UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
43rd meeting
held on
Wednesday, 21 November 1990
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 43rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. Rana (Nepal)

CONTENTS

Question of Antarctica: general debate. consideration of and action on draft resolutions (continued)

Programme of work

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record

Corrections [illegible] the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.43
5 December 1990
ENGLISH

90-63262 3298V (E)

23 p

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 67 (continued)

QUESTION OF ANTARCTICA: GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

The CHAIRMAN: Members may recall that aaaording to the programme of work the Committee should have completed its consideration of item 67 this morning, However, a number of delegations have informed me that intensive consultations are stillgoing on with regard todraftresolutions A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.1 and A/C.1/45/L.64. Moreover, time will be needed to explore the possibility of any programme budget implications and of oral statements concerning draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.1 by the Secretariat. Taking there developments into account, I propose that we complete the general debatethis morning - we have only three names left on the list of speakers - and take action on the two draft resolutions on Monday.

If the Committee agrees, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The first speaker this morning is the representative of Kenya.

Mr. AMBEYI-LIGABO (Kenya): The Antarctic region, with more than 5 million square miles surrounding the South Pole is, after space, the most isolated region and humanity's last unexplored frontier. It holds about 70 per cent of the world's available freshwater resources and comprises approximately 10 per cent of the earth's surface. Its land appears only where the 15,000-foot peaks of mountain ranges break through the ice. As a result of its peculiar polar location, the bulk of its ice mass and the huge extent of the surrounding seas, the continent exerts a fundamental influence on the atmosphere, oceans and the biological conditions of the entire globe.

(Mt. Ambevi-Liaabo. Kenya)

This region, because of its value for scientific research and co-operation and, especially, its location and ecosystem, as mentioned earlier, is of such great importance to the entire community of nations that it is truly unfair for its management to remain in the hands of an exclusive club of a few rich nations. How can one explain and understand the paradox whereby on the one hand the death of the cold war and the beginning of a new era of co-operation in international relations are proclaimed and on the other hand we are told that the United Nations should have nothing to do with the Antarctic region?

It is on record that since 1983 Kenya has addressed itself to this subject and questioned the scope of obligations and undertakings under the 1959 Antarctic Treaty. We recognize that the Treaty, among other things, prohibits any measures of a military nature and imposes a ban on nuclear explosions, whatever their nature, as well as on the disposal of radioactive waste material. This gives the region appreciably important demilitarised status.

However, my delegation has major difficulties: first, with the rule that the ability to conduct scientific research in Antarctica is a strict prerequisite for accession to the Treaty: secondly, with the non-democratic decision-making process over issues pertaining to Antarctica; thirdly, with the refusal of the Treaty parties to engage in negotiations on a universalized mechanism that would enable all nations to share the benefits derived from Antarctica both now and in the future: and, fourthly and finally, with the total disregard of United Nations resolutions calling on the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty to invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations to attend their meetings.

Given that the present Treaty has these major flaws, my delegation does not believe that the interests of all mankind in Antarctica can best be served by making the management of the area the exclusive right of a few rich nations, It is

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

therefore Kenya's strong belief that the management of Antarctica should be universalised, since the region is, in truth, the common heritage of mankind. The current exclusive and discriminatory arrangement, which puts the fate of Antarctica and, consequently, of the world community in the hands of the 25 Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty, is unacceptable and repugnant to the ideals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The impact of human encroachment and oil spills on the Antarctic ecosystem cannot be overemphasised. The number Of stations has increased significantly. There were 34 rtationr in 1983 and at present there are more than 57 stations, operated by 20 nations. Many of these stations are merely involved in duplication of research. The only way to stop the establishment of more stations by nations seeking decision-making status under the Treaty is to establish an international scientific station that would make it unnecessary to duplicate research, but would help in the drawing up of scientific priorities. In this case, duplication of logistical or other infrastructural requirements needed to establish national stations would be rendered unnecessary.

