



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.84
2 December 1986

ENGLISH

Forty-first session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 25 November 1986, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh)

- Address by His Excellency Mr. Jose Napoleon Duarte, President of the Republic of El Salvador
- Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) [28] (continued)
 - (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General
 - (d) Report of the Fourth Committee
 - (c) Draft resolution

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MR. JOSE NAPOLEON DUARTE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR

The PRESIDENT: This morning the Assembly will hear an address by the President of El Salvador.

Mr. Jose Napoleon Duarte, President of the Republic of El Salvador, was escorted into the General Assembly Hall.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations the President of the Republic of El Salvador, His Excellency Mr. Jose Napoleon Duarte, and to invite him to address the General Assembly.

President DUARTE (interpretation from Spanish): Two years ago when my Government had been in office for four months, I felt that I should appear before the Assembly to describe to the world my people's achievements in its unwavering determination to attain freedom, pluralistic participative democracy, development, social justice and, essentially, peace as the fruit of true national reconciliation. The time had come to present to the Assembly the noble and legitimate aspirations of my people and Government. It was a time when the dreams of five decades were finally being realized, after many years of dictatorship.

It was also my intention to come to the United Nations last year to tell the world about the achievements we had been making in our endeavour and to present to it our spirit of peace, but I was unable to do so, overcome as I was by the infamous kidnapping of my daughter, Ines Guadalupe. Therefore I made an appeal from my country for reason, concord and the international community's solidarity in the hope that it would support my efforts for a just and humane solution to that act. I am deeply grateful for the support I received from the United Nations.

(President Duarte)

Today, a great many of those dreams, viewed from the standpoint of defending values, have become an unquestionable reality which is recognized by even our sternest critics. In our most recent history three great misfortunes have befallen my people, deepening its poverty and suffering. These three great disasters which, if compared with some biblical events, might be called the three great plagues, have afflicted and continue to afflict El Salvador. The first was the disaster brought about by war; the second was the economic disaster resulting from the effects of international terms of trade; and the third was a natural disaster which wrought economic and social damage greater than the first two disasters combined. The damage caused by seven years of war and seven years of economic crisis cannot be compared to the damage caused by seven seconds of the earthquake of 10 October.

There certainly remains a great deal to be done in every walk of life for Salvadorian citizens, but the determination of my people and Government is unwavering and we will overcome every obstacle that lies before us. That is why today I have the honour to address the Assembly and to speak about the enormous problems my people is facing and the urgent tasks that need to be undertaken to repair and rebuild our capital city which was devastated by the earthquake of 10 October last.

My presence here is fundamentally in response to the clamour of all my people who have placed their hopes and trust in the help and solidarity that the international community may be able to offer to overcome the vicissitudes now affecting them, because these seriously threaten the true consolidation of democracy in El Salvador. The earthquake meant sacrifice for each Salvadorian citizen. Those who had a great deal lost a great deal, but those who had little lost everything. That is the truth of the terrible tragedy that has struck us.

(President Duarte)

The earthquake made clear to all the poverty, the suffering, the hunger, in which we live. Thousands of families who lived in caves, who normally were hidden from view, emerged in those seven seconds, panic-stricken and showing the effects of the suffering and the subhuman conditions in which they lived. That cataclysm struck every one of us without exception. It shook our very conscience. It shook the depths of our hearts and our minds, and brought out an immense and deep cry to the world as a whole. It made us more human and brought us closer together in our distress and bereavement. The earthquake has been our harshest trial, to which my people has responded with faith and hope.

The terrible tragedy that struck San Salvador caused the death of 1,500 people, wounded 10,000, left 300,000 homeless and caused a great deal of damage to the historic, material and cultural heritage of our people. The material losses exceed \$10,000 million, including damage to the hospital network, the educational system, the production and trade system and the public services system.

According to data provided by private enterprise, from 85 to 90 per cent of the industry located in the capital city was damaged by the earthquake. That made a deep impact on the national economy and production, since the metropolitan area is the nerve centre of the country's economic activity. The earthquake destroyed the hospital network of the metropolitan area and consequently thousands of Salvadorians are now being attended to in makeshift field hospitals where major and minor surgery is performed in truly precarious conditions.

In the educational area damage was done to 150 educational centres, equivalent to a minimum of 1,500 classrooms. I should also mention that 90 per cent of the cultural heritage was damaged. Libraries, museums, monuments, churches, theatres and sports facilities were destroyed.

(President Duarte)

As regards public services, the drinking water distribution network servicing one third of the capital was affected along more than 50 kilometres of its length, without counting the other drainage systems and water supply aqueducts, about which it is impossible to assess the damage because they cannot be reached.

As regards telecommunications, four telephone exchanges were destroyed. Repairs to them will cost over \$26 million. Similarly, there was damage to the electric power network, estimated at more than \$20 million. The urban infrastructure and the transportation system were seriously affected. Cracks opened up in the streets and the direct and indirect damage in this area exceeds \$30 million, without counting the cost of repairs to streets, the removal of rubble, and cleaning.

Special mention should be made of the complete disruption caused by the earthquake in the administrative management of various governmental units. Countless public service buildings were damaged irreparably. The direct cost under this item exceeds \$50 million, without assessing the indirect cost resulting from removal of these services to other facilities.

Damage to the production and trade sector exceeds \$135 million, not counting the cost resulting from the paralysis of their activities, which total some \$71 million.

These figures might appear small to some industrialized countries, but for my country they are truly enormous. They add up to at least 25 per cent of the gross domestic product.

As a result of this natural disaster poverty has worsened and the living standards of my countrymen have become more precarious. The ability of the central Government and the municipal Governments to respond to needs has been substantially reduced. The disaster has compelled us to assume emergency functions that had not

(President Duarte)

been foreseen and to set in motion medium- and short-term plans that will have to be integrated into a new national development scheme.

All of this is a challenge to which we must respond without resources of our own. There lies the tragedy. While the war and the economic crisis seriously restricted our ability to meet social needs, today the earthquake makes it totally impossible for us to do so.

(President Duarte)

The earthquake resulted in a serious deterioration in the living conditions of the Salvadorian people and required a radical turnabout in my Government's economic and social development planning. As the General Assembly will understand, this situation obviously requires a reformulation and reprogramming of our sectoral development plans and strategies, which must now focus on the aims and goals needed for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of a new El Salvador.

These three great disasters have been and are still being faced stoically by my people. In response to the destructive effects of the prolonged people's war, we have united to strive for national reconstruction. To war, violence and death, we respond in accordance with the five great aims of my Government's policy, which are: humanization, the ethical and political imperative that guides our conduct in the social sphere; pacification, the noblest and most cherished ideal of Salvadorians; democratization, as a process that generates consensus, pluralism and the freedoms needed for the full realization of the individual in society; participation, with a view to making the individual more responsible with respect to his rights and duties in the building of a democratic society, and reactivation, to stimulate the economy and ensure far-reaching social reforms.

In the context of these aims, this year I called once again for the continuing pursuit of dialogue as the mechanism that is proper to a democratic system and would lead us to progress along the road to peace, through the triumph of reason, in the form of a political willingness to make concessions and to resolve difficulties. I firmly believe in dialogue for peace, not dialogue for war. On three occasions I have called on those who have taken up arms to come and sit round the table and to discuss peace, not war.

The new political and democratic machinery that is now being established in my country promotes the mechanism of dialogue because it essentially rules out the use

(President Duarte)

of violence and instead emphasizes political plans and encourages discussions between the different sectors. Unfortunately, those who have taken up arms have not responded to those actions and to those appeals, which faithfully reflect the true feelings and historic requirements of the El Salvador of today.

The safeguarding of the democratic process, in the particular conditions in my country, requires an intense and imaginative effort to which we shall continue to devote ourselves until that process is healthy and thriving. One element in that process must be the incorporation into our democratic life of the groups that have taken up arms, through a serious, sincere and realistic dialogue within the established constitutional framework that will make it possible to attain a peaceful solution, thus ending the bloodshed among Salvadorians and strengthening our unity in the work of reconstruction and national renewal. This is because we believe that dialogue is the only appropriate means in a democracy, not to negotiate democracy, which is unacceptable, but to ensure its universal application and its proper direction.

We would be falling into a grave historical error if, as a result of the difficulties we are facing at the present time, we were to pause in our endeavours, or even worse, slide back into the despicable dictatorship of the past. Today, more than ever, the philosophy that guides our attitude is to continue in our efforts to introduce changes that will make it possible for our people to enjoy full and effective democracy with due respect and protection for human rights, which constitute the basic and fundamental element of the policy of my Government, while also pressing ahead with the structural measures that will enable the broad masses in the country to live a life of dignity, thus removing the causes of the conflict that has cost us so much bloodshed.

(President Duarte)

In this context, my Government must praise the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) for their help in seeking a comprehensive agreement on peace and security in the area, through the continuation of the Contadora efforts. This is fully in accordance with the official position of my Government which, at the time when the Contadora initiative was first put forward, proposed, and obtained the agreement thereto of all the countries involved in the undertaking, that the Central American problem should be settled in comprehensive terms, on a simultaneous, multilateral and regional basis. This would, of course, be contingent on the verifiability of the set of agreements to be adopted, as set forth in the draft Contadora Act for Peace and Co-operation in Central America submitted to my Government by the Contadora Group and the Lima Support Group on 6 June 1986 in Panama. El Salvador is strongly in favour of the offer made by the United Nations Secretary-General and the Secretary General of the OAS to my Government. It is our understanding that this offer would become effective at the stage that begins with the entry into force of the Contadora Act. It is encouraging that this concept clearly means that those two high officials have appreciated the urgent need to preserve dialogue and negotiations in the regional forum, and for this purpose it is essential to remove, by means of a comprehensive agreement, the obstacles preventing the renewal of that process, especially those obstacles which by their nature are geared to sectoral solutions and could hamper negotiations and multilateral discussions.

In the context of that framework proposed by the two officials, I wish to make a digression, because I know that the debate on the Malvinas item is to begin here shortly. I wish to say that El Salvador supports the view of Argentina on this issue that the question of sovereignty over the islands should be resolved by negotiations in which the legitimate rights of the Republic of Argentina are recognized.

(President Duarte)

My Government believes that the two officials, in urging the preservation of the forum desired by Salvadorians, are aware that this requires the resumption of the as yet incomplete process, and that that resumption in turn requires the removal of the obstacles that are preventing it. We therefore applaud the decision of both officials, in the light of their respective positions, to join with the Central American community in highlighting the need for the removal of the obstacles that we have consistently pointed out, in the interests of the peace, democracy, pluralism, development and security of Central America.

Faced with the economic disaster that is overwhelming us and defying solution, the farm workers, the trade unions, the employers and the Government in El Salvador have been making valiant efforts to reactivate our economy through an economic system that serves all and is based on a genuine ideal of social justice.

My Government is aware that the internal structural defects in the developing countries are due largely to the persistence of unjust international economic relations. In conjunction with the heavy debt-servicing burden, they result in a situation in which our countries are becoming increasingly dependent on the centres of the economic world, and the situation of those centres, and their influence, have a marked effect in increasing the imbalances in our economies, and this in turn is reflected in a growing social and political instability which, in addition to lowering the quality of life of our peoples, is also hampering the strengthening of the democratic process.

