



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.105/PV.19/Rev.1*
4 June 1963

ENGLISH ONLY

COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 18 March 1963, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. MATSCH

(Austria)

Organization of the work of the Committee in 1963 (continued)

* The present text supersedes document A/AC.105/PV.19 which contained technical errors.

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE IN 1963 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: At our last meeting on 28 February, the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union were invited to continue their efforts to reach some sort of an agreement with regard to the location of the forthcoming session of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and the Legal Sub-Committee.

These two delegations met several times since that meeting, but unfortunately have been unable to reach an agreement with respect to the meeting place of the two Sub-Committees.

The Chair now has no other choice but to request the Committee to continue the exchange of views on this subject in order to find a solution. Before calling on the first speaker, I wish to inform the members that the Geneva Office of the United Nations has cabled very recently that the Expert Group on Commodity Arrangements has made a conference service request for the period 6 to 17 May. The period from 14 May on is still tentatively reserved by the Secretariat for the Scientific Sub-Committee. The Olive Oil Conference in Geneva intends to reconvene for a few days during the middle of April. The period from 16 April on is still tentatively reserved for the Legal Sub-Committee. Therefore, every effort should be made to have a solution emerge at this afternoon's meeting with respect to deciding on where the two Sub-Committees will meet.

(The Chairman)

At our last meeting the representative of Canada made a suggestion to the effect that the Scientific Sub-Committee should meet in Geneva and the Legal Sub-Committee should meet in New York. Perhaps, in addition to those members who have already done so, including the representative of the Soviet Union and the representative of Poland, other members would be prepared to indicate their views also, so that a more over-all picture may emerge with regard to possibilities for a solution. The over-all picture on the preferences of members, from what was said at the last meeting, indicates that a large majority of the Committee's members would be prepared to go along with the suggestion to have the Scientific Sub-Committee meet in Geneva and the Legal Sub-Committee meet in New York.

The Committee will recall that the representative of Iran has already drawn the attention of the Committee, at our last meeting, to the report of the Secretary-General, document A/5317, the "Review of the Pattern of Conferences", in which the Secretary-General states that, in view of the special problem which will arise in 1964 as a result of the major construction programme at Headquarters, the question of the pattern of conferences should again be discussed at the eighteenth General Assembly. On the basis of this report the General Assembly adopted, on 19 December 1962, resolution 1851 (XVII), by which, in paragraph 3 of the operative part, the Secretary-General is invited

"... to bring to the attention of the competent organs the importance and urgency of the measures outlined in ... his report, as well as the need for moderation on their part in fixing their programmes of meetings" at Headquarters "for 1964, in view of the major reconstruction work to be carried out" at that office.

In accordance with the recommendation contained in General Assembly resolution 1851 (XVII), the eighteenth General Assembly will therefore deal with this question of the pattern of conferences and will, as it did in the past, list those meetings of United Nations bodies which will not be held at Headquarters in 1964.

The reference made by the representative of Iran to General Assembly resolution 1851 (XVII) at our last meeting may be included in our report on this session, after mentioning the site for the two Sub-Committees' meetings for 1963, perhaps, as the Chair would suggest, by the following sentence:

(The Chairman)

"Noting General Assembly resolution 1851 (XVII), the Committee is awaiting additional information from the Secretary-General before the eighteenth session of the General Assembly with regard to the conference service situation in 1964, when major reconstruction work will be carried out at Headquarters. The indication is that, due to reconstruction work, it may be impracticable to hold meetings at Headquarters in 1964."

That would be the sentence to be included in our report on this session. At present, additional information from the Secretariat on the situation with regard to conferences services is not yet available, except that the reconstruction work will start early in 1964 and that the reconstruction plan has been drawn up.

(The Chairman)

I would therefore appeal to the Committee, and particularly to those members who have not agreed to the proposed solution that in 1963 the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should meet in Geneva and the Legal Sub-Committee should meet in New York, to reconsider in order that we may have an agreed solution on the basis of that proposal, bearing in mind the text which I have just read out and which I shall now repeat:

"Noting General Assembly resolution 1851 (XVII), the Committee is awaiting additional information from the Secretary-General before the eighteenth session of the General Assembly with regard to the conference service situation in 1964, when major reconstruction work will be carried out at Headquarters. The indication is that, due to reconstruction work, it may be impracticable to hold meetings at Headquarters in 1964".

Mrs. ROSSEL (Sweden): I should first like to thank the Chairman for the excellent statement he has just made and for having brought the Committee up to date. We are glad to have the information about the plans for reconstruction work next year.

The Swedish Government would have preferred, for practical reasons, that both Sub-Committees should meet in Geneva. We have reiterated this position in conversations with the Chairman. However, since a large majority seems to be willing to go along with the Canadian compromise formula -- namely, that this spring the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should meet in Geneva and the Legal Sub-Committee should meet in New York -- we are prepared to consider that compromise formula, especially if it would mean that the Committee could, in the light of the text just read out by the Chairman, agree to the proposal.