Another question relating to a permanent ban on mining and prospecting in Antarctica and its surrounding areas is of great interest to my delegation. Accordingly, we welcomed most warmly the opposition to the Antarctic minerals Convention announced in May 1989 by Australia, which was later joined by France and New Zealand, and supported by Italy and Belgium through the enactment of domestic legislation.

It is also noteworthy and gratifying that the international community is becoming increasingly aware of the environmental degradation in Antarctica and its harmful impact on the global environment. The Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which met in Nairobi in

(Mr. Ambevi-Liaabo. Kenya)

August 1990, has added a new dimension and an impetus to our call to preserve Antarctica as a nature reserve and a world park. We hope that this positive approach to halting environmental degradation in Antarctica will be pursued vigorously within the framework of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, to be held in Brazil in 1992.

In Europe there have been unprecedented political changes which only a few years ago nobody had ever thought of and which were, indeed, unimaginable. On the basis of these changes, Kenya sincerely believes that the few nations that have arrogated to themselves power and exclusive rights over the Antarctic region will, sooner rather than later and owing to immense international pressure and national pressure within those countries themselves, see reason and bow to global realities.

On 19 July 1990, Mr. Curtis Bohlen, Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in his testimony before the Sub-Committee on Human Rights and International Organizations of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives, said:

> "The Washington Administration is mindful of the concerns that are being raised about the potential impact of mining on the Antarctic environment. We are consulting with other countries to find a solution that could re-establish a consensus among all parties on this issue."

(Mr. Ambevi-Ligebo, Kenya)

While we appreciate the fact that the concerns of the community of nations have at last reached the ears of the most powerful administration of the world, Kenya does not share the view or conclusion that re-establishment of an already broken consensus among Antarctic Treaty Parties is a solution to the problem of environmental degradation in Antarctica.

Kenya believes that the solution to the environment problems in Antarctica can be found only through a comprehensive environment convention on the conservation and protection of Antarctica and its ecosystems and the establishment of a nature reserve or a world park - all within the framework of the United Nations.

Another issue which is of great concern to my delegation is the question of South Africa. The pillars of apartheid are still solidly intact and therefore, as an African delegation, we cannot remain indifferent to the continued participation of the racist Pretoria régime in Antarctic Treaty meetings and activities.

The time has come for the Antarctic Treaty Parties, the majority of whom regard themselves as bastions and champions of democracy and equality, to muster political courage and reconsider South Africa's membership instead of underwriting apartheid by condoning the participation of a racist régime in the meetings and activities of the Consultative Parties.

Mr. ZAFAR-UL-HAQ (Pakistan): The continent of Antarctica has a total area of 14 million square kilometres, approximately one-tenth of the world's land surface. Ninety-nine per Cent of it is covered by a thick ice sheet. It is unique in that it is the only continent without any indigenous inhabitants or permanent settlers. The waters of the Southern Ocean are among the most biologically productive in the world and support one of the earth's unique, highly adapted and specialized ecosystems.

(Mr. Zafar-Ul-Haq, Pakistan)

The General Assembly has, over a number of years, debated the question of Antarctica and has underscored the vital importance of the continent. These debate8 have also highlighted the concern of the vast majority of the Members of the United Nations at its exclusion from participation in the decisions concerning the fate of Antarctica, which undoubtedly has a direct bearing on the future of our planet.

The Antarctic Treaty, signed in 1959 by a small number of countries, brought the continent, in effect, under their supervision. It is unequal and discriminatory since accession to the Treaty does not entitle the acceding States to participate in decision making. That is the prerogative of the Consultative Parties, which exercise full control over the admission of new Consultative Parties.

The Antarctic Treaty purports to further the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. It is, therefore, difficult to understand the logic behind the refusal of the Consultative Parties to invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations to attend the meetings of the Treaty Parties despite repeated requests by the international community expressed through the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly year after year.

The exclusive nature of the Treaty is evident from the fact that the documents of it8 meetings are not made public; the precise nature of the decisions is not made known to outsiders, and information trickles out only to the extent that the Consultative Parties wish to make it public. It would, ther fore, be reasonable to assume that the information leaked out or made available to the rest of the world community would be filtered in a manner suited to the requirements of the Treaty signatories.