(President Duarte)

Many of our countries have carried out major economic adjustments that have been achieved at great social cost since they reduced levels of productivity and created an imbalance between national income and expenditure, and therefore made it difficult to stabilize and reactivate our economies. In view of this situation, it is imperative to increase North-South co-operation which must be based on justice, international social justice, and must be characterized by greater flexibility in the developed economies that can truly help to strengthen the structural changes of our countries, and thus create conditions of political, economic and social stability, and not the contrary.

In this context, efforts pursuant to the decision to continue to promote the structural reforms that have been initiated in my country are now being focused on agrarian reform which, in accordance with the principles embodied in our Political Constitution and with the irrevocable historical mandate of the Salvadorian people, will be consolidated as the third and last phase of this process is embarked upon in the coming months.

The action taken by the Government to cope with the natural disaster, namely, the earthquake of 10 October has been proceeding in an intensive fashion and co-ordinated with the various segments of Salvadorian society, with which we have pooled our efforts in assisting and alleviating the suffering of the thousands of people who have been affected. This earthquake has enabled us to focus more clearly on the tragedy afflicting our people. El Salvador will be equal to this challenge, thanks to the determination shown by every segment of the population which has demonstrated that it is capable of setting aside its differences at a time that requires national unity and concerted efforts to tackle the crisis we face.

(President Duarte)

It is a tribute to the sense of responsibility and civic-mindedness of our people that there has not been a single serious case of disorder or pillaging; nor have we experienced any epidemics or widespread diseases of any kind, thanks to the efforts of all Salvadorian citizens. I must also mention the sense of dedication and selfless desire to help that has been displayed by various service sectors and institutions, private enterprises, trade unions, rural workers, universities, the armed forces, public and municipal employees, workers, professional associations and various other organizations whose efforts supplemented the humanitarian assistance provided by the Red Cross and other organizations, clubs and churches which helped to alleviate the sufferings of the Salvadorian people. This joint effort has highlighted the real values that should be characteristic of a pluralistic, participatory and egalitarian society, in which altruism predominates over selfishness, humility over arrogance, friendship over hatred and unity over misunderstanding.

El Salvador will maintain that scheme of things for all time because tragedies are also historical lessons that help us to reaffirm our sense of brotherhood and cement our humanitarian spirit of co-operation. In this context, I wish to emphasize that, without the aid and co-operation of the international community, El Salvador could not have coped with this emergency effectively and efficiently because the tragedy exceeded the capacity and resources of my country to protect and assist the victims of the earthquake.

I must mention in this connection the adoption by the General Assembly on 14 October this year of the draft resolution on Emergency Assistance to El Salvador, in which the international community expressed its sympathy and recognized the magnitude of the catastrophe, and called upon all States to contribute generously to the relief and reconstruction efforts in the affected

(President Duarte)

areas. It also requested the Secretary-General to mobilize resources to contribute to the relief and reconstruction task undertaken by the Government of El Salvador, to co-ordinate the multilateral assistance, and in consultation with my Government, to identify emergency and medium-term and long-term needs.

On behalf of my people and Government, therefore, I wish to express my deepest thanks to the international community for this resolution in which the General Assembly reiterated by consensus its appeal for solidarity and support for the rehabilitation of El Salvador and called upon the international community to continue its efforts to promote the development of my country in general. The appeal contained in this humanitarian resolution, addressed in particular to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Food Programme (WFP), and the World Health Organization (WHO) is commendable and highly encouraging. For that reason I wish to take this opportunity of informing you that I have come here to reiterate my most sincere and deeply felt thanks, and once again to express the gratitude of the people and Government of El Salvador to all countries represented here, and to those countries which, without distinction of creed, or ideology or ideas, immediately sent help to my country; and to those governmental and non-governmental bodies and private associations which, in one way or another, are helping to alleviate the suffering of the Salvadorian people through the assistance that they have provided and are continuing to provide.

My Government also wishes to acknowledge the valuable assistance that the United Nations is continuously providing to my country through the local UNDP office in San Salvador, and particularly the major effort that the United Nations, together with regional organizations, such as the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), have recently made in connection with the

(President Duarte)

earthquake, whose consequences have brought me to this noble universal forum to present this report on the damage suffered and on the reconstruction needs of my country.

Although we have to a great extent been able to cope with the first phase of the national emergency, including immediate care for the victims of the earthquake, we are still tackling the second phase during which we must satisfy the basic long-term needs of the population affected by the earthquake. Thousands upon thousands of Salvadorians are living in the streets under a sheet of plastic. We have planned the implementation of projects for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of El Salvador. These two last phases present the greatest and most dramatic challenge for my people, for despite our firm determination to face the problems created by the earthquake, we have been obliged to appeal for international solidarity and assistance. For that reason I venture to express the hope that the Governments and organizations represented here will provide all possible assistance to enable us to set about this difficult, arduous and humanitarian task in accordance with the generous and important General Assembly resolutions to which I have referred with deep appreciation.

(President Duarte)

All international assistance - multilateral and bilateral - given us to start the process of national rehabilitation and reconstruction will be administered by the Office of the President of El Salvador, with the co-operation of all segments of life in the country. We have tried to administer in the most open way the aid that has been furnished to overcome the crisis caused by the earthquake. We have exerted our best efforts to take care of those who have suffered the most, the humblest, the poorest. We are determined that the assistance thus far furnished by the world will be distributed honestly. As an example, I have told my Cabinet that not a single cent, not a single grain of corn that has been provided to us will be wasted or used in any way except to help the poor. I have told my Cabinet that the Government's first task must be to help the people emerge from the rubble.

I have with me not only documents which contain a general evaluation of the damage and the possibilities of redressing it, but also documents drawn up by international auditing companies such as Arthur Young, which made a painstaking and detailed audit of each shipment that arrived in the country and of every donation made by States. The documents indicate where and to whom each item was delivered. The same international companies audited the funds collected so far, and they report that, internally and with some international assistance, the figure has reached \$2 million.

I repeat that in these documents members of the General Assembly will find each donation listed - one by one - so that the world and the Salvadorians can be sure that this Government is going to see to it that every penny, every item donated, will go directly to the Salvadorians who need it the most - those living in the rubble, on the banks of the rivers, in caves, in huts, those who have endured hunger and who are now coming out from under. Today all of us Salvadorians are aware of the tragedy of the poverty our people are experiencing.

(President Duarte)

So I have come to deliver to the General Assembly these documents which have been audited by international firms and which detail the contributions, in cash and in kind, which have been received and distributed to the people, with affection and fraternal respect.

The people and Government of Salvador have placed their faith and hopes in the assistance and co-operation that the international community can provide. We remain firmly convinced that this assistance will be given resolutely and magnanimously and that, taken together with the efforts of our people, will enormously facilitate the process of national reconstruction to which we are devoting our efforts. We trust that this will make it possible for democracy in El Salvador to emerge strengthened from this harsh trial that destiny has reserved for us.

Hope and solidarity are essential to overcome crises in the lives of nations. No democracy is weak if in its hardest times it can rely upon the unselfish and humanitarian assistance of the international community. My people and my Government have faith in the United Nations and its Members.

El Salvador is once again on its feet. The assistance and co-operation of the international community have made the difference between short-term helplessness and recovery with faith in and hope for the future of the Salvadorian people.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I thank the President of the Republic of El Salvador for the important statement he has just made.

Mr. Jose Napoleon Duarte, President of the Republic of El Salvador, was escorted from the General Assembly Hall.

AGENDA ITEM 28 (continued)

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/41/23, Part VII); A/AC.109/878)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/41/284)
- (c) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/41/870)
- (d) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/41/L.19)

The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Fourth Committee in document A/41/870?

It was so decided.

Mr. BATLLE (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/41/L.19 on the question of the Malvinas Islands. At its fortieth session the General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority resolution 40/21, the text of which is substantially the same as that now before the Assembly. Unfortunately, in the year that has elapsed since the adoption of that resolution there has been no progress towards a peaceful and definitive settlement of the problems outstanding between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands.

As we are told by the Secretary-General in his report,

"it has not proved possible so far to find common ground to engage the two parties in the kind of talks envisaged in resolution 40/21".

(A/41/824, para. 6)

Uruguay, as a Latin American country situated in the South Atlantic, is very especially affected by this problem and has put on record a number of times its deep concern about it. That concern has mounted recently as a result of the United Kingdom's declaration on south-west Atlantic fisheries, of 29 October.

The British Government has sought to exercise jurisdiction or sovereign rights for certain purposes in a zone of 200 nautical miles around the Malvinas Islands and on the continental shelf and has thereby arrogated to itself powers which are properly those of the legitimate sovereign of the islands. In this way it has sought to assume competence which is exclusively within the sovereignty of the coastal State, altering the pre-existing situation and even encroaching on areas which are indisputably within Argentine jurisdiction.

(Mr. Batlle, Uruguay)

Uruguay, which has traditionally supported what it regards as Argentina's legitimate claims to sovereignty over those islands, deplores the unilateral action of the United Kingdom Government, which is at variance with international law. That action has aggravated the sovereignty dispute and, as is pointed out in the communiqué on this matter issued by the Uruguayan Government, in the present circumstances can serve only to generate dangerous tensions in the region, which in turn cause a deterioration in the conditions needed to establish a climate of mutual trust which would lead to a dialogue between the parties.

Concurring with us on this point, the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States (OAS) adopted by consensus this very month a resolution expressing deep concern at this new element of tension and potential conflict introduced by the British declaration of 29 October; supporting the efforts of the international community to bring about peaceful negotiations on all aspects of the dispute over the Malvinas Islands, including the question of sovereignty; and calling upon both parties to explore all the possibilities of entering into negotiations and to refrain from taking measures which would introduce changes in the delicate situation which now exists.

The first and fundamental step for which the international community is calling is the beginning of negotiations between the parties.

On 2 November, acting on the express mandate of the President of Argentina, Mr. Raul Alfonsín, President José Sarney of Brazil and President Julio María Sanguinetti of Uruguay, the Foreign Ministers of the three countries - Mr. Dante Caputo, Mr. Roberto de Abreu Sodre and Mr. Enrique Iglesias - met in Punta del Este to consider the consequences of the British declaration of 29 October, and in the press communiqué issued on that occasion the three Governments, inter alia,

(Mr. Batlle, Uruguay)

"confirmed to the international community their belief in bilateral diplomatic negotiations as the appropriate mechanism for finding a peaceful solution to the dispute and expressed their firm hope that the future would prove the effectiveness of that course".

My delegation believes that the Argentine Government's declaration of 17 November, in which it stated its willingness to initiate global negotiations with the United Kingdom in accordance with resolution 40/21, constitutes an important step towards a start being made along that path. It proposes, as preparation for such negotiations, an open dialogue with the United Kingdom in order to create the conditions of confidence necessary for approaching the negotiations successfully and determining the timetable for them.

My Government welcomes this initiative and views it as a positive response by one of the parties to the request made in resolution 40/21, and now reiterated in the present draft resolution, for negotiations to be initiated with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively problems pending between the two countries, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands.

It is not for this forum to prejudge what elements or factors form an integral part of the substantive solution of this problem, but it is within the power of the General Assembly to take whatever steps it considers timely and appropriate to contribute to a peaceful and mutually satisfactory solution to this problem, within the framework of its general competence to consider any matters or questions within the scope of the Charter and its specific competence to discuss any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security and to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation which it deems likely to

(Mr. Batlle, Uruguay)

prejudice the general welfare or friendly relations among nations. I am referring to Articles 10, 11 and 14 of the Charter.

