disputes arise whose likelihood of settlement, given the silence of international legislators, would be based on nothing more than a certain number of unilateral claims or on decisions that will not be based on any initial stand taken by sovereign States as to what they understand by "outer space", "objects in space" or "space activities".

Thus, for these various reasons we believe that it is necessary to define a number of notions which were left out in the treaties and conventions on outer space. But we believe that it is possible to do so, and this is the second question with which I should now like to deal, since the argument that it is impossible to undertake such a study has often been brought up. It has been said, for instance, that the absence of sufficient scientific details has prevented us from doing anything positive or specific on this question. I might recall, however, that this situation is not without precedent, and that we need only refer in this connexion, to the discipline of the law of the sea.

It has also been said that the limits of science and technology are constantly receding and that, consequently, it would be premature to do anything which would prevent or slow down technical and scientific progress or which would be outmoded just barely after it had emerged. But, there again, nothing prevents us from taking prudent and evolutive steps which would preserve these possibilities in the future. From a strictly practical point of view, we have been told that such consideration is impossible because of lack of time and because the Legal Sub-Committee is too busy with other questions. That is true, but perhaps in the future, when one of the items which at present has priority on the agenda has been resolved, the definition of a number of notions which appear in the treaties could be undertaken, replacing the priority subject that has been resolved.

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

It has also been said that there is no satisfactory method of approach to this question. It is true that when an effort was made to approach this question scientifically, a number of difficulties were encountered which, in 1970, led to a certain amount of lassitude. My delegation believes that it might be possible to define some type of methodology for an approach to this question, specifically, by drawing up a short list of what there is to do.

The first question which arises consists of knowing what we are to define. Should we define "outer space", "space object" or "space activity", or should we define several of these notions simultaneously be stressing any one of them?

The second question is how to define one or the other, or all these notions. Should we adopt a technical approach, a scientific approach or a functional approach? The first two have already been tried in the past, and they were not successful. Perhaps we should therefore place greater importance upon the third choice.

Another question which might also arise is that of determining the scope to be given to this definition or these definitions. Should this definition or these definitions be provisional or final? Should they serve as a guide or should they be legally binding? These are fairly minor points, but they should be brought up.

I come now to the specific conclusions which my delegation wishes to make on the definition of space. I should like to highlight three points. The first is that we could perhaps change the title of the question that now appears on the agenda and in the report. Thus far we have always spoken of the "definition" or "delimitation" of space. At times we have also seen the word "activities" appear. I believe that we should now have a fairly broad definition of the subject and speak of the "definition or delimitation of outer space and/or the definition of space objects, space devices and space activities".

The second conclusion is that next year we might attempt to give this question, if not priority consideration, at least greater importance than we have in the past, to the fullest extent that time allows.

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

The third conclusion deals with methodology. It should be possible to establish a methodology for an approach to this question, and my delegation suggests that the Secretariat should draw up a list of the main items that are to be considered and which will be answered, always endeavouring to reach a common point of view before getting involved in detailed discussions of a particular solution.

I should now briefly like to say a word on the draft treaty relating to the moon. My delegation, like many others, regrets that this draft was not brought to a successful conclusion in the Legal Sub-Committee last year, particularly since at one point we were all convinced that that could have been done. At the present time there is perhaps some disenchantment on the part of some delegations. Other delegations believe, on the contrary, that success will be possible next year. In any case, one question does arise, namely, should there continue to be an opportunity to discuss this item next year, given its great interest and the importance which many of us attach to it, or should we let matters ripen for a while, so that perhaps with time they can be resolved and a compromise can be reached?

(Mr. Chahid-Nourai, France)

My delegation, I repeat, is very interested in seeing this treaty become a reality, and our only reason for raising this matter was to assess what has emerged during the debates. Apparently the principal delegations concerned have expressed certain doubts. Therefore, we believe that in order to organize our work properly we should determine the views of those principal delegations as to what should be the status of the draft treaty relating to the moon in so far as organization of our work is concerned.

Mr. YASH PAL (India): In our opening statement, our delegation referred to an offer by India of necessary facilities for setting up a regional remote sensing ground station in India. We are of course aware that the setting up of such regional stations or centres would not automatically dissolve all the problems of principle which have been continuously discussed in this body and its two Sub-Committees.