The Parties to the Treaty have time and again argued that the Treaty has worked in an exemplary fashion. It is true that it has held in abeyance the territorial claims of certain States over Antarctica and the use of the continent

(Mr. Zafar-ffl-Hau. Pakistan)

for peaceful purposes only. All these are positive elements. However, this does not and cannot imply that a Treaty which is open, non-discriminatory, equitable and universal will not prove to be equally, if not more. effective.

It is indeed ironic that while the Antarctic Treaty recognizes the interest of all mankind in Antarctica, the Parties to the Treaty have reserved to themselves exclusively the right to decide what is in the common interest Of mankind. The decisions taken in the common interest of mankind are kept as closely guarded secrets from the vast majority of the same mankind.

The international community has expressed deep concern at the continuing degradation of the environment. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development is to be convened in 1992 to discuss this major problem. The interest and the increasing concern of the world community over the environmental degradation in Antarctica and its impact on global environment were manifested at the first substantive session of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference held in Nairobi from 6 to 13 August 1990. And yet, Parties to the Antarctic Treaty which are so disturbed about global environment and about its protection - and this we appreciate - refuse to divulge information or even discuss environmental questions relating to Antarctica. This attitude would certainly work to the detriment of the preparation of a comprehensive treaty dealing with the problems of global environment.

The adoption of the Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities by the Parties to the Treaty in June 1988, despite the objections and protests of the overwhelming majority of the States of the world, is another example of the fact that the Treaty Parties do not hold themselves accountable to the international community and that the decision-making lies in the hands of a few. However, it is fortunate indeed that, following the adoption of the minerals

(Mr. Zafar-Ul-Haq, Pakistan)

Convention, some of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties, namely, Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, India, Italy and New Zealand, have reportedly reconsidered the issue and decided not to sign or ratify the Convention.

It is our fervent hope that, in order to safeguard the Antarctic ecosystem, the minerals Convention will not be allowed to enter into forae. We believe that, in the interest of our common future, the minerals Convention must be discarded and a permanent ban on prospecting, exploration and exploitation of minerals must be enforced.

Many environmentalists and scientists are of the view that Antarctica should be preserved as the last continent that has not been substantially altered by human activity. Some of the Treaty Parties have also lent support to the call of the international community for the establishment of Antarctica as a nature reserve or a world park. In our view, any move to draw up a comprehensive environmental convention on the conservation and protection of Antarctica and its dependent and associated ecosystems and to establish a nature reserve and world park, must be negotiated with the full participation of the international community and should be pursued within the context of the United Nations system, including the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.

(Mr. Zafar-Ul-Haq, Pakistan)

Antarctica is the common heritage of mankind. Protection and conservation of the continent are the common responsibility of all. Any régime for the protection of Antarctica must have the support of the international community if it is to be successful. Only an open, equitable, accountable and universal treaty can achieve the effective protection of Antarctica and its environment.

The establishment, under United Nations sponsorship, of a station in Antarctica, with the aim of promoting co-ordinated international co-operation in scientific research, would benefit mankind. In particular, it would ensure that the importance of Antarctica to the global environment and ecosystems was kept in view. Such a station could also act as an early-warning system with regard to climatic change and accidents.

It is unfortunate that the racist minority régime of Pretoria not only is a consultative party to the Treaty but continues to participate in the meetings of the Consultative Parties despite the demand of the international community that it should be excluded from participation in any such meetings.

In its final declaration, the Ninth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries reaffirmed that Antarctica should for ever be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, in the interests of mankind, and should be accessible to all nations. It recognized the interest of mankind as a whole in Antarctica, in terms of international peace and security and of the environment and its impact on global climatic conditions. It affirmed the interest of mankind in ensuring that the environment and the dependent and associated ecosystem of Antarctica are conserved and are protected against all harmful human activities. It stated that the international community is entitled to information on all aspects of Antarctica and that the United Nations must be made a central repository of such information. My delegation supports the declaration in its totality and

(Mr. Zafar-Ul-Haq, Pakistan)

calls upon the parties to the Antarctic Treaty to co-operate with the rest of the international community to secure its implementation.