The draft resolution before the Assembly is, therefore, purely instrumental in nature. The inclusion of other elements, particularly those having a bearing on substantive issues, would be irrelevant in this case and could defeat our purpose, which is the beginning of a process of negotiation between the parties.

A few weeks ago, at this session, the General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution declaring the South Atlantic a zone of peace and co-operation. That majority included the favourable vote of the United Kingdom. That resolution, the first on the subject to be adopted by the General Assembly, concerned the general aspiration of the international community to ensure that the South Atlantic region should be free from all sources of tension and that the national unity, sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of every State of the region should be respected. It urged all States to refrain from the threat or the use of force and to observe strictly the principle that the territory of a State should not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force, in violation of the Charter, and also the principle that the acquisition of territories by force is inadmissible. Further, it called upon all States scrupulously to respect the South Atlantic region as a zone of peace and co-operation.

Any vestige of colonialism or the foreign occupation of territories is an injustice, and thus an obstacle to peace and co-operation. Any situation of tension or international friction, any international dispute, causes a crisis in the mutual confidence and friendly relations among nations and therefore is an obstacle to the strengthening of peace and the very opposite of co-operation.

(Mr. Batlle, Uruguay)

The Argentine-British dispute over the islands of the south-west Atlantic is an obstacle to the consolidation of a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic.

Obviously, the matter which the Assembly is considering does not in itself relate to the natural resources of the region or to their management.

(Mr. Batlle, Uruguay)

The situation we are dealing with is of another and, of course, very different nature and of a much more profound character. In this respect, Uruguay wishes to place on record yet again its solidarity with the views of the Argentine Republic.

We believe that the declaration made by the Argentine Government on 17 November, confirmed yesterday by the Argentine Foreign Minister, Mr. Dante Caputo, in this Assembly, constitutes a substantial step forward in the search for a just and peaceful solution to this question.

In Uruguay's view, a path has been opened up and the United Kingdom should not refuse to move along it.

Our country, which has fraternal relations with the Argentine Republic, has maintained and continues to maintain with the United Kingdom very long-standing and important ties of friendship, which were strengthened at a time of great difficulty for the United Kingdom and for the world. We therefore look forward to conduct from the United Kingdom in keeping with its best traditions and also in keeping with its obligations as a permanent member of the Security Council.

We hope that the draft resolution of which we are a co-sponsor and which the Assembly will certainly adopt, will induce the parties to start negotiations which will resolve this dispute once and for all. Were that to happen, the United Nations would emerge strengthened in its objectives and functions and there would have been a renewal of friendship between two peoples bound together by close historic links, and a priceless contribution to the strengthening of peace would thereby have been made.

Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly is considering the question of the Malvinas Islands for the fifth consecutive year. That may seem repetitive and routine, as Sir John Thomson said yesterday, but it should be borne in mind that this repetition is due precisely to

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

the inflexible will of the British Government which has disregarded the repeated appeals of the international community, contained in various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, for a solution to the dispute.

This question, as all the delegations of Latin America have stated, is not only an Argentine cause, but that of all the peoples and Governments of Latin America as well. In this respect, the Bolivian people and its Governments have since the last century steadfastly supported the Argentine Republic on the Malvinas issue.

Bolivia's support derives, not solely from mere solidarity between two peoples bound by geography and destiny, but rather because both of us share principles of international law, particularly the principle of non-recognition of territorial conquest by force of arms. On behalf of the Constitutional Government, headed by President Victor Paz Estenssoro, I reaffirm Bolivia's unswerving commitment to the cause of the Argentine Republic in the dispute over the sovereignty of the Malvinas Islands which, in the opinion of my Government, are an integral part of Argentine national territory.

My delegation is grateful to Foreign Minister Dante Caputo for his detailed account yesterday of the question of the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and also for his presentation of the Argentine position over recent events in the south-west Atlantic, and we would particularly wish to draw attention to the judicious, serene and dignified manner in which he presented his case.

Bolivia joined other countries in sponsoring, over the past four years, draft resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Those resolutions urge the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute over the question of the

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

Malvinas Islands and call upon the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices by helping the parties to start negotiations.

At the fortieth session, a group of countries friendly to Argentina and the United Kingdom submitted a draft resolution which opened up new prospects for a solution. That draft, which was adopted as resolution 40/21, differed procedurally from the resolutions adopted on the matter by the General Assembly at its sessions in 1982, 1983 and 1984, in that no reference was made to the substantive aspects of the question. That initiative was an interesting one and provided an opportunity to break the deadlock caused by the United Kingdom's negative response to earlier resolutions.

My delegation is grateful to the Secretary-General for his selfless efforts under resolution 40/21, and we find it deplorable that so far there has been no resumption of the negotiations, as stated in the Secretary-General's report (A/41/824).

It is obvious from that report that the Argentine Government is prepared to start negotiations with the United Kingdom under the terms of resolution 40/21. On the other hand, the Secretary-General notes that the United Kingdom only wishes to improve relations with regard to practical matters, leaving aside the core of the question dividing the United Kingdom from the whole of Latin America, particularly from Argentina, in this dispute. This is particularly interesting because Sir John Thomson himself remarked yesterday in part of his statement that his Government knew that sovereignty was a difficult question, but not an insoluble one. My Government thanks the Argentine Republic for its dedication to peace and law in solving this question and it is also concerned by the reticence of the

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

United Kingdom to settle this dispute within the framework of a peaceful solution provided for in the United Nations Charter and repeated in various Assembly resolutions.

It has been argued that part of the problem is the situation of the islanders and their right to self-determination. My delegation has clearly stated previously that self-determination is an inalienable right of peoples in order to determine their destiny. In this case, nonetheless, it does not apply because the island population, which is the result of military occupation, was transplanted to the islands to perform logistic functions or to be employed in the colonial enterprise which sought to benefit from the British dominion over the islands. That population has always regarded itself as British and wishes to continue to be British, as Sir John Thomson said yesterday. It never wanted independence and never had its own national identity. In other words, it never sought to become separate from metropolitan Britain, as has been made clear in four decades of debate in the Fourth Committee. In other words, they want to maintain a colonial situation.

My delegation wishes to be very clear on this point. I have to point out that historical evidence shows that the Argentine population inhabiting the Malvinas Islands up to 1833 was expelled by the invaders. For example, a number of families expelled from the Malvinas sought refuge in Chuquisaca, Bolivia. I need not refer to the historic bond with Bolivia which, until 1825, shared with the Argentine provinces, including the Malvinas, which were part of the Viceroyalty of La Plata.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

In our view, the legitimate population of the Malvinas, which could have sought self-determination, was expelled, and therefore we cannot agree that the civil servants or descendants of civil servants of the British colonial administration should now seek, on the pretext of self-determination, to jeopardize the unquestionable rights of Argentina by perpetuating a colonial situation clearly contrary to the course of history and one which wounds the feelings of the peoples of Latin America, who have always been deeply committed to freedom.

This year my Government was obliged to draw attention to the declaration of the United Kingdom of 29 October in which the United Kingdom announced to the international community its decision to impose a fisheries zone in the south-west Atlantic, a regrettable decision which has been rejected by all the countries of Latin America.

Bolivia would emphasize, in the fullest spirit of cordiality, the need for the United Kingdom to ponder this unilateral action which inhibits any possibility of resolving the dispute and which, indeed, widens the gulf separating the Government of the United Kingdom from all Latin America, in particular from Argentina.

We especially urge the Government of the United Kingdom to consider fully the Argentine Government's honest offer of 17 November to resolve all pending issues on this question. We must emphasize that this offer was made by a lawfully elected democratic Government, one which reflects the peace-loving nature of an Argentina respectful of international law.

It is difficult to believe that the United Kingdom Government could allow this new opportunity to slip by and would, on the contrary, seek to maintain the status quo which we know is rejected by large sectors of political opinion in

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

the United Kingdom itself in addition to the international community. The decision to settle the matter rests solely with the British Government. Latin America strongly urges the United Kingdom to respond with traditional magnanimity and wisdom. So does the international community.

My delegation associates itself with the appeal of the sponsors of draft resolution A/41/L.19 and requests the Secretariat to include Bolivia in the list of sponsors.

Bolivia's support for Argentina, as our Foreign Minister, Mr. Guillermo Bedregal, stated

"is a moral commitment to the Argentine people, to its history and legacy, particularly to its dignity, a commitment which accepts no subterfuge and no capitulation".

Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): Over 150 years have elapsed since the United Kingdom, taking shelter behind its military and naval hegemony, forcibly occupied the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, an integral part of Argentine territory. That act of force deprived the Argentine Republic of its territory, but could not deprive it of its rights.

Today those rights to Argentine sovereignty remain as valid as they were then. Perhaps more so, since international law and rights have been developed and perfected and now support Argentina's just claims to its territory.

A year has elapsed since the General Assembly last considered the question of the Malvinas Islands. On that occasion the General Assembly, faced with a continuing colonial situation and an unjustified delay in starting negotiations, urged the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume those negotiations in order to find a peaceful solution to the dispute.

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

Developments since that time indicate to us that the situation is far from encouraging. On the contrary, we have observed a serious and disturbing deterioration that prompts us to insist that bilateral negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom begin immediately.

Throughout this year, we have been witness to a show of good faith by Argentina in its desire to settle its dispute by peaceful means on the basis of international law. We have heard Argentina's consistent appeal to the United Kingdom to sit down at the negotiating table and to settle their dispute in conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. However, the United Kingdom has lent a deaf ear to those appeals and, on the contrary, is perpetuating and deepening a colonialist situation in that Argentine territory.

On 29 October last, the United Kingdom responded to the international call for resumed negotiations and for it not to place further obstacles in the path of a negotiated solution. But how did it respond?

On 29 October, the British Government decided to extend the exploitation of fishery resources to a zone of 200 miles around the Malvinas Islands. That decision not only seriously disturbs the efforts under way in the international arena to create an atmosphere of understanding, but it awakens and stimulates feelings of wrath among Latin American peoples in the face of a high-handed colonial act.

We must once again place on record our opposition to the attempts to apply General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) to the Malvinas Islands outside its true purpose and spirit by giving it obsolete and manipulative interpretations.

The Latin American countries, the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement and the international community are deeply concerned by the massive British military

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

and naval presence in the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands. We believe that this increase in the British military presence is a serious threat to the peace and security of our continent.

We reiterate our position that the establishment of bases and other military facilities in territories under colonial domination is incompatible with the principles of the Charter and constitutes an obstacle to the decolonization process.

In conclusion, I should like to quote the words spoken a few days ago by President Daniel Ortega, reaffirming the position of Nicaragua. He said

"The people and Government of Nicaragua have not vacillated and will not vacillate in their total support to the Argentine Government. Despite the situation of foreign aggression experienced by Nicaragua, despite the enormous limitations placed on our country by that same foreign aggression, we have been, we are and we shall remain at the side of our Argentine brothers by doing everything we can in support of their noble cause, which is also our cause."

Mr. KNIPPING VICTORIA (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again the General Assembly is considering the question of the Malvinas Islands. This time there is a new element in the situation which could result in a very dangerous development in the problem, because it undoubtedly constitutes a gratuitous provocation which could eventually have grave consequences.