Mr. NARENDRA SINGH (India): Mr. Chakravarty suggested at the last meeting that further informal efforts should be made to find an agreed decision. He said that it was his hope that the two space Powers would not disappoint us all by failing to agree.

The Indian delegation would like to restate its position. As we have said here before, we should prefer both Sub-Committees to meet in Geneva. If, however, the Committee decides to accept a compromise -- for example, the type just stated by the Chairman, based on the suggestions made by the representatives of Canada and Iran -- we are prepared to go along with it fully. This situation has gone on for quite some time now, and we think that it is necessary that an agreement should be reached quickly.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union deems it necessary to make the following statement. Basing itself on past practice and bearing in mind the convenience of delegations taking part in the meetings, the Soviet Union continues to believe that it would be appropriate for the regular sessions of the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and the Legal Sub-Committee to be held in Geneva, as has been the case in the past. Attempts by the United States to change the established practice of work in the Sub-Committees have put us on our guard, since it is difficult to judge them as anything but expressions of a United States policy to create further obstacles to international co-operation in various fields. In assuming such a position, the United States is in fact threatening international co-operation in the exploration and peaceful utilization of outer space. The United States is doing so by introducing a purely organizational matter -- the question whether the regular session of the Legal Sub-Committee should be held in Geneva or New York.

The Soviet Union Government attaches great importance to international co-operation in outer space and regards the development of such co-operation as an important contribution to the strengthening of relations among States and to the improvement of the entire international situation.

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

In the light of that consideration and of the wish expressed by representatives of a number of countries for a speedy solution to the impasse that has been created, the Soviet Union Government despite the practical inconvenience to itself, will not object to the regular session of the Legal Sub-Committee being held, as an exception, not in Geneva but in New York.

The Soviet Union Government agrees, on condition, of course, that the convening of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York, this year, as an exception, will not constitute a precedent for the future.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other representative wishes to make a statement on this issue, and if I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to the formula which I read out.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, we are basing ourselves upon the position that the Committee takes note not only of what you yourself has just stated but also what was stated by the representative of the Soviet Union just now.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to what has just been said by the representative of the Soviet Union, the Chair refers to the fact that his condition and his statement will appear fully in the record of this afternoon's meeting of the Committee.

Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic): At this juncture I intend to confine my remarks to the issue under discussion, and I hope that at a more appropriate time you will be kind enough to call on me to make a statement on another issue.

It was indeed felicitous to my delegation to listen to the statements that were made this afternoon, and I am sure that all the Members of the Committee share my view in assessing the situation. I think that the atmosphere is auspicious for us to settle this point which has been pending for a long time.

I listened very carefully to your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, but it is not very clear in my mind. I believe that if you agree and if the members of the Committee concur, there is nothing against reaching now a definite agreement so far as the meetings of the two Sub-Committees during 1964 is concerned, namely, to replace the phrase which you had proposed to indicate that the Committee agreed that the two Sub-Committees during 1964 will meet outside the Headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to what has just been said by the representative of the United Arab Republic, the Chair thinks that the debate on the question of making a decision now as to where the two Sub-Committees should meet next year will be superfluous because without knowing the additional information that the Secretary-General will present to our Committee before the eighteenth General Assembly session, such a discussion seems not necessary because what we shall then hear perhaps will be a factual consequence, that the two Sub-Committees will have to meet outside of the Headquarters.

(The Chairman)

I think that we have to await the report that the Secretary-General will submit to our Committee on the Conference Service facilities at Headquarters in 1964.

Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic): I am grateful for your explanation, Mr. Chairman, but I think I did not invite the Committee to have a debate on this issue, as you have intimated in your explanation. What I did was simple. I made a suggestion that the Committee should agree at this stage that the next meetings of the two Sub-Committees during 1964 should be held outside of the Headquarters. This may lead to the two meetings being held in Geneva, but I did not want to spell it out at this time, having in mind your explanation. I would like to reiterate once again that I did not invite a very thorough debate on that. But I think that the Chair could very easily assess the opinions of the members of the Committee on the suggestion which I have made.

The CHAIRMAN: If I understood the representative of the United Arab Republic correctly, he is proposing or suggesting that the Committee should now deal with the issue as to whether the two Sub-Committees should meet next year outside of the Headquarters. Or is he prepared to defer this question to be discussed and assessed after we have received the report of the Secretary-General on the conference facilities for 1964, which we will probably receive at our next meeting, before the Assembly starts in the middle of September? Does the representative of the United Arab Republic agree that the Committee should take a decision at that time as to where the two Sub-Committees should meet next year?

Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic): I apologize for taking the floor for the third time on this issue. I believe that I was clear in my two previous statements that we should reach a decision at this stage; I mean now, that we decide that the two meeting of the two Sub-Committees during 1964 will take place outside of the Headquarters. I do not believe that this is a very difficult problem because I do not visualize that it will be possible -- it may be, but I do not believe so, as far as I am concerned -- that the report which may be submitted by the Secretary-General will itself decide this issue. I believe that if we can take a decision during this meeting on this particular issue, it will help a great deal when we take other items on our agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is therefore on the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic, opening the debate on the question that the Committee should decide now where the two Sub-Committees should meet or, perhaps it is better to say, where the two Sub-Committees should not meet next year, that is, at Headquarters in 1964. I tried to postpone this issue because, as I have said, when we receive the report of the Secretary-General it may be a factual consequence of the report that the two Sub-Committees will have to meet outside of the Headquarters.

I am now opening the debate on the issue to decide where the two Sub-Committees should meet in 1964, that is to say, not at the Headquarters. I now invite any representative who wishes to speak on this issue to make a statement.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have listened very carefully to the representative of the United Arab Republic, and I have the impression that he is not talking about a debate. He is simply making a proposal and it would appear that this proposal has not met with any opposition. Therefore we should not be speaking of a debate but should be ascertaining whether there are any objections and if there are none, this should become the decision of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is now inviting the Committee to state whether it agrees that the two Sub-Committees should meet next year outside of the Headquarters. If I do not hear any objection, I would consider this as an agreement reached by the Committee.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I was impressed by your own statements that it seemed somewhat more appropriate to deal with next year's meetings a little later when we had more information as to exactly what the situation will be in 1964. I note in passing that our agenda item is "Organization of the work of the Committee in 1963". Although I think it may very well turn out to be entirely inappropriate for us to have our meetings at Headquarters during 1964, I do not think we really know quite enough about the facts to come to a decision at this time. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I was impressed with what I gathered to be your feeling that it was perhaps a little premature to decide the matter now.

It is perfectly obvious that the fact of the reconstruction of Headquarters will play a very large part in the decision, when we finally come to one, as to our meetings next year. But I did feel that the position that you yourself took, Mr. Chairman, seemed a somewhat preferable one: to postpone a final decision as to our being away from Headquarters until we know a little bit more about it, presumably at the meetings of the Committee to be held this summer.

The CHAIRMAN: I see that no other representative wishes to speak now on this subject. May I therefore ask the representative of the United Arab Republic whether he could not go along with what I said before. The general atmosphere today seems to be a more co-operative one than at our last meeting, and if we do not get a consensus of the Committee now, how can we reach an agreement? I am afraid that this suggestion may start a controversial debate, but I feel that such a debate could be completely avoided if we await the report of the Secretary-General, from which facts may emerge to the effect that it is technically not possible to have meetings of the Sub-Committees next year at Headquarters.

Therefore, with the permission of the Committee, I would first of all obtain the consensus, the decision of the Committee as to the meetings of the Sub-Committees this year. Perhaps the representative of the United Arab Republic will not press for a decision now. It would seem preferable to await the report of the Secretary-General. We could then see much clearer what the possibilities are and perhaps the report will indicate that the meetings of the Sub-Committees next year at Headquarters are impossible.

(The Chairman)

In this way we would avoid perhaps a lengthy debate, because it seems that it is not possible now for an agreement to be reached between the two major Powers on this issue. Therefore, I would ask the representative of the United Arab Republic not to press for a decision at this time and await the report of the Secretary-General at the end of the summer.

Mr. FAHY (United Arab Republic): When I made my proposal, or suggestion, I did not visualize that it would invite a debate between the Chairman and the representative of the United Arab Republic. What I had in mind was to try to settle this issue and take up the more serious business before the Committee. Certainly if there is an objection to the suggestion which I made, I will not press for it. As you may recall, Mr. Chairman, I did not make a formal proposal. I am willing, in a spirit of co-operation, to go along with the wishes of the Committee.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I am obliged once again to draw your attention to the fact that the Soviet Government is giving its consent to the holding of the session of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York as a matter of an exception, on the understanding that this will not constitute a precedent for the future. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to formulate the decision of the Committee in such a fashion as to take this circumstance into account.

The CHAIRMAN: As I said before, in reply to the representative of the USSR, the records will show that this consent of the USSR constitutes a matter of an exception and does not constitute a precedent for the future. I am inquiring now as to whether the representative of the USSR is satisfied that the Chairman has drawn the attention of the Committee to the fact that the reservation of the delegation of the Soviet Union will be made clear in the record of this meeting.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Let me repeat that the Soviet delegation will be satisfied with a decision of the Committee stating clearly that we agree to the holding of the session of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York as a matter of exception. We should like to hear this stated clearly and unequivocally.

