



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/PV.1239
15 September 1983

ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF
INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 1239th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 1 September 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone)

CONTENTS

Question of the Falkland Islands (continued)

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (continued)

Military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-0750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

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

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS) (A/AC.109/752; A/AC.109/L.1486)
(continued)

Mrs. CORONEL de RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish):

I wish to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.109/L.1486, doing so also on behalf of the delegations of Chile and Cuba, co-sponsors of the draft resolution, whose names do not appear on the document for technical reasons. The draft resolution is introduced out of a desire to ensure that the Republic of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland may resume negotiations in order to find a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute relating to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) as soon as possible.

The draft resolution takes into account the existence of a de facto cessation of hostilities in the South Atlantic and the expressed intention of the parties not to renew them. It also reaffirms the need for the parties to take due account of the interests of the population of the Islands in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII) and 37/9. Likewise, it reaffirms the principles of the Charter of the United Nations on the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The draft resolution requests the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute relating to the Islands. It expresses its support for the renewed mission of good offices undertaken by the Secretary-General on the basis of General Assembly resolution 37/9 in order to assist the parties to resume negotiations.

Finally, the draft resolution states that the Special Committee decides, subject to any directives which the General Assembly may issue at its thirty-eighth session, to continue to examine the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

(Mrs. Coronel de Rodriguez, Venezuela)

As can be seen from the text, the intension of the sponsors is clear. It is, first, to contribute to the Committee's work in such a way that it may achieve its objectives, and, secondly, to urge the parties to the dispute to spare no efforts to achieve a peaceful, practical and lasting solution to the problem of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

I trust that members of the Committee will give their full support to the text, since it is fully in keeping with resolution 37/9, adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

The co-sponsors ask that the Committee reach an immediate decision on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that Mr. Cheek has indicated his wish to provide the Committee with further information. I call on Mr. Cheek.

Mr. CHEEK: Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you for allowing me to speak once again. I have additional information which I believe the Committee will welcome.

(Mr. Cheek)

The petitioner, Mr. Betts, made what I consider to be a useful comment yesterday that his and other speeches should be circulated in the Islands and we can say, in fact, that the petitioners' speeches from the meeting of the Fourth Committee of last year were made public in the Islands. We have already taken steps to ensure that his speech and others from yesterday will likewise be publicized. This of course continues our policy of providing as much information as possible from these meetings and also from those meetings between Argentina and Britain which Islanders attended and which were then terminated on 2 April last year.

One further point: we listened to an address yesterday which indicated that 70 per cent of the Islands' working population is employed by either the Falkland Islands Company or the Falkland Islands Government. The Committee may like to hear an accurate figure taken from last year's tax returns, which reveals that only 43.75 per cent of the work-force work for the Falkland Islands Company and the Falkland Islands Government.

One last point: the other petitioner, Mr. Rozee, said - or rather complained, if I may use that expression - that ordinary people - and he specifically mentioned shepherds - had no chance of advancement in the Islands. May I use two examples which hardly equate with his remarks. First, in my own case, I am the son of a shepherd and, because of circumstances at that time, I only attended school between the ages of eight and 14. Yet, as in most parts of the world, one can advance oneself if one is prepared to work hard. Secondly, with the sub-division of large farms over the last few years, no fewer than 21 shepherds have managed to buy their own "small" farms - I am talking of something in the region of 10,000 to 20,000 acres - and start their own businesses that way. I hardly think this equates with the petitioner's comments.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I think that the Committee will have been struck by the difference between the speeches of the representative of Argentina yesterday afternoon and my own. His speech, if I may say so, was directed largely towards legal questions and towards the General Assembly. My speech, if I may so characterize it, was directed primarily towards the considerations which are the special responsibility of this Committee, in other

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

words, the responsibility that this Committee has towards the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. I think the Committee will have been struck by this difference and I think it is a fundamental point.

I should like to mention one or two points which were raised yesterday and which I think must just briefly be rebutted. The fact is that there was an invasion of the Falkland Islands in 1982, a few weeks after what had appeared to be a fruitful session of bilateral negotiations. That invasion changed the situation. It is simply no use pretending that 10,000 men going into somebody else's territory controlling somebody else's unwilling population can be neglected. It has cut short the negotiations which were continuing at that time. It has just changed the situation and we have to begin from that point.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

It strikes me as odd, therefore, when I hear accusations of militarism directed against my Government. The militarism came, if I may say so, from only one source. It is palpably ridiculous to suggest that there is something like a base of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in the South Atlantic. This simply neglects the North Atlantic Treaty, which is a public document that restricts NATO to a specific area in the Northern Hemisphere. There is simply no question of a NATO base anywhere in the Southern Hemisphere, let alone in the Falkland Islands.

I deplore the suggestion to the contrary because it seems to me that we have a difficult enough situation between the Argentine and the United Kingdom over this question without bringing in overtones of the East-West rivalry.

It has also been suggested that somehow or other there is something special about this base in a nuclear way. That too is ridiculous, and I must say I am surprised that it comes from a Government which has not ratified the Treaty of Tlatelolco and is directed against a Government - mine - which has ratified the two relevant protocols.

