

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
FORTY-SECOND SESSION



FIRST COMMITTEE
48th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 18 November 1987
at 3 p.m.
New York

*Official Records**

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADETTO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

QUESTION OF ANTARCTICA: GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT
RESOLUTIONS (continued)

*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 will be issued after the end of the session in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

584

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 70 (continued)

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

Mr. SIDDIKY (Bangladesh): For the fifth time the international community, acting within the framework of the United Nations, is debating the issue Of Antarctica. Past debates have revealed the increasing intensity with which the international community has expressed its legitimate interest in, and genuine concern for, the fate of the continent, which, more than any other land mass in this global village called Earth, affects the lives of all living beings. The debates have also revealed that, in addition to maintaining the delicate balance of the ecosystem, Antarctica is vital to the environment, scientific research, international peace and security, and the economy Of today, and more so of tomorrow.

The question, therefore, naturally is how a **continent** so vital to mankind and to life on earth is to be managed. Should it be by some countries possessing power and money which can pay the entry fee or by all whose lives are vitally affected? Before we answer that question, let us take a quick, chronological **look** at the international solutions proposed **on** this vital question.

In 1948 the United States of America first proposed joint management of Antarctica by a small group of countries. **In** the same year Chile responded with a noble proposal to freeze **territorial** claims for five years and to permit scientific research activities, expeditions and bases without prejudice to sovereignty claims in the area south of **60°** south latitude. In 1956 **New** Zealand Prime Minister Nash suggested a form of United Nations trusteeship over Antarctica. In 1975 **New** Zealand also suggested that Antarctica be **made an** international park. From 1956 to 1959 India asked the General Assembly to give consideration to Antarctica to secure agreement on the use of the continent and its resources for peaceful purposes and the welfare of all.

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

In February 1958 the first meeting of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research, established by the International Council of Scientific Unions, was held. On 3 May 1958 President Eisenhower circulated the United States note inviting 11 other nations to seek joint administrative arrangements for Antarctica. During October-November 1959 the Treaty was negotiated in Washington D.C., and it was signed on 1 December 1959. The Treaty entered into force on 23 June 1961.

The object of this chronological exercise is to trace an evaluation of a communal, not an individual, solution to an important problem of that time. Since then the importance of the problem has been magnified, and the political map of the world has changed, giving rise to the emergence of many independent nations arising out of the bonds of colonialism. We can find confirmation of this in the intention of the framers, in the preamble to the Treaty, which states in the first and last paragraphs :

"Recognizing that: it is in the interest of all mankind that Antarctica shall continue forever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and shall not become the scene or object of international discord;

" ...

" ...

"Convinced also that a treaty ensuring the use of Antarctica for peaceful purposes only and the continuance of international harmony in Antarctica will further the purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations".

The Principles that unarguably emanate from the preambular Part of the Treaty are, first, that the use of Antarctica is in the interest of all mankind) secondly, that it shall for ever be used exclusively for peaceful purposes only; thirdly,

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

that it shall not become the scene or object of international discord; and, fourthly, that international harmony so generated will further the purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

The supporting acts for those four basic principles can be seen in the operative part - the articles themselves. Article I, in support of the principles of peaceful purposes, prohibits, inter alia, any measures of a military nature. One also notices that the scope of the peaceful purpose was confined to scientific research. Further, in support of the principle of international co-operation derived from the specific reference to the Charter, the Treaty embodied some concrete measures of co-operation in article III. The other articles were mainly concerned with operational details.

Clearly, the possibility of commerce, commercial use of Antarctica's resources, prospecting, exploration, exploitation of mineral resources and so on did not escape the framers of the Treaty. But they did not include any such acts, realizing that to do so could violate the principle of peaceful purposes and all other principles in as much as they had the potential to turn the continent into a scene or object of international discord. It certainly does not require great wisdom or experience in world affairs to realize that if economic activities take place, militarization of areas where such activities take place cannot remain far behind. That could be why no activities other than scientific co-operation were mentioned and the phrase "inter alia" was used in article I to prohibit not only activities of a military nature but of all other kinds except those mentioned in the articles themselves, such as scientific co-operation.

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

Yet today the Parties to the Antarctic Treaty System, and in particular the Consultative Parties, in a twist of logic and rationale are actively engaged in drafting conventions for the exploitation of living and non-living resources, violating all four basic principles of the Treaty and going beyond the clearly laid down scope of the Treaty. This we dare call an act of original sin by the Treaty Parties; and in their rush to do so they would not mind putting forth all the specious arguments with which the international community has been bombarded during the last four years.

Let me recount briefly the main line of argument advanced by the proponents of this vastly expanded interpretation of the Antarctic Treaty system. First, the Treaty system is billed as an "open" and not an "exclusive" one. We all know from the workings of the Treaty system the hierarchic difference between the States with Consultative Party status and those with non-Consultative Party status with no decision-making power. The qualification needed to become a Consultative Party has become so prohibitive in terms of financial and technical know-how requirements that almost half the Member States are still out of the policy-making orbit. An examination of the original Treaty will show that the provision of an otherwise good faith observance of the activities of the Treaty - and I refer to paragraph 2 of article IX of the Treaty - has been, by manipulation, converted to the status of a conditionality clause, thus giving another blow below the belt to the superior principles of the Treaty. This has served the original Treaty members well, I presume, for out of nowhere two levels of membership have been created by a self-serving interpretation. The question one would now like to ask is: If the Treaty is so open and non-restrictive, why do not the Consultative Parties remove this self-created class distinction and make the Treaty more universal, which would be more in line with the fundamental principles of the original Treaty?

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

The next argument given is that the Treaty has worked well in practice, that it has kept the area clear of military and nuclear activities, that it has allowed research activities without any problem, that it has been able to maintain the area free from pollution and to keep it environmentally clean. We agree at this point - and we do so with appreciation - that direct militarization or physical parceling of land has not yet taken place, but we also cannot fail to note that the noble objective of scientific research has, in many cases, degenerated into mineral prospecting. Further, the Treaty Consultative Parties have got themselves not only involved in the exploitation of *living resources* but also very much poised for the exploitation of non-living resources, thus paving the way for slow militarization and assertion of territorial claims or rights associated with sovereignty in the areas to be exploited in Antarctica.

I submit that such a blueprint for action is in direct contravention of paragraph 2 of article IV of the Antarctic Treaty, which prohibits such activities. How can the Treaty Parties allow the establishment of a mineral régime that will give rights for prospecting, exploration and exploitation without establishing a valid right or title over the area in question? And how can such rights be asserted in the absence of an international accord without giving rise to international discord - a cardinal prohibition principle of the Treaty?

As regards the claim with regard to keeping the area free from pollution, I am afraid there is no confirmation by independent observers of such a claim. In fact, the report of the respectable Greenpeace International circulated to delegations here reports a lack of regularity measures, causing serious environmental damage, and a lack of conservation measures, resulting in overfishing in Antarctica by the members of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties. I refer to page 5, paragraph 2; page 7, paragraph 7; page 8, paragraphs 2 and 5; page 11, paragraph 7; and page 13, paragraph 5 of the report.

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

Another point advanced by the Treaty Parties is that the Antarctic Treaty System has served the international community well. May we humbly ask which international community here is being alluded to? Certainly it does not include the vast majority of States outside the Treaty System.

The object of drawing a little attention to the provisions of the Treaty was to show how in practice a few countries have deliberately diverted a fine instrument of international co-operation from its explicit goals of peaceful purposes, international co-operation and avoidance of discord to one of exclusivity, class distinction and discord, which the Treaty explicitly wanted to avoid. The concern of non-Treaty Parties such as Bangladesh is not over the Treaty or its basic principles, but over the undesirable and inappropriate interpretations that have been imputed to it by the Consultative Parties and over their practices. That deviation from the fundamental goals and distortion of them cannot but cause the international community to be worried and concerned over a matter in which it has a vital stake.

This vital stake has become more pronounced and clarified as a consequence of the recent debate on environment at the current session of the General Assembly. During the Brundtland debate, as which it was popularly known, the President of the Maldives, while emphasizing the importance of the preservation of the global ecosystem for his country's survival, said that a few feet of rise in the sea-level could mean the end of his country. Any misuse of the ecosystem of Antarctica, apart from the effect of the "ozone hole", could in our opinion independently raise the sea-level, for we do not know what consequences the infusion of a vast amount of energy-using devices, such as are required in large-scale mineral exploitation, could do to the mountains of ice and the icy environs of Antarctica. This therefore is an area in which we must exercise extreme caution and in which the international community must share in the decision-making process, for there more

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

countries in the world in the same situation as the Maldives, and the stakes are too high and too important to be left to some self-appointed guardians of Antarctica.

