

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTY-NINTH MEETING

Held on Wednesday, 17 September 1970, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. HAYMERLE

(Austria)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE (A/AC.105/55 and Add.1, 2 and 3);
- (b) REPORT OF THE LEGAL SUB-COMMITTEE (A/AC.105/58);
- (c) REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON DIRECT BROADCAST SATELLITES (A/AC.105/51 and A/AC.105/66)

The CHAIRMAN: I am very happy to announce that it is my understanding that the delegations that had different views about the date on which our meetings should be resumed have reached an agreement in informal consultations. If I understand rightly, the agreement is that the meetings should be resumed on 12 November. If I hear no objection, I shall ask the Rapporteur to insert that date, 12 November 1969, in the report and to read to us again the text as it now stands.

I should like also to thank all delegations for their real spirit of co-operation, the spirit which has always characterized this Committee and which still prevails. I hope that this is a good omen for reaching a successful conclusion on the substantive matter which is now under discussion.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: This is from Conference Room Paper No. 2, issued on 16 September 1969. It reads:

"The Committee decided to conclude the first part of its twelfth session with the adoption of this interim report. In addition, the Committee determined that in view of its mandate in resolution 1243 B of the General Assembly 'to complete urgently the preparation of a draft agreement on liability for damage caused by the launching of objects into outer space and to submit it to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session', consultations and negotiations should be undertaken among the member States of the Committee under the leadership of its Chairman and in consultation with the Chairman of the Legal Sub-Committee with a view to coming to an agreement on a draft convention on liability for damage. The Committee decided to hold its resumed session at the earliest possible date, and in any case not later than 12 November 1969, in order to discuss the results of these consultations and negotiations. The Committee further decided that it would submit its report of its resumed session on this matter to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly."

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to this text and it will be inserted accordingly in the report.
It was so decided.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the successful outcome of your efforts to reach a unanimous agreement on a matter which was considered to be of great importance in our session.

I should like to know if it would be possible to have from the Secretariat a comprehensive document on the state of the negotiations on the convention on liability. My delegation believes that it would be useful for the informal negotiations and for the resumed session of this Committee to have a paper in which the state of the negotiations would be clearly set out -- a paper in which the points already agreed upon would be indicated. On those points where agreement has not yet been achieved the paper should indicate the different proposals and, wherever possible, the reasons for putting forward the proposals. We believe that such a document -- if the Secretariat can prepare it -- would be useful in the informal negotiations and in the discussion at the resumed session.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Italy for his very useful suggestion, and I shall ask the Secretary of the Committee whether such a paper could be prepared by the Secretariat.

Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (Secretary of the Committee): I am certain that, in addition to the report of the Legal Sub-Committee at its last session, which gives a full account of all the proposals before the Committee, and the summary records of the Legal Sub-Committee, which also give an account of the various viewpoints discussed at the last session, the Legal Office of the Secretariat will provide all the delegations with the necessary papers.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: I refer to the report as presented in document A/AC.105/L.48. On the first page we shall change the wording to "Interim report of the Committee to the General Assembly".

(Mr. Souza e Silva, Brazil)

On the second page, under the heading "Twelfth session of the Committee", in paragraph 7, we shall insert the following sentence:

"In the course of the discussions statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, Romania, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States. The statements are reproduced in the verbatim records of the 61st to 66th meetings."

In paragraph 8, we shall add:

"The Committee also heard statements by the representatives of FAO, ITU and UNESCO and the representative of COSPAR. The statements are reproduced in the verbatim records of the 63rd to 65th meetings."

In paragraph 9, we shall insert the statement of the Chairman which I read earlier.

(Mr. Souza e Silva, Brazil)

Then we come to chapter II, "Recommendations and Decisions", and I ask the Committee to refer to the Conference Room Paper issued on 15 September. In the presentation of the draft report, the sole change to which I want to call the attention of the Committee is that the report of the Legal Sub-Committee, which was included in the third part as C, will be included in the second part of the Committee's report, and the report of the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites will have the third place.

In my presentation there is no change in the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, as regards the report of the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites, the reference made to this meeting said "intergovernmental conference of experts". We shall have to put the correct and full title of the meeting, which is "meeting of governmental experts on international arrangements in the space communications field".

In the line just above where it says "education, science and culture in the field of direct broadcast satellites", we have deleted the words "in the field of" and inserted the words "in relation to" for purposes of drafting.

Now we turn to the part which refers to the report of the Legal Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like delegations to tell me whether up to now this would meet with the approval of the Committee.

Mr. DEMORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I apologize, Mr. Chairman, but I fear that I did not understand the question very well. Is that with regard to what the Rapporteur just told us, or with regard to part A of the draft report? If possible, we should like to consider this draft, point by point. I should like to submit a few remarks, but I am not quite certain what you asked of us.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I was under the impression that, since we have referred to points A and B, we must see whether the Committee agrees with the report that has been submitted so far and whether there are any proposals in that regard.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to add my delegation's congratulations to that of the others on your work to bring about conciliation. I should also like to thank our Rapporteur and to congratulate him for the excellent draft report he has submitted. Mr. Souza e Silva has certainly been most worthy of the trust placed in him when this Committee charged him with this very delicate function, which he has fulfilled with such ability and mastery. It was a very complex task. It is important to submit on the one hand a draft which will be a faithful reflection of the debate and on the other hand a draft which may meet with the approval of all delegations. Nevertheless, he did succeed in reconciling the two requirements in practically all cases.

However, I should like to make one or two remarks on part A of the draft report, with regard to the interim report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. First of all, I should like to ask that we separate the recommendations of the Sub-Committee so that they will not be mentioned in a general manner in paragraph 1 but be separated.

In the first paragraph of part A of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, the Committee took note of and endorsed the Committee's recommendation. This is done in a general way, but my request is as follows. We should mention the different recommendations of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, but in their proper places -- in paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5 and others, if need be -- because after having read paragraph 1 we shall address ourselves to annex III and not to the parts of the report which follow. Once the Committee adopts all the recommendations of the Sub-Committee, it is pointless to read what follows in the report.

Furthermore, there would be a slight contradiction in certain cases since we approved recommendations to a certain point, and on certain points of detail there was no agreement in the Committee. I think we should mention those points on which there was agreement and do so in a forceful manner, and we should either not mention those areas on which there was no agreement or else mention them adequately so that they reflect the views expressed in this Committee. In other words, I should like to propose that paragraph 2 begin as follows: "The Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Sub-Committee that the Secretary-General should appoint a qualified individual to the Outer Space Affairs Division with the full-time task of promoting the practical applications of space technology. It endorsed the recommendations of the

(Mr. Denorme, Belgium)

Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee with regard to the functions of this specialist, as mentioned in paragraphs 24, 26, 27 and 30." With regard to the division to which this specialist should be allocated there have been divergent views in this Committee, and we could accept the suggestion to leave discretion in the matter to the Secretary-General; or perhaps suggest that the Secretary-General request the interdepartmental working group mentioned in document A/AC.105/L.41, paragraph 20, to review the Secretariat arrangements dealing with outer space and present a report on this subject, and the question of the specific allocation of the specialist in the promotion of space techniques could thus be solved. That is a specific proposal with regard to point 2.

Points 3 and 4 deal with recommendations on the future establishment of launching stations, and I think that here the question of approving those recommendations is fully reflected in the report.

With regard to point 5, the Committee should also endorse the recommendation of the Sub-Committee concerning its future work, or, even better, taking into account the debate which took place, it should be said that the Committee intends at a future session -- which should take place in February, if my memory does not fail me -- to examine the whole of the organization of the work of the Committee and Sub-Committees and to invite the members of the Committee to elaborate before the February meeting a list of suggestions, and in February it should set up a list of priorities with regard to proposals made by the members of the Sub-Committee.