Then there is the oddity of the references to South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands. These have nothing historically or legally to do with the Argentine claims to the Falkland Islands. They are an entirely different matter. The Argentine claim to South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands came long, long after its claims to the Falkland Islands, and I will not take up the Committee's time on this question but will simply note that they have been refuted in the proper place by my delegation.

Finally, I should like to come back to what seems to me to be the heart of the matter for this Committee. Other United Nations bodies can perhaps look at other and wider questions, but surely this Committee has its own charter and its own particular set of responsibilities. I would ask the following questions: Is the right of self-determination inalienable? Yes. Do the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories have the right of self-determination? Surely yes.

(Sir John Thomson, United Kingdom)

Is the Falkland Islands a Non-Self-Governing Territory? This Committee has accepted it as such for 25 years. Do the Falklanders have the inalienable right to self-determination? Surely yes. Does this Committee have the responsibility to uphold the inalienable right of self-determination for the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories and therefore for the Falkland Islanders? That is a question I leave to the Committee.

Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): I have listened with great attention to the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, and I must say that the statement I made yesterday was supported by concrete facts rather than by my own personal opinions. As for the arguments put forward by the representative of the United Kingdom in the statement he made yesterday, as well as in the words he has just uttered today, they were covered, in large part, in the statement I made during yesterday's meeting.

Nevertheless, before moving on to other points, I should like to state clearly that when we refer to the establishment of a military base, as I explained in detail yesterday, it is not merely an opinion we Argentinians are expressing; the members of the British armed forces themselves have on many occasions referred to the construction of such a base which would be of fundamental strategic importance for the defence of the South Atlantic. It is perfectly clear from their own statements that this is no capricious interpretation by one of the parties.

With regard to the interpretation the representative of the United Kingdom gives to the right to self-determination of colonial peoples in connection with the question of the Malvinas Islands, that does not hold up under even the most cursory

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

analysis. That is hardly surprising, since for 19 years the Special Committee and the General Assembly have rejected that interpretation. One noteworthy aspect of the British statement is the manner in which it eluded any reference to two fundamental elements of the question before us. The first element is the fact that the United Kingdom violates the United Nations Charter by not complying with the fundamental obligation incumbent upon all States to settle their international disputes in a peaceful manner. The United Kingdom, a Founding Member of this Organization and a Permanent Member of the Security Council with special responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, refuses to settle its dispute with Argentina through negotiations, which is the primary means contemplated in the Charter for the settlement of international disputes. Moreover, the United Kingdom refuses to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly on the question of the Malvinas Islands which, as we know, urge the parties to enter into such negotiations. It is unnecessary for me to point out that in so doing the British Government is pursuing a policy that endangers the peace and stability of the region.

The second element that was not mentioned in the United Kingdom's statement has to do with the militarization of the territories that are in dispute with Argentina. The British Government knows full well that its current policy in the South Atlantic, which envisages the transformation of the Malvinas Islands into an air and naval base, brings it into confrontation not only with my country but with the entire Latin American region. As can be seen in the working paper prepared by the Secretariat, document A/AC.109/752, there are 4,000 members of the British armed forces on the Islands, more than twice the population.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

The United Kingdom is building a strategic airport capable of receiving the largest existing aircraft. This is obviously out of all proportion to the United Kingdom's alleged purpose of defending the Islands. Furthermore, it has nuclear-powered and nuclear-armed warships in waters adjacent to the disputed territories, as well as an arbitrary, illegal exclusive zone which bars access by Argentine craft to a considerable part of the exclusive economic zone of Argentine continental territory.

All these acts undoubtedly violate the United Nations Charter and are eloquent proof of the United Kingdom's unwillingness to solve the existing dispute by peaceful means.

Finally, I also wish to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that in yesterday's statement the British representative insinuated that this Committee lacks competence over the question of the Malvinas. There is no doubt that the Committee on decolonization is competent to deal with all Territories under colonial domination. That is its raison d'être. In the specific case of the Malvinas that competence has been exercised since 1964. Since then the Committee has year after year adopted decisions on this issue. As if that were not enough, let it be recalled that the United Kingdom itself, in 1946, included the Malvinas on the list of colonial Territories. The real situation is that the United Kingdom, by means of technicalities, is trying to deny the colonial nature of the Malvinas and thus annex the territories involved in the dispute with my country. The decolonization process is very far advanced and this Committee has played a very important role in this gigantic task. The British efforts to undo those efforts will certainly not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no further speakers the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/AC.109/L.1486.

I shall first call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. RAM (Fiji): My delegation explained its position on this item at length when the subject was discussed in the General Assembly last year. Our comments here will therefore be brief.