Before referring to the British decision to establish what it calls a fishing and conservation zone of up to 200 miles around the Malvinas Islands, I shall, to place this subject within its true context in the United Nations setting, give a brief account of the background to this matter and its development in the Organization.

At its twentieth session, in 1965, the General Assembly took note of the existence of a dispute between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas and recalled that its resolution 1514 (XV), of 14 December 1960, was prompted by the cherished aim of bringing to an end everywhere colonialism in all its forms, one of which covered the case of the Malvinas Islands. In operative paragraph 1 of resolution 2065 (XX) the General Assembly invites the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to proceed without delay with the negotiations recommended by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the problem, bearing in mind the provisions and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the interests of the population of the Malvinas Islands.

Eight years later, in 1973, at its twenty-eighth session, the General Assembly, gravely concerned at the fact that no substantial progress had been made

(Mr. Knipping Victoria,
Dominican Republic)

in negotiations on this matter, indicated that the way to put an end

"to this colonial situation is the peaceful solution of the conflict of sovereignty between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom with regard to the ... islands";

and expressed

"its gratitude for the continuous efforts made by the Government of Argentina, in accordance with the relevant decisions of the General Assembly, to facilitate the process of decolonization and to promote the well-being of the population of the islands". (resolution 3160 (XXVIII))

In 1976, at its thirty-first session, the General Assembly considered the question once again and reiterated its gratitude to the Argentine Government for its continuous efforts to facilitate the process of decolonization and to promote the well-being of the population of the islands, requested the parties directly involved to expedite the negotiations concerning the dispute over sovereignty, as requested in General Assembly resolutions 2065 (XX) and 3160 (XXVIII), and established a new condition by calling upon the two parties

"to refrain from taking decisions that would imply introducing unilateral modifications in the situation while the islands are going through the process recommended in the above-mentioned resolutions". (resolution 31/49, para. 4)

During its past four sessions the General Assembly, in resolutions 37/9, 38/12, 39/6 and 40/21, has firmly reiterated its position on the elements of this problem and the principles that must be applied to achieve a comprehensive, peaceful, just and lasting solution to the question of the Malvinas Islands.

A detailed examination of the numerous General Assembly resolutions on this matter leads to the following conclusions: first, the question of the Malvinas

(Mr. Knipping Victoria,
Dominican Republic)

Islands is an integral part of the decolonization process; secondly, there is a sovereignty dispute over those islands between Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; thirdly, the only way to settle the dispute is by peaceful means in accordance with international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter; fourthly, due account must be taken of the interests of the population of the Malvinas Islands; and, fifthly, the maintenance of colonial situations is incompatible with the United Nations ideal of universal peace.

This historical and retrospective analysis encompassing a period of more than 20 years leads us to assert, without fear of exaggeration, that a set of criteria and concepts has come into being over the years in the United Nations that forms a body of doctrine on the Malvinas Islands which we could quite properly call "the United Nations doctrine on the question of the Malvinas Islands". That doctrine leaves no doubt of the colonial nature of the Malvinas or that the solution depends basically on the restoration of territorial integrity to the sole entity to which it rightfully belongs, taking duly into account the interests of the population.

There can be no doubt that the great process of decolonization carried out by the United Nations constitutes one of the major accomplishments of our Organization. An extraordinary role has been played by the Latin American countries in that movement of justice. Latin America has left its imprint on the process and that is a permanent source of pride since it reflects its deep-rooted feeling of freedom and international co-operation and solidarity.

For these reasons, it is clear that as long as the present situation of the Malvinas Islands persists it will continue to be a sharp thorn pricking the legal conscience of Latin America.

As I pointed out at the beginning of my statement, the question of the Malvinas Islands is being considered at a time when the United Kingdom has

(Mr. Knipping Victoria,
Dominican Republic)

unilaterally decreed a fisheries and conservation zone of 200 miles around the islands. That decision fundamentally affects the maritime area in which the Argentine Republic has traditionally, peacefully and incontestably exercised jurisdiction and control.

There can be no doubt that this action by the British Government will not promote a response to the repeated appeals of the General Assembly for the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations. Instead it constitutes a new element of disturbance likely to give rise to new and dangerous tensions in the South Atlantic that would jeopardize the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Knipping Victoria,
Dominican Republic)

Fortunately, the new Argentine democracy, in a gesture which is a tribute to it and does it honour has reacted to this provocation by reiterating its willingness to engage in dialogue and negotiations, thereby demonstrating quite clearly its commitment to peace.

My delegation has repeatedly stated that my country's foreign policy is based on consistent opposition to any form or vestige of colonialism. In keeping with this firm belief, we consider that the maintenance of colonial and neo-colonial situations is incompatible with the United Nations ideal of universal peace. The peaceful settlement of international disputes and conflicts has been a permanent feature of the policy of the Dominican Republic throughout its history.

My country, which has unswervingly supported the just and legitimate claim of the Argentine Republic to the Malvinas Islands, and is convinced that it is essential to break the existing deadlock, in order to establish a genuine climate of peace in the South Atlantic, wishes to take this opportunity to address an urgent appeal to the parties concerned, countries with which the Dominican Republic has traditional ties and close relations, to resume their negotiations in order to find a global, appropriate, honourable and lasting solution to the dispute.

Mr. NAVA CARRILLO (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): As the consideration of the question of the Malvinas Islands by the Assembly gets under way once again this year, the international community finds itself facing new circumstances which, unfortunately, do not bring with them the good news that it would have liked to hear about the development of this problem. On the contrary, new obstacles have emerged which dim the prospects for a solution even further.

(Mr. Nava Carrillo, Venezuela)

The declaration by the United Kingdom on 29 October last, of what it terms a fisheries conservation and management zone around the Malvinas, establishing its jurisdiction even over the adjoining continental shelf, can be viewed only as a method of extending its territorial occupation, as an act which violates the legitimate rights of Argentina, and as a manoeuvre which compromises possibilities of bilateral negotiations in a propitious climate.

Accordingly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Simon Alberto Consalvi, stated at the recently concluded sixteenth session of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS) in Guatemala:

"We take the view that this measure will significantly hamper efforts to put an end to a situation which shows undeniable characteristics of anachronistic colonialism. The decision of the British Government affects the rights of Argentina and disregards the relevant resolutions of this Organization and of the United Nations. This is a foolhardy measure that will generate further and even stronger reactions."

It is noteworthy that these developments occurred just as the consideration of the item in this forum was about to begin, and that only a few days previously the General Assembly had adopted resolution 41/11 by an overwhelming majority - the United Kingdom also voting in favour - by which the South Atlantic was declared a zone of peace and co-operation.

Acts of this kind should be condemned as generating tension aimed at creating an atmosphere that will render impracticable express recommendations of the United Nations and other international forums in which the parties are urged to work towards a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the dispute concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands.

(Mr. Nava Carrillo, Venezuela)

It appears unnecessary to continue emphasizing the validity of Argentina's historical and legal arguments in support of its territorial claim, as their substance has been described to the Assembly in previous years. It is now time to promote the normalization of relations between Argentina and the United Kingdom, so that a just, global and final solution of the dispute can be arrived at.

What is the point of prolonging a situation that is doing so much damage to both States, that is having the effect of aggravating relations between the United Kingdom and the inter-American community, that tends to create tension in the South Atlantic and that impairs the credibility of our multilateral institutions?

Venezuela commends the willingness expressed often by Argentina to resume negotiations with the United Kingdom in a climate of trust and mutual respect in the context of General Assembly resolution 40/21. In this connection, in its official declaration of 17 November last, it called, as a preparatory step, for an open dialogue to create the conditions necessary for the initiation of such negotiations. Although not a legal requirement, Argentina has proposed the formal cessation of hostilities, in accordance with the repeated appeal of the United Kingdom, to provide a basis for the peaceful solution of the conflict which should, moreover, put an end to the so-called military protection zone created around the Malvinas Islands by the United Kingdom.

Argentina is thus demonstrating a flexible attitude in an effort to solve, little by little, bilateral differences stemming from the dispute over sovereignty; in this respect the valid interests of the inhabitants of the islands would be protected, even by international guarantees and safeguards.

The role played by the Secretary-General in the process of preparing the way for a dialogue is of the greatest importance and is resolutely supported by the international community. Venezuela notes with concern, however, that the

(Mr. Nava Carrilio, Venezuela)

Secretary-General's efforts have not been successful, and as stated in his report to the Assembly of 13 November:

"Recent events have made clear that time is not necessarily working in favour of overcoming the obstacles that stand in the way of a peaceful and lasting settlement to the problems pending between the two countries." (A/41/824, para. 6)

(Mr. Nava Carrillo, Venezuela)

In September of this year the Secretary-General once again addressed to the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina his willingness to assist in the search for a peaceful solution to their disputes. One of the parties has consistently reiterated its willingness to resume negotiations, in conformity with resolutions of the General Assembly, and has provided credible proof of flexibility and maturity. If the situation were to remain at a stalemate or were to worsen in the near future, the international community will know who is responsible.

Accordingly, the Government of Venezuela, in accordance with its statement of 30 October of this year, reaffirming its solidarity with the people and Government of Argentina, expresses the hope that the Government of the United Kingdom will show a willingness to create an atmosphere of understanding favourable to an improvement in the relations between the two countries that could lead peacefully to the restoration of Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands.

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Ever since the United Nations began to consider the question of the Malvinas Islands, Cuba has made clear its position that there could be no question as to the sovereignty of the Argentine Republic over that territory which, historically and geographically, belongs to the Argentine people. Today, we wish to reaffirm that position.

The issue here is one of principles, strengthened by the profound feelings of solidarity of the brother nations of Latin America, which see in the continuing occupation of those islands by the United Kingdom an affront to the whole continent. I would like here to quote the words of Commander in Chief

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

Fidel Castro Ruz, President of the Council of State and of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba, at the Third Congress of the Cuban Communist Party:

"The episode of the Malvinas has confirmed that the imperialists are capable of trampling under foot the feelings of an entire continent, whenever it suits their interests."

For some years now the General Assembly has been clearly and firmly stating its view that the Malvinas Islands and the waters adjacent thereto belong to the Argentine Republic, and that the international community should ask the Governments of that country and of the United Kingdom to settle at the negotiating table the differences which divide them on this thorny question, which undoubtedly constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

The Argentine Government, as the Foreign Minister of Argentina has now reaffirmed, is prepared to engage in a dialogue to find a negotiated solution to this situation. It must be pointed out that Argentina has shown flexibility and a sense of responsibility, and has made evident its willingness to examine the question of the Malvinas through a bilateral dialogue. But Great Britain's response has been an obstinate refusal to discuss the sovereignty issue, and it has thus blocked negotiations and turned a deaf ear to the appeals of the international community.

It is essential that all parties should bear their proper responsibilities with respect to the United Nations and the provisions of the Charter on the obligation of all Members to work to preserve international peace and security, and consequently those parties should resolve once and for all to engage in a dialogue to seek a negotiated settlement of the Malvinas dispute.

A few days ago, shortly after the General Assembly had adopted, by 120 votes in favour, 1 against and 8 abstentions, the resolution on the zone of peace and

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

co-operation of the South Atlantic, the United Kingdom Government unilaterally decided to extend the exclusion zone to 200 miles round the Malvinas Islands. That measure is a source of deep concern and has inflamed tensions in the region, because it plainly poses a challenge, an affront, to the feelings of the Argentine people.