Finally, concerning point 7, we could add that the Committee has adopted recommendations B and C, contained in paragraph 23 of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. I think that that would cover approximately all the questions which are now included in paragraph 1 of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Could the representative of Belgium give us in writing what he has just proposed, so that we might be able to read it? We have nothing in writing.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I have a few notes here, but if you wish I could draw up a document quite rapidly.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): First of all, I should like to ask the Committee whether there is any objection to having the report amended in the manner proposed by the delegation of Belgium.

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation, like many other delegations here, has some difficulty at this point, because of the lack of a written text of the proposal submitted by the representative of Belgium. For this reason, we should like to suggest that everything that was stated here by the representative of Belgium should be submitted in writing and be circulated to us at the second part of our session, which will meet not later than 12 November, as we understand it.

It seems to me that this is the most realistic procedure to follow, as we should then be able to study the written proposal of the Belgian delegation.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The only thing I can say is that it will not be possible to submit a report on part A, not even an interim report. There will be nothing on part A. I suggest, therefore, that Mr. Denorme should submit his proposal in writing, and then we can determine whether or not we could agree on it now; or perhaps his proposal might be so different from our text that it would require further examination and study. Does the representative of the Soviet Union agree to this proposal, namely, that we should ask Mr. Denorme to submit his suggestion in writing now so that we could read it and study it in the Committee?

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Do you mean that we should study it today, at this meeting?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Yes, I wanted to ask Mr. Denorme to submit his suggestion in writing so that we could read it and study it and then discuss it. Perhaps we could agree on it.

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that Mr. Denorme's proposal, like that by any representative in this Committee, merits serious consideration and study. For this reason, I believe it is not in Mr. Denorme's interest or the Committee's for him to submit his proposal hastily. It would hardly be justifiable; it would be a mark of disrespect to Mr. Denorme himself.

Therefore, in my opinion, it would be useful if Mr. Denorme would submit his proposal in writing, and then, once we have received that document, we could consider it at our next meeting, at which time we could express our views on it. Now we have only a few minutes remaining before we must close today's meeting, and it seems to me that there is hardly time for the Committee to examine this proposal.

Mr. EVANS (Australia): The delegation of Australia is in sympathy with the opinion just expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union on the proposals made by my colleague from Belgium. However, in the light of the fact that the representative of Belgium made a statement justifying his suggestions for additions to the draft report, I wonder whether, in fact, he might not be able, if given ten minutes or a quarter of an hour, to draft some language for us to consider, which may involve only the addition of a few words here or there in the report.

I think we all have great sympathy with this suggestion. In fact the Australian delegation -- especially in the Legal Sub-Committee meetings, and particularly where we are dealing with legal texts -- has always supported the idea of having, where possible, written texts; but we should be quite prepared to consider proposals which, if they could be formulated in a few phrases or words, we could easily dispose of here one way or the other.

This, after all, is not an abnormal position in the stage of our work that we have reached, namely, the consideration of our report. We hope that we can finally settle this matter today, as it would not be our wish to reopen these questions at our subsequent session, which has been scheduled for quite another topic.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that was the suggestion I made before. I am not quite sure how extensive a change in the report this would be, and I thought that, if the representative of Belgium could make a draft now, we could see, with the text in hand, what it involves, and then we could decide whether to postpone discussion on it until our next meeting or come to an agreement today. I think, therefore, if the representative of the Soviet Union agrees, that we should ask the representative of Belgium to tell us, in writing, what he has in mind, what kind of changes he proposes on the lines of the suggestions he has made. Then, after we have seen his proposal, I think we should decide what to do with it. Does the representative of the Soviet Union agree to this?

I am sympathetic with regard to this question, but, if there are major changes, then of course we cannot examine them now. However, if there are some minor changes, perhaps we could examine them now. I personally do not know exactly what is involved; so I should very much like to see the text before we take a decision.

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet delegation is prompted by the desire to help you, Sir, and the Belgian delegation also. However optimistic we may be, we understand how difficult it is for the Belgian delegation, in the space of ten or thirty minutes, to write that out and have it circulated.

I have deep admiration for my Australian colleague's rapid thinking and his quick suggestion, but I hardly think it possible for us to express our views in the course of a few minutes. In any case, if you insist, Mr. Chairman, we are ready to follow your recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to say to the representative of the Soviet Union that the Chairman never insists on anything, because he is entirely in the hands of the Committee. In any case I think there would be no harm -- and we should be very grateful for it -- if the representative of Belgium could tell us in writing what he proposes. Meanwhile, if the Committee agrees, we could advance our work.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): I think it would perhaps be easier for us to take decisions if the representative of Belgium indicated more precisely whether he intended only to give a complete list of the proposals -- in which case, therefore, we would not only approve in general terms the proposals of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee but we would specifically indicate all the proposals -- or it was his intention that only part of the proposals should be formally endorsed by us. In the first case, we really think that it would be very easy for the Committee to approve the text that he would submit, because there would be no substantive discussion on the text. In the second case, it would perhaps be a little more difficult for us.

The CHAIRMAN: I may perhaps ask the representative of Belgium to answer the question put to him by the representative of Italy.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The only desire here of the Belgian delegation is to make possible the adoption of a report which will faithfully reflect the debates which took place in the Committee. The proposals made by me were grouped in such a way as to show the reasons which justify them, but, if you wish, Mr. Chairman, I can either rapidly draw up a text in writing or else -- as I had hoped -- when we discuss this draft report I shall be able to submit my amendments verbally paragraph by paragraph. I did not think there would be the difficulties which seem to arise now and which make some of these proposals appear incomprehensible. Mr. Chairman, I shall do whatever you decide.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): If I may make a suggestion, I should like to ask Mr. Denorme to try to put this in writing, and then we shall be able to see, paragraph by paragraph, what changes he proposes and, if we reach agreement, that will be fine; if not, then we shall have to leave that question open until our next session, as proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union.

(continued in English)

I have been informed that the representative of India -- who has not been here until now -- wishes to speak on part A of our report. Is that correct?

Mr. ARORA (India): That is correct, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

I regret very much that, because of some very urgent work, I was obliged to be absent until now; it was not possible for me to come earlier.

Before I come to the report of the Committee, particularly part A, which is now being discussed, I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on having secured for the Committee an agreement regarding the date for the resumption of the session. I understand that 12 November has been agreed upon. I must again congratulate the delegations of the Soviet Union and Belgium for having shown a spirit of compromise and accepted this date, and I should also like to express a great deal of gratitude to the representative of France for having suggested the compromise date yesterday.

(Mr. Arora, India)

Coming to the draft report of the Committee, my delegation has felt that at the last session of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee in March very important matters were discussed, some of them arising out of the proposals made by my delegation. It is the view of my delegation that some of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee's report should find a place in the body of the report of the main Committee. Accordingly, we should like to propose the following paragraph for consideration by the Committee. I shall read it out. Perhaps the Secretariat would like to have copies made of it and later circulate them to the Committee. It reads as follows:

"The Committee took particular note of the decision of the Sub-Committee that henceforth it would itself promote more energetically the applications of space technology and, in future meetings, would consider various concrete initiatives, including, for example, panel meetings in collaboration with appropriate United Nations specialized agencies, international and/or national organizations, and also that the Secretary-General has been requested to prepare a comprehensive assessment of the requirements concerning meritorious specific requests for practical space applications, for example, survey missions, panel meetings or fellowships which may fall outside the normal purview of the specialized agencies or that of the United Nations Development Programme and the ways of meeting them, including the magnitude of the administrative, technical and financial involvement."