(Mr. Ram, Fiji)

My delegation welcomes the call in the draft resolution for resumption of negotiations to settle the sovereignty dispute. At the same time, my delegation would like to reiterate its view that the Falkland Islands are a Non-Self-Governing Territory and as such come within the purview of Article 73 of the Charter and resolution 1514 (XV). In accordance with that Article and the resolution, the interests and wishes of the inhabitants of dependent Territories are to be paramount. We note, however, that the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution before us do not make explicit reference to the applicability of resolution 1514 (XV). For instance, the scope of the proposed negotiations mentioned in operative paragraph 1 is confined to the sovereignty dispute, without explicitly stating that the rights and wishes of the inhabitants of the Territory would be respected. My delegation is of the view that the draft resolution before us is not well balanced. We will therefore abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): The main lines of Australia's approach to the Falklands issue are well known. They were expressed in this Committee last year and later in the General Assembly. Briefly, Australia supports the right of the Islanders to be consulted about their future. Their views on what should happen to them and when it might happen are obviously very important. They are views which neither Britain nor Argentina could or should ignore.

I would also remind the Committee of Australia's position on the events of April, May and June last year. Australia condemned the invasion of the Falklands. Australia would continue to oppose any efforts to resolve the problem by military means.

In brief, then, there has been no change in Australia's strong position on the right of the Falklanders to be adequately consulted about their future or in regard to our opposition to the use of force to attempt to settle situations such as the Falklands dispute.

These indeed are the measuring rods against which we have sought to test the draft resolution (A/AC.109/L.1486) now before the Committee. We have concluded that the draft resolution is deficient in both respects. It would seem to brush over the impact of the events of 1982. It also reproduces the same rather lame language devised last year in the General Assembly regarding

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

the rights of the Falkland Islanders to be consulted. It requires only that "due account" be taken of the "interests" of the population. Australia continues to regard that formulation as inadequate.

The foregoing notwithstanding, Australia also favours the resumption of contacts and co-operation between the United Kingdom and Argentina at the appropriate time. It is a matter of regret to my country and to my delegation that the climate for such a resumption of contact continues to be unfavourable. We would hope that each of the parties concerned could seek to make a contribution in this regard. It would be our further hope that contacts, when renewed, would lead to a fair and just agreement on the future of the Falkland Islands.

For the reasons outlined above my delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.109/L.1486.

Mr. KOLBY (Norway): The Norwegian Government has on previous occasions expressed its concern over the dispute between the United Kingdom and Argentina over the Falkland Islands. Norway is deeply committed to the principles of the non-use of force and peaceful settlement of disputes, as embodied in the United Nations Charter. We therefore strongly regretted that Argentina, as one of the parties to the conflict, resorted to the use of force to solve a dispute which was subject to negotiations.

After the Argentine invasion in April last year many things were drastically changed and we believe it is not possible to proceed as if the invasion did not happen. However, we are of the view that eventually a long-term arrangement for the Islands must be arrived at through negotiations between the parties concerned. Such arrangements must be in accordance with the United Nations Charter and must take full account of the principle of the right to self-determination of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

At this stage we would think there were numerous issues which need to be discussed and negotiated - questions related to trade, finance, economy, transportation and communication between the Falkland Islands and Argentina. We would welcome any steps by the parties concerned aimed at furthering such discussions, which may eventually, we hope, lead to long-term arrangements acceptable to all parties concerned.

(Mr. Kolby, Norway)

Unfortunately, the draft resolution before us today does not address important concerns which we believe it essential to address in order to solve the conflict. The draft resolution only recommends the sovereignty dispute for negotiations between the parties and not the many other issues and problems that we would think it more important to solve at this stage. Furthermore, in our view the draft resolution does not make sufficient reference to the right of the inhabitants to self-determination. The peoples' right to self-determination is, after all, the guiding principle of our work in this Committee and should, in our view, be properly reflected in all the decisions and resolutions of the Committee concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories.

For these reasons my delegation will not be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution before us.

Mr. YERE (Ivory Coast)(interpretation from French): Speaking in explanation of vote my delegation clearly will not dwell on the substance of this matter. The sad conflict last year in the South Atlantic strikes my delegation as a painful illustration of what incomprehension and intolerance can lead to when they exist in international relations. My delegation believes that this pointless conflict, which has such grave consequences, could have been avoided if restraint had been exercised.

Now that we are back where we started from, it seems clear that the only permissible alternative for a solution to the problem is the use of peaceful means, a course that should never have been abandoned. My delegation, which regards the notion of dialogue as an article of faith, can only associate itself with those who call upon both Governments directly concerned to resume negotiations. We in the Ivory Coast believe that dialogue is an irreplaceable instrument in the quest for a solution to conflicts, no matter what their origin. Dialogue in the cause of peace must be entered into without prior conditions. It is in this spirit that my delegation will support the draft resolution before us.

We are of course aware of the inadequacies in the text. The fundamental principles on the basis of which the Special Committee works are clear. They are immutable and their integrity must be preserved. It is up to us to ensure that they will be applied fully and uniformly to the Territories under consideration in the Special Committee. If, for whatever reason, those principles are invoked in an unequal manner and if, for whatever reason, the Special Committee feels impelled to make a selective choice among its principles, a number of questions then arise, and the reply to such questions will tell us whether we are continuing to be objective and credible.