I could go on to cite the inadvisability, inappropriateness, nay, the folly of the metiers of the Antarctic Treaty System in keeping the majority of the nations out of their fold by creating artificial procedural barriers and not using the framework of the united Nations to resolve the serious problem of managing the world's last global common heritage, Antarctica, for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

In the Brundtland report, Antarctica has been rightly so placed and defined because of the "commonality" of this continent along with the oceans and outer space. The call for the exploitation of the resources of the continent of Antarctica for the benefit of all mankind in a manner consistent with the protection Of its environment through a united Nations-sponsored treaty system has come from different directions. The declaration adopted by the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Bon-Aligned Countries, held at Harare in 1986, has said so; the Organization of African unity (OAU) at its forty-second ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa in 1985, has said so; and the Fifth Summit Of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, held in Kuwait in 1987, has said so. Even the European Parliament acknowledges the commons nature Of Antarctica in its resolution of 18 September 1987, although it has a different prescription for its solution. What is needed is the adoption of a peaceful, equitable and non-exploitative régime in Antarctica that will be accountable to the international community only, This does not mean the internationalization or politicization of the issue, as has been feared by the European Parliament, but the universalization of an issue in which every State has a legitimate stake and interest.

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

A rational and peaceful way to accomplish this would be for the member States of the Antarctic Treaty system to involve the Secretary-General in all their activities in order to keep the international community fully informed; to put a moratorium on all activities involving prospecting, exploring and exploitation of the resources of the continent, as has been called for in the resolutions on this subject in the General Assembly; and to begin the process of a new comprehensive political debate on Antarctica with non-Treaty States in order to evolve a universal treaty by 1991, when the present Treaty will be open to modification or amendment.

Bangladesh shares the sentiments of the delegate of Peru to the Conference on the Law of the Sea, Mr. Alvaro de Soto, who in 1979, while acknowledging the contributions and experience of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties, said that the present Antarctic Treaty "cannot purport . . . to prejudge the definitive status of Antarctica" and that the Antarctic Treaty should be viewed as an interim régime which would "facilitate a convergence, in due time, between those within and those without".

Last, but not least, is our abhorrence for the continued participation of the racist apartheid régime of South Africa in the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties. We wonder why the sophisticated legal minds of those countries cannot take off the specious veil of representation of the racist apartheid regime and deny South Africa participation so long as genuine majority representation from that country is not forthcoming. There is no dearth of case law in this respect in international law.

In conclusion, my delegation does not believe in confrontation. However, I assume we are not expected to give up our very legitimate demand for what is fair and reasonable on the part of the Consultative Parties merely because an arrangement was made in favour of the fortunate and the resourceful - and before

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

other nations emerged - for the management of global commons, such as Antarctica, when mankind as a whole does not benefit.

Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): Allow me first to express my great pleasure at seeing you in the Chair guiding our deliberations on this important agenda item. Through my association with you over the years, I have come to appreciate your wisdom, tact and vast experience in international diplomacy. I am sure that by applying these eminent qualities to the subject-matter under discussion, you will achieve the same successful results as you did so impressively when dealing with the items on disarmament.

Ever since Antarctica was first included in the agenda of the First Committee, a large number of delegations, representing both Parties to the Antarctic Treaty and non-Treaty States, have expressed themselves on various aspects of this question. The wide-ranging debates that have taken place and the Secretary-General's study and his subsequent reports have clarified a number of pertinent issues and contributed to a better grasp of the significance of the region, both in its geopolitical and ecological import and in its scientific and economic potential. They have also highlighted the growing concern of the large majority of nations regarding the way in which that vast and barely explored continent is being administered. As a result, Antarctica has assumed increasing prominence, particularly in terms of its far-reaching and complex ramifications for the international community as a whole.

Throughout the consideration of this question, members readily acknowledged the commendable service being rendered by the Antarctic Treaty nations to the world at large, by fostering scientific research and environmental protection, while at the same time providing a valuable model for peaceful co-operation in conditions of total demilitarization and denuclearization.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

In recognition of the greatly aroused interest of Governments and in response to the successive resolutions adopted by the First Committee and the General Assembly, there has indeed been a greater, albeit still selective, flow of information and data on the functioning and activities of the Antarctic Treaty system. It is also worth noting that since last year, the Consultative Parties have enlarged their list of invitations to organizations of their choice to participate in their meetings. Although such participation was limited to a predetermined select number of items on the agenda, one may hope that it connotes the gradual opening of the system to other organizations interested in Antarctic affairs.

It is of deep concern to my delegation, however, that greater availability of information on Antarctica has not yet resulted in a correspondingly enhanced degree of mutual understanding and convergence of views on certain basic points of contention.

Serious misgivings concerning the structure, scope and decision-making process of the Antarctic Treaty system have persisted. No conclusive answers have been provided to such disturbing ambiguities as the interrelationship between the Antarctic Treaty system and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, especially with regard to questions of jurisdiction, dispute settlement and the role of the International Sea-Bed Authority in any future exploitation of resources in the maritime areas of the Antarctic region. Divergent perspectives remain concerning the extent and modalities of proper interaction between the Antarctic Treaty system and the United Nations system, particularly in the context of ensuring Antarctica's utilization for exclusively peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all mankind. Furthermore, the steady expansion of activities in that region and, in particular, the trend towards the eventual exploration and exploitation of Antarctica's mineral resources, have heightened concern about

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

environmental degradation, resource depletion and the revived contention over territorial and sovereignty claims. Consequently, doubts continue as to the ability of the Antarctic Treaty system to resolve these emergent problems in a manner equitable to the interests of the international community.

It is undeniable that the Treaty has for the past quarter of a century operated primarily in the interests of its Consultative Parties, to the exclusion of the vast majority of nations. The untenable inequality and inequities inherent in the system are exemplified by the fact that a small number of countries have arrogated to themselves the right to regulate all aspects of Antarctica. Thus, in the context of the Antarctic Treaty's two-tier membership structure and policy-making mechanism, of the 37 members, only the 20 Consultative Parties have the prerogative to make decisions, while the remaining 17 do not. Quite clearly, irrespective of whether or not a State is a Party to the Treaty, it remains a virtual bystander under the Antarctic Treaty system unless it is a Consultative Party. *

*Mr. Nashashibi (Jordan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

In theory, any State can accede to the Treaty and become a Consultative Party. To acquire that status, however, the candidate member must pay quite a prohibitive "entry fee": It must either finance an Antarctic scientific expedition or establish a scientific station there. It amazes us that such an irrelevant and anachronistic requirement is still being maintained and defended in this era of democratization of inter-State relations and international co-operation for development. In these conditions, the reluctance of the developing countries especially to join the Treaty is quite understandable, for it entails assuming obligations while being precluded from exercising any meaningful rights.

One area in particular that continues to be surrounded by an aura of exclusive confidentiality is that of the ongoing negotiations on a régime for mineral resources. The Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties tell us that the régime they are negotiating is of little commercial consequence for now since not much is known about the actual extent of mineral deposits and since in any event the technological feasibility of their exploitation is still far off. These assertions, however, are not corroborated by the rather unseemly haste and secrecy with which these negotiations are being conducted with a view to their completion by the middle of next year.

When the disposition of scarce resources which are beyond national jurisdiction are placed beyond the decision-making ambit of the international community as a whole, it inevitably causes the greatest concern. To compound the situation further, the Antarctic Treaty itself does not even cover the question of mineral resources, which raises the issue of the legal standing of these negotiations and the instrument they will eventually yield.

It is Indonesia's unchanged view that any future exploration and exploitation of the mineral resources of Antarctica should be based on a régime that would take fully into account the interests of the international community, ensure the

(Mr. Alatae, Indonesia)

maintenance of peace and security in the region, guarantee the protection of its environment and the balanced conservation of its resources, and provide for the equitable management and sharing of the benefits of such exploitation. In fact, those aims are fully in line with what the Antarctic Treaty itself has set as its principal objectives.

Another area of *potential* contention has to do with the prospective relationship between the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Antarctic Treaty system, especially in relation to such questions as respective jurisdictions, sovereignty claims, the settlement of disputes and the future exploration and exploitation of resources in the marine areas of Antarctica. Let me note at the outset that, even among the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties themselves, there exist significant differences of view on, for example, the issue of maritime jurisdiction.

In my statement last year I dealt rather specifically with various aspects of potential controversy which are in need of further clarification and elaboration, and I shall not go into them again. Let me simply summarize that, as an archipelago State, Indonesia naturally attaches the utmost importance and prominence to the Convention on the Law of the Sea, to which, as it noted, an overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations are signatories. Hence, we shall object to any attempt at unilateral interpretation or delimitation of the applicability and jurisdiction of the Convention over those spheres already clearly designated as being the common heritage of mankind.