The Antarctic Treaty was concluded at a time when a large number of States that are now Members of the United Nations were still struggling to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. The world has changed since then. So should the régime in Antarctica. It must acquire legitimacy through openness, universality and equity, and through a renewed commitment to the philosophy that Antarctica is the common heritage of mankind, that it is not subject to appropriation by any State or person, and that it should be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes. The delegation of Pakistan will continue to strive towards this objective, in co-operation with the other Members of the United Nations.

I conclude by expressing my delegation's full support for the draft resolution on the subject. It was introduced by the representative of Malaysia, and Pakistan is one of its sponsors.

Mr. ADEKANYE (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation wishes to associate itself, once again, with the concern that other representatives and, indeed, a large section of the international community have expressed about the question of Antarctica, which is now before the Committee under agenda item 67. Since the 1983 session, when several States, including Nigeria, first brought this matter before the United Nations General Assembly, the world community's awareness of the ongoing activities in Antarctica has sharpened greatly, and its interest in those activities has increased dramatically. It is reassuring that the dogged efforts of all concerned have been paying off and that, as a result, Parties to the Antarctic Treaty, particularly the voting members, are beginning to respond to global public opinion as regards their activities in the southern virgin continent.

The significant changes in international relations that have bean evident in the past year have resulted in renewed interest in questions related to the

(Mr. Adekanye, Nigeria)

interrelationship between enduring global peace, common security, economic development and a sustainable environment. In the world of the 1990s the question of Antarctica can only gain increasing prominence as the world reels under the full impact of the welcome wave of democratisation, openness and public aaaouatability. Antarctica may not have settled the human-population problem, but its marine and living resources, its delicate ecosystem and its strategic value all make it no less deserving of the attention of all mankind - the Parties to the Antarctic Treaty and everyone else.

Against this background we note with regret, from the Secretary-General's report on Antarctica - document A/45/459 - the persistence of old norms of exclusiveness, discrimination and secrecy in the administration of Antarctica, as well as in meetings on and activities in the continent. The 25 Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties take all the major decisions, while the 14 non-aonrultative partner8 appear to be mere onlookers.

As Nigeria ha8 stated on several occasions, we consider the 1959 Antarctic Treaty to be fundamentally flawed. It remains the least popular of all multilateral disarmament Treaties in force today. After 31 year8 of existence, the Treaty can boast of only 39 signatories, of which the only one from the African continent is apartheid South Africa. Secondly, its restriction of membership to those countries with the scientific and technological capability to undertake a research expedition in Antarctica is shortsighted and discriminatory and runs counter to the very principles and objectives of the United Nations that the Treaty claims to espouse. Thirdly, it8 lack of recognition of a role for the United Nations itself in the affairs of such an important uninhabited continent, which constitutes nearly 10 per cent of the globe, makes the intentions of the Treaty Parties rather suspect. Nigeria, therefore, has found it difficult to support the

(Mr. Adekanve. Nigeria)

Treaty, the very existence and practical manifestations of which foster inequality and reinforce injustice between nations.

We are concerned that a Treaty designed to promote pure scientific-research activities in Antarctica has gradually, over the years, served instead to promote the commercial interests of a few countries, on account of the continent's vast economic and other potential. We find it difficult to reconcile ourselves to the fact that, far from averting international conflict arising from competing and territorial claims, the Treaty has, in reality, legitimized such claims. It has promoted the ownership of scientific stations, bases and territories occupied by some of the consultative Powers, and has done so in a manner reminiscent of colonial conquests of the past. For us, the Treaty's claim of nuclear-weapon-free, demilitarised status for Antarctica appears hollow in view of the fact that the Treaty parties have turned a blind eye to apartheid South Africa's *free* access to a portion of Antarctica for the purpose of conducting missile tests, as was mentioned recently in the Secretary-General's report of 29 October 1990 - document A/45/571 - concerning investigations into South Africa's nuclear-tipped ballistic missile capability.