The CHAIRMAN: In order to satisfy the representative of the USSR, the Rapporteur could be invited to include in his report the fact that the consent of the USSR to have the Legal Sub-Committee meetings in 1963 in New York is a matter of an exception and does not constitute a precedent. This reservation would be included in the report of this session which the Rapporteur will have to draw up. Therefore, in addition to the record of today's meeting, the formal reservation made by the representative of the Soviet Union will also appear in the report of the Committee, in a document to be presented to the next session of the General Assembly.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We may be speaking in different languages, but we must come to an agreement and arrive at a single opinion. What we have in mind is not a reservation, not the records, not a statement by the Rapporteur but a decision by the Committee taking our position into account. We should also like to know whether there is any objection to a decision of the Committee that would state clearly that this involves the adoption of a decision as a matter of exception. Is there any objection on the part of any member of the Committee to this? If there are no objections, then it may be taken that the decision is accepted.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): We are so close to agreement here that I do not want to enter into any real argument or discussion. I would assume that the consensuses of this Committee are consensuses; one is not merely an exception as applied to any other. I regard the Committee as being perfectly free to decide next year that its sub-committee meetings may be in various different places. I have no objection to the Soviet Union's statement that it regards the holding of the legal Sub-Committee in New York as, in its view, an exception. I suppose that I could say that the United States regards the holding of the Scientific Sub-Committee in Geneva as an exception; we do not say that, because we think that in each case it is up to the Committee itself to decide where its sub-committees' meetings are going to be held. We are so close to an agreement on this matter, which has taken so long to discuss, that I hope very much we can dispose of it quickly and along the lines that I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair would add to what has just been said by the representative of the United States that already at our last meeting, on the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico, and then repeated by the Chair, that this Committee is different from any other committee in so far as we have only two major Powers who have actually reached outer space; although all the other members can actively co-operate and contribute to the work, nevertheless, any progress is based on agreement between the two major Powers. The two major Powers for their part have offered all the improvements and research results for the benefit of all mankind. This is therefore the general pattern of work of this Committee.

Having said this, I think it is very clear that any decision as to the future meeting of the two Sub-Committees depends on agreement between the two major Powers. This is the basis we have used since our existence. It had worked well last year. Last year we were in a very co-operative mood. I think we should try to reach agreement also on this issue in our Committee today. And I think I have explained that the representative of the USSR can be assured that he will be consulted and his opinion will be a decisive factor in the future discussions and the future decisions with respect to where the two Sub-Committees will have to meet. Therefore, I request him to let me know whether my explanation satisfies his intentions.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, we are grateful to you for your goodwill and co-operation in seeking a solution to this question. However, I should like to invite your attention to the fact that we are being put very much on our guard by the behaviour of some representatives here, including your remarks Mr. Chairman, concerning the proposal made by the representative of the United Arab Republic to the effect that the meetings of the Sub-Committees next year should not be held in New York; that also applied to what was said by the representative of the United States, who unequivocally stated that he does not agree to the adoption of a formulation concerning the holding of the sessions of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York by way of an exception.

From what has been said it is apparent that the representative of the United States is not showing any desire to reach a mutually acceptable decision on the substance of the matter and in standing by his earlier position.

From the foregoing it may be seen once again that the representative of the United States is not concerned with the maintenance of an atmosphere of co-operation in the Committee and is placing the interests of his delegation above the interests of the Committee's work. This is all the more regrettable in that the representative of the United States shows no understanding of the position which we have just stated and that that position is not being duly evaluated by the representative of the United States.

If the representative of the United States is not prepared to take a decision now -- a decision to which we have referred -- and requires further instructions from his Government, then we believe that such an opportunity should be given to the representative of the United States so that we might come to a final decision on this present question.

The CHAIRMAN: I am inquiring of the representative of the United States whether he would like to get instructions on this matter or whether his intervention before is to be considered a final one? I call on the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. CAMPBELL (United Kingdom): I hardly venture to trespass in this very rarified atmosphere to which, Mr. Chairman, you have drawn our attention, but it does seem to my delegation that we have virtually reached agreement on where the Sub-Committees will meet this year. So far as next year is concerned, I must say that the representative of the Soviet Union talked about instructions. I am afraid that we, for our part, have no instructions regarding the place of meeting next year. I am perfectly sure that my Government would go along with the decision of the Committee at the time. But as far as this year is concerned, we would have thought that we have virtually reached agreement now, namely, that this year the Scientific Sub-Committee shall meet in Geneva and that the Legal Sub-Committee shall meet in New York, and that this decision -- if the Committee does take this decision -- does not constitute a precedent. I would have hoped, I must say, that we could reach agreement on this basis.

Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada): General Assembly resolution 1851 on the pattern of conferences establishes the principle that these conferences should be as much as possible held at Headquarters. If I understand the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union, he wishes to establish just the contrary principle: that we should accept Geneva as the normal venue for the Sub-Committees' meetings. I am just wondering whether there is much wisdom in being so inflexible and rigid about this. I suppose that we could conceive a case where perhaps the Soviet Union one day would want to invite a Sub-Committee to meet in Moscow. We may foresee the possibility that in connexion with the Sounding Range in India the proposal might be made that the Technical Sub-Committee meet in New Delhi. I just mention these as possibilities, but they point out to the fact that if we adopt an inflexible rule, particularly at this stage, we may find ourselves in a rather difficult situation at a given moment. I think that it would be much better to leave that point open right now for the sake of reaching the agreement which has been rather difficult to reach on the venue for this year.