On a related question, my delegation also notes that, notwithstanding the existence of the Convention on the Conservation of Marine Resources, the over-exploitation of those resources, inter alia because of intensive commercial fishing in the seas adjacent to the Antarctic, has already resulted in the rapid depletion of some species. There has been, as we know, a proliferation of legal

(Mr. Alataa, Indonesia)

régimes governing different Antarctic activities. But developments under each of these regimes have gone on and have been considered in isolation from one another. This raises questions regarding effective co-ordination among these times inter se and with the Antarctic Treaty system. Given the general lack of mechanisms for enforcing regulatory rules over these régimes and in the event of non-consensus, each Antarctic Treaty Consultative Party at present is allowed to pursue its own self-serving policies - which cannot but threaten the fragile ecosystem of Antarctica,

A further element impinging profoundly on the sensibilities of non-Party States and indeed on that of a number of Treaty Parties is that a renegade régime, shunned by the vast majority of the international community and suspended from participation in this very Assembly, remains a member "in good standing" in the Antarctic Treaty system. That the racist Pretoria régime is allowed to continue its participation in the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties in the face of universal censure and of calls for its total isolation is an unacceptable anomaly to all those who condemn apartheid as a crime against humanity. My delegation believes the Treaty Parties would do well to rid themselves of this stigma on the Treaty's political and moral principles and provisions.

By now it is self-evident that the complex of contentious issues, both actual and potential, to which I have summarily alluded carry far-reaching implications beyond Antarctica and the Treaty itself. Indeed, they touch upon such fundamental concepts as multilateralism, interdependence, democratization of international relations, and equality among States.

Four consecutive years of debate on the question of Antarctica in this Assembly have brought greater clarity to many of its intricate aspects but have unfortunately not yet provided us with agreed answers to these basic questions:

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

How best should Antarctica be managed so as to ensure that it will indeed continue for ever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, never become the scene or object of international discord, and be truly dedicated to the interests of all mankind? How can we ensure wider and more active global participation in the affairs and activities of the Antarctic Treaty system without in any way invalidating its present achievements or undermining its present structure and functioning?

In addressing those questions there is clearly a difference in approach between the Treaty Parties, on the one hand, and the non-Treaty Parties, on the other. We are therefore at a crossroads. The Antarctic Treaty Parties can either persist in their position of narrow legality, of assuming rights deriving from such self-determined criteria as "expertise", "experience" and "actual scientific research") or they can recognize the legitimacy of the international community's interests and concerns in Antarctica, agree to co-operate with it and to harmonize concerted efforts to enhance the efficacy and equity and secure the wider acceptability of the Antarctic Treaty system. The non-Treaty Parties, on the other hand, can either seek to supplant or replace the present Treaty system, with all the risks that such a course would entail) or they can, taking into account the existing realities and possibilities, try to ensure - preferably in co-operation with the Antarctic Treaty Parties - that the process of dynamic adaptation of the Treaty system and the resolution of its present deficiencies can be started.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

Since choosing the first in either set of options would lead only to confrontation - and nothing could be farther from my delegation's or, I am sure, anyone else's intention - there seems to be no rational choice other than that of choosing the second option.

For that approach to succeed, however, certain essential adjustments and measures must first be carried out. We would suggest the following, among other things: First, the present two-tier decision-making mechanism of the Treaty should be reformed so as to ensure its more democratic and equitable functioning, and the criteria and conditions for accession to membership should be appropriately revised. Such adjustments would certainly increase confidence in the Treaty thereby strengthening the system as a whole.

Secondly, greater access to and wider dissemination of information on Antarctic Treaty meetings, activities, negotiations and decisions should be ensured, with the United Nations acting as the central repository of such information. That could only enhance the credibility of the Antarctic Treaty system and of the profession of its members that it is indeed an open, transparent system without exclusivity of any sort.

Thirdly, an effective organic link should be established between the Antarctic Treaty system and the United Nations system, at the highest level of co-ordination. The proposal to invite the Secretary-General's direct involvement, as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87, now before this Committee, should be viewed in that context.

Fourthly, there should be provision for more active participation by all relevant United Nations organs, bodies, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations in the deliberations and programmes of the Antarctic Treaty system in order to encourage their input and draw upon their established expertise. This is

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

particularly relevant in the fields of environmental, meteorological and other scientific research, which increasingly require a global, interdisciplinary approach and greater international co-ordination.

Finally, a moratorium should be imposed on the negotiations on the establishment of a minerals régime. We believe that until such time as all members of the international community can be privy to and/or participate effectively in the elaboration of such a régime the present negotiations among Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties cannot but be seen as an attempt to present us with a fait accompli and as such constitute an exercise fraught with the potential for international contention and discord.

All the suggestions I have made are, in one form or another, reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 now before this Committee, of which Indonesia is a sponsor. We believe they are reasonable and rational suggestions, if we indeed share the same interest in ensuring that the management, exploration, exploitation and use of Antarctica is conducted in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and of promoting international co-operation for the benefit of mankind as a whole. We further believe that their implementation would strengthen rather than weaken the Antarctic Treaty and lead to the evolution of a system fully accountable and hence fully acceptable to the international community. It is therefore my delegation's hope that they can gain the widest support of all members of the Committee and become the basis for more constructive co-operation and consensus action among us all, Treaty Parties and non-Parties alike, in the future.

Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia) : We have heard some 16 speakers so far in this debate. While, generally, those speakers have supported the Malaysian initiative and expressed some criticism of the Antarctic Treaty, some have in fact acknowledged some of the virtues of the Treaty. But I speak today on the question

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

of Antarctica on behalf of more than twice that number: I speak on behalf of States Parties to the Antarctic Treaty. This is a joint statement reflecting the views of Consultative and non-Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty.

I regard it as an honour to have been entrusted with the task of speaking on behalf of a group so truly diverse in terms of political orientation, influence, economic and social, development and geographical location. Despite those differences, Parties to the Treaty have displayed a remarkable consistency and unity in relation to Antarctica. This joint statement is but another indication - if one were needed - of the ongoing unity of purpose and direction shown by the Treaty Parties.

When the Antarctic Treaty was signed in 1959 there were 12 signatories. Since that time the Treaty has shown a steady growth in membership, so that today the 37 States which are Parties to the Treaty represent the majority of mankind. They include all the permanent members of the Security Council, major developed and developing countries, countries from the East and the West and from the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and all the States which border on the Antarctic region.

Since I last addressed the Committee on this matter, five States - Australia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Greece and the Republic of Korea - have acceded to the Antarctic Treaty, while the German Democratic Republic and Italy have become Consultative Parties.

That is an impressive growth in membership, especially as many of the new accessions to the Treaty have occurred since the question came before the United Nations. Still other countries are considering acceding to the Treaty, while others are seeking consultative status. That in itself is an indication of the continuing viability, growing strength and successful operation of the Treaty system.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

This is the fifth annual debate on the question of Antarctica. From the beginning, Treaty Parties have had misgivings about the real value of such debates, but they have participated in them because of their belief that it was important that the successful functioning of the Treaty should be better known. They have also supplied a great amount of material on Antarctica to the Secretary-General. Some of it has been published, but much more is available for inspection in the files of the Secretariat. I would encourage genuinely interested delegations to consult that material - some of it largely unread - which is evidence of the Treaty Parties' continued willingness to keep the United Nations informed of relevant developments, notwithstanding their view that there are no problems or tensions in Antarctica that can justify having this item considered each year by the General Assembly.

That willingness to share information should not be surprising, for from its very inception the Treaty was designed to complement and further the purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, to use wording from the preamble to the Treaty itself.

(Mr. Woolcott , Australia)

We have heard much in this debate and previous debates about the alleged defects of the Treaty system. The complaints depict the Treaty as something static, something frozen in time - presumably in 1961, when it came into force. The Treaty system is accused of being closed, of operating in secrecy and of working only for the benefit of its own membership, rather than for the good of humanity as a whole. These arguments are not new. They have been heard in this Committee for five years, but increasingly they are refuted by the facts, and indeed in many cases they have been moderated.

We believe that the Treaty already enjoys the legitimacy and the transparency which, according to suggestions in this debate, it lacks. The Antarctic Treaty is an established international legal instrument, registered with the United Nations, which any State is welcome to sign.

Let me address several specific points of criticism. First, there is the myth of exclusivity. This was not true even in 1961; the Treaty explicitly provides for the accession to it of any Member of the United Nations. Indeed, States not members of this body may also be invited to accede, as has happened recently. The Treaty is not some sort of exclusive club) we repeat that it is open to accession by any country with an interest in the future of Antarctica.

Another proof of wisdom can be found in the provision which constitutes a fundamental element of the present Treaty system, providing for a freeze - no pun intended - on territorial claims in Antarctica during the time the Treaty is in force. This provision has enabled all countries to co-operate, and indeed to compete, without pressure, in Scientific research in the continent.

In the same vein, I should also respond to suggestions that the Treaty Parties are currently engaged in carving up Antarctica's mineral resources for their own benefit. That is both unjust and untrue.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

First, it was the recognition of the need for firm environmental protection which motivated Treaty Parties to negotiate a minerals convention to govern any possible minerals activity in the future.

Secondly, there is no vast cornucopia of minerals available for exploitation in Antarctica, and the extraction of those that do exist would seem economically impracticable for the foreseeable future.