In a response to the decision of the Government in London, President Fidel Castro, in a message to the Argentine President, Raul Alfonsin, said:

"Once again we reaffirm the full backing of our people and Government for the just claims of the Government and people of Argentina over the Malvinas Islands and adjacent waters, and we also state our most firm disapproval of this unilateral measure, which encroaches on Argentine sovereignty, runs counter to the efforts of the international community to seek a just and peaceful solution to this colonial conflict, has caused the indignation of the brother nations of Latin America, and poses a grave threat to international peace and security."

It is not by establishing military bases or sending sophisticated military hardware to the Malvinas that the situation will be resolved. As a permanent member of the Security Council, the United Kingdom bears special responsibility to the United Nations and, accordingly, should refrain from taking any type of measure that could contribute to the worsening of the situation. On the contrary, it would be only logical for the United Kingdom to agree to recognize what belongs to the Argentine nation by historic right. We all remember that barely two months ago an important group of Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting in Harare, firmly and clearly expressed their full endorsement of Argentina's claims.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

No legal subterfuge can be used as a pretext to prove that islands located thousands of miles from the United Kingdom belong to the United Kingdom. We are convinced that the Argentine people will overcome all obstacles put in its way to prevent the Malvinas Islands from being restored to the national territory. History shows, and the United Nations proves, that colonialism, like long nights, slip away into the past, and that is why I wish to conclude these words on the colonial case of the Malvinas by quoting José Martí, who instilled in my people so much faith in history, and spoke of the shame of those who sing to the future. He said:

"Let us make our own history, looking into our souls, and that of others, by dealing with their acts. After any crisis, there always remains the subjective muse, as it is fashionable - and appropriate - to say, and the historical muse. Fortunate are those nations like ours which still have, over and above their various personal sorrows, heroic deeds of which to sing." The Argentine people, too, will be able to sing of its heroic deeds.

Mr. PITARKA (Albania): At this session, too, the General Assembly is considering the question of the Malvinas, which Argentina and other countries of Latin America have rightfully demanded be included again in the agenda of our Assembly. It is undoubtedly the duty of the United Nations once again to consider this important issue and work out ways and means of fulfilling its obligations deriving from the Charter, as well as provide an answer to the lawful concern and demands of Argentina.

Various speakers who have spoken before me in this debate, the representatives of the countries of Latin America, in particular, have justifiably expressed their concern, and demanded that this problem be solved as soon as possible in accordance with the legitimate interests of the Argentine people and their inalienable right to re-establish and fully exercise their sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, which are a part of Argentine territory detached and still kept under occupation by Great Britain.

In speaking in this debate the delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania wishes to reiterate once again its position of principle on this question, which remains timely and bears directly on the national interests of a sovereign people, as well as on the peace and security of the whole South Atlantic region. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania and the Albanian people have supported and will continue to support Argentina's right to re-establish and exercise its full sovereignty over these islands. It demands that Great Britain instantly put an end to its colonial occupation of these islands and to all its military, political and economic operations that violate the sovereignty and integrity of the Argentine people and endanger peace and security in the South Atlantic, where a tense situation has already been created because of the rivalry of the two super-Powers for hegemony and spheres of influence.

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

International public opinion and the peoples of the world - those of Latin America first and foremost - have rightly condemned the occupation of the Malvinas Islands as a dangerous adventure. They consider the persistence in that occupation to be a challenge both to Argentina and to the whole of Latin America. In supporting the legitimate demands of Argentina, the peoples and countries of that continent demonstrate once again their resolute opposition to all foreign occupation and to efforts to preserve the abhorrent and anachronistic colonial system.

The Albanian people unreservedly join the fraternal Latin American peoples in supporting the legitimate demand of the sovereign people of Argentina for the re-establishment of its inalienable rights over the national territory that historically belongs to it.

Mr. MORAN (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Spain has frequently had occasion to express the profound concern it feels at the situation pertaining to the dispute over the Malvinas Islands. Unfortunately, this year not only is there no sign, apparently, of any rapid and satisfactory solution but new elements have made more remote the necessary understanding for which the international community earnestly hopes.

Spain maintains excellent relations with both parties, deriving in one case from a common history and in the other from a desire for political integration. The fact that it has not proved possible to reopen a dialogue between Argentina and the United Kingdom to achieve a peaceful negotiated solution to this conflict between them is, therefore, a source of concern to Spain. In his report (A/41/824), of 13 November, the Secretary-General states that he regrets having to report once again that it has not proved possible so far to find common ground to engage the two parties in the kind of talks envisaged in resolution 40/21.

(Mr. Moran, Spain)

The colonial problem of the Malvinas Islands is well understood and the United Nations has established and reiterated over a period of more than 20 years a doctrine which Spain, like the great majority of the countries represented here, fully shares entirely. In accordance with resolution 2065 (XX), which has been developed by various consensuses on the subject and in the resolutions of recent years, this conflict will be properly resolved only through the application of paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV), that is, by the restoration of the territorial integrity of Argentina, which would not mean ignoring the legitimate interests of the population of the islands.

The substantive question having been enunciated and the position of the Assembly made known on this matter, we find that the lack of dialogue and absence of progress in this regard not only impede the quest for a negotiated, peaceful solution but also make it possible for new elements of tension to arise. The British declaration on south-west Atlantic fisheries is one such phenomenon in that it broadens to 150 miles the exclusive economic zone around the Malvinas Islands, which can only complicate the situation. Spain has already expressed its reservations to the British Government concerning this initiative.

Draft resolution A/41/L.19, of 29 October, which is now before us and for which Spain will vote, contains, as we had occasion to point out in connection with last year's resolution, the necessary elements for the commencement of a dialogue and negotiations between the parties that will make it possible to re-establish on a firm basis the confidence that has been lost. It would necessarily lead to the solution of pending problems, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands.

(Mr. Moran, Spain)

In this respect, the Spanish Government greatly appreciated the declaration of 17 November, in which the Argentine Government expressed its willingness to negotiate, and, from this rostrum Spain wishes to appeal to the parties to take decisive steps to arrive at a settlement of their differences by means of thorough, wide-ranging negotiations.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): The question of the Malvinas Islands has been the subject of United Nations interest and concern, in one form or another, for some 22 years now and indeed continues to occupy a prime position within our current order of the day. And so it should, for, although the armed conflict which so tragically and so unnecessarily erupted in 1992 between the United Kingdom and Argentina has ended, the relationship between those two nations remains strained and far from normal. The tension which characterizes their relationship manifests itself quite clearly today within the South Atlantic and constitutes a lingering source of justifiable concern to all peace-loving nations.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The reason for that unpleasant and unfortunate state of affairs is quite simply that the root cause of the issue to which we address ourselves today has still not been resolved. I speak, of course, of the question of sovereignty.

There can be few among us who harbour any doubt as to the legitimacy of Argentina's claim to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands. For many years now, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries as a whole has lent its full support to that claim and has maintained a deep and abiding interest in all developments relating to it. Both within the United Nations system and when the issue came before the non-aligned nations, full cognizance was taken of the difficulties involved - of the historical and geographical realities that had and have still to be faced; full consideration was given to all parties involved in the issue, including, of course, the inhabitants of the islands themselves. Although there has never been any question, therefore, as to which party should exercise sovereignty over the islands, the restitution of that sovereignty has always been viewed as a goal to be obtained through negotiation and dialogue.

The resort to force in 1982 was thus a negative and disappointing development. And Zimbabwe and many other non-aligned countries argued then, as now, that the peaceful settlement of disputes is central and essential to the philosophy of international co-operation and peaceful coexistence. That conflict did not and indeed could not solve the central issue here - the question of sovereignty; and, as the battle-clouds cleared, that issue remained stubbornly unresolved between the two parties to the dispute. In the days, weeks and even months that followed the conflict, as emotion ran high on both sides, again nothing was achieved.

But that was four years ago. Even a brief survey of the situation as it exists today will reveal that there has still been no meaningful progress made with

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

a view to resolving the Malvinas question. In some respects - although there has been no further recourse to armed conflict - the situation today is worse than it was one or even two years ago, and there are indications that unless a breakthrough can be achieved, and soon, tension in the region will continue to mount, which would result in a corresponding deterioration in the prospects for peace and security there. We cannot allow that to happen.

Since taking office, the democratically elected Government of President Raoul Alfonsín has maintained its firm commitment to the resolution of the Malvinas question through peaceful means and the restitution of Argentine sovereignty over those islands through a process of dialogue and negotiation. That is an honourable position, fully in line with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and with the principles of the Non-Aligned Movement. As such, it has received the support of the Non-Aligned Movement. Of prime importance was the General Assembly's adoption last year of resolution 40/21, which, inter alia, called upon all parties to

"initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the pending problems between both countries, including all aspects on the future of the ... Malvinas". (resolution 40/21, para. 1)

The Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, meeting in Harare last September, while reiterating their firm support for Argentina's right to restoration of sovereignty over the Malvinas through negotiation, fully endorsed United Nations resolution 40/21 and repeated their call for the resumption of negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom, with the participation and the good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General. They urged the Government of the United Kingdom to agree to the resumption of negotiations and

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

"to refrain from taking decisions that would imply introducing unilateral modifications in the situation while the sovereignty dispute remains unsettled". (A/41/697, p. 118, para. 260)

Since 1982, Argentina has approached the Malvinas issue in an honest and forthright manner, by committing itself to a peaceful resolution of the problem and by repeatedly stating its willingness to initiate negotiations in search of the imaginative solution that this particularly delicate issue requires. My Government and the non-aligned countries as a whole have commended the Argentine Government for its realistic and open approach and, in the words of the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries,

"for its substantial contributions to the peaceful and lasting solution to the problems pending between Argentina and the United Kingdom". (A/41/697, p. 118, para. 260)

Let us cross now to the other side of the divide: In his letter dated 22 September 1986 to the Secretary-General on the subject of the Malvinas, Sir Geoffrey Howe expressed his Government's regrets that, notwithstanding its wish to improve relations with Argentina and notwithstanding repeated efforts on its part to work towards that end, little progress had in fact been made. Sir Geoffrey went on to identify the main cause for this as being Argentina's insistence that Britain should first commit itself to negotiations on sovereignty before there could be any other discussion of any other aspects of their bilateral relations.

The truth, as we know, is that Argentina has supported resolution 40/21, which sets no pre-conditions for beginning negotiations - although in fact many of us do recognize that the question of sovereignty over the Malvinas is the core of the conflict and as such should constitute a key aspect of any negotiations between Britain and Argentina.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Apart from the continuing abnormal relationship between London and Buenos Aires, there are other, related elements of the Malvinas question which have given us all cause for concern and which continue to do so to this day. The first is undoubtedly the ever-increasing British military, naval and air force presence in and around the islands and the construction there of a major airfield, capable of accommodating strategic military aircraft.

The Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, in Harare, while recalling that the establishment of bases and other military installations on dependent territories is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and, more specifically, with United Nations resolution 40/21, also reaffirmed that those developments are

"a cause for great concern to the countries of the Latin American region, endanger the peace and adversely affect stability in the area". (A/41/697, p. 118, para. 260)

In that respect, my delegation notes the United Kingdom's vote in favour of the resolution entitled "Zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic", and would draw its attention most specifically to operative paragraph 3 of that resolution.