We have been asked to clarify our offer. In this regard, our delegation would like to say a few words on the possible role of such regional centres.

It should be recognized that raw data or data products obtained from remote sensing of a country are not in themselves very useful to that country unless proper analysis procedures are developed by a body of scientists, and the equipment and people to do all the work in relation to the ground-truth for the features of interest are available. The universal application of remote sensing is not all that universal without this special input. Pretty pictures on the walls do not necessarily lead to resource development. In addition to scientific interpretation of data, one also needs to develop expertise in information management, some of which is again specific to the social and physical infrastructure of the individual country. Because of this, a regional centre should not only be a regional data-receiving centre, but also a regional research centre in the science and management of remote sensing, where scientists from various countries of the region can work together to evolve instrumentation and techniques specially relevant to their needs, or the needs of their countries.

Not all countries have already established ground-truth-collecting equipment, the required sensors for this, or the high-powered computers often needed. Some of this equipment and sensors could be developed at this regional centre and loaned to the countries for special campaigns, while

(Mr. Yash Pal, India)

approaches for research could be tailored to the requirements of various countries. For example, the relative emphasis between computer-based and people-based analysis may be very different for different countries. The composite signature analysis could again require specificity, because the sizes of fields and the mix of crops would be different for different countries.

Therefore, our delegation feels that the regional data-receiving centres should in fact be in the nature of regional remote sensing development centres. Indeed, one can envisage that such centres could start functioning even before the direct data reception facilities are established.

Much of the discussion these days is in respect of the pre-operational LANDSAT satellites, which have proved to be so successful and so useful. However, there are also operational weather satellites from which the regional data can be received and disseminated to various countries. Much of this is already being done, but the high-resolution radiometer data from some of the satellites is not promptly or easily available to many countries, nor are appropriate people to use this data. This could also, in principle, come within the purview of the regional remote sensing development centres.

Turning now to the question of what India can offer for such a regional centre, the details of this can be worked out after discussion and after one knows that there is general support for this proposition. However, some information may be of use to the representatives who have asked us this question.

India is developing rather extensive facilities in the area of remote sensing. We are working on satellite imagery. We have carried out several remote sensing campaigns using aircraft; there is extensive activity in the development of sensors such as thermal infra-red scanners, multispectral scanners, television sensors, including adaptation of inexpensive video-recorders for remote sensing, and microwave radiometers at various frequencies. Payloads are being designed for remote sensing, using airplanes and free-flying and tethered balloons, and for satellites. Our first experimental satellite for earth observation will be launched in 1978, with the co-operation of the Soviet Union. We are building an earth station to receive high-resolution data from weather satellites.

(Mr. Yash Pal, India)

The facilities for photo-interpretation of remote sensing data exist and are being enhanced by setting up a signature research laboratory and other facilities. Facilities for computer-based analysis of pictures and data, using an interactive computer, are being set up. There is also some work on optical processing of pictures and on composite signature analysis.

Most of these facilities exist at one centre, where our research and development is largely concentrated. We are offering the possibility that this centre may be recognized and further developed as a regional centre for remote sensing development.

We do not yet have a LANDSAT receiving station. The reasons for this, at the moment, are non-technical.

Coming to another point, my delegation would like to share briefly some experience of the first large-scale direct broadcasting experiment which is being conducted in India -- experience which is probably relevant to some of our concerns in this Committee.

We believe that for the developing countries the primary attraction of direct broadcast satellites would be to reach remote areas, far from urban centres, with programmes related to education and development in a broad sense. This is essentially what is being attempted during the Satellite Instructional Television Experiment, which is now under way.

This is not the time or place to discuss all the insights and experiences that are being gathered, but if there is one lesson which we have learnt from this, it is the following: The programme content, the manner of presentation and the messages should relate intimately to people's needs and the existing infrastructure. Even if there is a mix of only a few programmes which leads, for example, to a farmer using a wrong seed -- and this has happened -- or which demands of him inputs that are not available -- sprayers, special types of fertilizers or special insecticides -- or holds a promise which cannot be fulfilled, the credibility of the whole package is destroyed.