Thirdly, the negotiations to establish the Antarctic minerals régime are neither hurried nor furtive. All 37 Treaty Parties are entitled to participate in them, and when a convention is concluded, all States will be able to accede to it and to undertake any future mineral resource activities under it.

In fact, the Treaty Parties agreed seven years ago on the principle that any mineral resources in Antarctica will be developed in a manner which will not prejudice the interests of all mankind. The convention is being negotiated on that basis.

It has also been suggested that the Treaty Parties have arrogated to themselves the right to determine the minerals convention. I have already pointed out the widely representative nature of the group of States Parties to the Treaty, but there is another factor. While it is quite improbable that the continent's mineral resources could be economically exploited in this century on the basis of present technology, advances in science and technology could ultimately make such exploitation possible. In addition, the possibility of mineral exploitation activities could raise serious environmental issues, and these are being addressed in negotiating the convention. It would be irresponsible not to take measures now against such potential problems.

While these matters are under discussion, the Treaty Parties have themselves agreed to a moratorium on minerals exploration and development. We believe that

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

this is a highly responsible action, designed to ensure that there is no prejudice to the interests of all mankind in Antarctica. It follows from this that the Treaty Parties believe that any calls for a moratorium on the negotiation Of the minerals **régime** are unrealistic.

On another issue, as Treaty Parties have explained many times before, Antarctica cannot properly be compared to outer space **or the** deep sea-bed, as **some** speakers in this debate have done. unlike outer space and the deep sea-bed, Antarctica is the subject of a preexisting legal Treaty. There are also **territorial claims** over **most** of the continent. **But** I shall not dwell on these arguments now, since they are on record in previous debates.

Another aspect of the Treaty system's demonstrated capacity to evolve has been the provision of information on Antarctica. **As** international interest in the **continent** has expanded, the Treaty Parties have taken steps to provide greater quantities of information and to take account of this interest. For example, it is **now** regular practice for the final reports of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings - the core of the Treaty system - to be circulated as **United Nations** documents. These reports contain information on the operation of the Treaty itself, as well **as** on matters such as scientific research, environmental protection, tourism, **meteorology**, telecommunications and air safety. The latest of these reports - dealing with the **XIVth** Consultative Meeting, held at Rio de Janeiro only last month, **from** 5 to 16 October - has recently been sent to the Secretary-General by my colleague the Permanent Representative of Brazil, host country for the Meeting. Besides circulating these reports and making available a large volume of other material through national **contact** points, the Parties are taking systematic steps **to** ensure the public availability of all conference and **information** documents from earlier Consultative Meetings.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

That is not all. For example, the Treaty Parties have provided considerable information for incorporation in the Secretary-General's study on Antarctica, which has been made available to the General Assembly. They have also made known their positions on the questions raised in resolutions 41/88 A and 41/88 C, and their views have been incorporated in the Secretary-General's most recent reports (A/42/586 and A/42/587). The information available is not extremely selective, as one representative said yesterday. On the contrary, a comprehensive and very substantial amount of information has been provided, and the Secretary-General has acknowledged this.

I have spent some time outlining Treaty Parties' reactions to only some points of criticism which have emerged in the debates on this item, because we do not want to be repetitive. I was, however, most interested to see that the opening speaker in this debate, the Permanent Representative of Antigua and Barbuda - whose country was the original sponsor, with Malaysia, of this item in 1985 - has now adopted a position different from Malaysia's. He has clearly acknowledged that the Treaty is effective) in fact, he referred yesterday to the "genius" of the Treaty and noted that Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties are managing Antarctica in a manner which merits their continuation in this role. He has also made other suggestions of some interest, and Treaty Parties will be studying his proposals further.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

I believe that aspects of the Treaty system which I have outlined testify to its flexibility and its ability to respond to changing circumstances. It has shown itself as open to evolution in its procedures, open to dialogue and open to co-operation with other relevant international organizations. The openness of the Treaty system has received positive commendation in the Brundtland report. This very openness is a cornerstone of the success of the Treaty.

I must emphasize that the Treaty Parties, while open to evolution within the Treaty system, are determined to maintain its essential and underlying principles. They take this attitude not because of any unwillingness to listen to criticism but because of the clear success of the functioning of the Treaty.

In its 27 years of operation, the Treaty has ensured the complete denuclearization and demilitarization of Antarctica, it has promoted scientific research and environmental protection, it has kept the continent free from international tensions and discord, and it has done valuable work in the preservation and conservation of living resources in the Antarctic. These are remarkable achievements, given the heterogeneous and diverse nature of the Treaty Parties. Just as remarkable is that decisions in the Treaty system are made by consensus. That is a most appropriate procedure since the preamble to the Treaty speaks of Antarctic co-operation as according with "the progress of all mankind". Such a philosophy naturally calls for a broad consensus approach.

It is for this reason that the Treaty Parties have consistently argued that if the General Assembly is to consider Antarctica at all, such consideration can only proceed usefully on the basis of consensus.

If this is not the case, if divisive texts are adopted by vote, especially votes like those at the Forty-first session in which, on two of the three resolutions, 45 States did not participate and 12 abstained - more than a third of

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

the membership of the United Nations, including virtually all Treaty Parties and countries with any involvement in Antarctica - how can all mankind be brought together?

It was for this reason that Treaty Parties regretted the adoption by vote of resolutions on Antarctica at the fortieth and forty-first sessions. It was for this reason that they have this year engaged once again in negotiations to bring about a return to consensus handling of this item.

Last March I visited Kuala Lumpur at the request of my Foreign Minister, Mr. Bill Hayden, for discussions with the Prime Minister of Malaysia and the former Foreign Minister and senior officials of the Foreign Ministry. Mr. Hayden followed up this visit with a letter to the then Malaysian Foreign Minister urging a return to consensus at this session of the General Assembly.

More recently, as the Chairman of the New York Group of the Antarctic Treaty Parties, I travelled to Rio de Janeiro in October. One reason was to discuss the prospects for a consensus resolution with delegations to the Fourteenth Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.

More recently, the Permanent Representative of Malaysia and I have had many hours of consultations with each other and with our respective groups. I with the 37 countries that have acceded to the Treaty and he with a smaller group of countries that generally support the Malaysian initiative.

Starting from the point that the Treaty Parties were among the 45 countries that did not participate in the votes on resolutions 41/88 A and 88 B Last year and restating that Treaty Parties have never acknowledged a need for institutionalized United Nations involvement in the question of Antarctica - an area in which there are no evident problems and which is subject to an existing open and legal treaty - the Treaty Parties consider that they have shown a considerable spirit of compromise in the search for consensus.

(Mr. Woolcott , Australia)

In the course of intensive discussions in the last six weeks, both sides exchanged numerous draft proposals. However, despite the personal efforts of my friend and colleague, the Permanent Representative of Malaysia, Datuk Yusof Hitam, and his advisers, it is clear that owing to the lack of interest on the part of some sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 it has unfortunately not been possible to reach consensus. This was despite last-minute efforts over the past 24 hours even up to this afternoon to arrive at a satisfactory result.

This situation is unfortunate and regrettable. For Treaty Parties the issues involved are important and matters of principle. The Treaty Parties are always prepared to look for means of bridging the gap. Their various proposals during the negotiations should be seen in that light. In particular they saw scope for examining ways and means to increase and widen their co-operation with the United Nations and specialized agencies. Proposals of this nature were in fact discussed, but regrettably no final agreement was reached. Treaty Parties remain willing to display flexibility and still seek a return to consensus, but not at what they see as the cost of the erosion of the successful functioning of the Treaty system.

Despite our efforts, at the end of the day it was not possible to produce a text that managed to reconcile the positions of both sides and it is a matter of regret to States Parties to the Treaty that there was too wide a gap to achieve a consensus text at this session of the Assembly.

I conclude by placing Antarctica's future in its widest possible context. Treaty Parties and critics of the Treaty both accept the need to continue to manage this unique continent in the interests of all mankind. Where they differ is on the means, not the ends.

Shortly we shall be voting on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87, the essential thrust of which is unacceptable as it stands to Treaty Parties. Neither the vote nor the adoption of the draft resolution will, in our opinion, serve humanity's

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

interest in Antarctica nor affect the continued effective operation of the Antarctic Treaty. This can be done only on the basis of international unity, a unity that takes into account fully the achievements and continuing success of the Antarctic Treaty System.

Mr. DJIENA (Cameroon) : The Cameroonian delegation is particularly pleased to participate in the debate and state the view of my Government on agenda item 70, entitled "Question of Antarctica", which we believe is the concern of the international community. Since 1959 the cold continent has been governed by the Antarctic Treaty, governed only by an exclusive club of States.

(Mr. Dj iena, Cameroon)

My delegation is mindful that the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea - following upon the Declaration of Principles governing the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor, and the Subsoil Thereof, beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction - provided for a régime for the exploitation of the resources of the Area, as defined in the 1982 Convention, beyond national jurisdiction.