The second element which has caused us concern is the declaration on South-West Atlantic fisheries issued on 29 October 1986 by the Government of the United Kingdom - a move which was deplored by the non-aligned countries at a plenary meeting of the Movement held in New York last week.

The Chairman of the Movement, Prime Minister Robert Mugabe, has already expressed to the British Government his deep concern and that of the non-aligned countries as a whole at this latest development, which in the opinion of the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Movement is likely to provoke new tensions in the region and make the search for an overall solution to the Malvinas question more difficult.

In marked contrast to that really quite provocative move, we now have before us a declaration made by the Government of Argentina on 17 November 1986, which represents a further, most constructive effort on the part of that Government to break the deadlock and initiate some forward momentum with regard to implementing resolution 40/21 and the relevant recommendations of the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, as contained in the Harare final documents.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

We welcome the Argentine declaration and commend it most sincerely and earnestly for the consideration of the British Government. We believe Argentina's proposal to issue formal notification of the cessation of hostilities and its invitation to the British Government to begin "an open dialogue" with it with the aim of bringing about the conditions of confidence necessary for approaching successfully the negotiations in accordance with United Nations resolution 40/21 represent a most significant contribution on the part of Argentina and should therefore serve to allay the concerns expressed by Sir Geoffrey Howe in his letter of 22 September 1986.

I repeat, this development is one which requires the close and careful consideration of the British Government: indeed, I think we would all be extremely disappointed if - as seemed to be indicated in the statement made to this Assembly by the representative of the United Kingdom - the British Government were to ignore or reject out of hand these constructive and helpful proposals.

In conclusion I should like to quote, not from a document of the Non-Aligned Movement or of the Argentine Government, but from the profound and wise words of Sir Geoffrey Howe's address in the General Assembly last year:

"The world community must give firm backing to all those who eschew violence in favour of patient diplomacy. That is the way towards a just and lasting peace based on the principles long espoused by the United Nations ... This Organization is based on confidence in the power of diplomacy, negotiation and dialogue. My Government shares that faith. The vital necessity is for the process of dialogue to get urgently under way in this area where for so long minds have failed to meet." (A/40/PV.9, pp. 60-61)

We could not agree more with Sir Geoffrey. These are indeed wise and statesmanlike words, worthy of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Affairs. We welcome and commend them to all, especially to Sir Geoffrey himself. Unfortunately, those words were not used when he was speaking about the Malvinas issue, yet they represent the exact sentiments of the vast majority of mankind with regard to that question. We all share his faith in the power of diplomacy, negotiation and dialogue. Should the British Government have the wisdom, now, to react favourably to the positive and constructive Argentine declaration then it can be assured of the strong understanding and support of the entire international community. Failure to do so will lead only to further tension between Buenos Aires and London and to further instability in the whole South Atlantic region. This must be avoided.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): The discussion on the agenda item before us has detailed a clear picture of the situation relating to the Malvinas Islands and the efforts to promote a political settlement of that question. For my delegation it has been a matter of the deepest regret that there has been no movement forward at all on this issue in the past few years and that indeed on occasions there have been developments which have tended to retard the efficacy of such efforts.

Our position on this question has been clear and consistent. It was reaffirmed by the Non-Aligned Movement at the highest level at Harare. India believes that this question can only be resolved politically, through amicable bilateral negotiations.

My delegation has co-sponsored draft resolution A/41/L.19, which reiterates the request to the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the problems pending between them, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. The draft

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

resolution also requests the Secretary-General to continue his renewed mission of good offices in order to assist the parties in complying with that request.

The draft is informed by our collective awareness of the interest of the international community in the peaceful settlement of their differences by the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom. It was because we were convinced that negotiations were proceeding in the right direction and that a peaceful solution was a very real possibility that we were particularly anguished by the resort to the use of force in 1982. At that time India had appealed, on 6 May 1982, to all parties concerned to desist from the use or threat of force and to return to the process of negotiations, so that a peaceful solution could be worked out. Following the outbreak of hostilities and the adoption of Security Council resolution 502 (1982), India urged that the eruption of a wider conflict should be averted and supported the commendable efforts and endeavours of the United Nations Secretary-General to evolve a framework within which the search for a peaceful settlement could go forward.

It may be recalled that at the Ministerial Meeting in New Delhi in February 1981, a year before the outbreak of hostilities, the Non-Aligned Movement declared:

"In the special and particular case of the Malvinas Islands, the Ministers firmly reiterated their support for the Argentine Republic's right to the restitution of that territory and sovereignty over it and requested that the negotiations with the United Kingdom in this regard be speeded up."

(A/36/116, annex, para. 104)

It follows that any unilateral action which diminishes the possibilities of dialogue will not contribute to the peaceful resolution of the problem. When negotiations between the two sides were rudely interrupted in 1982 we urged their

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

resumption. We do so again today. This issue of decolonization must not be allowed to continue to fester and we are sure that both parties look forward to the resumption of a bilateral relationship of trust and co-operation sanctioned to them by their history.

I wish to emphasize that the draft resolution before us is not one of a substantive nature. It is essentially a pointer to procedure which we feel should be adopted, that is, the resumption of dialogue. The question of the Malvinas or the Falkland Islands has understandably aroused very deep feelings among those involved with it directly and affected by it. We can only renew our belief that peace, coexistence and the values enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations demand that both sides look not to the past but to the future.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): The Ghana delegation welcomes the consideration of agenda item 28 on the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) in the General Assembly because it constitutes one of the most delicate tasks of the forty-first session. The conviction shared by almost all delegations that this is a decolonization issue is inversely proportional to the political acrimony that it has engendered between the main contending parties, Argentina and the United Kingdom. It is the hope of my delegation, as it must be for many others, that the present consideration will help towards reducing tension on all sides and towards paving the way for a definitive resolution of this thorny problem.

In making a contribution to the debate on this issue, the Ghana delegation does not wish to delve into the merits or otherwise of the claims of the two parties concerned. They have been stated many times over in the past and yet we are nowhere near a solution. I rather wish to recall that on 27 November 1985 - a year ago - the General Assembly adopted resolution 40/21, the main thrust of which was an appeal to Argentina and the United Kingdom:

"to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the pending problems between both countries ...".

(operative para. 1)

The intention of the Ghana delegation therefore is to assess in this debate the progress so far made, if any, towards that objective. We consider this attitude more useful than a tedious rehashing of all the traditional arguments either in favour of the sovereignty claim or otherwise.

To this end, my delegation has carefully studied the working paper prepared by the Secretariat in document A/AC.109/878 dated 6 August 1986 and the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/41/824 dated 13 November 1986. We regret to state that both documents assess that no tangible progress has been made as far as meeting last year's request is concerned. The working paper states:

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

"During the year under review the United Kingdom Government has maintained its position according to which, while desirous to improve its bilateral relations with Argentina and to hold talks towards that end, it is not willing to have included in them the question of sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)." (A/AC.109/878, para. 24)

Referring particularly to the mandate of last year, the Secretary-General has also reported failure in his report thus:

"I regret having to report once again that it has not proved possible so far to find common ground to engage the two parties in the kind of talks envisaged in resolution 40/21." (A/41/824, para. 6)

This is indeed an unfortunate situation for us all because, on the one hand, it frustrates the best efforts of the United Nations to complete decolonization of the territory and, on the other hand, it is indicative of the non-lessening of the tension that has characterized the relations between the main parties to the dispute. On all accounts, therefore, the purpose and objective of the General Assembly's decision last year has not been attained. The failure has been due to a lack of mobility in the positions adopted since last year, in spite of the efforts of the Secretary-General.

But in the view of my delegation the situation is not totally hopeless as we note that some contact was made during the period under review. For example, there were contacts made with and by parliamentarians on both sides in various European capitals and in Mexico City. During these meetings the need to re-establish diplomatic and commercial relations between Argentina and the United Kingdom was discussed. The informal discussions did not move on to preparing the ground for the negotiations envisaged in resolution 40/21. However, they constituted contact which we hope in the long run will have the cumulative effect of creating an

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

atmosphere conducive to solving the dispute concerning the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). What was missing was formal contact for negotiations.

It was in pursuance of a possible improvement in the relations between the two countries that the Ghana delegation co-sponsored last year, and again this year, the draft resolution on the issue. Our attachment to the draft resolution this year is due to the fact that it again urges the normalization of relations between Argentina and the United Kingdom. It does not do more than that and we would not have associated with it if that had not been the case. We place emphasis on the normalization of relations and early negotiations because everything else is predicated on relations between the two countries. In other words, peace and security in the region will only be secured when, as a first step, relations are normalized.

It is in this light that we are pleased to note in the report of the Secretary-General to which I have already referred that:

"The Government of Argentina, for its part, has expressed its willingness to initiate immediately negotiations with the United Kingdom, under the terms of resolution 40/21, in order to resolve peacefully the differences between the two countries, including all aspects concerning the future of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)." (A/41/824, para. 5)

This is a forward-looking attitude which we wish to commend. We read with great hope also in the same report that:

"The Government of the United Kingdom remains committed to improving bilateral relations with Argentina over practical matters, setting aside the sovereignty issue, on which it considers that views are fundamentally opposed, and to defending the rights of the Falkland Islanders to self-determination."

(para. 4)

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

This is also a heartening statement and we would have been happy to hail it fully too except that it is at the same time tantamount to insisting on a pre-condition.

We will not go so far as to wish to pronounce at this time on the substance of the sovereignty issue. What we wish to say to both parties is that they should endeavour to agree to approach the negotiating table without any pre-conditions. We offer this piece of advice, not out of a desire to ignore or suppress the particular view of either side, but rather to emphasize that an insistence on pre-conditions of whatever kind can only make negotiations more distant and even irrelevant over a long period of time. We urge the two parties, therefore, not to insist on the fulfilment by the other side of any condition before they sit at the negotiating table. Often the dynamics of talks, even preliminary talks, can themselves set the stage and propel parties on to substantive details in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual respect. We urge the two parties to try this approach.

Reference has been made by the principal parties and others in the current debate to the recent legislative measures taken by the United Kingdom for the conservation and management of fishery resources in the areas around the Islands. That action, as we have seen, has served to worsen relations between the two countries. The debate is ample proof. We have listened very carefully to the reasons adduced by the United Kingdom delegation for the taking of those measures.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Those reasons are probably laudable, although not supported by the subsequent Food and Agriculture Organization's report issued recently on the same subject. My delegation feels that, in the interest of peace and harmony, it would have been infinitely more preferable to have fully consulted the countries of the immediate region before taking the measures. This procedure is not unknown in similar cases elsewhere, especially in areas where the potential for litigation and altercation is very high. That this procedure was not adopted is the result of the lack of dialogue between Argentina and the United Kingdom.

In the face of such daunting circumstances, the Ghana delegation is not discouraged and will continue to lend its humble effort to the finding of a solution. The way to that solution is mainly in the improvement of relations, primarily between Argentina and the United Kingdom, with the rest of the international community playing a supportive but crucial role. We sincerely hope, therefore, that the two countries will heed this appeal of the international community and begin building the bridge by which dialogue can lead to a settlement.