(Mr. Yash Pal, India)

In a very crude sense, the direct broadcasting system in many developing countries would enable them to open a country-wide school of non-formal education. Disturbance of such a school by pop-groups or sales agents of a high-consumption society would be, to say the least, very counter-productive, and I am not referring only to consumer societies from outside but also to high-consumption societies which exist in our own urban centres. We have had experiments in villages, around cities, where the programmes have not worked because a large part of the programme was really meant for some of the city people who were looking for diversion and escapism rather than for education. Let us not take the concept of free flow of information to a level where classrooms and laboratory sessions are invaded by vaudeville players and even esoteric learned professors.

Mr. STOVIE (United States of America): I should like to make several brief comments specifically about the work of the two Sub-Committees which have met during the past year. I think it is very appropriate, first of all, to suggest that perhaps the Outer Space Committee might wish in particular to commend the work of the two Chairmen of those Sub-Committees, Ambassador Wyzner and Mr. Carver, for the particularly outstanding contributions that they have made this year in very difficult meetings with very full and controversial agendas. I think that we all owe a great deal of our success in the meetings of the Sub-Committees to those two gentlemen who contributed a great deal.

With regard to the Legal Sub-Committee, in particular, it is the feeling of the United States delegation that it would be desirable for the Outer Space Committee to endorse the work of the Legal Sub-Committee as reflected in the report of that Sub-Committee. In particular, it would seem appropriate to endorse the recommendation that the Legal Sub-Committee continue its work on the draft treaty on the moon, direct broadcasting and remote sensing agenda items with the same high priority with which it undertook its study of those items last year. It may also be desirable this year for the Outer Space Committee to urge all members of the Legal Sub-Committee to make efforts to conclude the draft treaty on the moon in the next year and to refer it to this parent Committee at our next session in 1977.

(Mr. Stowe, United States)

We think it would also be desirable to commend the work done on the drafting of principles to guide broadcasting authorities in direct television broadcasting from satellites and to request that the drafting efforts be continued. I would note that, as we have heard in several statements this morning, the text of the nine principles were agreed to by a Working Group of the Legal Sub-Committee and referred to that Sub-Committee as a whole at the end of the Working Group's session. In Annex II, paragraph 5, of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee it is recognized that the texts of the nine principles were agreed to by the Working Group. Then in paragraph 26 of the body of the report as a whole it is stated that:

"The Sub-Committee took note with appreciation of the report and of the work done by Working Group II," ---

that is, the Working Group on direct broadcasting ---

"and noted with satisfaction the formulation of the following nine principles..." ---

and then the report goes on to specify the subject-matter of those principles. The drafting of those nine principles was a considerable achievement. Obviously we must now go on to confront the most difficult of the issues in this area, those issues dealing with the question whether States should have any type of prior consent to international direct television broadcasting.

As we noted in the United States statement in the general debate, these issues are most difficult because they, in fact, involve values which reflect fundamental differences among political systems represented here. In the view of the United States, we must be most careful in developing these international guidelines to ensure the protection of the principle and, to the greatest extent that it exists, of the practice of free and open exchange of information and ideas. We hope that a continued careful and deliberate attempt by the Legal Sub-Committee to address these questions will, in fact, be able to develop a consensus formula to protect these interests as well as to accommodate the concerns that have been expressed by other delegations.

In terms of the procedures to be followed, we would agree with those who stated earlier that we have now completed in the Working Group our reading of these nine principles. Our agreement in the Legal Sub-Committee as a whole

(Mr. Stowe, United States)

will, of course, await the completion of the entire text of the relevant principles, and at the time the Working Group has completed its task it will then, in our view, be necessary to review the texts of all of the principles in the context of the entire set. Obviously, in this as in any other document, we have got to read each one of the relevant principles in light of the others. I would not anticipate that this would cause any great difficulty, but I do wish to record our view that, from the very start, we and all other delegations have been agreeing in the Working Group to these texts on an ad referendum basis with the express reservation that in the Legal Sub-Committee as a whole we wish to review them all after the Working Group has completed its task.

On the subject of remote sensing, we believe that it would be appropriate to commend the work done in the Legal Sub-Committee in beginning the examination of the legal implications of remote sensing, including the identification of common elements and, where possible on the basis of that discussion, the drafting of guiding principles.

(Mr. Stowe, United States)

It is extremely important, we believe, that in that discussion there be a great deal of attention paid to the interdisciplinary nature of remote sensing and to the need to ensure a synthesis of the scientific, technical, legal and political considerations involved.