In involving all aspects of the seas, the Convention recognized that the time had come for an approach to new and progressive development which ought to be codified in inter national law for the common her itage of mankind. In our view, the Antarctic continent is an expansion of that common heritage. In effect, the international community seized on the opportunity to avail itself of this fact in its resolution 41/88 A to C requesting the Antarctic Treaty Parties to keep the members of the United Nations, through the Secretary-General, fully informed on all aspects of Antarctic issues, to suspend ongoing negotiations on the arrangements for a minerals régime and to exclude the racist apartheid rdgime of South Africa from participation in the meetings of the Consultative Parties at the earliest possible date.

(spoke in French)

Despite the resolutions of the General Assembly and notwithstanding the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the international community, the Consultative Parties to the Treaty refuse, as we have just heard, to take part in any decision-making process on the question in the United Nations.

The report of the Secretary-General (A/42/586) is particularly enlightening on the subject. It states that the Consultative Parties cannot embark on a debate on this question without prior recognition of the principle of consensus as a rule for decision-making, which, in the view of the supporters of the Treaty, would reflect

(Mr. Dj iena, Cameroon)

the unity of the international community. Unfortunately, not only is this procedure not provided for in the Charter of the United Nations, but in the bodies where it is applied, as in the Conference on Disarmament or, in a different form, in the United Nations body chiefly responsible for the maintenance of peace, the results are not particularly encouraging. In the context of recent negotiations, experience has shown that concessions always entail demands for further concessions, and that would lead to total renunciation by non-Parties for the benefit of increasingly demanding Consultative Parties. We believe that it is high time for those Parties to show a spirit of compromise and accept the Organization's rules of the game with regard to the obligations incumbent on all Member States by virtue of the Charter.

It is in this spirit that we wish to express our consternation at the initiatives of some Consultative Parties which, in the long run, seek the exclusion of this question from the agenda of the General Assembly. It is worth recalling here that all States, large and small, are part of the great community of nations. In the light of the various dangers of the thermo-nuclear era, we are all facing the same fate. No State or group of States can afford the luxury of isolationism or of grouping in a closed circle while professing devotion to the ideals and purposes of the United Nations. The attitude of the Consultative Parties, which consists in refusing to participate in the decision-making process in the United Nations on the question of Antarctica, or in imposing prior conditions, quite clearly shows the mistrust between States and between certain States and the Organization. And this inevitably strengthens the idea that the States Parties to the Treaty do not wish to bring all the facts to the knowledge of the international community.

(Mr. Dj iena, Cameroon)

For four years now the Committee has been seized of this question, whose importance for the international community requires no elaboration, whether here, in the General Assembly or in the regional context - as attested by the reports of the Secretary-General and the Final Declaration of the Eighth Meeting of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries and the various resolutions of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) . The international community has always wondered about the deep-seated motivations which led the 12 signatory States to establish the system that derives from the 1959 Treaty on Antarctica. By way Of response, the supporters of the Treaty assert that it is an irreplaceable instrument for the maintenance of peace and harmony in Antarctica, that it guarantees Antarctica's character as a nuclear-free zone, that it has made possible the development of scientific research and the protection of the continent's ecological environment and that it has promoted co-operation both between States and between States and international organizations. Although these assertions are debatable, even if no one can deny the results to which they refer, we wish to state emphatically that the true problem arises from the actual concept of the relationship between that continent and the international community.

My delegation believes that the concept of the common heritage of mankind should apply to Antarctica, with all the political, juridical and economic consequences it implies . This would strengthen the role of the United Nations as an instrument of co-operation for the exploration and exploitation of natural resources for the benefit of mankind, as was clearly demonstrated by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Not only are present-day conditions for admission to the Treaty system discriminatory - even if they seem neutral from a purely legal standpoint - but we should also mention the difficulties raised by ongoing negotiations on mineral resources and the continued participation of South Africa.

(Mr. Dj lens, Cameroon)

With respect to the aforesaid negotiations, where even the developed and developing countries within the Treaty system hold opposing views - in itself a reason for bringing the matter back to the United Nations, where an equitable result could be found - we should emphasize that the minerals régime proposed for Antarctica raises a serious problem. How will that régime be applied given the conclusions of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and given the system already planned for the international Authority for the management of the sea-bed? In the view of my delegation, it would be difficult to find a satisfactory answer to this question.

With regard to the Participation of South Africa in meetings of the Consultative Parties, my delegation has already repeatedly stated its position. Indeed, the majority of Member States, including the Consultative Parties to the Treaty on Antarctica, strongly condemn the apartheid system prevailing in South Africa, and the United Nations has clearly expressed its condemnation of this heinous policy, which it regards as a crime against humanity.

(Mr. Dj iena, Cameroon)

Perusal of document A/42/587 clearly shows that South Africa continues to take part in meetings of the Consultative Parties. That country's presence in the Treaty system for obvious reasons cannot be justified. That is why we shall continue to demand its exclusion and sincerely hope that Member States, in particular those which are well known for their attachment to democracy, freedom and human rights, will support the international community's efforts in that connection. *

The question of Antarctica, like all sensitive and new issues, arouses fears, passions and reactions which clearly show the extent to which national interests govern international policy and the conduct of States above and beyond any ideology and moral or legal ethics. But in a world henceforth comprised of interdependent States, all threatened by a nuclear holocaust, we must take into account, in our positions, the inevitable evolution of the Phenomenon of power and the existing unequal development in order that we may steel ourselves and engage resolutely, without ulterior motives, in the task of building a new and more just world with an unpolluted environment.

In this context, the role of the United Nations as the body for the harmonization of views and relations among States on all questions of common interest, including Antarctica, is an irreplaceable one and should be strengthened.

Mrs. NAMGYEL (Bhutan) : Today mankind's survival is threatened as never before. Nevertheless, we take comfort in the fact that the immediate threat of a thermonuclear war has not only dawned upon but has also at long last brought reason to prevail among those very super-powers whose indulgence in a mutual passion for power engendered the nuclear-arms race. As in the case of all other Members Of this world body, my country too finds reason to harbour the hope that the summit

*The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mrs. Namgyel, Bhutan)

meeting of the leaders of the two super-Powers in December will bring renewed hope of the possibility of lasting peace. Sadly, however, it is not only nuclear war that threatens our survival but also the gradual degradation of the quality and capacity of the environment to sustain life. Can we not find reason, courage and harmony to protect and strengthen the ultimate sources of life that together form Earth's environment?

It is within the broader framework of this concern and in the interest of peace that the question of Antarctica must be raised and resolved.

The future of Antarctica is the common concern of all mankind. Convinced of this, my delegation is firm in the belief that geographical location cannot be considered as a factor justifying any form of claim or concern in Antarctica. All nations, be they far or close, coastal or landlocked, and irrespective of their economic or technological capabilities, must assume a shared responsibility to ensure that no activities are conducted on the continent now or in the distant future which would undermine the fragility of its environment or threaten international peace and security. My country is particularly concerned lest that vast continent and its surrounding waters, with a virtually undisturbed ecology and which must presumably have a benign influence on the global environment, should become an open ground for indiscriminate scientific experimentation, resource exploitation and militarization.

My delegation would like to express its deep and sincere appreciation to the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty for their success and for their continued efforts to ensure that the entire region of Antarctica will remain free from nuclearization and militarization. Above all, we congratulate them for the efforts they have made to maintain the continent's delicate ecological balance. We also fully appreciate the harmonious spirit of understanding and cooperation that

(Mrs. Namgyel, Bhutan)

has prevailed among Parties to the Treaty in spite of their divergent national interests.

We are however of the view that, as the intensity and extent of the activities and involvement of the various Treaty members become deeper, especially with the possibility of discovering greater and more economic resources and with the perceptions of military advantage, the inherent differences among Treaty Parties are likely to result in issues and discord which the Treaty, with its limitations may not be able to resolve. Hence my delegation fully subscribes to the following views expressed in the report of the World Commission on Environment:

"The fact that the 'question of Antarctica' is today on the United Nations agenda indicates the reality that there is a debate in the international community over the future management of the continent. Under the combined pressures of economic, technological, environmental and other trends, there are new initiatives to establish a régime for mineral exploitation. New questions about equitable management are presenting challenges that may reshape the political context of the continent within the next decade.

"During the forthcoming period of change, the challenge is to ensure that Antarctica is managed in the interests of all humankind, in a manner that conserves its unique environment, preserves its value for scientific research, and retains its character as a demilitarized, non-nuclear zone of peace."

(A/42/427, annex, p. 274)

We are all aware that the report received the unequivocal support of most delegations both in the General Assembly and in the Second Committee during the deliberations on the environment.

It is my delegation's conviction that, in order to ensure that the future of Antarctica is not jeopardized, all members of the international community must be

(Mrs. Yangyel, Bhutan)

associated in the present and future management of the region. We regret to note, however, that the majority of the developing countries today have little or no say in the matter simply because they lack the resources to conduct research on the continent. The lack of scientific and technological capability is by no means a measure of a nation's ability to contribute positively to the future of the continent.