Mr. PEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We are grateful to the representative of Canada for his attempt at clarification, but I think that in connexion with his interpretation we must give our own clarification.

First of all, it is surprising that the representative of Canada should see a lack of flexibility in the position of the Soviet delegation. It would appear either that the Canadian representative is himself in error or that he is trying to mislead someone else. The USSR delegation has just demonstrated the flexibility of its position. After what it has said here, our delegation can hardly be reproached for showing a lack of flexibility and the Canadian representative's remark is obviously not true. That is our first point.

Secondly, we are talking about the adoption of a decision in which it should be noted that the convening of the session of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York this year is an exception and cannot constitute a precedent for the future. That is entirely reasonable and in line with past experience. We ask that this proposal should be given due attention.

Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): I would like, if I may, to ask the representative of the Soviet Union to say whether I have understood him correctly. If I understood his formulation correctly, it is to the effect that the decision -- I hope it is a decision -- of the Committee to hold the meetings of the Technical and Scientific Sub-Committee in Geneva this year and the meetings of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York is in no way to be regarded as a precedent for any future decisions, since he has particular reservations with regard to the meetings of the Legal Sub-Committee being held in New York. If my understanding is correct, and if that is the position, I am of course entirely willing to agree with it and to go along with it with pleasure.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair would suggest that after this discussion on the question of precedents, that after the Committee has agreed to the suggestion that the Technical and Scientific Sub-Committee should meet in Geneva and the Legal Sub-Committee here in New York, there should be a sentence added that it is also made clear in the report of this Committee on this session to the General Assembly that this agreement that one of the

(The Chairman)

Sub-Committees should meet in Geneva and the other in New York, is made without constituting any precedent for the future.

Mr. FEDCRENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that the question, instead of being simplified, is being made more complicated, and that this is being done deliberately. For the state of complete clarity, we consider it necessary to repeat our proposal:

"The Soviet Government despite the practical inconvenience to itself, will not object to a regular session of the Legal Sub-Committee being held, as an exception, not in Geneva but in New York."

"The Soviet Government agrees on condition, of course, that the convening of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York, as an exception, this year will not constitute a precedent for the future."

The CHAIRMAN: If we can apply this formula which has been read out by the Soviet representative, to the effect that the holding of the meetings of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York is considered as an exception and does not constitute a precedent for the future, if we can use this phrase in a general form to apply to both Sub-Committees, then I think the solution of this issue is made very clear, that it is an exception for the Legal Sub-Committee and it is not a precedent for the future, and the same applies with regard to the Technical and Scientific Sub-Committee. Then, both views would be combined in a general formula.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): I was reluctant to take part in this debate, for I recall that at our last meeting we had a rather lengthy debate trying to formulate our opinions and to come to some agreeable solution. I recall that the representative of India, supported by the representative of Mexico, proposed that the interested delegations and the Chairman should get together to work out some kind of agreement. I think that we can all note with satisfaction that that period was not completely wasted and that we came to some sort of meeting of minds so far as the place of the meetings this year of the two Sub-Committees is concerned. Now we have got into difficulties in

(Mr. Lewandowski, Poland)

regard to the final formulation of that agreement or that consensus. Since we have had a very worthwhile discussion on the question you yourself, Mr. Chairman, brought up with regard to the meetings in 1964, and we have heard some amendments to the formulation you proposed. The exchanges of views lead me to make a proposal that the Committee might agree to postpone a final decision and to convene another meeting, possibly tomorrow, in order to give the delegations which participated in the discussion with regard to the formulation of the final decision to get together and, with your co-operation, to arrive at a final formulation which can be approved by the Committee, in the way we did last year. I think this would save us not only time, but also a lot of misunderstanding. I appreciate that some delegations might want to consult either their Governments or themselves so far as the formulation is concerned, and I think that the delay, far from being unnecessary, might produce, either tomorrow or the day after tomorrow, the final formulation of an agreement.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no member wishes to comment on the suggestion that has just been made by the representative of Poland, I should like to sum up the situation.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): I have full respect for the Chairman's ability to summarize the consensus of views round this table, but I would like to suggest that we work out the final formulation of our consensus during the interval between this meeting and the next meeting, which the Chairman might set for tomorrow or the next day. In this way we could avoid having a discussion on what the Chairman would now put into the record as a summary of today's meeting. I propose that we adjourn this meeting now and meet again at a convenient time. In the meantime, I think the Committee would be grateful to the Chairman as well as to the delegations concerned if they would work out a final formula of the consensus which we heard round this table today with respect to the meetings of the Sub-Committees this year as well as the formulation proposed by the Chairman at the beginning of this meeting for the meetings of the Sub-Committees in 1964.

The CHAIRMAN: After summing up the development this afternoon my conclusion would have been exactly the same as the proposal made by the representative of Poland. The Chair feels that the situation should be further considered at our next meeting on Wednesday at 10.30 a.m.