With regard to the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, we would also urge that the full Committee endorse the conclusions and recommendations contained therein. There are two points in particular that were left open for discussion in and recommendation by the Outer Space Committee, and I should like to address them very briefly, in particular paragraph 80 relating to the co-ordinating role of the United Nations in the question of remote sensing. As I have just said, the United States delegation believes that it is extremely important that the different relevant disciplines be integrated in the development of any legal document, and certainly in terms of any organizational structures that we may attempt to develop in the United Nations.

Regarding the three options before us, the United States believes that the Committee should first of all attempt to develop specific implementation of the third option, namely, a specific and detailed examination, perhaps by the Secretariat, of ways in which we could more fully utilize this Committee and the Sub-Committees within their existing terms of reference. It is our belief that our work could, in fact, be improved by a rigorous examination of the utilization of our time and resources, and we would urge, first of all, that in the efforts to achieve the objective of co-ordination in the field of remote sensing the Committee endorse the third option suggested. We would also urge that the Committee endorse the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee relating to a conference.

In paragraph 103 of that Sub-Committee's report we find a recommendation that this Committee request the Secretary-General to inquire of all Member States as to their views on participating in such a conference and what they would see as its main objectives. This Sub-Committee also requested that the Secretariat prepare a study on certain relevant questions, the most important of which, in our view, is a rather precise examination and identification of exactly what it is that one would hope to accomplish by such a

(Mr. Stowe, United States)

conference. We believe that this question really must be answered satisfactorily before it is worth the time and the effort which would be involved in assessing or undertaking the organization of such a conference.

In conclusion, I would simply reiterate that in the view of the United States delegation both Sub-Committees have done rather outstanding work this year under difficult circumstances of a very heavy workload on the agenda and very complex questions which affect us all. We think that good beginnings have been made and we look forward to the continuation of this work, hopefully with the same rate of progress, in the coming year.

Mr. KOLOSSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): At this late hour our delegation decided to deal with only one item in our statement, that is, the item on the elaboration of principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting.

Our delegation, which in its introductory statement assessed highly the positive results attained by the European Conference, notes with great gratification the fact that the principles adopted by this Conference are becoming increasingly recognized and that the Final Act concluded in Helsinki on 1 August 1975 has been referred to by an increasing number of delegations. We welcome this and in turn we should also like to draw attention to the significant importance of the document not only for the sake of the participating States but also for the sake of the entire world and all peoples, and we should like to draw the Committee's attention to some provisions of this document.

We note the fact that an attempt has been made to stress only one section of this document, which is a single unit. It is one package, and this is well known to the members of our Committee. It is not a matter of which section of the Final Act should be discussed, but which principles governing international relations between States apply to our work. One of the delegations speaking today quoted the seventh principle of the Final Act, entitled "Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience,

(Mr. Kolossov, USSR)

religion or belief". The Head of our State signed the Final Act, and obviously he also subscribed to this principle. But we should like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the following is stated in the preamble to this section containing the declaration of principles by which the participating States will be guided in their mutual relations:

(Mr. Kolossov, USSR)

"The participating States,

" ...

"Declare their determination to respect and put into practice, each of them in its relations with all other ... States" -- we stress: 'with all other States' -- " ... the following principles," -- and very important words follow -- "which are all of primary significance, guiding their mutual relations".

Thus, in referring to this document, it becomes clearer to us that we should refer to all the other principles, to the aggregate total of the principles, and as Committee members will undoubtedly agree, a number of these principles are directly related to the problem of direct television broadcasting.

I shall not now read out all ten principles -- representatives are quite familiar with this document -- but we deem it necessary to read out a few words from Principle I, which is entitled "Sovereign Equality, Respect for the Rights Inherent in Sovereignty", which states as follows:

"The participating States will respect each other's sovereign equality and individuality as well as all the rights inherent in and encompassed by its sovereignty, including in particular the right of every State to juridical equality, to territorial integrity and to freedom and political independence. They will also respect each other's right freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems, as well as its right to determine its laws and regulations".

We could refer to Principle VI, "Non-intervention in Internal Affairs", and to Principle VIII, "Equal Rights and Self-Determination of Peoples". In the latter Principle it is specifically stated that:

" ... all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference," -- and, we stress again -- "and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development."