Finally, as a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, my delegation fully supports the position adopted at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Harare, to the effect inter alia that, in the interests of all mankind

"Antarctica should be used ... exclusively for peaceful purposes, should not become the ... object of international discord, and should be accessible to all nations." (A/41/697, part I, para. 198)

Mr. GRANDERSON (Trinidad and Tobago) : The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago is once again participating in the debate on the question of Antarctica. We do so because we firmly believe that a continent which is vital to international peace and has considerable environmental, climatic, scientific and potential economic significance to the world is a matter of universal concern and should not be the exclusive domain of a small group of States, some of which have expressed their early national interest in the form of unilateral territorial claims.

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad
and Tobago)

Antarctica, which covers about 20 per cent of the Earth's surface and contains 70 per cent of the world's store of fresh water, is of primary importance to the life of man from the ecological and environmental standpoint. That continent has been described as "a regulator of global climate and weather and as a barometer for global pollution problems". That latter role was vividly illustrated by the recent discovery of a hole in the protective ozone layer above Antarctica resulting from the use of certain toxic chemicals.

The pristine nature of Antarctica makes it a unique laboratory for scientific exploration, which over the years has become increasingly diversified. The scientific significance of Antarctica to the international community as a whole is emphasized by the scientific activities undertaken by several international organizations, not the least of which is the World Meteorological Organization,

Antarctica is also, potentially, a vast reservoir of mineral resources. The eventual exploitation of those resources would have an incalculable impact on the fragile ecosystem of the continent and possibly dramatic consequences for the global economy. Since 1982 the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties have been carrying out negotiations to establish a legal régime governing the exploitation of those minerals. The pace of those negotiations was recently stepped up, despite the number of thorny issues to be resolved. It was agreed in May of this year that a final session of the fourth special Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting would be held during the first half of 1988 and that a draft convention would be adopted there. That undue haste, no doubt linked to the evolution of the United Nations debate on the question of Antarctica, is troubling. Even more troubling is the fact that decisions of major consequence for the global environment, for the global economy and for international peace and security will be taken by a handful of countries without wider public and international comment and scrutiny.

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad and Tobago)

That approach is a negation of the concept of universality, on which the United Nations is founded. It also ignores the increasingly recognized need for effective multilateral co-operation in the management and resolution of global problems. That is in no way mitigated by the invitation extended to the Consultative Parties to developing nations to accede to the Antarctic Treaty. In view of the substantial requirements that have to be satisfied for a State to become a Consultative Party, accession would take place at the level of non-Consultative Party, without the right to participate in decision-making, a status tantamount to second-class citizenship.

My delegation wishes to reiterate the concern expressed in General Assembly resolution 41/88 B of 4 December 1966 that exploitation of the resources of Antarctica should ensure the maintenance of international peace and security, the protection of its environment, the non-appropriation of its resources and the international management and equitable sharing of the benefits of such exploitation. The Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties should impose a moratorium on the negotiations to establish a minerals régime until such time as all members of the international community can participate fully in such negotiations. MY delegation believes that there is a need for a more equitable international régime for Antarctica. As we said in our statement last year, the concept of the common heritage of mankind and the precedents of United Nations instruments on outer space, the Moon and other celestial bodies and on the law of the sea offer useful insights and lessons to that end.

The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago also wishes to express its concern at the continued presence of the apartheid régime of South Africa within the Antarctic Treaty system. The Consultative Parties have put forward the argument that this continued participation allows them to monitor the activities of South Africa, a

(Mr. Grander son, Trinidad
and Tobago)

past master in the art of deceit and duplicity. According to The Observer of 28 December 1986, the South African régime has decided to build a runway at a cost of £4 million on the remote Antarctic territory of Marion Island. Given the fact that in 1979 a United States satellite detected, not far from Marion Island, a flash of the kind usually associated with nuclear tests, we doubt that this runway is intended to contribute to the scientific exploration of Antarctica.

We once again appeal to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to exclude racist South Africa from their meetings. In that context, we express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report (A/42/587). We note with sadness, however, the response given on behalf of the Consultative Parties.

The debate in this Committee on the issue of Antarctica over the past few years has underlined the legitimate interests and concerns of the wider international community. In the course of the debate a number of suggestions and proposals to meet those concerns and bring the Antarctic Treaty system into line with the present realities of the global community have been put forward. We think they merit further study. They should not be brushed off as surreptitious efforts to erode a system whose achievements no one really denies.

My delegation hopes that Antarctica will become a shining symbol of multilateral co-operation in an increasingly interdependent world and not the expression of narrow national interests. We hope it will become the embodiment of the principle of universality and a working example of the collective effort of the international community to manage a continent whose vital importance makes it the shared heritage of all mankind.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call now on the representative of Malaysia, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87.

Mr. HITAM (Malaysia): I have the privilege to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87, on behalf of all its sponsors. Before doing so I wish to express our deep regret that consensus has once again eluded us.

We began our consultations some months before the beginning of this session of the General Assembly. We did so in the hope that an early start would give us an opportunity to explore all avenues that might lead to a consensus. We remain convinced, as we always have been, that consensus constitutes the best basis for serving the interests of all. It is important that through consensus we lay a firm foundation for international co-operation in an area of such vital significance to this planet. I regret to note that despite those efforts no serious or constructive ideas from the Treaty Parties have emerged anywhere, whether here or in Kuala Lumpur. We have been told repeatedly that the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties will resist any change to the Antarctic Treaty system.

In our consultations we took a constructive attitude, focusing on possible ways to advance the cause of consensus. It was our feeling in the circumstances that the participation of the Secretary-General in relevant meetings of the Consultative Parties, including meetings on minerals negotiations, and a report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its forty-third session evaluating those meetings would be a reasonable proposition for a consensus text. The idea is also that the Secretary-General should serve as a bridge between the Parties and the non-Parties to the Treaty. In that way, the Secretary-General could facilitate constructive dialogue in the interests of all.

(Mr. Hitam, Malaysia)

Indeed, we had the feeling that success was almost at hand and that opposition to this reasonable approach was not substantive, but some Consultative Parties believed that they should not be under any compulsion to invite the Secretary-General to their meetings. A few of the Consultative Parties had even intimated privately that such a proposal found favour with them. We therefore profoundly regret that, although the opportunity existed for consensus, it did not result, not for substantive reasons, but because some Consultative Parties felt averse to being compelled to invite the Secretary-General to their meetings. We consider that an invitation to the Secretary-General in no way implies compulsion. Indeed, we had even acknowledged the intricacy of the Treaty and tried to find a form of words to accommodate that concern. Our position represents an expedient and pragmatic way in which, through the Secretary-General's involvement, the non-Treaty Parties, which constitute the overwhelming majority, can also begin to feel that they are involved in the process of managing the Treaty system.

As my good friend and colleague the Permanent Representative of Indonesia said, we are at a crossroads, but a small minority of the Treaty Parties have refused to allow the others to make the journey with us in the desired direction.

At this stage I wish to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 and others in the like-minded group of non-Treaty Parties that have once again given my delegation their support and confidence in conducting the consultations and negotiations on their behalf. I also wish to express my appreciation to Ambassador Woolcott of Australia, who negotiated on behalf of the Consultative Parties. I am sure he is as disappointed as I am that we have again missed the opportunity for consensus. I assure him of our willingness to try again, but I differ with him on the gap, or the number, that separates the position of some Treaty Parties and the non-Treaty Parties. I am

(Mr. Hi tam, Malaysia)

also disturbed by the rejection of the proposal to invite the Secretary-General to the meetings of the Treaty Parties.

I now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87. It is a merger of resolutions 41/88 A and 41/88 B, adopted by the General Assembly last year. It is essentially a logical follow-up to those two resolutions. The preambular paragraphs are self-explanatory. The twelfth preambular paragraph reaffirms the international community's right to

"information covering all aspects of Antarctica"
and says that the United Nations should

"be made the repository for all such information in accordance with General Assembly resolution 41/88 A".

The thirteenth preambular paragraph reaffirms

"that any eventual minerals régime on Antarctica should take fully into account the interests of the international community, and that a moratorium on the negotiations to establish a minerals régime should be imposed until such time as all members of the international community can participate fully in such negotiations, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 41/88 B".

There are five operative paragraphs, of which paragraph 3 is taken unchanged from paragraph 2 of resolution 41/88 B. In it the General Assembly

"calls upon the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to impose a moratorium on the negotiations to establish a minerals régime until such time as all members of the international community can participate fully in such negotiations".

That paragraph is included because the Treaty Parties are pursuing their negotiations on a minerals régime despite our concern that such negotiations are unacceptable within the present framework. It is noted that the Treaty Parties

(Mr. Hitam, Malaysia)

have made known their intention to complete their negotiations by May 1988. In our view, therefore, the call for a moratorium is completely justified.

Paragraph 1 states that the General Assembly

“Calls upon the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to invite the Secretary-General or his representative to all meetings of the Treaty Parties, including their consultative meetings and the minerals régime negotiations*.