(Mr. Adekanye, Nigeria)

The net effect of all them and other related developments is that the Antarctic continent is far from what was envisaged in the 1959 Treaty. First, serious negative effects have been evident in the systematic depletion of the scarce and dwindling living and non-living resources of Antarctica as a result of increased human activities engineered by large-scale economic attractions and potentially huge mineral deposits like oil, gas and rare metals.

Secondly, aonstruation of scientific stations, runways, tourist hotels and other supporting facilities are taking their toll on the 2-per-cent ice-free terrestrial part of Antarctica, which has become over-aongerted, with adverse consequences for the fragile ecology of the continent. Most important, the issue of frequent environmental pollution, suppressed over the years because of the physical location and remoteness of the virgin continent, has come to the forefront of international concern as the world grapples with the full consequences of environmental pollution and degradation. There have been reported cases of the dumping of toxic wastes by stations and vessels, the burning of fossil fuel and combustible wastes in open pits, with the consequent aerial spread of pollution, and large-scale oil spills from vessels and storage pumps. The case of the Argentine supply vessel bahia Par-, which spilled nearly 250,000 gallons of oil near Palmer Station in February 1989 and polluted almost 15 kilometres of the Antarctic coast, is particularly relevant. That accident has not been fully investigated nor has its environmental effect on the surrounding waters, the penguin colonies and the krill stocks been accurately determined up to now.

As a coastal State and part of the African continent sharing the South Atlantic Ocean, which commands the approaches to a vital portion of Antarctica, Nigeria cannot but be concerned about these adverse developments in Antarctica. It is common knowledge that upsetting the delicate balance of the Antarctic ecosystem

(Mr. Adekanve, Niaeria)

through substantial human activities, such as mineral exploration, would cause a decrease in the Antarctic ice temperature with a corresponding rise in its sea level. For the virgin continent with over 90 per cent of the world's ice, a rise of even a few inches could result in a sharp increase in global sea levels that could submerge many coastal settlements, particularly those in close proximity. On the other hand.. because Antarctica plays a vital robs in deep ocean circulation, far away from the Antarctic beds, pollution of its ocean would have far-reaching effects several thousand kilometres away and into the northern oceans, including the South Atlantic. That is why my Government was compelled to highlight this serious concern in the opening speech by our Minister of External Affairs at the second meeting of the States of the Zone of Peace and Co-operation of the South Atlantic, hosted by Nigeria at Abuja, from 25 to 29 June 1990.

On that occasion, he drew attention to the need for the environmental protection of the South Atlantic region, and called for utmost vigilance in ensuring that the region's marine environment was safe from the illegal dumping of radioactive and other hazardous wastes on our sea-beds thus safeguarding the marine life and fauna on which our fishing resources depend. The statement went further:

> "In this connection, member States of the Zone need to take great interest in the disturbing developments currently taking place on the virgin continent of Antarctica whose reported mineral wealth has already attracted international attention. Antarctica must continue to serve purely as a global scientific laboratory and its exploration to be confined to peaceful non-commercial purposes. The increasing reports of massive oil spillage from ships and tankers plying Antarctica should spur us into action to alert the international community to the grave dangers of environmental pollution and spill-over effects into the South Atlantic Ocean, including our shores."

(Mr. Adekanve, Nigeria)

As a first step in addressing these concerns, my delegation welcomes the new momentum in favour of a legally binding moratorium on mineral exploration in Antarctica by some key members of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Party States, including France, Australia and New Zealand. We also note the relevant, positive stand being taken by the public, parliamentary houses and non-governmental organizations in a number of countries, including Belgium and Italy and, most recently, the United States.

Even before the Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities (CRAMRA) was signed in Wellington, New Zealand, in 1988, Nigeria had spoken against attempts to lend legality to the degradation and despoliation of the Antarctic environment. It is thus a triumph, limited though this was, for those championing the cause of exclusively peaceful scientific research activities in Antarctica that CRAMRA now stands discredited. It is yet another discriminatory ploy meant to perpetuate the flaws in the Antarctic Treaty.