Mr. ONONAIYE (Nigeria): The debate on agenda item 28, "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)" is perhaps one of the few appropriate and urgent matters before the General Assembly. One year has elapsed since the question was last considered. The Assembly had hoped that the process of dialogue and peaceful settlement of the differences between the contending parties would have started. Unfortunately, however, the developments in the area attest to a rather ominous circumstance. We are convinced that the cause of peace in the South Atlantic, in particular, and globally, in general, will be enhanced if the Governments of the Republic of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland firmly and resolutely commit themselves, in the spirit of the Charter of our

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

Organization, to initiate and commence dialogue even on a basis of preliminary talks before negotiations begin to resolve their differences peacefully.

We have carefully reviewed the report (A/41/824) of 13 November 1986 and the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, especially chapter X thereof, in document A/41/23 of 11 September 1986. Similarly, we have availed ourselves of the opportunity to evaluate the correspondence addressed to the Secretary-General by the parties to the dispute.

We are distressed at the lack of progress. The yawning gap separating the two countries to the dispute over the issues of sovereignty of the islands and the principle of the right of self-determination for the inhabitants appears to be widening. The threats to peace have, meanwhile, been aggravated by more recent attempts to modify the existing geographical delimitations around the islands. In our view, such action cannot advance, and evidently has not advanced, the course of peaceful settlement of the dispute. It is obvious that one side alone cannot resolve the matter in a way it deems appropriate. It is the primary responsibility of the parties to the dispute and the duty of this Assembly to ensure that unilateral action capable of worsening the situation and provoking further conflict is avoided.

My delegation recognizes the complexity and the very unique nature of the problems involved in the matter under consideration. We do so not only because of our practical experience in decolonization, but also because of the intimate involvement of my country in the process of decolonization in Africa and other parts of the world in the last two and a half decades. We recognize the fact that the question of sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as the right of self-determination very often arouse emotion, especially among those who are

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

directly affected. Consequently, several principles of international law become pertinent to the dispute. Inevitably, recourse to different interpretations and principles to solve substantive problems comes to the fore.

However complex and seemingly intractable the problem may look, it would be absolutely unrealistic to suggest that it cannot be solved, or that the existing status quo can be sustained ad infinitum. My delegation is quite convinced that the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter are more than adequate as point of reference in finding a solution, if only the two parties involved will demonstrate the necessary political will. We cannot but add our voice to the appeals to both sides to resume negotiations without any pre-condition, under the auspices of the Secretary-General and on the basis of the mandate of the Assembly, a mandate which, I am sure, will be renewed once more.

We are satisfied that the international community and the United Nations have acted responsively and responsibly on this matter. The dispute is regrettably between two traditionally friendly countries. We recall that this Assembly first considered the question of the islands in 1965 and adopted resolution 2065 (XX) which called on the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina to proceed with negotiations with a view to finding a solution to the sovereignty dispute in the spirit of the Declaration on decolonization and in the interest of the people of the islands. Subsequently, and particularly in the last four years, following the bitter experience of 1982, the General Assembly has paid special attention to the dispute and adopted resolutions aimed at facilitating the process of negotiations and peaceful settlement.

Similarly, both the Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of American States have issued declarations and adopted resolutions urging the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume their

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

negotiations and to find an appropriate solution to their dispute. The latest of this series of appeals is contained in the Harare Declaration by the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, as follows:

"The Heads of State or Government reiterated their firm support for the Republic of Argentina's right to have its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands restored through negotiations. They reiterated their call for the resumption of negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom with the participation and good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General." (A/41/697, para. 259)

Our interest is peace in the area. We appeal to both parties to resume dialogue and negotiations without pre-conditions.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

For the information of representatives, the following delegations have been added as sponsors of draft resolution A/41/L.19: Bolivia, Colombia, Guatemala, Panama and Peru.

Before calling on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before voting on the draft resolution, I should like to remind them that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by them from their seats.

Mr. NYAMDOO (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): In the consideration of this item my country's position is based on the premise that Argentina has legitimate sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands.

We regret that the Government of the United Kingdom has disregarded the international community's repeated appeals and decisions and continues to pursue a policy aimed at perpetuating the colonial status of those islands by building up its military strength. This is demonstrated in particular by the decision on the regulation and exploitation of fisheries within a radius of 200 miles of the Malvinas Islands and the exercise of jurisdiction over the entire continental shelf, for this decision is at variance with the United Nations General Assembly's recommendations concerning unilateral changes in the existing situation.

The Mongolian delegation welcomes the constructive and flexible position of the Government of Argentina with respect to a peaceful and political solution of the dispute over the Malvinas Islands. In its declaration of 17 November the Government of Argentina expressed its willingness to initiate global negotiations in accordance with General Assembly resolution 40/21 and, as a previous and preparatory step, to initiate an open dialogue with the United Kingdom.

In this connection, I wish to note that in draft resolution A/41/L.19 the General Assembly reiterates its request to the Governments of the parties to the

(Mr. Nyamdoo, Mongolia)

dispute to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the outstanding issues between the two countries. The international community is entitled to require that the United Kingdom - a permanent member of the Security Council bearing special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace - renounce its colonial policy with regard to the Malvinas Islands. It is our hope that the United Kingdom will respond positively to Argentina's proposal.

Our delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): The question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) has been before the Assembly for a long time. Last year the Assembly was presented with a similarly worded resolution, namely, resolution 40/21, which has not moved the problem any closer to a solution; nor has it encouraged the parties to go to the negotiating table.

My delegation is fully committed to a peaceful settlement of the dispute. To achieve that, both parties to the dispute must agree to negotiating without any pre-conditions. At this moment, however, one party still wants to talk about self-determination for the Falkland Islanders while the other insists on talking about the transfer of sovereignty from one party to another. It is clear, therefore, that there is no meeting-ground between the parties.

In our view, the principle of self-determination - just like the principle of sovereignty - is of paramount importance in any solution of the problem, and it is most unlikely that draft resolution A/41/L.19 will move the parties closer to a solution. My delegation would have been happy with a resolution that omitted the phrase "including all aspects on the future of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which appears in the fourth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 1. We certainly

(Mr. Makeka, Lesotho)

support the idea that the Secretary-General should continue his mission of good offices and we associate ourselves with those who urge the parties not to resort to unilateral actions in the region that may give rise to more tension. We are particularly concerned that the action of Her Majesty's Government in unilaterally imposing a fishing zone around the islands cannot contribute towards the peaceful solution of the problem.

In those circumstances, my delegation will abstain from the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. FERM (Sweden): The unsolved dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom over the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) continues to be of great concern to the Swedish Government.

We share the Secretary-General's regret that it has not proved possible so far to find common ground to engage the two parties in the kind of talks envisaged in resolution 40/21. We support his and other efforts to promote a dialogue between the parties that will progressively lead to a just and lasting settlement of the question of the Falkland Islands that lies at the core of their continuing estrangement. We continue sincerely to hope that the two Governments will be prepared soon to take further steps towards considering the full range of issues necessarily involved in this dialogue. We are encouraged by the declarations of the two Governments that they are seeking ways to resume the dialogue.

Consequently, my Government supports the requests in draft resolution A/41/L.19 which is before us. In our view, the draft resolution is a constructive attempt to promote a resumption of the dialogue between the two parties concerned, without any pre-conditions and in accordance with the United Nations Charter. We believe, as the Secretary-General says in his report, that

(Mr. Fern, Sweden)

meaningful progress can be made through a dialogue, coupled with confidence-building measures, towards solving all the differences between the two parties. We join in the international appeal that they should resume such a dialogue.

There are, in my Government's view, two main principles that have to be applied to the solution of this issue. The first is the right to self-determination. The right of the people in every colonial territory freely to determine its own future is a fundamental principle of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The second principle is that conflicts must be resolved through peaceful means. My delegation reads the references made in the draft resolution, in both the preambular and operative parts, to the United Nations Charter in that light.

For those reasons, my delegation has decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution. It goes without saying that we regret that it has not been possible this time to agree on a text that we all could have supported.

Mr. HAMADNEH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): The fact that Argentina and the United Kingdom have not reached a peaceful settlement of the Falklands problem is a cause of great concern to my country, particularly in view of the fact that Jordan is bound by ties of traditional friendship with the United Kingdom and has growing ties of friendship and closeness with Argentina, since we are both members of the Non-Aligned Movement and share its principles. We fully appreciate Argentina's role in the Movement and its support for the causes of the third world. We particularly appreciate its understanding attitude to the question of Palestine and the Middle East conflict.

We appeal to the United Kingdom and Argentina to work towards a common understanding that will facilitate negotiations towards a peaceful settlement of all problems pending between the two countries, including the question of the Falklands Islands (Malvinas).

We call on the Secretary-General to persist in and step up his efforts and his mission of good offices to bring about an open and frank dialogue between the two countries which would create the mutual confidence necessary for the solution of the conflict.

Consequently, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/41/L.19.

Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): First, I should like to say how pleased we are at the positive developments we see in this year's draft resolution on the question of the Falkland Islands as compared with that of 1985. Unfortunately, however, we fail to detect any progress in bridging the gap between the two parties, Argentina and the United Kingdom whether within the framework of the Berne negotiations, which have been suspended, or in the context of other means acceptable to the two parties under the auspices of the United Nations and the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Al-Ansi, Oman)

On the contrary, in the last two years there have been some unfortunate tendencies towards an escalation of tension between the two parties and unjustifiable manoeuvres to associate the issue with another international conflict, particularly since the two parties reiterate official declarations of their already well-known positions.

We feel that there should have been no military confrontation between the two countries in 1982 for my country has long-standing, traditional and satisfactory trade and other relations with the United Kingdom. We are also developing diplomatic relations with Argentina and the ambassadors of the two countries have submitted their credentials in Muskat and Buenos Aires.

Since the problem can be resolved peacefully only with the agreement of the two parties and given that we must remove all negative elements, that it is hoped that the legitimate demands of both parties can be met and that the principle of self-determination of peoples of the third world must be upheld, that principle must be taken into account, together with the principle of respect for sovereignty. We hope that the Secretary-General will be able to report next year that progress has been made towards the desired solution.

We hoped for this in the past and it is our hope for the future. Until then, my delegation will maintain its traditional position in the voting on this draft resolution. I am sure that our British and Argentine friends will understand our position and appreciate that we are not against either party and that we continue to assess at their true value our relations with each of them. We hope that in the future we shall be able to come up with a balanced draft resolution that will be approved by consensus and that the conflict will be resolved by peaceful means.

Ms. KGABI (Botswana): We shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/41/L.19 because we remain firmly convinced that only negotiations can resolve the Falklands (Malvinas) issue. We support neither a British fortress Falklands nor a mechanical transfer of the islands and their inhabitants to the sovereignty of Argentina. What we support is simply the initiation of negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom, the principal purpose of which must be to find means of resolving peacefully and definitively the problem of the Falklands (Malvinas) in all its aspects, while respecting the right of the inhabitants to self-determination.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): My delegation will, as in the case of similar draft resolutions in previous years, vote against draft resolution A/41/L.19.

There are many points made by some previous speakers to which my delegation takes exception. At this late hour I will not detail them all. I must, however, stress that the statement made by the Ambassador of Zimbabwe that the British military, naval and airforce presence in and around the islands is "ever increasing". That is wrong. On the contrary, the British military, naval and airforce presence is ever decreasing. It is now less than half what it was when we had to reconquer our territory following the invasion.