Paragraph 2 states that the Assembly

“Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report on his evaluations thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-third session”.

I have already stated our reasons for the inclusion of those two paragraphs. We are convinced that the Secretary-General can play a crucial and constructive role in dealing with all our concerns.

In paragraph 4 the General Assembly

“Urges all States Members of the United Nations to co-operate with the Secretary-General and to continue consultations on all aspects relating to Antarctica”.

That will facilitate the Secretary-General's role of encouraging consultations in a productive manner. Dialogue between the Treaty Parties and non-Treaty Parties in that manner is a vital element in the construction of a scheme which will serve the comprehensive interests of the whole international community. That is important “mileage” in this year's consideration of the item.

Paragraph 5 is self-explanatory; in it the Assembly calls for inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of its forty-third session.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 are fully satisfied as to the reasonableness of the concerns expressed in it, and we are confident the Committee will adopt it, as it has adopted similar draft resolutions in the past.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I now call on the representative of **Zambia**, who will introduce draft resolution **A/C.1/42/L.86**.

Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): My delegation is happy to introduce draft resolution **A/C.1/42/L.86**, under agenda item 70, "Question of Antarctica", on behalf of the members of the Group of African States. The delegation of Malawi was going to introduce it, but circumstances are such that that has not been possible. We **thank** the **Malawi** delegation for its magnanimity and indeed for the honour bestowed on us.

At the outset, I wish to point out that the draft resolution is essentially an Update of **General** Assembly resolution **41/88 C**, of 4 December 1986, concerning the sensitive issue **of the continuing** participation of the apartheid racist re'gime Of **South** Africa in the meetings of the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty of 1959. **Representatives** will recall **that** the racist Pretoria **régime** of South Africa has not participated in the deliberations of the **General** Assembly since its expulsion in 1974. Many of the States members of this Committee took part in **that** momentous decision to expel **the apartheid** Pretoria re'gime because of its policies and practices of **racial** discrimination.

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

It is therefore ironic that some of these Member States that so generously subscribed to the expulsion of the racist Pretoria régime from the work of the General Assembly should be found commiserating with the apartheid régime of South Africa in the Antarctic Treaty system before that régime abandoned its obnoxious system of apartheid. Might I mention also that several members of the Antarctic Treaty system, and indeed the Consultative Parties, have adopted national measures against the apartheid system pursued by the racist Pretoria régime.

I need not emphasise the fact that apartheid has been universally condemned by the United Nations as a crime against humanity. There is therefore a serious moral question involved when some Members of the United Nations family which claim to be against apartheid sit side by side in the Antarctic Treaty system with the racist régime of South Africa.

The aim of the draft resolution before us is to correct that political immorality. In its preambular paragraphs, the General Assembly would note with regret that the racist apartheid régime of South Africa, which has been suspended from participation in the General Assembly, has continued to participate in the meetings of the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty. It would recall the resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its forty-sixth session, held at Addis Ababa in July 1986, as well as the relevant paragraphs of the Political Declaration adopted at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare from 1 to 6 September 1986. It would recall further that the Antarctic Treaty is by its own terms, intended to further the purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. It would note further that the policy of apartheid practised by the racist minority regime of South Africa, which has been universally condemned, constitutes a threat to regional and international peace and security.

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

In the operative paragrapha of the draft resolution the General Assembly would view with concern the continuing participation of the apartheid régime of South Africa in the meetings of the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty. The main point is set forth in its appeal, once again to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to take urgent measures to exclude the racist apartheid régime Of South Africa from participation in the meetings of the Consultative Parties at the earliest possible date. It would go on to invite the States parties to the Antarctic Treaty to inform the Secretary-General on the actions taken regarding the provisions of the draft resolution. Furthermore, it would request the Secretary-General to submit a report in that regard to the General Assembly at its forty-third session and would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-third session the item entitled "Question of Antarctica".

My delegation believes that support for this draft resolution is the litmus test for all members of the Committee, and especially the Consultative Parties, allowing them to dissociate themselves in a demonstrable manner from the apartheid Pretoria régime of South Africa. It is the fervent hope of my delegation therefore that this draft resolution will meet with the approval of this Committee, which is so opposed to the policies and practices of apartheid. I therefore wish to commend this text to the First Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before the Committee takes decisions On draft resolutions A/C.1/42/L.86 and L.87 submitted under agenda item 70, entitled "Question of Antarctica", I shall call on delegations that wish to make a statement other than a statement in explanation of vote.

Mr. CHOHAN (Pakistan): I should like briefly to clarify the remark made by the representative of Australia when he stated:

(Mr. Chohan, Psk is tan)

"... it is clear that owing to the lack of interest on the part of some sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 it has unfortunately not been possible to reach consensus." (uupra, p. 33)

Yes, it is regrettable that a consensus could not be reached. What is, however, unfortunate is that those who created hurdles at every step in the way of the efforts of the sponsors to seek a consensus resolution should with such great facility blame them.

For the past few months, if one thought has inspired the endeavours of the sponsors of the draft resolution on Antarctica, it was the earnest desire to arrive at a consensus document that would address the wishes of the entire membership of the United Nations on the vital question of Antarctica. If there has been a failure to arrive at a consensus resolution, it has not been for lack of purpose or effort on the part of the sponsors. The failure lies in the rigidity of the other Side. Frankly speaking, we are disappointed, but we have faith in the process of dialogue. We shall continue our endeavours in the future in the hope that those who oppose the wishes of the vast majority of the Member States of the United Nations will see the Light of reason. We shall continue our efforts to build bridges of understanding in order to remove the barriers of exclusivism which they have erected.

Mr. QADER (Bangladesh): I should like to register some dissent to the statement made by the representative of Australia.

Bangladesh was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution that was adopted last year and is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution submitted by Malaysia at this session. I should like to assure the representative of Australia that our main objective is to build bridges and not to burn them or to raise impediments. We have seen, as has been most eloquently explained by the representative of Malaysia, how every member of the Malaysian delegation has tried his best to come

(Mr. Qader , Bangladesh)

to an agreed consensus on this matter and we have also seen how they tried very constructively to frame the consensus resolution, which time after time was ejected by the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties group or perhaps by the Treaty system as a whole.

(Mr. Qader , Bangladesh)

Be that as it may, we thought that in the making of statements things would be kept at a decent level. We find it **incongruous** for a delegation to state that support for a draft resolution by 45 countries represents the interest of mankind rather than lack of support by 92 **Member States**. I find it very difficult to understand those peculiar mathematics.

Mr. ADAM (Sudan): I should like to comment on some remarks made by the representative of Australia in his statement before the Committee this afternoon.

Sudan has for a number of years **now** been one of several sponsors of draft resolutions concerning Antarctica. The representative of Australia, in his capacity as spokesman for the New York group of the Treaty Parties, stated this afternoon:

"... it is clear that owing to the lack of interest on the part of some sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/42/L.87** it has unfortunately not been possible to reach **consensus.**" (supra, p. 33)

I am sure all of us here would have preferred to discuss all matters relating to Antarctica in the open, with the full transparency required in a matter as important as the future of Antarctica. However, my delegation would like **to** emphasize the **following** points: first, the representative of Malaysia and his advisers, as was stated by the representative of **Australia**, have always worked in **close** co-operation with the sponsors of the draft resolution. This has been the case since the item was first brought before this Committee. Secondly, because of the **clear** lack of co-operation on the part of those who represent the Treaty Parties, the sponsors and a large number of representatives who support them were not able to engage in an open and genuine dialogue with the Treaty Parties. Therefore, there was no other way than to designate our own spokesman to negotiate on our behalf. Thirdly, the sponsors have always produced their **own** draft which, unfortunately, has never met with the approval of the Treaty Parties in spite of

(Mr. Mam, Sudan)

◆ 〰 〰 〰 ● xxmasivc concessions made to them one after the other, the la test being today. This last-minute endeavour was also the outcome of collective consultations among all the sponsors of the draft before us.

Where does the lack of co-operation lie? Does it lie with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 or with the rank and file of the Treaty Parties themselves?

The sponsors of the draft would be only too happy to see all members of this Committee consulting and openly discussing this vital issue in this room or anywhere else that would be suitable.

Lastly, let me assure you that openness is not our problem. Co-operation has been adequately demonstrated by all the sponsors of the draft resolution on Antarctica now before the Committee and by the sponsors of the texts before the Committee in the past successful years.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): As no other delegation wishes to make a statement at this stage of the debate, I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on one or both of the draft resolutions submitted under item 70 of the agenda.

Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Before the voting, I wish once again to speak briefly on behalf of States Parties to the Antarctic Treaty.

The representative of Malaysia said in introducing draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 that a small minority of Antarctic Treaty Parties had prevented consensus. In order for the record to be correct, let me state, as Chairman of the New York group of the Antarctic Treaty Parties, that while there are naturally shades of opinion within such a large group as the Antarctic Treaty Parties, it is not correct to say that a small minority of the Antarctic Treaty Parties prevented consensus. In my final consultations between 11.30 a.m. and 3.15 p.m. today, I found that the Treaty Parties were virtually unanimous in concluding that they

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

could not accept the final compromise text offered by Malaysia on behalf of the group.