The language, as you will notice, is taken from the report of the Sub-Committee; it has been taken from paragraphs 26 and 27. I could read it again, if that is the wish of the Committee, or perhaps the Secretariat could have it reproduced and it could then be circulated, whichever way is more convenient.

I will perhaps have another suggestion to make, but that can come at a later stage.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to know whether that second suggestion would involve some changes or a new formula, because I feel that what you have proposed now is somewhat similar to the proposal that has been made by the representative of Belgium, that is, that we probably cannot decide today -- not having a text before us -- whether we can agree on it or whether we shall have to refer this to our next resumed session. Therefore, we should be very grateful if it would be possible to have that proposal issued as a paper.

Mr. EVANS (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take the floor again, but I do so to agree with you again that it would be useful to have a paper, and further to comment that, from the point of view of the delegation of Australia, the general outline of the suggestion that has been made would be quite acceptable to us since it does reproduce a significant conclusion from the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's report and is very largely based precisely upon the wording of that report. To that extent, I think, perhaps the proposals made by the representatives of Belgium and India are not quite in the same category.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): During the statement of the Italian delegation in the substantive discussions on the matter before us, we indicated that we attached great importance to the point of spreading new space technology mainly among developing countries. Therefore, in principle, the proposal made by the representative of India meets with our support. I must, in any case, draw attention to the fact that we are trying to single out some of the proposals put forward by the Sub-Committee. This means that we would give some priority to some of these proposals. In principle, I am not against such a proceeding, but I wonder whether it can be done without further discussion. If this Committee feels that this can be done, the Italian delegation would go along with the majority, but, in that case, it would ask that the amendment proposed by the representative of India also be extended to paragraph 13 of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee -- namely, to initiate preliminary consultation with FAO and other concerned United Nations bodies on the advisability of convening in 1971, or soon thereafter, a panel for the discussion of the applicability of space and other remote sensor techniques to the management of food resources. We think that the question of food resources is one of the main issues of the future. Therefore, if we must single out some of the proposals put forward by the Sub-Committee, we would ask that this specific proposal also be included in the scope of application of the Indian amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: If I may say a word on this, I think we have here a number of very valuable suggestions, but more and more I feel that we are not now drafting a report but are entering a question of substance and are discussing matters on which it will be very difficult to achieve agreement at this, the last

(The Chairman)

meeting of the first part of the session. I am therefore increasingly inclined to take note of all these very useful suggestions and to follow -- we shall see whether we shall proceed accordingly -- the suggestion which has been made by the representative of the Soviet Union, that is, that in all probability we cannot today solve all the problems and that we shall start this discussion at the resumed session. I should be glad if suggestions could be submitted in writing. If members can do this, we can see what we have before us, and we would have the proposals which have been made by the representative of Belgium and the representative of India and would take note of the proposal just made by the representative of Italy -- I do not know if there are any other proposals. I think, then, that we should today add just one paragraph to our interim report, to the effect that suggestions have been made and that they will be decided upon at the resumed session.

Miss ALVAREZ (France) (interpretation from French): I just wish to say that I share the view expressed by the representative of Italy with regard to knowing whether our Committee's report will cover all the recommendations which appear in the report of the Sub-Committee. I think this is a point on which our Committee should reach agreement.

I wish to make another remark concerning working procedure. I realize that some delegations will submit substantive amendments to our Committee's report and that they will require consideration. On the other hand, it is perfectly logical for delegations to present verbal amendments when a report is being considered during the last days of the Committee session. I wonder if it is necessary to postpone approval of this interim report until the resumed session. I wonder if we could not try to reach agreement and consider the report paragraph by paragraph and adopt it today or tomorrow with the amendments that are to be submitted in writing by some delegations. I do not think this should give rise to any problems; it happens in all committees, and I think we would do well to conclude consideration of this report, which is only three or four pages long and which contains recommendations of the Sub-Committee with which we are all perfectly well acquainted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I should like to assure the representative of France that what she suggests is precisely what we are trying to do right now: we are trying to reach agreement on this report. But since we have so little time we must determine whether it is possible for us to do so.

We have two alternatives: either we reach agreement this afternoon, or we defer the question until our next meeting.

(spoke in English)

I think we must now wait for the texts that are to be circulated.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada): I wish to make one comment on what you, Mr. Chairman, have just said concerning the possibility of considering at a subsequent session the amendments that are put to us today if we are unable reach agreement on them at the present meeting. It seems to me that this would in a sense destroy the understanding we reached earlier in relation to paragraph 9 and would also completely change the language read out earlier, because the point of having a second session was to consider what had happened to the negotiations on one particular matter. If we are not going to have an interim report of any substance at this meeting, I think this other whole question will have to be reopened.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case, we should have two topics on our agenda at the resumed session.

Mr. ARORA (India): I must confess that I am rather at a loss, not having arrived in time, which I regret very much. I do apologize, as I did earlier.

I can understand that there may be recommendations or suggestions which are of such a nature that they need to be considered and which have not been put before the Committee or any sub-committee, which must be considered ab initio, while there are other suggestions which have not only been considered by a committee but have already been decided on. The fact that they are not mentioned is, perhaps, an indication of a certain laxity on our part in that we did not devote attention to them earlier when the Rapporteur asked us to do so.

(Mr. Arora, India)

We regret that we did not put in these amendments earlier, but we thought we should have had an opportunity to talk about these matters again in the Committee. As a matter of fact, I spoke to the Rapporteur a few days it was yesterday or the day before -- and at that time I had the impression that there would be no difficulty in having the Sub-Committee's recommendation, which was agreed to unanimously, added to the report.

The representative of Australia has said that this is one of the important recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. We must recognize that the last session of that Sub-Committee was very important. For the first time it considered some of the important tasks that it should undertake in the future, and if we do not cover it appropriately in our report I think it will be misunderstood.

I must confess that these paragraphs are being suggested at the instance of Dr. Sarabhai, who was in New York yesterday and the day before. When I showed him the draft report of our Committee he was rather surprised and said that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, for the first time in his experience -- and he has been associated with the Sub-Committee from its very beginning -- had taken these important decisions but that they were not reflected in the main Committee's report. He thought that it would be misconstrued if they were not reflected in the report.

I think we should -- perhaps even at the cost of some delay in concluding this Committee's work -- consider some of these suggestions, including the one made just now by the representative of Italy, on which there is no difficulty and which could be added to the report. Other matters too could be discussed, and decisions taken on them, and they could be included in light of the decisions at which we arrive. I, personally, think there is no difficulty so far as these amendments are concerned. The Secretariat can have these amendments circulated as we continue to consider the other parts of the report, and then we can come back to them and see whether or not they will be accepted.

My suggestion is that we do not close consideration of part A; that we come back to it after we have considered parts B and C. In the meantime, my delegation will submit the amendment that we have proposed so that, together with the suggestion made by the representative of Italy, it may be considered towards the end of this meeting.

(Mr. Arora, India)

I mentioned earlier that I wanted to propose an amendment to paragraph 5 of part A. I do not know whether I should do so now or we shall come to it later. I am in no hurry about it.

The CHAIRMAN: May I say to the representative of India that that is exactly what we are doing now. We have reached agreement that we shall not conclude discussion of part A but that when we have seen what was proposed we shall discuss it. But doubts were raised as to whether or not this could be concluded today. We shall see what we can do when we have the text before us.

I would ask the representative of India to tell us what he has in mind so far as paragraph 3 is concerned; perhaps this, too, should be put in writing. Or is this just a minor matter?

Mr. ARORA (India): As a matter of fact, it could be considered a minor amendment or a major amendment, depending on the way one looks at it.