Nigeria thus calls for a universal rigime that would protect the Antarctic environment. impose an effective control over minerals prospecting and extraction, and halt the present indiscriminate scramble for their commercial exploitation. The current Antarctic Treaty is, even though claims are made to the contrary, inherently incapable of performing these roles in the long run. Neither can it meet the legitimate aspirations of the international community in consonance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The perennially hostile disposition of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to the request by non-parties for open and frank discussions on the question, and the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties' preferences for utter secrecy in the conduct of the affairs of a continent affecting the peace, security and development of all nations, big or small, leave much to be desired.

(Mr. Adekanye, Niaeria)

In the same vein, the Antarctic Consultative Party States' refusal to invite the Secretary-General or his representative to their current meeting in Santiago, Chile, which started on 19 November, in complete disregard of previous, relevant General Assembly resolutions, does not contribute to confidence-building.

It is my delegation's considered view that the review of the Antarctic Treaty in 1991 should provide ample opportunity finally to rectify these serious shortcomings so that the Treaty will enjoy broad appeal in the years ahead. At the core of these reforms is the fact that Antarctica must serve as and be declared a nature reserve or world park, made equally accessible to all countries, and a laboratory for scientific knowledge and research. All territorial claims whatsoever must be permanently frosen. In place of the present Antarctic Treaty there should be a new legal régime, concluded under the aegis of the United Nations, to ensure universal membership and to safeguard the interests of all nations.

Pending that arrangement, however, the monitoring of the activities of Antarctica by the United Nations, through the Secretary-General, should be facilitated. It is my delegation's hope that these suggestions will be considered seriously and that the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties will be favourably disposed towards the two draft resolutions on the question before the Committee - A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.1 and A/C.1/45/L.64 - which my delegation fully endorses.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Malaysia to introduce the revised text of the joint draft resolution on the question of Antarctica.

Mr. REDZUAN (Malaysia): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.1, entitled "Question of Antarctica", on behalf of my own country and Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Comoros, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Lesotho, Mexico. Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Developments since our delibrations on this item last year have more than ever underlined the need for international collective action for the protection of Antarctica. At the same time, there is a clear link with the increasing consciousness and concern of the international community for its global environmental protection. Since Antarctica covers 10 per cent of the Earth's surface and involves about 70 per cent of the world's available freshwater resources, we share a common responsibility to protect its environment. Because of its critical importance to the global environment and ecology, Antarctica must stand as a challenge to the international community to shoulder this shared responsibility, which is consistent with the current crends in international relations, when cold-war divisions are giving way to international democratisation, consensus and co-operation. The thrust of the draft resolution is indeed towards achieving that aim.

I regret to inform the Committee that once again consensus has not been possible. Nevertheless, the sponsors have endeavoured to take into account to the greatest possible extent the views and concerns of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties. It is clear that the tone of the draft resolution reflects this awareness of the need for balance and accommodation in the interests of all members.

(Mr. Redsuan, Malaysia)

However, as I pointed out earlier, the draft resolution's overriding objective is the protection of Antarctica. If sacrificing such an objective is the price for the achievement of consensus, there can be no doubt about the sponsors' clear preference.

The draft resolution emphasises the importance of Antarctica to the global environment, and the need for its protection against all harmful human activities and for the democratisation of the management of the continent for the benefit of mankind as a whole. The preambular paragraphs reaffirm the significance of Antarctica and its relationship to the global environment. The preambular part also reaffirms that Antarctica should continue for ever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it should not become the scene or object of international discord. It further reflects the consciousness of the environmental degradation that mining would cause to Antarctica, and welcomes the initiative taken by some Consultative Party countries in promoting Antarctica as a nature reserve or world park and the banning of prospecting and mining in and around Antarctica.