The draft resolution before us is seductive in its simplicity and cosmetic appeal, but it cannot be divorced from the circumstances which gave rise to it. Some of the sponsors of the draft resolution have claimed that it is purely procedural and that it in no way prejudices the position of either the Argentine or the British Government.

(Sir John Thomson,
United Kingdom)

This is not so, sadly. The draft resolution does purport and does actually prejudice the position. As I pointed out yesterday, the draft resolution calls, in operative paragraph 1, for negotiations on "all aspects on the future of the Falkland Islands". Unless I have misunderstood the Foreign Minister of Argentina, he insists that "all aspects" must include the question of sovereignty. In his speech yesterday he said:

"So long as the core problem" - he meant sovereignty here, of course - "is ignored, we shall not be able to solve the accessory problems." (A/41/PV.82, p. 21)

So the draft resolution supports the Argentine contention that sovereignty must be discussed. It opposes the United Kingdom contention that sovereignty should not be discussed. Therefore, the resolution is not neutral; it is pro-Argentine. Of course, if the Foreign Minister of Argentina - who is not here - is prepared to declare that we are wrong and the talks aimed at normalizing relations between us need not be predicated on a willingness to discuss sovereignty, then of course we should be faced with a very different situation. But we know that that is not the case.

We are prepared, as I said yesterday, to discuss everything but sovereignty. Argentina refuses to discuss anything unless sovereignty is on the agenda. That is the nub of the issue before us. What we are faced with here are two irreconcilable points of view that cannot be wished away by voting for a resolution which supports one side and opposes the other.

We could put it to a test. Yesterday, I twice asked the Foreign Minister of Argentina whether he was ready to negotiate with my Government such matters as the elimination of the consequences of the conflict, commerce and trade, diplomatic and consular relations, transport and communications and, whenever appropriate, the

(Sir John Thomson,
United Kingdom)

matters relating to the conservation of fishing resources. The General Assembly will recognize that this is a direct quotation from the Minister's speech yesterday, which in turn was quoting the Argentine declaration of 17 November.

This course, that is to say discussing all these matters that I have just listed, between the two Governments, would be the practical way to improve relations between our two normally friendly countries. That would be the way to reduce our differences step by step. That would be moving forward in a constructive, pragmatic spirit. That would be doing exactly what Sir Jeffrey Howe recommended in the passage which the representative of Zimbabwe quoted just now with so much eloquence and emphasis.

I got no answer to my question yesterday. I suppose that is because Argentina refuses to discuss what it calls the accessory problems, without discussing sovereignty. In other words, Argentina is putting a condition on the opening of any talks.

My Government also has a condition. The Argentine condition is that sovereignty must be discussed; our condition is that it must not be discussed. Both sides are making a condition, and they are opposite conditions. In these circumstances, I ask the Foreign Minister, or the Permanent Representative of Argentina, once again, whether Argentina would not be willing to enter talks with us designed to improve our relations by dealing with some or all of the questions other than sovereignty, which he has listed in his speech? Surely, this is a reasonable offer. I hope he will accept it. I hope also that he will accept that the principle of self-determination is applicable in this colonial situation, as it is in others.

Many speakers have insisted that the Falklands is a colonial situation. Well then, self-determination applies. Anyone who heard the elected representatives of

(Sir John Thomson,
United Kingdom)

the Falklands speak in the Fourth Committee yesterday will know that they do not want to become Argentine citizens, that they do wish to remain British, and that they insist that they should have control over their own future. Unfortunately, unless the Argentine Foreign Minister now gets up and proves me wrong, Argentina does not accept that the Falklanders should control their own future. That is an irreconcilable point of difference between my Government and the Argentine Government.

So we come back to where we have been in the last four debates in this annual ritual. The Argentines have not moved and we have not moved. I suggest that if we are going to improve our relations, we should start step by step and that the Argentines should agree to discuss those many points which they listed in their speech without pre-condition.

Mr. SAEMALA (Solomon Islands): The Solomon Islands delegation has listened attentively to both sides of the debate on this item, and considered draft resolution A/41/L.19 pertaining thereto. In our view, the draft resolution contains elements that could lead to fruitful negotiations. There is, however, one fundamental omission which we regard as important. We appreciate the need for Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to initiate negotiations. We would, however, wish to see a reference to the people of the Falklands, or Malvinas, whose right to self-determination should be respected. At the same time, we had hoped to see a more compromising approach to working out an agenda for negotiations.

We are still hopeful that these two traditionally friendly nations will continue their search for peaceful solutions. In the circumstances, Solomon Islands will cast its vote in the spirit that it is likely to be conducive to establishing meaningful dialogue between Argentina and the United Kingdom.

Mr. EL-MULLA (Kuwait): Kuwait will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/41/L.19.

We consider that, like that of resolution 40/21, the present text is a balanced one. In this respect my delegation would like to emphasize the importance of the universal Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That Declaration has played, and continues to play, a vital role in the process of decolonization, an important aspect of which is the exercise by peoples of their right to self-determination. That right should not, however, be used to perpetuate colonialism; it should, rather, enhance the very process of decolonization.

The PRESIDENT: Before proceeding to the vote I should like to inform the Assembly that the Secretary-General has indicated that he does not at this time foresee any programme budget implications in the implementation of draft resolution A/41/L.19 and that, should a change in circumstances give rise to expenditures, the Secretary-General would seek, with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the necessary funding under the terms of General Assembly resolution 40/254, on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1986 to 1987.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/41/L.19.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belize, Oman, Sri Lanka, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Nepal, New Zealand, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates

Draft resolution A/41/L.19 was adopted by 116 votes to 4, with 34 abstentions (resolution 41/40).

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those delegations that wish to speak in explanation of their vote on draft resolution A/41/L.19.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (interpretation from French): France voted in favour of draft resolution A/41/L.19, on the Falkland Islands.

Through this vote my country has sought to associate itself with the efforts the international community has been making since the conflict of June 1982 in order to arrive at a just and lasting solution of the dispute between two nations with which France has friendly relations.

My delegation is convinced that only negotiations without prior conditions and covering all aspects of the problem are likely to lead to a solution in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, which in particular calls for the peaceful settlement of disputes, international co-operation and exercise of the right to self-determination.*

By casting this affirmative vote, the French delegation intends to support the modalities proposed by the sponsors in order to induce the parties to settle their dispute. This should not be interpreted to mean that my country has taken a position on the substance of the issue.

Mr. JACOBVITS DE SZEGED (Netherlands): The Netherlands voted in favour of the draft resolution just adopted because its wording does not in any way prejudge the outcome of negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom on all the issues dividing them.

We welcome the fact that this year the resolution has been adopted in the balanced form in which it was presented. In this way it can serve the General Assembly's primary purpose of facilitating an early resumption of negotiations.

Concerning the question of sovereignty, the Netherlands Government firmly believes that any future arrangement should give effect to the right of self-determination of the inhabitants of the islands. Decolonization, as in the

*Mr. Al-Ansi (Oman), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Jacobvits de Szeged,
Netherlands)

case of the Falklands, must be based on resolution 1514 (XV). Under the Charter of the United Nations, the right of self-determination is a fundamental one.

The Netherlands fully shares the conviction of the Secretary-General of the United Nations as expressed in his report that, through a process of frank and open dialogue, coupled with confidence-building measures, meaningful progress can be made towards solving all the differences that currently separate Argentina and the United Kingdom. We welcome the continued readiness of the Secretary-General to assist both parties to that end.

Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): I wish to set out the key points underlying our affirmative vote on draft resolution A/41/L.19.

Our vote on this matter is unchanged from last year. In considering this issue, Canada has consistently refused to prejudge the outcome of the dispute. We have instead advocated negotiations on all issues as soon as possible in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

The draft resolution upon which we have just voted is an accurate reflection of this position. We view it as the most appropriate means towards the peaceful end we all seek. We therefore voted in favour of it.

This vote should not, however, be interpreted as an endorsement of the specific substantive position of either party to this dispute.

Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): The draft resolution before the Assembly would not have presented any difficulty for my delegation if within its framework the right of the peoples of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) to be consulted on their future constitutional status in the context of decolonization had been recognized. In the absence of such a provision, merely to urge the two States parties to the conflict to resolve their dispute peacefully does not go the whole road to settling the matter as we deem it should be settled.

Our position on the issue does not affect our good relations with the two countries.

Mr. DELPECH (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to make a few comments now that the voting has taken place.

The representative of the United Kingdom referred in his last statement to a decrease in the British military presence in the islands. This very morning my delegation submitted a note to the Secretary-General referring to aggression committed against an Argentine fishing vessel within the past 48 hours. That vessel was navigating outside the exclusion zone. A C-130 aircraft of the air force based in the Malvinas Islands flew over it three or four times. That demonstrates that there is constant military activity in the area. That is why we cannot accept the statement that there has been a decrease in the military presence.

Secondly, the United Kingdom representative said that the procedural nature of the resolution - which various delegations had noted - did not hide the nub of the issue: the problem of sovereignty. Everyone here is fully aware that the resolution contains a request - which the General Assembly has regarded as procedural - to the two parties to negotiate on all aspects on the future of the islands. We all know, too, that this implies, on the Argentine side, all the aspects that Argentina is prepared to discuss at the negotiation table - including, naturally, sovereignty.

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

This is a dispute about sovereignty, recognized as such by the United Kingdom. The British representative recognized it in his statement yesterday. It has been recognized by the British Government, as we said yesterday. It has been recognized also by the international community. So we cannot understand - in logical, legal or political terms - why, when it is recognized that this is a dispute over sovereignty, one of the parties should refuse to consider one of the aspects that that dispute entails. As we said yesterday, this is all the harder to understand when that party is a permanent member of the Security Council - one of the five States specifically responsible for the maintenance of peace and security on our planet.

What I have just said serves also to answer Sir John Thomson's allegation that the words "all the aspects" in the resolution include sovereignty. From the Argentine point of view, they clearly do include sovereignty, but we believe that they also include all the aspects which the United Kingdom can submit at the negotiation table, without anything being excluded.

Hence, we do not understand why we cannot negotiate as civilized and modern nations about a dispute which the entire international community recognizes.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): We have now heard the last speaker.

One representative has requested to be allowed to exercise the right of reply. I would remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, the first statement in the exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes and the second statement to 5 minutes, and they should be made by delegations from their seats.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I could scarcely believe some of the things I have just heard the Ambassador of Argentina say.

First of all, I reserve my delegation's right to comment on whatever letter it is he may have sent. I have not yet seen it.

Secondly, I must repeat that the British forces in and around the islands have decreased by a very large amount. The Ambassador is just plain wrong in saying once again that there has been an increase in military forces. This is a purely factual matter: this is not a question of opinion. It really is surprising to me that the Ambassador of Argentina is not prepared to look at the facts as they are. I repeat that I could scarcely believe what I heard.

I shall not prolong the debate. I shall merely note that yet again there has been no answer from the Argentine delegation to the question that I have posed in this debate, three times now - that is, whether Argentina is willing to discuss with us those questions that it has set out, without insisting that a discussion of sovereignty is a pre-condition.

We have heard a lot of speeches, and I think it is fair to say that a great number of them did recognize what Argentina still refuses to recognize: that the principle of self-determination does apply to the Falkland Islanders.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 28.

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.