A decision was taken at the last meeting of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, as recorded in paragraphs 46-50 of the report of that Sub-Committee. Some procedure was laid down with regard to the future work of the Sub-Committee. It is for this Committee either to accept it or to reject it and make new suggestions. My delegation considers -- and I am speaking now after having consulted Dr. Sarabhai yesterday -- that the Sub-Committee already has many important items before it. It has taken into consideration many important subjects; it has taken initiatives in many fields; and those initiatives are appreciated by this Committee. Therefore, while this Committee might ask either the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee or the Legal Sub-Committee to present it with a list of subjects for future discussion it should not mean that the subjects already before it, or those it considers important, should not be discussed.

My delegation would therefore like to suggest an amendment to this paragraph so that the Sub-Committee could continue to consider the subjects at present before it and those which have been suggested for its consideration while it prepares a list as suggested in paragraph 5 of this report. The amendment would be as follows.

(Mr. Arora, India)

After the word "Sub-Committee" in the second line of paragraph 5, the following would be added: "while continuing its consideration of the subjects before it and already suggested for its agenda".

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the representative of India would be good enough to submit a written text of his amendment so that it may be circulated. We shall consider this matter when we discuss part A of the report.

Mr. McGOUGH (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): So far I have hesitated to intervene in the debate, but at this time my delegation feels it is necessary to make a suggestion in regard to paragraph 4, concerning the visit of the experts to the base at Mar Chiquita. My suggestion is very brief, and I do not think that it will make any basic change to the text of the paragraph. It states in the sixth line, according to the Spanish version: "to visit the Mar Chiquita station in Argentina at an appropriate time in order to report to the Committee...".

My delegation pointed out during the general debate that the experts' visit to Mar Chiquita was imminent. In fact, we also informed the Secretariat that the visit would take place between 2 and 11 October next. For that reason we think it would be more advisable and more helpful to those who will read the report of the experts to delete the words "at an appropriate time", and instead to insert a short phrase such as the following: "... the visit will take place between 2 and 11 October next". That is my suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that we can probably reach agreement on this formula now. If there are no objections, we shall add this sentence to the report in the paragraph indicated.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the Rapporteur to continue his report and speak on part II B?

Mr. SCUZA E SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: Mr. Chairman, before I continue, I should like to comment on one of the remarks made by the representative of India. He said that in the draft report which I am submitting to the Committee, some parts of the report of the meeting of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee were not reflected precisely. This report which I am submitting is not meant to reflect this or that part of the reports of subsidiary bodies; it is meant to report what happened, what was said and what was transcribed in the verbatim records and in the formal paper which was distributed in this Committee.

Although he sees the report in a different light from that in which I have presented it, unless I receive different instructions from the Committee, I shall not be able to present the report according to the individual wishes of the various delegations.

Now, proceeding to the presentation of the report, I was coming to the draft of the Legal Sub-Committee's Report, where a change has been made on page 4, the sentence in brackets "decision of the committee, etc." is deleted and on page 5 also, the sentence "last" in brackets is deleted and is to be replaced by what is stated in Conference Room Paper Number 2, page 2. These are the only modifications in the last chapter of the report.

Conference Room Paper Number 2, issued on 16 September, reads:

"With respect to the future work of the Legal Sub-Committee, the delegation of Belgium suggests that a system of priorities be established for the consideration of the question of the solution and limitation of outer space and also the other topics referred to in paragraph 14 of the Legal Sub-Committee's report."

Because there was not sufficient time to consider the Belgian suggestion, the Committee decided to defer the discussion of this matter to its next session in 1970, to be held before the ninth session of the Legal-Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I now draw the Committee's attention to the Report of the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites, which I suggest we consider paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1, 2 and 3 of the Report of the Working Group on Direct Broadcast Satellites were approved.

Mr. SKALA (Sweden): It is just a minor item. I think something is missing in the fifth line: it says: "Attention should be paid to the relevance to the developing countries." I think it should be relevance of direct broadcasting, or something like that. It seems to stand out a little alone. I am quite sure my English-speaking colleagues could confirm that there is something missing.

The CHAIRMAN: Could we, perhaps, ask our English-speaking colleagues to help us with this. What could we insert?

Mr. EVANS (Australia): In the absence of the representative of the United Kingdom, perhaps I can take it upon myself to take over for him. I do hold a brief for him to make one or two comments in his absence, if that were necessary, but what I am about to say is not one of them. But, I am sure that he would agree with the representative of Sweden that it would improve the drafting to include after the word "relevance" of direct broadcast satellites."

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that we should ask the Rapporteur to insert that wording in our text. Are there any further comments? No?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We now come to paragraph 5, which is still to be inserted in the text before us. Are there any proposals?

Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada): I should like to say only that Canada and Sweden have circulated a text, which I hope everyone has seen. I could introduce it at some length, but if it is generally agreeable perhaps it would not be necessary to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: As the Swedish and Canadian delegations are in agreement, I shall read their text, which I understand has been circulated and discussed already by several delegations. Paragraph 5 would read:

"With regard to the convening of a further session of the Working Group and bearing in mind that it was an ad hoc body, the Committee decided to recommend to the twenty-fourth General Assembly:

"(i) that it authorize the Outer Space Committee, at its first session in 1970, to consider in the light of the discussions of the two reports of the Working Group at the twenty-fourth General Assembly and of such comments of member States and of the specialized agencies concerned that may have been received by then whether a further session of the Working Group would prove desirable and,

"(ii) that it authorize the Outer Space Committee to set a place and date for such a possible further session of the Working Group if the Outer Space Committee should decide after consideration that such a further session is desirable."

I feel that that paragraph represents all the ideas which have been expressed during this meeting. As delegations have already seen the text and discussed it, and if there is no objection, I shall take it that this text would be agreeable to the Committee, and I shall ask the Rapporteur to insert it in the report.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Having disposed of part B, we shall turn now to part C, "Report of the Legal Committee", and take it up paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): First of all, I should like to make certain that I am not making a mistake. I refer to the second paragraph, on which I should like to raise a question. It is true that many members expressed their regret in the Legal Sub-Committee that the session was unable to present an agreed draft convention on liability for damage caused by objects launched into outer space. I wonder whether the Committee might replace the expression "Many members" by "The Committee expressed its regret". It seems to me that no delegation took part in the debate without expressing regret that the Committee had not been able to submit a draft. It seems to me that the Committee as a whole regretted that that was not possible.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Belgium has proposed that in paragraph 2, the opening words "Many members" should be replaced by "The Committee expressed regret..." I believe that during the whole of our debate there was no diverging view on that. All delegations have expressed their regret that the Committee has not so far completed the task which has been on our agenda for so many years. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees with the suggestion made by the representative of Belgium.

It was so decided.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I have another proposal with regard to paragraph 4. It is simply a change in form. The sentence which begins "It was agreed that the Committee should endorse..." should be changed to "The Committee decided to endorse..."

It was so decided.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: As we are discussing the report of the Legal Sub-Committee, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that we start by saying that the Committee had before it the report, and so on. I wonder whether we should use the more conventional form, that is, "The Committee had before it..." or "The Committee took note of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee...". As we have already decided on the question of priority, and we have decided on the whole of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee, my suggestion is that we should say "The Committee took note of the report".

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that there would be any objections to the suggestion just made by the representative of Belgium.

I believe that the wording suggested by our Rapporteur is a good one. However, we have not yet completed our study of the draft report of the Legal Sub-Committee's work. One paragraph has not yet been discussed. I think that we were at paragraph 4 (b) when the representative of Belgium interrupted our discussion. May we now take up this paragraph, starting with the background paper on results and so forth. I take it that there are no objections to this paragraph.

Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: I refer the Committee to the paragraph contained in Conference Room Paper No. 2, on page 2, which I read when I made the presentation of the report. I think that all delegations have that paper before them. The paragraph would, in effect, be the last paragraph of part B of our report.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I wanted to take the floor once again to say that this wording does indeed reflect our debate. However, my delegation did not confine itself to suggesting that an order of priority be established but made a precise suggestion which was supported by several other delegations. It seems to me that there appeared to be agreement on the idea that at this point we should not mention a precise order of priority, it being understood that the Committee would then prepare this order of priority at its next session in February 1970. I should like to ask if I was correct in assuming that the Committee agreed to prepare at its 1970 session a list of priorities having regard to the proposals made during this debate. If not, then I would insist that the order of priority which I proposed should be included in this paragraph since it did involve a precise suggestion made by a delegation.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Report of the Legal Sub-Committee were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): It was my understanding that no decision had been taken such as was mentioned by the representative of Belgium. In that case, for myself I do not see any difficulty in including more precisely the wording of his proposal. I think that there would probably be no objections if the wording of the proposal as made by the representative of Belgium should be inserted as it was made, more precisely.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): I assume that this also extends to the point raised by the representative of Belgium, which I myself raised, according to which the Belgian suggestion on priorities was supported by other delegations. I think that this fact should be mentioned in the report.

Mr. EVANS (Australia): It would be the understanding of the delegation of Australia that the full content of the proposal by the representative of Belgium would be made explicit in the report if that were agreed to, the full content being that the priorities as listed by him followed the statement that this only an assumption that the convention on the liability for damage had in fact been concluded. If that understanding is correct, then my delegation thinks that this is the correct way to proceed.

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation feels that since this item is contained in the report it would be useful to leave this to the drafting of the report.

The CHAIRMAN: If I am correct the representative of the Soviet Union has suggested that there should be no change in the report.

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): This is on the second page of the Russian text, in working paper No. 2 of 16 September 1969. It says here that with regard to the future work of the Legal Sub-Committee the Belgian delegation suggested the preparation of a list of priorities dealing with defining the limits of outer space and other topics covered in the Sub-Committee's report. In view of the limited time for dealing with the Belgian representative's proposal, the Committee decided to

(Mr. Piradov, USSR)

defer consideration of this proposal until the next session in 1970, which should be held before the ninth session of the Legal Sub-Committee. Our delegation supports the recommendation contained in the Rapporteur's text because it reflects the situation as it stands in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that what has been proposed is this. The representative of Belgium has suggested that there are two alternatives, that one could either say that the Committee decided that the order of priorities should be established, which the Rapporteur has very clearly said was not the case. No decision has been taken that a priority list should be established.

(The Chairman)

In any case, the second sentence should remain as it is, because there was not sufficient time to consider the Belgian suggestion, namely, "The Committee decided to defer the discussion of..."

Now the Belgian representative says that, as it is his own proposal which he has now inserted in this paper, the proposal as written does not reflect exactly what he had proposed, and so he wishes to amend the proposal that he submitted to the Committee. A second suggestion was that of the representative of Italy, who asked that the other delegations which supported this proposal should also be mentioned as having supported it. I wonder whether the representative of the Soviet Union would still have his objections if he realized that the proposal does not change the decision of this Committee -- which is adequately reflected in this paper -- that no decision has been taken on this question of priorities. The only question which has been raised is that of the representative of Belgium, who has asked that his proposal, which was submitted to this Committee, should be worded differently, because he does not believe the written text adequately represents what he has in mind. I take this to be a correct statement of the facts.

May I, perhaps, before we continue, ask the representative of Belgium what wording he would wish to have inserted in the report, after which we shall ask the representative of the Soviet Union to tell us what his objections are. If I may be quite clear, it is not a decision of this Committee that we are incorporating in this paper, but a proposal which has been made by one delegation.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Since you ask me, Sir, I should like to say that you have very accurately summarized what I have already stated. First of all, I realize that no decision was taken, as our Rapporteur has stated, and I cast no doubts on the text that was submitted to us. But I raise the question as to whether or not a decision on the principle concerning the establishment of an order of priorities at the first meeting in 1970 might not be possible. If such a decision is possible, then I shall not insist that the Belgian proposal be included. However, if such a decision is impossible at the present time, then I would simply ask that the Belgian proposal be included as it has been drafted.

(Mr. Denorme, Belgium)

All we need do is to refer to the summary records of that meeting -- when Ambassador Schuurmans took the floor -- in order to find the exact wording of this proposal, together with the explanation given by the representative of Australia with respect to the reservation that, first, the convention on liability had to be prepared. This is what I wished to say.

Furthermore, I felt that it would be useless to insist that this is a Belgian proposal. I prefer to have it anonymous. However, if it is mentioned, then I should like it to be stated that this proposal was supported by other delegations; and I note that the representative of Italy also asked that this be mentioned in the report.

Miss ALVAREZ (France) (interpretation from French): First, I should like to support the proposal made a few moments ago by the representative of Italy concerning the inclusion of a reference in this paragraph to the effect that other members of our Committee supported this proposal.

As you will recall, the representative of France spoke in favour of establishing an order of priority among the fourteen subjects which the Legal Sub-Committee included in annex V of its report. Regardless of the decision that might be taken on the four priority subjects that were suggested by the representative of Belgium, my delegation feels that it would be useful if, at the next session of our Committee in February 1970, this item of priorities, both for the Legal Sub-Committee's work as well as for the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's work, should be considered. It would be useful at this very session if our Committee could take a decision on the principle of this matter -- naturally, without prejudging the order of priority ultimately to be decided on at the next session of our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether this matter has been clarified, or whether he wishes to make some further remarks.

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I find myself in such a situation that everything seems confused to me. The situation, though confused, is not as complicated as might appear. As I understand it, the Belgian delegation wishes to clarify the point of view of the Belgian delegation. Is that right? In so doing, it has submitted an amendment to its own proposal. This is quite usual in the work of international organizations, and it seems to us that the original proposal made by the Belgian delegation is more acceptable. We should like to leave it in its original form as it stands in the report -- that is, as it appears in the report which we have before us. It is fully satisfactory as it stands in the report. We think, in this case, that there is no need to take a decision on this point, and this has been explained to us. The question is so clear that any further discussion will simply amount to deferring a final decision on the matter.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): First of all, I should like to support the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union. It is very easy to follow the thinking of various delegations concerning the organization of our work -- and in saying this, I am by no means criticizing your excellent guidance, as Chairman, of our work.

Furthermore, my delegation has no intention of amending our original proposal, made on 17 September, when Ambassador Schuurmans, the Permanent Representative of Belgium, stated in this Committee:

"Taking into account paragraphs 13, 14 and 15 of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee and the fact that a draft agreement on liability will receive the approval of the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session, my delegation" -- that is, the Belgian delegation -- "suggests the following system of priorities: first, the definition and the delimitation of outer space; secondly, the registration of objects launched into outer space; thirdly, the rules which should govern human activities on the moon and other celestial bodies;" (A/AC.105/PV.63, p. 16)

As my delegation has no change to make to this proposal, we ask that it be included as it stands in the report.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that for the time being we leave that last paragraph as we are probably going to have some discussion on it before we finally conclude the debate on part B of the report. If we were to reach agreement on paragraph 5 of the report, I would just ask whether that would conclude discussion on the report in so far as part B -- formerly part C -- is concerned.

Mr. THACHER (United States of America): I have two small points. First, with regard to the subject we have just been discussing, it may be that the representative of France would like to have language included here to embrace not only the four topics suggested for consideration by the Belgian proposal but also the fourteen topics set forth in annex V of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee, to which she referred a few minutes ago. It seems to me that, in the present formulation, there is a discrepancy in that it failed to mention annex V of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee, which contains a listing of fourteen separate topics, and, presumably, when consideration is given next year to the question of setting the priority which the Legal Sub-Committee will follow, it would also wish to take the fourteen topics into account.