Mr. COOK (Australia): I can appreciate the merits in the proposal of the representative of Poland that we should adjourn for a couple of days to see whether we can work out some final wording. But we do seem to be so close on this matter that it seems a pity to break up again. Is it possible to ask whether everybody would not be agreeable to a formula which seems to take account of everyone's views, namely that the Committee agrees, as an exception and without precedent for the future, that the Legal Sub-Committee should meet in New York and that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should meet in Geneva? Does that not solve everyone's problems?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): I do not want to start a debate, but I am afraid that the formula given by the representative of Australia might start a debate. Therefore, I would again urge the Chairman to ascertain whether the Committee is agreeable to adjourning the meeting until Wednesday morning, when this matter can be finally decided. I am sure that if the proposal made by the representatives of India and Mexico the last time had not been accepted we would have had endless debate at that time. Although it postponed the final decision for a few days, that proposal was a very wise one. In the same spirit, I propose that we adjourn the meeting now. I do not prejudge whether one or another formula might be acceptable. We have had sufficient debate on this already, and I would implore the Chairman to ask the Committee whether there is any objection to my proposal to adjourn the meeting until Wednesday morning.

Mr. COOK (Australia): Perhaps we could suspend the meeting for thirty minutes or for forty-five minutes. It is still quite early in the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the representative of Poland agree to a suspension of forty-five minutes?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): With all due respect to the optimism of the representative of Australia, and I certainly envy his optimism, may I state that I have yet to recall any problem of this nature being solved in forty-five minutes. We have been discussing this problem for over one hour already, and I do not see any harm or difficulty in adjourning now and meeting again on Wednesday morning. I would ask the representative of Australia to be so kind as to withdraw his suggestion, and if there is no other objection we could adjourn now and have a really good meeting on Wednesday morning of fifteen minutes.

Mr. COOK (Australia): In a spirit of compromise I would be very happy to agree that the time of the suspension should be reduced to thirty minutes.

Mr. THACHER (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, we gained the impression from your opening remarks that if either Sub-Committee is to meet this year in Geneva, it will require a prompt decision by this Committee in order that the facilities for such a meeting to be held in Geneva may be reserved for the use of that Sub-Committee. With this in mind, and because my delegation, for one -- and I suspect that we are not alone in this predicament -- lacks instructions from our Government with regard to the question of fixing in any way the location of Sub-Committee meetings in the calendar year 1964, Ambassador Plimpton has absented himself from the room to seek such instruction as we can obtain on this point. I would therefore urge that we not delay the reaching of a decision with regard to Sub-Committee meetings in 1963 any later than today, and I would urge other members to agree to a suspension of the present meeting. So far as our own situation is concerned, we would be quite content with fifteen minutes. However, I would urge that we not adjourn to another day. I note that at the end of our last meeting, which was on 28 February some twelve days ago, it was understood that our next meeting was to be convened during the subsequent week at the latest. We were unable, for various reasons, to meet that target and we have in fact allowed twelve days to go by with what I am sure all of us consider to be an issue of no great importance. I therefore support the suggestion that we suspend our meeting for a short period this afternoon.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): In view of what was said just now by one of the delegations most actively interested in this problem, I am willing to withdraw my motion and go ahead with the proposal to suspend the meeting for, I would suggest from experience, forty-five minutes.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must make the Committee aware of the fact that, should we not produce any final results after this forty-five-minute suspension, I will ask you to give me the floor as the first speaker, to return to my original motion.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems that the Committee agrees to suspend the meeting now for forty-five minutes. We shall therefore resume at 5.05 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 4.20 p.m. and resumed at 5.10 p.m.

Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic): I am happy to report to the Committee that it was possible during the recess to agree on the following formula:

"The United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

"1. Decided that the Legal Sub-Committee will meet at United Nations Headquarters during the period previously agreed upon and that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee will meet in Geneva during the period previously agreed upon;

"2. Having in mind General Assembly resolution 1851 (XVII), decided that its Sub-Committees will meet during 1964 outside United Nations Headquarters".

I hope that that formula will meet all the points of view which have been expressed here, and I sincerely thank all the delegations which have made it possible to arrive at this agreement.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I request that I be given the floor after a decision is reached on the proposal of the representative of the United Arab Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to the formula just read out by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

It was so decided.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Mr. Chairman, may I request you to include in the report the following statement of the Soviet delegation:

"The USSR delegation stated that it did not object to the convocation of the Legal Sub-Committee in New York in 1963 as an exception and that this should not constitute a precedent for the future."

The CHAIRMAN: That statement will be included in the report by the Rapporteur.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now continue the discussion of item 1 of the agenda, and I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic to make the statement which he had been prepared to make at previous meetings.

Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic): During previous meetings of the Committee, my delegation advisedly refrained from taking part in the debate on the various points which the Chairman and other delegations raised concerning the programme of work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its two subsidiary bodies during 1963. That, however, does not mean that we have serious objections to what the Chairman has proposed; we are in general agreement with his proposal.

Having said that, I feel it my duty as the representative of a developing country to draw the attention of members of the Committee to a question the importance of which is, in our opinion, at least equal to that of the various items referred to the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee.