There is certainly a Territory that is the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). There is without any doubt a population there, and it cannot be denied that there is also an administering Power. Does this mean, however, that the problem is one of decolonization in the sense in which this Committee understands that term? If the reply to that question is in the affirmative, the Special Committee will

(Mr. Yere, Ivory Coast)

not achieve any progress until it fully applies its own rules. If the answer is in the negative, it would be more sensible to consider referring the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) to a more appropriate body. The peace and stability of the region are at stake.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further explanations of vote before the vote, we shall now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.109/L.1486

Draft resolution A/AC.109/L.1486 was adopted by 19 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. LWENO (United Republic of Tanzania): On behalf of my delegation, I should merely like to explain our vote by saying that Tanzania has always shared the concern of the international community over the dispute relating to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). We have always supported the basic principles of the United Nations with regard to the peaceful settlement of international disputes. It is for this reason, therefore, that we have always supported the idea of resuming bilateral negotiations between the Government of Her Britannic Majesty and the Government of Argentina with a view to normalizing their bilateral relations in search of a lasting peace.

Accordingly, as we did last year, we have voted in favour of a similar draft resolution.

Mr. CHIN Yung-tsien (China)(interpretation from Chinese): More than a year has elapsed since the military conflict over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) ended. During this period the thirty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution 37/9, which requests the Governments

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

of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute relating to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and requests the Secretary-General to undertake a renewed mission of good offices.

The seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries held in New Delhi in March of this year reiterated, its Political Declaration, the firm support of the Non-Aligned Movement for the Republic of Argentina's right to have its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands restored through negotiations, urged that those negotiations between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom be reopened, with the participation and good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General, and reaffirmed the need for the parties to take due account of the interests of the population of the Islands.

In spite of the de facto cessation of hostilities in the South Atlantic and the expressed intention of both parties not to renew them, it is regrettable that negotiations have not resumed and the state of military confrontation continues to exist. Consequently the threat to peace and security in that region has not yet been removed.

(Mr. Chin Yung-tsien, China)

The Chinese Government and people have all along resolutely supported the just struggle of the third-world countries and peoples for safeguarding their State sovereignty and territorial integrity. We hold that Argentina's claim over the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) should be respected. The Chinese delegation hopes that the two parties concerned would, in accordance with the relevant resolution of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, resume at an early date negotiations on the sovereignty dispute over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. We also support the efforts of the Secretary-General to renew his good offices. It is our sincere hope that by peaceful negotiations a just and reasonable solution can be reached to this dispute left over by history. This will conform not only to the general aspirations of the international community, but also to the interests of the peoples of both sides, and will be conducive to the maintenance of peace in the South Atlantic and the world at large.

Based on the aforementioned position, the Chinese delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.109/L.1486.

Mr. CISSE (Mali) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/AC.109/L.1486, convinced that the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes is fundamental, particularly in today's troubled world.

It seems to my delegation that the resumption of negotiations will be a fundamental factor in peace and security, not only in the Latin American region but also in the international arena.

My delegation is convinced that, above and beyond the nature of the conflict, it is essential to encourage all initiatives and any willingness to re-establish a just and lasting peace.

Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all I should like to thank very warmly all members of this Committee who have in one way or another supported us in this just cause of the Malvinas as well as the members of the Bureau and the Secretariat, for all their efforts.

(Mr. Muñiz, Argentina)

The adoption of the resolution contained in document A/AC.109/L.1486 reaffirms not only the colonial essence of the Malvinas question, but fully supports the position of the Republic of Argentina, as this body has done since 1974, when it first considered this sovereignty dispute which is of such fundamental importance and concern to Argentina. We are convinced, as we have always been, that with the support of Latin America, the Non-Aligned Movement and the great majority of the members of the international community in general, compliance with General Assembly resolution 37/9 is the only suitable way of achieving a just, peaceful and lasting solution to the dispute over the Malvinas. The resumption of negotiations, through the good offices of the Secretary-General, to eliminate all factors which help keep alive this sovereignty dispute between my country and the United Kingdom implies not only strict compliance with all decisions of the United Nations adopted on this subject, but also respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, which seeks to eliminate colonialism in all its forms, as it is incompatible with the United Nations ideal of universal peace.

Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I had not intended to speak at this moment, but in the light of the statement we have just heard, I feel obliged to express a degree of disappointment that this Committee, above all committees in the United Nations, which is specifically charged with the task of having regard to the interests and wishes and aspirations of people in Non-Self-Governing Territories should in this way have done perhaps less than most members feel in their hearts they should have done for the people whose future is at stake. We have heard two or three explanations of vote which managed to neglect the question of the people altogether. We have heard two or three explanations of vote which called for a resumption of negotiations without much heed to the fact that negotiations were taking place when an invasion of the Islands took place against the wishes of the population. We have even heard it suggested that my Government is taking a militaristic attitude. My Government may have something like 4,000 troops in the Falklands. That seems a rather modest amount when we had to deal with 10,000 Argentine troops there against the wishes of the people only a year ago.

Mr. LOPEZ DEL AMO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I had not intended to speak either, but the remarks of the representative of the United Kingdom prompt me to do so.

Yesterday he was complaining that in our statement on a point of order, we took too much time and that it was the longest such statement he had ever heard. We also complain about the great length of British colonial domination of the Malvinas Islands, much longer and with much greater implications. Today he is also complaining about the resolution adopted by this Committee, on a sovereign basis and by an overwhelming majority: 19 to none with five abstentions.