The second point I should like to make is simply to suggest -- if it is agreeable to the Committee -- that with regard to the paragraph in this section, which has been referred to as paragraph 4 (b), that is to say the paragraph reading "A background paper on the results of the studies to be furnished by the specialized agencies and the IAEA in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2453...", it might be useful if the Rapporteur agreed to make a foot-note which would set forth the relevant paragraph of the resolution to which we are making reference. I believe that it is paragraph 11 in the resolution which the Assembly adopted last year. It would perhaps help the reader to understand what this paragraph means.

The CHAIRMAN: I think there have been two suggestions made by the representative of the United States. May I perhaps ask him in which way he would formulate the first.

Mr. THACHER (United States of America): The first, Mr. Chairman, was a presumption on my part, and I merely wish to suggest to the representative of France that, if she wishes to pursue it further, in drawing up the language upon which we will hopefully agree very shortly, she may wish to insert a reference to the fourteen-point list of topics contained in annex V. But, if she does not care to do so, I would certainly not press for it.

Miss ALVAREZ (France) (interpretation from French): In fact, I had alluded to the list of fourteen items which appear in annex V of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee, since the four priority items proposed by the representative of Belgium had been chosen from those fourteen items. But since this paragraph deals with the proposals submitted by the delegation of Belgium, I think that, since that delegation is satisfied with the drafting, I have nothing to add.

I should merely like to say that in this paragraph mention is made of the future session of our Committee in 1970. I should only like to know whether at that session it will be possible to have an idea of the agenda of the Committee in order to know why we will be meeting and what we shall have to consider. If the question of the date of the next session of the Sub-Committee has to be settled before the end of the General Assembly, then I should like to receive some clarifications with regard to the agenda of the next session of our Committee, which is to be held in February.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Perhaps, as I did before, I shall ask the Secretary of the Committee what is the agenda for the session beginning early next year.

Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (Secretary of the Committee): As I mentioned before, the purpose of the session which is to take place at the beginning of next year is to decide on the time and place of the meetings of the Sub-Committees. But that does not mean that this was a decision by the Committee or anybody that that session -- to be held in the early part of the year -- was to be restricted to that question; I mean that that question was resolved even without a meeting of the Committee, as it happened last year when the Committee did not meet at that

(Mr. Abdel Ghani, Secretary of the Committee)

time because the members of the Committee, in consultation with the Chairman, agreed on the schedule of the meetings of the Sub-Committees. Therefore, this procedure question is not necessarily the only item on the agenda of this session. The Committee could decide to put on the agenda of the early session of the Committee whatever topics the Committee wishes to discuss in that session. It is not necessary to be restricted to those procedural questions.

The CHAIRMAN: May I add to this that the Committee is master of its own procedure, and we can decide now that that question should be discussed at a later stage, and we will in fact have decided this when we adopt the report in this way, that is, that the Committee in its session in February next year will discuss this problem.

I think we have decided by putting this paragraph in the report. Therefore, it will be on the agenda.

Is that agreeable to the representative of France?

Miss ALVAREZ (France) (interpretation from French): Yes, Mr. Chairman. I realize, of course, that it is up to our Committee in this session to decide on the agenda and the order of procedure for its next session to be held in February.

The CHAIRMAN: The agenda of the next session will be drawn up according to the decision which we take now. So, as we decide that this question should be referred to the next session, I think it will automatically be on the agenda of the next session because it is the decision of the Committee.

As for me, there is no doubt that that will be the case. But I am in the hands of the Committee if there exists the feeling that we should take another formal decision. However, it is a decision if we insert a paragraph to that effect in the report, and I think that it was the unanimous view of this Committee that it is too early to discuss that matter now -- and that was a formal proposal by the representative of the Soviet Union, which was supported by the representative of the United States, that that matter should be discussed at the meeting in February 1970.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the Rapporteur whether this would conclude the report?

Mr. SCUZA E SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: I am in doubt only about the proposal made by the representative of Belgium.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should discuss that later.

Having had these three parts, I think we will reach agreement on this report.

May we now turn to the first question before us -- part A. We have a Belgian paper, three Indian papers and a Mexican paper. I take it all delegations have received copies of these papers?

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to make a proposal, Mr. Chairman. In view of the number of these amendments, and the desire of the Soviet delegation -- as also of other delegations, I believe -- to get to know them, I wonder if you would give us five or ten minutes so that we can read them, following which we could submit our comments.

The CHAIRMAN: Speaking as Chairman, I should like to support the suggestion just made by the representative of the Soviet Union; I myself should very much like to read the papers before we discuss them.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to support the proposal made by the Soviet delegation, but first it might perhaps be useful if my delegation clarified one point. I drew up this draft in English so that it would be possible for the Secretariat to reproduce it immediately. I have noticed that a number of words have been omitted from the text in paragraph 8, rendering it unintelligible. In order to facilitate understanding, I shall now read out the correct wording:

(spoke in English)

"With respect to the future work of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, the first session of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space in 1970 should consider the organization of the work of its sub-committees, taking into account", etc.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We shall now adjourn for a few minutes so that we may read the texts.

The meeting was suspended at 5.35 p.m. and resumed at 7 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: We can continue now. Before starting, I should like to tell you that the interpreters have asked how long they will be needed and whether they will be needed tomorrow. I have told them that I hope they will not be needed tomorrow and that I hope, too, that we shall be finished in half an hour.

Let me take this opportunity to express to our interpreters our appreciation for their patience in working with us.

I shall now call on the Rapporteur.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: We shall take up first the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee. The first amendment is that proposed by the representative of Mexico to paragraph 4. The last line should read: "The Committee welcomes the Secretary-General's decision and looks forward to receiving the experts' report".

The CHAIRMAN: As I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to the amendment proposed by Mexico.

It was so decided.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil) (Rapporteur): The second amendment is from the delegation of India. It is proposed that in paragraph 5 the following words be added after the word "Sub-Committee" in the second sentence: "while continuing its consideration of the subject before it and already suggested for its agenda".

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to the amendment proposed by the delegation of India.

It was so decided.

Mr. EVANS (Australia): Paragraph 2 would be changed to read:

"The Committee endorsed the appointment by the Secretary-General of a qualified individual with the full-time task of promoting the practical applications of space technology. It was noted that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee had recommended in paragraph 24 of its report (A/AC.105/55) that this individual should be appointed to the Outer Space Affairs Division. In this connexion a proposal was made that the individual appointed should be attached to the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. A suggestion was also made that discretion should be left to the Secretary-General in deciding where in the Secretariat the expert should work. Some delegations further considered that the Secretary-General should request the interdepartmental working group mentioned in document A/AC.105/L.41, paragraph 20, to review the Secretariat arrangements dealing with outer space and present a report on this subject to the Committee at a subsequent stage."

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to the text as read out by the representative of Australia.
It was so decided.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: We shall take up now the report of the Legal Sub-Committee. I refer first to the third paragraph, the part which is between brackets and which was deleted. We would include the words stated in Conference Room Paper No. 2, as follows:

"After discussion, the Committee decided to hold further consultations and negotiations on the liability convention (see paragraph 9 above)."

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no comments, I shall take it that the Committee agrees.

It was so decided.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: Then we have a proposed new paragraph, to follow that one, reading:

"On the proposal of the Italian delegation, the Committee agreed that, to assist the negotiations, the Secretariat should provide the necessary documentation."

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that proposal.

It was so decided.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: The next point concerns the last sentence on page 5 between brackets, which would read as follows:

"With respect to the future work of the Legal Sub-Committee, the delegation of Belgium suggested that a system of priorities be established and made a formal proposal on a possible list of such priorities at the 63rd meeting of the Committee. This proposal was supported by several delegations."