I should also like to refer to the interventions made a few moments ago by the representatives of Pakistan, Bangladesh and the Sudan. Each made comments on the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Australia. I should simply like to repeat that I was not speaking as the Permanent Representative of Australia, but speaking on behalf of States Parties to the Antarctic Treaty, which, of course, includes Australia.

As I mentioned earlier, in my first statement during the debate, it is a matter of deep regret to the Treaty Parties that consensus decision-making on this important item has once again not proved possible. This is particularly regrettable given the effort and the time invested by both sides in the intensive consultations on a text over the last few weeks. Those negotiations helped to narrow the gap between the two sides, but not to a sufficient degree to permit a restoration of consensus. It is a matter for regret that unfortunately it has been impossible to reach consensus. Mindful of the comments made by the Chairman in opening the debate on this item yesterday and much as we would have wished to be taking a decision on a consensus text, we now have to address the draft resolutions before the Committee. It is important that the Treaty Parties make their positions clear in the voting on the two draft resolutions before us in order to leave no doubt as to their view that the core aspects of Antarctica should continue to be handled only on the basis of consensus. For this reason they will not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87, thus reflecting their collective and continuing disappointment at the failure to achieve consensus.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

On draft resolution **A/C.1/42/L.86**, Parties will reflect their views on it in ways which do not prejudice their position on the successful functioning of the Antarctic Treaty.

Antarctic Treaty Parties reiterate their belief that the General Assembly's consideration of Antarctica can proceed usefully and realistically only on the basis of consensus, and we do not accept the suggestion made by several speakers a few minutes ago to the effect that we are the sole obstacles **to** that consensus. We are united in our determination to safeguard the effective functioning of the Treaty system and believe that the consensus necessary for a productive international consideration of Antarctica can be based only on resolutions which give full regard to the Antarctic Treaty and the continuing operation of the Treaty system. For that reason, we regret that the proponents of the draft resolutions seem to **remain** unwilling to take the steps which could **achieve** consensus.

I request a **roll-call** vote on draft resolutions **A/C.1/42/L.86** and L.87. As I have previously indicated, a number of **Member** States will indicate that they are not participating in the voting. I ask that the records of this Committee should indicate explicitly that **those** Members choose not to participate in the voting.

Mr. HUANG Jiahua (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation has participated in the **Committee's** consideration of the question of Antarctica with a **strong** aspiration and anticipation of strengthening co-operation and restoring consensus. The two days of debate have shown some encouraging evidence with regard to broadening international **co-operation** in Antarctic activities, despite the **serious** difficulties that **remain unresolved**.

It is heartening to see that all sides emphasize and attach great value to the identical points that they maintain **on** the question of Antarctica. Both States Parties and States not parties **to** the Antarctic Treaty view the fundamental principles **and** purposes of the Treaty positively and **recognize** the role and

(Mr. Huang Jiahua, China)

achievement in various aspects of the Treaty system, such as ensuring that the continent is used for peaceful purposes in order to prevent it from becoming the scene or object of activities of a military nature or of international discords, as well as other aspects such as scientific research and the protection of the ecosystem. Moreover, all sides share the opinion that the management of Antarctica should be conducted in the interests of all mankind and that international co-operation in Antarctic activities should be expanded and strengthened. They also acknowledge the efforts made by Antarctic Treaty Parties with a view to perfecting the present Treaty regime, promoting co-operation with the United Nations and its specialized agencies and providing the Organization with relevant data and information on Antarctica.

We are also happy to note the sincere endeavours of all States concerned at the present session of the United Nations General Assembly to restore a consensus approach to the question of Antarctica. Notwithstanding the fact that no final agreement has been reached, the exercise has nevertheless helped to enhance mutual understanding, narrow the discrepancies and bring all sides closer on some points, such as contemplating some form of United Nations presence at appropriate meetings on the Antarctic Treaty, or the need to expand international co-operation. We believe that the negotiations will lay a foundation for our future consultations.

Furthermore, on the anti-apartheid question, we consider it commendable that some States Parties to the Antarctic Treaty have proceeded from their solemn political anti-apartheid position to consider their voting on the question in order to support that just struggle.

Of course, there still exist wide differences of view and opinion between States on international co-operation in Antarctic activities, which, as a result, have regrettably prevented consensus. We maintain that further careful study should be given to such issues and concerns, including appropriate ways and means

(Mr. Huang Jiahua, China)

to strengthen relations and co-operation between the Treaty Parties and the Secretary-General of the United Nations to promote participation by more countries, especially developing countries, in Antarctic activities in playing their role in the Antarctic system and to ensure that the future régime for Antarctic mineral resources will conform to the principles and purposes of the Antarctic Treaty in the interests of all mankind. The Chinese delegation believes in this regard that so long as all States concerned will, in sincerity and with patience, continue to endeavour to promote dialogue and avoid confrontation, seek common ground and leave their differences aside, and consult with each other to find consensus, they will definitely contribute to the eventual just and equitable solution of the question of Antarctica.

It is in that spirit and for the aforementioned purpose that the Chinese delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 and cast an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.86.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): We have heard all explanations of vote before the voting on the two draft resolutions, namely, A/C.1/42/L.87 and L.86.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.88, it is, of course, understood that in the light of the statement made this morning by its sponsor, it will not be considered by the Committee, and we shall not vote on it.

(The Chairman)

We shall begin with draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87, which was introduced by the representative of Malaysia earlier in the present meeting of the Fifth Committee under agenda item 70, 'Question of Antarctica'. The sponsors of the draft resolution are Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, the Congo, Ghana, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mali, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

Ecuador, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour : Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against : None

Abstaining : Antigua and Barbuda, Canada, China, Fiji, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Solomon Islands, Turkey, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 10 abstentions. * **

*During the course of the roll-call vote the following delegations announced that they were not participating: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

**Subsequently the delegation of Sri Lanka advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The result of the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.87 is the following: 73 votes in favour, none against, 10 abstentions and 42 delegations not participating. Accordingly, the draft resolution is adopted.

We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/42/L. 86, introduced by the representative of Zambia on behalf of the members of the Group of African States, earlier in the present meeting of the First Committee. It was submitted Under agenda item 70, "Question of Antarctica".

A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

Trinidad and Tobago, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour : Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Ireland, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi,
Portugal

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.86 was adopted by 96 votes to none, with
7 abstentions.*

• During the course of the roll-call vote the following delegations announced that they were not participating; Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The result of the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.86 is the following: 5 votes in favour, none against, 7 abstentions and 22 delegations not participating. Accordingly, the draft resolution is adopted.

I shall now call upon speakers who wish to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish) : The Uruguayan delegation wishes to make a clarification concerning the vote we cast on the draft resolution we just acted on.

Uruguay took the decision not to participate in the vote on this draft in keeping with the views upheld in respect of the previous resolution and on the basis of the fact that the functioning of the Antarctic Treaty is guided by its provisions and the rules of international law in respect of treaties, so that there are no grounds for the effective application of this draft resolution.

I wish also to state clearly that this should in no way be construed as meaning that Uruguay is indifferent to the profound reasons that gave rise to the presentation by the African States of the draft resolution that has just been put to the vote. Uruguay shares their deep and growing concern at the attitude of the minority régime in South Africa and its open defiance of the international community. I believe that we have shown this all along and Uruguay intends to go on showing that this is the way it feels, in competent bodies and wherever the situation so warrants.

Mr. VELASCO (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish) : The delegation of Peru voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.86, which was submitted by the delegation of Zambia. In so doing the Government of Peru has acted on the understanding that this will strengthen the appeal of the international community that the Government of South Africa should put an end to the inhuman system of apartheid, and therefore our vote in no way implies that we question the principles

(Mr. Velasco, Peru)

of **international** law applicable to the **rights and** obligations **deriving** from inter national treaties.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : No other **delegations** are on the **list** to speak in explanation **of** vote.

The Committee has **now** completed its work on agenda **item** 70, in accordance with the programme established for the present stage of **our** work, **that** is, the general **debate on item** 70, question **of** Antarctica and consideration of **and action** on draft resolutions relating thereto.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should Like to inform you that the following delegations are on the list of speakers for the next meeting of the Committee, to **be** held tomorrow morning, It will be held at **11 a.m.** at the request of certain regional groups, which wish to consult with each other earlier in the morning.

At that meeting the Committee will **begin its** general debate on agenda items **relating** to international security: **i** tems 71, 72 and 73, **and** will also consider draft resolutions relating thereto, as well as possible decisions.

The **following** delegations will speak tomorrow: the Uerman **Democra tic** Republic, **Gu** inea, **Hungary, the Union** of Soviet Socialist Republics, Denmark (speaking on behalf of the 12 metier States of the European **Community**) , **and Poland.**

The meeting rose at 6.20 **p.m.**