I think the results of our work today should serve rather to ensure that the representative of the United Kingdom convey to his Government something which is not just the opinion of the Argentine nation, the nations of Latin America and the 100 or so nations in the Non-Aligned Movement, but which also represents the feelings of the majority of the international community: this sovereignty dispute, which has on earlier occasions been recognized even by the United Kingdom as such, is still pending solution, and a dialogue must be pursued in order to reach a peaceful solution. This is in the interests of the peoples of the United Kingdom, of Argentina and of peace in our region. We believe it important to take such an attitude and to heed the appeals of the international community. The achievement of peace and friendship among peoples is true victory - not the perpetuation of anachronistic situations detrimental to peace and justice.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation wishes to speak at this stage I thank the representatives of the United Kingdom and Argentina for participating in the consideration of this item. The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the item.

ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND OTHER INTERESTS WHICH ARE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES IN NAMIBIA AND IN ALL OTHER TERRITORIES UNDER COLONIAL DOMINATION AND EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE COLONIALISM, APARTHEID AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (A/AC.109/L.1481) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has before it in document A/AC.109/L.1481 a working paper containing a draft resolution on the item, prepared by me, which was distributed on 18 August.

In this connection, I wish to draw attention to Aide-Memoire 38/83, which has been distributed, concerning the status of the report by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations relating to the item.

If no representative wishes to speak on this item, I shall take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution in document A/AC.109/L.1481 without objection.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As our timetables have become rather blurred and overlapping in the consideration of a number of issues, the Soviet delegation would like to make a number of comments on the substance of the draft before we adopt the document.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Broadly speaking and in principle, the draft contains a correct assessment of the activities of foreign economic and other interests in the colonial and other dependent Territories. At the same time, however, in our opinion this document suffers from a number of defects - in particular, a lack of explicitness. In other words, not all the t's are crossed and not all the i's are dotted, as it were. This is the case, for example, with regard to the condemnation of those States that are involved in the exploitation of colonial Territories.

In this regard, speakers in the debate in the Committee have virtually named the States involved and those that are mainly to blame for the colonial plunder of the colonial and dependent Territories. Even so, in the document before us those countries are not named. Which countries are they? Everyone knows which they are and which are the main allies and partners of South Africa. These are the leading Western countries - the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and a number of other Western States. However, these States are not named in the document. We regard this as a serious shortcoming, taking into account the fact that other international forums have stated more precisely their attitude to the plunder of the resources belonging to the indigenous inhabitants of the colonial and other dependent Territories.

I cite as examples the recent International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris, and of another Paris conference on sanctions against South Africa. The situation is also reflected more precisely in resolutions of the General Assembly, an organ superior to the Committee, which sets the Committee's general orientation. By virtue of its position on decolonization issues, by virtue of the mandate given it by the General Assembly, the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples must, simply to keep up with other organs of the General Assembly - though of course it should go ahead of them rather than lag behind them - be more precise.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

Bearing in mind the many useful and valuable provisions that the document contains, provisions aimed at putting an end to the plunder and exploitation by the colonial Powers and foreign interests in the colonial Territories, and taking into account that the document is intended to serve the general cause of ending colonialism in the world at the earliest possible date, the Soviet delegation will support the draft. But it will do so with the reservations that I have just expressed.

Mr. PULZ (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to comment, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, on document A/AC.109/L.1481, on which we are required to take a decision. We feel that this is a useful and very helpful document. It is useful that it was drawn up on the basis of General Assembly resolution 37/31, adopted last November. We feel that the draft resolution is a valuable contribution to the struggle of the whole international community to put an end to the activities of foreign economic interests which are impeding the independence of colonial Territories.

Colonial plunder, together with the thorough economic exploitation of the colonial Territories, is condemned primarily with regard to the people of Namibia. However, the States which are in the forefront of this plunder and of support for the racist Pretoria régime - their main ally, which receives considerable protection from them - are not mentioned. We all know which States they are, as Secretariat documents prepared long before this meeting have identified them. Documents of the Council for Namibia and other United Nations organs have clearly identified them.

(Mr. Pulz, Czechoslovakia)

My delegation feels that those States should have been named, as they have been in the documents of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian people for Independence, a conference in support of that people in its struggle against colonial oppression and the racist régime of Pretoria. Those States were also named in documents of the meeting of the Organization of African Unity held in Addis Ababa and they have been named in the international press. They were explicitly named in many statements that we heard here yesterday and last week. Those States, which are the major allies of South Africa and the major exploiters of the colonial Territories, are clearly identifiable and their names are no secret. They are the United States, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy, Israel and other capitalist and mainly Western States.

It is a great mistake by the Committee not to name those States explicitly in this important document. By not naming them we are departing from the practice of other United Nations organs and international institutions. We are certainly not echoing the sentiments of world public opinion.

None the less, the Czechoslovak delegation feels that this is a useful and valuable document, and despite the fact that we feel that an error has been committed we shall support the draft resolution and vote for it.