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I have no comment on that formulation but I understand that a final sentence would follow that formulation. In other words, the final sentence would be:

"Because there was not sufficient time to consider the Belgian suggestion, the Committee decided to defer the discussion of the matter to its next session in 1970, to be held before the ninth session of the Legal Sub-Committee."

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections to that text, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: The decision having been taken on the whole draft of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee, I should again like to comment on my suggestion that the initial words of this report should read, "The Committee took note of the report of the Legal Sub-Committee" instead of "The Committee had before it".

The CHAIRMAN: I think that this will meet with the agreement of the Committee. If I hear no objection it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

Mr. THACHER (United States of America): May I ask whether we have completed that portion of the report which relates to the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee since it is not clear to me whether we have considered all of the proposals put forward by Belgium in connexion with it?

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the Rapporteur if he has any other proposals before him?

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: I do not think that I have any other proposals on this portion of the report.

Mr. ARORA (India): Regarding the proposals moved by the Belgian representative, I think that he would be in a better position to state whether all the amendments which he had suggested had been taken into account and taken care of.

I thought that I should point out that there were two amendments suggested by the Indian delegation. One has been accepted, and the other one is still to be considered. I had not raised this point earlier because I thought that we had not yet completed consideration of the report, and that you, Mr. Chairman, would take it up in due course. I just thought that I would remind the Committee that there is an amendment proposed by the Indian delegation which has yet to be taken up.

The CHAIRMAN: As all delegations have before them the amendment proposed by India, I wonder whether it would be necessary to read it out or to just invite comments.

Mr. ARORA (India): I cannot comment on whether it is necessary for it to be read aloud, but perhaps everyone has read his copy of the text. My delegation has a small change to suggest. At the end of the first sentence, just an addition of a few words after the word "organizations": ", within the context of paragraphs 22 to 31 of the Sub-Committee's report".

The CHAIRMAN: Does this text meet with the approval of all delegations?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Committee still has some important proposals to discuss.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from Belgium): I think that the Rapporteur was not informed of the consultations which took place during the recess. The text which he read for paragraph 2 is, in fact, a good text. I think that it is acceptable to all delegations, a text which should be adopted, but it is necessary to effect other amendments, in particular the deletion of a phrase in

(Mr. Denorme, Belgium)

the first paragraph, where the Committee adopted the whole of the recommendations, whereas now there is a desire to adopt them paragraph by paragraph. This is my first amendment -- to delete the words beginning with the word "and" in line 2 of paragraph 1 up to the word "Sub-Committee" in line 4.

Mr. THACHER (United States of America): I am not sure that I could support this amendment because, if I understand it correctly, it would appear to remove the Committee's endorsement from those recommendations forwarded by the Sub-Committee with regard to the topics of exchange of information, encouragement of international programmes, education and training, and possibly the future work of the Committee. I am sure that this is not the intention of the representative of Belgium, but I have the feeling that if this deletion were accepted we would present a report to the General Assembly which is a considerable improvement with regard to the recommendations forwarded by the Sub-Committee in relation to the promotion of the application of space technology with regard to international sounding rocket launching facilities but not with regard to those recommendations which are contained elsewhere in the report of the Sub-Committee.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): It is in fact necessary to mention that the Committee has endorsed the Sub-Committee's recommendations regarding the exchange of information and the encouragement of teaching and training. With regard to international programmes, I should like to point out to the United States representative that this is a title with two sub-titles: the report of the Working Group, which is discussed elsewhere, and the promotion of the application of space technology. We also deal with this subject later on in our report. I think that if we keep only the recommendations on the exchange of information and the encouragement of international programmes, education and training, this would do justice to the request of the representative of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the suggestion just put forward by the representative of Belgium meet the preoccupations of the representative of the United States?

Mr. THACHER (United States of America): If I understand it correctly, this paragraph would now read:

"The Committee took note with appreciation of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's report on the work of its sixth session, and endorsed the Sub-Committee's recommendations regarding the exchange of information and education and training. The text of the Sub-Committee's recommendations is reproduced in annex II."

If this is satisfactory to other members of the Committee, it is satisfactory to me.

Mr. ARORA (India): I am sorry I missed what the representative of the United States said, but I wish to know from the representative of Belgium how the sentence will now read. Could he read the sentence, for the convenience of the Committee, as it will be with the changes he has now suggested?

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The text would read as follows:

"The Committee took note with appreciation of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's report on the work of its sixth session and endorsed the Sub-Committee's recommendations regarding the exchange of information, education and training. The text of the Sub-Committee's recommendations is reproduced in annex II."

The CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory to the Committee?

Mr. THACHER (United States of America): It is satisfactory, only before the word "education" the word "and" should also be present.

Mr. IWAI (Japan): I should like to ask for some clarification of the amendments proposed by the Belgian representative in connexion with this matter. In the amendments of the representative of Belgium, from Nos. 1 to 8, there is no sentence saying that this Committee will endorse the recommendation of the Sub-Committee concerning the establishment of points of contact in the Governments.

(Mr. Iwai, Japan)

Paragraph 1, as amended, reads: "endorsed the Sub-Committee's recommendations regarding the exchange of information and education and training". In that case, the recommendation by the Sub-Committee concerning the establishment of points of contact in the various Governments would not be covered, because this point is not mentioned in the following amendments of the representative of Belgium. I should like to know if my understanding is correct.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I recognize that the representative of Japan is right in saying that we have omitted the recommendation that this Committee should endorse the item that he just referred to. Perhaps we could complete this by saying that the Committee also endorses the recommendation to assign special service to people who would be contacted concerning the promotion of space technology in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's report.

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I had hoped that, with the coming of evening, our work would be easier and simpler. Unfortunately, our work has been going ahead along different lines. In the consultations that took place during the recess I stated that we could not agree to this procedure -- a procedure whereby after something has already been approved by our Committee, namely, the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, it is then torn into little fragments. This would create an unbalanced picture of what actually took place in the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee.

Could we not come back to the original text, namely, paragraph 1 (a) of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, in the form in which it was drafted? I believe that we could approve this report in the form in which it was approved by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee.

Paragraph 2 of this section could remain in the form in which we approved it quite recently.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I have two comments on the statement just made by the Soviet representative. First, the representative of the Soviet Union and I consulted together, and I agreed to a number of points, provided that he accepts, inter alia, the first Belgian amendment. The Soviet representative agreed to this suggestion.

Secondly, at this point, if we change this procedure we will be including a contradiction in the report, because it is contradictory to say that we approve of all the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on the one hand, and on the other hand we then analyse these recommendations and say that we approve of them in part, but certain delegations have some doubts about their validity. For this reason, I should like to ask that we keep to the agreement that we concluded, and I am ready to accede to the comments and suggestions made by the United States and Japan, but we cannot agree with the Soviet representative to the effect that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's report has been approved. That is not so. It was approved by the Sub-Committee, but it is still under study by our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether he would accept this formula?

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not want to delay our work. I fully agree with our Belgian colleague that agreements should be kept, but I have the impression that, from the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, only one part of that report was unacceptable to Belgium, and that was the appointment by the Secretariat of a particular individual.

(Mr. Piradov, USSR)

In retaining paragraph 2, which we agreed on here, it seems to me that we have given satisfaction to the representative of Belgium. But, if our Belgian colleague has comments on other sections of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, I should like to know to which part of that report he objects.