Members of the Committee may recall that in part B of resolution 1721 (XVI), which was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly, the Assembly expressed its belief that:

"the United Nations should provide a focal point for international co-operation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space".

In resolution 1802 (XVII), which was again adopted unanimously, the Assembly touched upon various activities aimed at furnishing technical facilities and know-how in this new field of outer space. In this connexion, it is relevant to quote paragraph 4 of part II of resolution 1802 (XVII), which stipulates that:

"the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space considers that the creation and use of sounding rocket launching facilities under United Nations sponsorship would contribute to the achievement of the objectives of resolution 1721 (XVI) by furthering" --

and I emphasize these words --

"international collaboration in space research and the advancement of human knowledge, and by providing opportunity for valuable practical training for interested users".

(Mr. Fahmy, United Arab Republic)

Furthermore, it will be noted that resolution 1802 (XVII), in its various parts, invited the United Nations agencies concerned with the granting of technical and financial assistance to encourage various activities with a view to providing more scientific knowledge and training facilities in the various areas related to this new field of outer space. In addition, members of the Committee may recall that at the Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of Less Developed Areas problems of outer space occupied a prominent place on the agenda, and many papers were presented for the study and consideration of the scientists attending that Conference.

I have tried to outline as briefly as possible the various provisions of the General Assembly resolutions, as well as certain activities which are already taking place under the auspices of the United Nations and its agencies in this new field. I hope that by now it is clear that my purpose is to demonstrate both the importance of the rapid developments in outer space and the role of the international organizations concerned. It is, I hope, by now abundantly clear that, as the advanced countries have special interests in outer space, the developing countries have every reason to be concerned and to seek further knowledge and assistance in this new field.

It is true that in this Committee we have started in the right direction by welcoming the kind of programme proposed by India, a programme which we in the United Arab Republic wholeheartedly support. Similarly, we are looking forward to seeing the San Marco project put into operation, and as many countries as possible benefitting from it. All these projects or programmes are of a multilateral character and at the proper time would be sponsored by the United Nations, in pursuance of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

This, however, does not in our opinion cover all phases of activity in outer space, and we believe that the entire question of technical assistance to the developing areas -- and I underline the words "developing areas" -- should be examined in its various aspects with the sole purpose of promoting international co-operation, furthering the exchange of information and providing facilities to the developing countries.

(Mr. Fahmy, United Arab Republic)

Therefore, we feel that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should examine the problem of rendering technical assistance and know-how to the developing countries with a view to reaching a comprehensive policy to be followed by the United Nations and the agencies concerned. I hardly need emphasize the importance of this endeavour -- and especially to countries like ours. I have no doubt that the most advanced countries share with us our belief in the importance of this problem.

What is expected from the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee is a report outlining the fields where technical assistance could be rendered to the developing countries on the peaceful uses of outer space. In choosing those fields, the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee will, we take it, have in mind the varied levels of progress achieved by the different Member States. This is a very important point because it will enable us to decide on the priorities of the areas of assistance needed in the immediate future.

Moreover, the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should be advised to report in detail on the types of assistance available and on the present capabilities of the international organizations within and outside the United Nations family.

(Mr. Fahmy, United Arab Republic)

So far as the type is concerned, it will be of interest if emphasis at this early stage will be on the training of nationals of the developing countries. This does not mean, however, that expert advice or assistance in the form of equipment should be barred if the request justifies it.

We realize that to have this task done properly a study is necessary to determine the needs of the developing countries, their capabilities and the various possibilities of carrying out at this early stage a humble programme for technical assistance.

As a starting point the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should base itself primarily on the existing facilities at the disposal of the organizations concerned. It is true that these existing facilities are not large enough to enable us to meet all the needs of the developing countries. However, these facilities may be supplemented by some voluntary offers which we expect to come from those countries which have advanced tremendously in this field.

In addition, we expect the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee in developing these programmes to exert every effort to achieve maximum co-ordination between the various agencies and thus avoid from the very beginning undesirable overlapping and unnecessary duplication.

The Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee may study and report on the best procedure to disseminate information on the importance of the peaceful uses of outer space, in order to create in the developing countries adequate awareness of the vital importance and the tremendous possibilities which may result from the exploration of outer space.

We believe that without disseminating enough information on outer space as a new sphere of activity, no programme, however perfect it may be, can have the most desirable effect.

Dissemination may include: information on the nature and importance of outer space research, exploration and use, and on the role which the developing countries could usefully play in international co-operative programmes in this

(Mr. Fahmy, United Arab Republic)

field. In addition to that, it may explain in simple terms what assistance and facilities the United Nations and its affiliated organizations could render, and how the developing countries could promote their national activities in this field.

As we firmly believe that any real progress in rendering assistance in such a new field could not be achieved without the co-operation of all those concerned, we urge all Member States, especially the two big Powers, the specialized agencies, and non-governmental organizations to co-operate in furnishing the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee with the necessary information needed for a speedy discussion.