Mr. ROWE (Australia): The Australian delegation will join the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.109/L.1481, but we have serious misgivings about certain aspects of the text. We do not accept that, as the resolution implies, foreign investment is inherently inimical to the economic interests of the peoples of all Non-Self-Governing Territories, nor that it must be an impediment to the exercise by those peoples of their right to self-determination. Foreign investment has contributed to the economies of many Non-Self-Governing Territories. In our view, there is something inherently contradictory between the calls the Committee makes for economic development in Non-Self-Governing Territories and the positions taken in this resolution with respect to foreign investment.

(Mr. Rowe, Australia)

My delegation has particular difficulties with operative paragraphs 10 and 17, and had those paragraphs been put to a vote we should have been unable to support them.

Mr. PEREZ (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): As this is the first time my delegation has spoken in the Committee under your chairmanship, Sir, I should like to begin by congratulating you on your election. Your great experience, prestige and knowledge are a guarantee to us all that our work will be carried out without our moving away from our objective, which is the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

I should also like to recall the distinguished contribution made by your predecessor, Mr. Chairman, the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, Frank Abdulah.

We shall join in the consensus on the draft resolution, since basically we share the ideas that it contains, but we do not agree with the language used in some of the paragraphs. We do not believe that all of the activities of foreign economic and other interests are an obstacle to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Moreover, the document is in obvious contradiction with other documents which we produce in the same Committee, in which we urge the Administering Powers to spare no effort to ensure the economic viability of the Territories under their administration.

Mr. LWENO (United Republic of Tanzania): In my delegation's view, Mr. Chairman, the document you presented is useful and adequately reflects our concern about the subject under discussion. We have no problem with it, and we shall support it as it is, without amendment.

Mr. KOLBY (Norway): My delegation will take part in the consensus on your draft, Mr. Chairman. However, we have reservations about several aspects of the text, and if there had been a vote my delegation would have had to abstain. Furthermore, our participation in the consensus will not prejudice our position during the forthcoming General Assembly session.

The Norwegian delegation supports the main thrust of the text before us. We share the view that Non-Self-Governing Territories and their populations are vulnerable to the strength of the foreign economic and other interests operating in those Territories. We feel that the Committee has a special responsibility to make every effort to contribute to the protection of the interests and rights of those peoples. We view the draft resolution as one way of acknowledging that responsibility.

At the same time, the draft resolution contains certain generalizations and reflections of opinions and concepts that we have problems with. For instance, it gives the impression that all economic activities are detrimental to the interests of the people in Non-Self-Governing Territories. In my delegation's view, there are several instances - particularly in the small Non-Self-Governing Territories - where there obviously is a need for foreign investments, and such investments would be an important element in the efforts to promote industrial development and provide much-needed employment for the inhabitants.

Moreover, in our view the draft resolution contains several requests which we believe fall exclusively within the competence of the Security Council.

Mr. RAM (Fiji): My delegation will join the consensus on the draft resolution because we agree with its main thrust. However, my delegation does not agree that all activities of foreign economic and other interests necessarily impede the implementation of the Declaration, and for that reason if some of the paragraphs of the draft had been voted on separately we should not have been able to support it.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation wishes to speak, I take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution contained in document A/AC.109/L.1481 without objection, it being understood that the reservations expressed by representatives will be fully reflected in the record of the meeting.

It was so decided.

Mr. MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation joined in the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution before us concerning the activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization, despite having reservations over the adequacy of the wording of certain paragraphs. In our view, the countries that support those economic activities in colonial countries, as well as those States that have close ties of co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa, such as Israel, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and others are, by their co-operation with the racist régime in South Africa, responsible for maintaining its policy of racial discrimination, while reinforcing that régime's colonial hegemony over the Territory of Namibia. Moreover, the support given by those countries to the transnational corporations and other foreign interests in the Non-Self-Governing Territories impedes and delays the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to those Territories. We hope that our reservations will be reflected in the records of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The comments of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic will certainly be reflected in the records of the meeting.

The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of this item.

MILITARY ACTIVITIES AND ARRANGEMENTS BY COLONIAL POWERS IN TERRITORIES UNDER THEIR ADMINISTRATION WHICH MIGHT BE IMPEDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/AC.109/L.1479) (continued)

The Chairman: I wish to inform members that, as circulated in aide-mémoire 34, a representative of the Central Committee of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, has expressed the wish to be heard by the Committee on this item. If I hear no views to the contrary I shall take it that the Committee agrees to accede to the request.

It was so decided.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Rafael Anglada Lopez took a place at the Committee table.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Anglada Lopez.

Mr. ANGLADA LOPEZ (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I appear before this international forum on behalf of the Central Committee of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party in order to contribute to the consideration of the military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers which might be impeding the implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

My name is Rafael Anglada Lopez and I am a member of the Central Committee of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party. With me is Mr. J. A. Gonzalez Gonzalez, who, ever since the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) has followed, step by step, the work done by this Special Committee on decolonization.