Mr. EVANS (Australia): I wonder whether, at this late stage, the positions of the delegations of Belgium and the Soviet Union might not be accommodated by a small suggestion, which I hope would be acceptable notwithstanding the observations made by the representative of Belgium on matters other than that referred to in paragraph 2. The suggestion I would make is that the sentence at the beginning of paragraph 1 would read: "The Committee took note with appreciation of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's report on the work of its sixth session and, subject to the contents of paragraph 2 below, endorsed the Sub-Committee's recommendations...". I may be wrong but I feel that that might meet the points put forward by both sides and provide a solution.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I in turn should like to say that I also do not wish to delay the work of our Committee. I simply wish to add that my delegation's reservation did not apply solely to the appointment of an employee to a certain department; it also concerned the working methods planned by the Sub-Committee. For that reason, I would accept the formula suggested by the representative of Australia, provided it read: "..., subject to paragraph 2 (a) and all the following paragraphs of this section dealing with the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee...".

The CHAIRMAN: I should now like to ask the Committee whether the formula which was suggested by the representative of Australia and amended by the representative of Belgium would be acceptable.

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Could we not ask the representative of Belgium to repeat his proposal once more?

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): It reads as follows: "The Committee took note with appreciation of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee's report on the work of its sixth session and endorsed the Sub-Committee's recommendations, subject to the provisions contained in paragraph 2 and all the following paragraphs of this section" -- in other words, everything following paragraph 1 in this section of the report.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada): Just to elucidate what I believe is the intention of the delegation of Belgium, I think this would read: "... subject to the provisions in paragraph (2) and the following paragraphs of section A of this report".

Mr. PIRADOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Could not the author of this amendment agree to a reference to paragraph 2 only, because I do not see in the following paragraphs -- paragraphs 3, 4, 6 and 7 -- any limitations of the contents of paragraph 1?

Mr. EVANS (Australia): The reason for my original suggestion was precisely to isolate what seemed to me to be the matter that was preventing you, Mr. Chairman, from bringing down the gavel on a successful session, and my delegation would hope that the original suggestion I made would find acceptance, including the acceptance of the delegation of Belgium, despite its reservations on work procedures. I might point out that my delegation has reservations on a number of points which we have approved, in a spirit of compromise.

If I may appeal to the representative of Belgium, at this late stage, I would do so, addressing to him the compliments of the delegation of Australia. The success of this session of the Committee is by no means a matter of which the Belgian delegation can feel ashamed; I think we all recognize what the delegation of Belgium has done to make this session a success. I would appeal to him at this late stage -- after we

(Mr. Evans, Australia)

have arrived at so many important decisions throughout this past week -- to agree that his reservation, which we respect, might nevertheless be accommodated to the amendment I have suggested. I hope that might prove acceptable to him, although I know his powers of pertinacity are almost boundless, I hope that at this stage my suggestion will prove to be a compromise that reflects the position of us all.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the suggestion that has just been made by the representative of Australia, I should like now to ask the representative of Belgium whether he would like to take the floor.

Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The representative of Australia -- my good friend, Mr. Evans -- has placed my delegation in a difficult position. On the one hand, he appeals to my pertinacious spirit and, on the other hand, he also appeals to my spirit of compromise. I am hesitant to take a position but I believe we might solve the question by saying "subject to paragraphs 2 and 5", since those are the two paragraphs which contain reservations with regard to the recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee.

If this suggestion is acceptable, I shall not insist that all the paragraphs be mentioned. It will suffice to mention only those two paragraphs in which reservations are contained, that is, paragraphs 2 and 5.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In order to receive further clarification, I should like to ask the Rapporteur how paragraph 5 now stands.

Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: There are objections to paragraph 5 in the draft report, and there are amendments by the delegations of Belgium and India.

Mr. ARORA (India): My delegation has very little to contribute at this late hour, except to say that the representative of Australia has come up with a very good compromise formulation in suggesting that endorsement be subject to whatever is contained in this report. Of course, he just mentioned paragraph 2, but it is understood that this Committee's endorsement of the report of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee is subject to what this Committee has to say in its own report. Therefore, my delegation thought that the sub-amendment moved by the delegation of Belgium, to the effect that it would be subject to the provisions of the paragraphs following paragraph 1, would have the same import. In the view of my delegation, it really makes very little difference whether or not all the other paragraphs are mentioned. However, the representative of Belgium would doubtless like mention to be made of paragraphs 2 and 5, on which he has certain reservations. Since these reservations have been expressed, and since the report of the main Committee -- that is, our report -- clearly indicates them, whether we like it or not, it would not be out of place to mention this provision -- that is, that the endorsement is subject to the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 5 -- in paragraph 1. As a matter of fact, the report of this Committee states it in so many words, in paragraphs 2 and 5. In some of its paragraphs, it endorses other recommendations of the Sub-Committee. Therefore, in my delegation's view, the addition of the words "subject to the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 5" or "subject to the provisions of paragraphs 2 to 7" or

(Mr. Arora, India)

whatever the number of the paragraphs may be, would make no difference. In the light of that fact, we accept the amendment proposed by the representative of Australia, as amended by the representative of Belgium.

The CHAIRMAN: I would now ask the Committee whether it approves the text as it now stands. I think it now states only facts.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee is agreeable to this text.

It was so decided.

Mr. THACHER (United States of America): May I ask where the amendment proposed by the representative of India, which we have accepted, beginning "The Committee took particular note...", will appear in our report?

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: I think the Indian text could be placed between paragraphs 6 and 7 of the draft.

Mr. ARORA (India): It would really hardly matter where the text proposed by my delegation was placed in the report, but it occurs to my delegation that it should perhaps come before paragraph 5. In paragraph 3, the Committee notes with satisfaction the work being carried out; in paragraph 4, the Committee notes the decision regarding the visit of a team to Argentina. The paragraph suggested by my delegation could appropriately be inserted immediately after that, as a new paragraph 5. In any case, it has been suggested that paragraph 5 should become the last paragraph of the report.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of India has proposed that this draft text be inserted as a new paragraph 5. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other observations on the draft report now before us? If not, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the interim report.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: That brings us to the end of a long working session. I should like to thank you all for your help and assistance, and to express to all the delegations that participated in this work my gratitude for their spirit of co-operation.

We have achieved something that seemed rather problematic a few days ago: we have reached unanimous agreement on the interim report before us.

You have entrusted your Chairman with a very difficult task. I should like to thank you very much for your confidence. I can only tell you that I shall do my best to merit the confidence you have placed in me. But I shall rely on you, because without your help, and without you, I cannot do anything.

We shall all sit together again soon and continue our work. At that time we shall discuss not procedure but substance. If we show the same spirit of co-operation and the same willingness to try to achieve something, I am convinced we shall move ahead on the question of liability.

I must apologize to the interpreters, because I told them we should be finished by 7.30, and it is now 7.45, but a quarter of an hour is the usual length of time by which the United Nations prolongs something.

Miss ALVAREZ (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the members of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, I wish to thank you most warmly for the remarkable manner in which you have conducted our work. You wanted this Committee to be a living body, and that wish was, perhaps, fulfilled to a greater extent than you had expected. You have demonstrated, during very thorny deliberations on a problem of very great importance to all of us, magnificent patience, a spirit of conciliation and qualities which have made it possible to achieve success at a time when we could not clearly see the way to overcome the difficulties. The manner in which you have presided over our work has been most welcomed by us.

At the same time, I should like to thank our distinguished Rapporteur for the care and the celerity with which he submitted our report and put together the pieces constituted by the various amendments.

I should also like to thank Mr. Abdel-Ghani, as well as all the members of the Outer Space Affairs Division, the personnel of the Secretariat, the interpreters and all those who have contributed to the success of this session.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Allow me to say to the charming representative of France how touched I am by the very kind words she has just expressed. I thank her from the bottom of my heart.

I give the floor to the Rapporteur.

Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil), Rapporteur: I share fully the Chairman's comments to the charming representative of France.

The CHAIRMAN: If I am correct, this concludes the first part of our session. We shall meet again in the resumed session not later than 12 November. Thank you very much for your patience.

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.