As you have seen, the idea is non-controversial, harmless, but beneficial -- beneficial to the developing countries, and we believe, in the long run, advantageous to the advanced countries too.

Our interest is, therefore, twofold, and if real progress could be made along the lines which we have suggested, international co-operation in outer space would proceed on solid grounds.

In concluding, I am sure that the members of the Committee would welcome an opportunity to discuss in the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee the points to which I have referred, and it is my assumption that the report of the Committee which we will approve later will take into account the views of my delegation.

Mr. FLIMPTON (United States of America): My delegation has listened with attention and with great interest to the remarks just made by the representative of the United Arab Republic. I agree with much that he has said and am confident that the subject of training will be one which the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee will wish to study carefully and attentively when it meets. Given the interest of many States in training and in education in space and space-related fields, we believe that this Committee can and should perform a very useful service by developing information on training opportunities in this area.

My delegation congratulates the representative of the United Arab Republic on his valuable and stimulating initiative along these lines.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any member who wishes to speak on this issue of training facilities?

Mr. NARENDRA SING (India): I want to say a few words about the statement made by the representative of the United Arab Republic. We agree that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should give thought to developing programmes for the training of technicians and scientists of the developing countries on the peaceful uses of outer space. We feel that the following are the developments in the use of outer space whose application would have practical value for the developing countries in the immediate future: first, better communications; secondly, more accurate methods of navigation; and, thirdly, better studies of weather on a global basis and better weather predictions, which would not only be useful for navigation but also in spheres such as agriculture, etc. In order that under-developed countries could take advantage of these new developments from the very beginning, they should have scientists trained in these respects.

We think that the representative of the United Arab Republic is right in not formally mooted any proposal that would be considered as a directive to the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee, for the whole idea is that this time the experts should have a go at these problems first before coming to us. No doubt, however, the scientific experts would take cognizance of what has been stated here today.

Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have listened carefully to the statement of the representative of the United Arab Republic. In the circumstances of modern science and of the enormous progress that has marked our modern epoch, it is quite natural to see the aspirations and yearnings of various countries and peoples to take part in the study of problems of outer space and the utilization of outer space for peaceful purposes.

At one of the previous meetings of our Committee we examined the proposal and project presented by the representative of India. As you will probably recall, the Soviet delegation supported with satisfaction the project advanced by the representative of India. We consider that the implementation of the Indian project will contribute to our over-all advance in the study of outer space problems and in the utilization of outer space for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Fedorenko, USSR)

As for the considerations that were advanced today by the representative of the United Arab Republic, I am tempted to make the following statement in this regard.

In the view of the Soviet delegation, the training of specialists in the study and use of outer space could be a possibility and could actually occur on a bilateral basis; in other words, on a basis of mutual agreement between the countries concerned. In this connexion we proceed from the premise that at the present time questions relating to the study and use of outer space involve the security of the States concerned, and therefore, as we see it, it is not possible to organize the training of specialists in this field on an international basis.

Mr. COOK (Australia): The Australian delegation, like most others who have spoken, welcomes the initiative of the representative of the United Arab Republic. The Australian delegation is in general agreement with the concepts underlying the suggestion of the United Arab Republic that the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee should discuss ways and means of improving the capability of the developing countries to take part in outer space endeavours. This capability, I think it is important to remember, applies not only to the exploration of outer space -- we have already gone some part of the way towards helping in that direction, in the sounding-rocket range proposal -- but also to another aspect, the peaceful uses of outer space: such things as weather and telecommunications, and other matters to which the representative of India referred.

I think also that perhaps it might be well to note that, as I understood it, the representative of the United Arab Republic referred not only to training -- though that was I think the major point in his mind -- but also to the provision by other countries of experts who might be able to help developing countries, and also perhaps even the supply of equipment.

(Mr. Cook, Australia)

In that connexion I think perhaps another point that might be taken into consideration is the desirability of linking training in some degree with existing and available facilities. There is not very much point in training technicians from developing countries if when they go back home there is no equipment for them to work with. That is a waste of everybody's time and a waste of resources and manpower which would be best avoided.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other member wish to take the floor? It appears that there are no other speakers.

The Chair would suggest that the minutes of this year's first session be transmitted to the Scientific Sub-Committee so that the members of the Sub-Committee will have the exact ideas which have been pronounced on the question of training facilities so that they may proceed with their study, including also the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union that also a bilateral basis, under mutual agreement, should be considered as a possibility for the training of future outer space scientists.

If there is no other comment, the Chair would suggest, as was done last year, that the draft report of this session by the Rapporteur be circulated informally within three days. If no member of the Committee indicates any objections to the Secretariat, it will be considered as agreed. This formula was accepted last year and we were able to avoid another meeting. Can I therefore take it that the Committee agrees to this procedure with regard to the draft report? I see no objection.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no further comment the Chair would now declare the end of this meeting and of the first session in 1963. Since I hear no objection, it is so decided and the meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.