We are convinced, Sir, that your contribution as Chairman of the Special Committee will be as great as that of the noble sons of Africa and of America - Ambassadors Coulibali, Nava Carillo, Salim Ahmed Salim and Frank Owen Abdulah - who made this Committee and resolution 1514 (XV) two of the finest achievements of this world Organization.

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

Resolution 1514 (XV) emphasizes the need to achieve the cessation of any armed action or repressive measure against peoples under colonial domination and declares that any attempt to violate completely or partially the national unity and territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the United Nations Charter.

Thanks to the work of the Special Committee, the General Assembly adopted resolutions 2105 (XX) and 2023 (XX) of 1965, urging the colonial Powers to dismantle military bases set up in colonial Territories and to abstain from setting up new ones.

In recent years, various Puerto Rican writers and university professors have devoted themselves to the task of examining in depth the effects of the American military presence in the colonial Territory of Puerto Rico and how it impedes the speedy implementation of the Declaration and of the inalienable right of our people to self-determination and independence. Among such professors Jorge Rodríguez Beruff, Carmen Gautier Mayoral, José Echeverría, Arturo Meléndez, Aline Frambes Buxeda de Alzérreca and the American, John Enders stand out. The work accomplished by the Caribbean peace and justice project, with its headquarters in Puerto Rico, is also important. Also noteworthy are the statements of various Puerto Rican petitioners before this Special Committee, particularly those of the leaders of the Vieques island-municipality, Carlos Zenón and Víctor Emeric and of the pro-independence leaders, Juan Mari Erás and Eneida Vázquez.

Our aim today is to provide this Special Committee with public and official information from the Federal Government of the United States, including its executive, congressional and judicial branches and its spoken and printed mass media, which clearly indicate the irrefutable fact that this administering Power, the United States of America, is acting in open violation of resolution 1514 (XV) with respect to its military activities in its colonial Territories.

It should be recalled that the right to self-determination and independence, in conformity with resolution 1514 (XV), is already part and parcel of customary international law. This was enshrined in the advisory opinions on Namibia of 1971 and on Western Sahara of 1975 by the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

The military activities of the United States in the Territory of Puerto Rico have come before the United States Supreme Court itself. In the case of Weinberger v. Carlos Romero Barceló, 102 Supreme Court 1798-1800 (1982), Associate Justice Byron White eloquently describes the role of Vieques and Puerto Rico for the requirements of the United States Navy.

(spoke in English)

"For many years, the Navy has used Vieques Island, a small island off the Puerto Rico coast, for weapons training. Currently all Atlantic Fleet vessels assigned to the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean are required to complete their training at Vieques because it permits a full range of exercises under conditions similar to combat. During air-to-ground training, however, pilots sometimes miss land-based targets, and ordnance fall into the sea. That is, accidental bombings of the navigable waters and, occasionally, intentional bombings of water targets occur."

(continued in Spanish)

The aforementioned United States Supreme Court case supported the earlier decision of the so-called United States Federal District Court for the District Puerto Rico, in the case of Carlos Romero Barceló v. Harold Brown, 478 Federal Supplement 646 (1979). In that opinion of the American court in San Juan, Federal District Judge Juan Torruella - the same judge who in 1979 gaoled the pro-independence leader Juan Mari Brás and almost 20 Puerto Rican patriots - describes with a wealth of detail the military facilities which the United States Navy has set up on the eastern coast of the Puerto Rican archipelago.

On page 654 it describes the activities of that Navy in and around Vieques; on page 655 it refers to the "inner range", and on page 656 to the "combat targets"; on page 657 it refers to the "air-to-ground activities"; and on page 658 it refers to the "ship-to-shore activities", "field artillery", "land manoeuvres", "amphibious landings", and the "facilities for naval munitions depots".

This entire dissertation of the military might of the United States in Puerto Rico culminates with "the fact that the Court takes judicial note of the present state of the world situation" and particularly with the following key words, "the training conducted in Vieques is vital for the defence of the interests of the United States". This is on page 707 of the document I have mentioned.

As the Special Committee already knows, the United States Supreme Court decided on 27 May 1980, in Harris v. Rosario, 100 Supreme Court 1929/1930, that the United States Congress is the authority governing the destiny of Puerto Rico, in accordance with the so-called Territorial Clause of the United States Constitution, in its Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. Thus, the highest United States court goes back to its old jurisprudence of the so-called insular cases, stemming from military acquisitions of the 1898 Spanish-Cuban-American war.

The news of the press in the last two months is self-explanatory. On 24 June 1982 the United States publication in San Juan, The San Juan Star, reported that the new American naval chief in Puerto Rico, Commodore Diego Hernandez, believes Vieques to be "the University of the Seas" for the United States Navy. On 5 August 1982 El Nuevo Dia reports that Hernandez is of the opinion that "in time of peace, military activities in the seas close to the eastern coast of Puerto Rico constitute the best training ground for the United States naval forces". Further on it states that "close to the island of Santa Cruz, in the United States Virgin Islands, submarine testing is being conducted, while in Vieques and other enclaves of the region activities of incalculable strategic value are under way".