Do these principles apply to our work? The answer to this is given in a very important section of the Final Act devoted to co-operation in humanitarian and other fields, where there is a special section on information. In the Preamble of that section it is stated clearly and directly that:

(Mr. Kolossov, USSR)

"... this co-operation" -- in the humanitarian field -- "should take place in full respect for the principles guiding relations among participating States as set forth in the relevant document" -- that is, the principles heretofore mentioned.

Our State attaches great significance to the human person, as mentioned at the recent Congress of our Party, as well as in our introductory statement. Everything that is done is done for man; we cannot imagine any field of law -- be it diplomatic law, the law of the sea or outer space law -- being formulated and set up for anything but man. Everything that is done is done for people -- for all people, and for every man individually. But we can take any subject or object, such as a house or a building, draw a dividing line through it and examine it at different levels. We can dissect the house horizontally, vertically or diagonally, and each cross-section will be somewhat different, although we are studying the inside of the same house. Thus the question arises: how should we dissect this "house" in our Committee?

We believe that, in the light of the fact that everything is done for the sake of man, our Committee is concerned primarily with relations among States -- I repeat: among States. That is, we are drafting the legal principles and norms of intergovernmental relations, and it is not by chance that the reports of our Committee are discussed in the First Committee of the General Assembly. This bears out my suggestion that we should dissect this "house" and look at its contents from the point of view of relations among States.

Our State, the Soviet Union, is a subscriber to the human rights covenants. We are gratified that these documents are quoted even by those delegations that have not ratified them, and we should like to stress once again that these covenants do not represent a unified code of criminal or civil law. They cannot replace the corresponding national codes; the codes of each State subscribing to the covenants remain in force. These covenants are not documents that give rights directly to man; no this is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about agreements among States to codify their national legislation or to adopt codes and legislation and rules which would be in keeping with the general norms and principles contained in these important documents. Not a single citizen of any country can say: "I do not recognize a national code; I am guided by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights". The covenant is not to be referred to by individuals, but, rather, is a document to be followed by those States that have ratified and signed it.

(Mr. Kolossov, USSR)

Article 19 of this document states that everyone has the right to receive and impart information. In paragraph 3 it is stated, first of all, that such rights carry with them special duties and responsibilities and, further, that such rights and the granting of such rights to everyone in a State may be subject to certain restrictions which shall only be such as are provided by law.

Now, if article 19 of this Covenant has been taken out of context, and only paragraph 2, but not paragraph 3, has been quoted, this is understandable: after all, what can we do when States have not agreed to paragraph 2? Moreover, there is also a third paragraph to this article; this is a fact.

As to the final question, the assessment of the work of our Legal Sub-Committee at its last session in Geneva -- we are now referring only to the principles of direct television broadcasting -- our delegation has already expressed its gratification at the fact that the Working Group of that Sub-Committee was able to draft and adopt nine principles without square brackets. We do not quite understand why there was a need for a second reading. In actual fact, this was a second reading, because the first reading of these principles took place not at the last but at the preceding session of the Legal Sub-Committee, in 1975. I believe that we are now speaking about a third and final reading which will be required after we conclude the work on the remaining principles and solve the question of the final form. Reference is made in the report to the fact that we have not yet settled this issue.

Then we can speak about a third reading, or, if you like, a drafting stage.

When we look at the report of the Legal Sub-Committee we see that paragraph 26 states that:

"The Sub-Committee ... noted with satisfaction the formulation of the following nine principles:".

Nothing is said here of the fact that they require further reading or redrafting. We would regret it if any delegation thought we did not fulfil our task at the last session and did not formulate these principles.

And in paragraph 3 of Annex II of the Sub-Committee's report, it is stated that:

(Mr. Kolossov, USSR)

" ... the Working Group was successful in formulating nine principles, including minor drafting changes to two principles agreed to last year." Thus a careful reading of this report which was adopted by the Legal Sub-Committee permits us to state that agreement has been reached on the nine principles, and our delegation believes that at this present session the Committee will be able to endorse the report of the Sub-Committee, as well as the high level of agreement reached on this matter, which is so important both from the point of view of the rights of individuals and from the point of view, which is no less important, of relations among States.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.