The preambular paragraphs also share the concern over the environmental degradation of Antarctica and its impact on global environment, as expressed at the first substantive session of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Nairobi last August. The preambular part further reaffirm8 the necessity for ensuring the comprehensive protection and conservation of Antarctica through a multilateral framework negotiated with the full participation of all members of the international community, It also addresses the need to prevent or minimise the impact of human activities resulting from the large number of scientific stations and expeditions in Antarctica. In this regard it welcomes the ongoing trend of acknowledging the

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

need for internationally co-ordinated scientific research stations in Antarctica in order to minimise unnecessary duplication in logistical support facilities.

In paragraph 1 the General Assembly would express its regret that despite numerous resolutions the Consultative Parties have not seen fit to invite the Secretary-General or his representative to the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties, including the special session of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting in Santiago from 19 November to 7 December this year. It once again urges the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to invite the Secretary-General or his representative to their future meetings.

In paragraph 2 the General Assembly would call upon the Treaty Parties to deposit information and documents covering all aspects of Antarctica with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and reguest the Secretary-General to submit a report on his evaluations to the General Assembly at its next session.

In paragraph 3 the General Assembly would express its conviction that any move to draw up a comprehensive environmental convention on the conservation and protection of Antarctica and its dependent and associated ecosystems, as well as establishing a nature reserve or world park, must be negotiated with the full participation of the international community. In this regard, we believe the matter should be pursued within the context of the United Nations system, including the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.

After consultations with our co-sponsora, we have agreed to delete paragraph 4. However, it remains our firm conviction that the various aspects of concerns over Antarctica's environment should be appropriately addressed by the 1992 Waited Nations Conference on Environment and Development.

In paragraph 5 the General Assembly would urge all members of the international community to support all efforts to ban prospecting and mining in and around Antarctica and to ensure that all activities should be used exclusively for

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

the purpose of peaceful scientific investigation, and that all activities should ensure the maintenance of international peace and security in Antarctica and the protection of its environment, and should be for the benefit of all mankind.

In paragraph 6 the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to undertake a comprehensive study, with the help of relevant United Nations programmes and specialised agencies, such as the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme, on the establishment of a United Nations-sponsored station in Antarctica, with a view to promoting co-ordiuated international co-operation in scientific research for the benefit of mankind, particularly the importance of Antarctica to the global environment and ecosystems, as well as to act as an early-warning system on climate change and accidents.

In paragraph 7 the General Assembly would urge all States to co-operate with the Secretary-General and to continue consultations on all aspects relating to Antarctica.

In paragraph 8 the General Assembly would further request the Secretary-General to submit, within its existing resources, a report on the state of the environment in Antarctica and its impact on the global system at its next session.

We are aware of the financial implications of our proposals in paragraphs 6 and 8. But the Secretariat could overcome the problem by preparing the reports using available data and resources. Data could also be obtained from international scientific studies by such bodies as Greenpeace. Data from the Treaty Party countries would also be welcomed to assist the Secretariat in preparing the reports,

Finally, in paragraph 9 the General Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-sixth session the item entitled "Question of Antarctica".

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

The sponsors of the draft resolution have made every effort to avoid confrontation. The text has been carefully drafted in reasonable language, taking into recount recent developments and reiterating fundamental concerns of the international communi ty.

We are confident that the Committee will adopt the draft resolution, as it has similar draft resolutions in the past. We therefore present the draft resolution for action by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker on the list of speakers for this morning's meeting and thus the Committee has concluded its general debate on agenda item 67.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the programme of work and timetable, on Friday, 23 November, the Committee is scheduled to embark on the next stage of its work, namely, the general debate, consideration of and action on draft resolutions under agenda items 68, 69 and 70, relating to international security. However, as there are no speakers inscribed in the list of speakers for that day, the Committee will begin its consideration of those agenda items on Monday, 26 November.

Also on Monday, as the Committee decided earlier, we will take action on the two draft resolutions under agenda item 67, "Question of Antarctica". I would encourage the delegations concerned to complete their consultations as soon as possible.

I would also propose that the deadline for the closure of the list of speakers for the general debate under international security agenda items be extended to Monday, 26 November, at 6 p.m. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the proposal is acceptable to the Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.