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

On 7 November 1982 The San Juan Star announced on the cover that the administration of President Ronald Reagan was studying the "reactivation" of the Ramey Air Base in Aguadilla on the north-western coast of Puerto Rico. On 18 April 1983 the same publication confirmed that after having abandoned the Ramey Base for 11 years, the United States Air Force will use it once again for training manoeuvres. On 25 April it was announced that the reactivation is the response to the need to forge "a response to the Soviets and the Cubans". On 27 April it was announced that the United States Air Force views Puerto Rico as the cornerstone in the efforts "to defend the Caribbean basin". On 29 April it was reported that the colonial Governor of Puerto Rico, annexionist Carlos Romero Barcelo, supported the announced take-over of the Ramey Base by the United States Air Force. On 8 May 1983 the presidential hopeful for the United States Democratic Party, Senator Gary Hart, supported the use of the territory of Puerto Rico for plans of the United States Air Force.

The colonial Governor, Carlos Romero Barcelo, stated in an interview with the daily El Mundo on 20 June 1983 that "from a strategic and military standpoint there are persons who understand that Puerto Rico is now even more indispensable than it was before the United States returned the Panama Canal. With what is happening in the Caribbean with communist Cuba situated where it is, Nicaragua in Central America and Granada at the other end forming a triangle where, if they so wish, they have air control of the Caribbean, Puerto Rico becomes even more important and strategic".

Indeed, in its issue of 3 August 1983 El Mundo announced that "Puerto Rico this month has an alternative to the international airport: the facilities of the Borinquen Airport in Aguadilla". A few days earlier, on 21 July, The San Juan Star had announced that a detachment of 35 soldiers of the United States Army Reserve was building a road 3 kilometres long on the Puerto Rican island of La Mona, along the La Mona canal, between Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic.

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

While all these events were happening in Aguadilla and La Mona, the United States Navy announced, on 6 May 1983, in The San Juan Star, "the reconditioning of a 1,200-foot communications tower in the township of Aguada, in order to improve communications with ships, aircraft and submarines in the Caribbean". The town of Aguada is near Aguadilla and in front of La Mona Canal, on the north-west coast of the country. The scientist, Neftali Garcia, announced in Claridad, on 18 August 1983, that the Pentagon is contributing to the expansion of the system of civil roads on that same coast of the country and improving "the expansion of the naval system" in Isabela township.

The Special Committee has already received evidence of the participation of more than 200 Puerto Ricans, members of the National Guard of the United States in Puerto Rico, in the military operations conducted in Honduras in February of 1983. These soldiers conducted "support operations" in Honduran territory on the Nicaraguan border, according to La Prensa of 3 February 1983.

In the meantime, on 28 March 1983 United States Secretary of the Navy, John F. Lehman, Jr., paid a personal visit to the well-known Roosevelt Roads naval base in Ceiba township. There, Lehman, a member of Mr. Reagan's cabinet, announced:

"The Roosevelt Roads base will acquire a growing importance in the coming decade because there will be greater activity in the region and it will, therefore, be necessary as a stabilizing influence."

At that time, according to The San Juan Star of 29 March 1983, the Navy was conducting in Vieques the Readex 1-83 Western Atlantic operations, with 77 craft and more than 300 aircraft. A few days earlier, Lieutenant-Colonel Kenneth W. Ritchard and Daniel P. Hummel, F-14 fighter pilots from the United States aircraft carrier D.D. Eisenhower, had been killed on the high seas.

On 7 June El Nuevo Dia announced the participation of eight Falcon F-16, high-technology combat aircraft in the Universal Trek military operations. That news publication reports that the F-16 is manufactured by a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) consortium, made up of the United States, Belgium, Norway and Denmark.

JSM/13/mh

A/AC.109/PV.1239

44-45

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

The Universal Trek operations had some press coverage in Puerto Rico. The journalist from El Mundo, Isabel Cintron, reported on 9 June 1983, from the Roosevelt Roads base in Ceiba, that 5,000 men of the United States Army, Navy, Coast Guard and Marines were taking part in those manoeuvres which were to last until 15 June.

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

On the same day Associated Press reported from Vieques that the theory of the military scenario is as follows: "Country Brown - read Cuba - a regional communist power in the sea of colours, is transporting arms and advisers to Green - read Grenada - a small island in the western sea of colours which is ideologically aligned with Brown." While United States military personnel continued their military games in the vicinity of Vieques, another 1,250 troops of the United States National Guard in Puerto Rico were conducting similar operations in the southern coast of Puerto Rico in the town of Salinas. On 7 June El Nuevo Dia published an official photograph of the National Guard in Salinas, indicating the presence of 4,200 troops of the 92nd Infantry Brigade in that United States military detachment.

The Review, Intercambio, of the Caribbean Project of Justice and Peace, reports in its issue number 4, dated April of 1983, that the United States National Guard in Puerto Rico increased its numbers from 7,000 to a total of 11,000 in the decade between 1970 and 1980.

On 12 May 1983 the cover of El Mundo reported that "the Navy confirmed the transfer to the United States Army of 941 acres of land at Fort Allen, in Salinas, in March 1983 for the training of local military forces". Fort Allen, which has sad connotations for the history of the Puerto Rican people, and for more than 1,000 Haitian refugees who suffered in concentration camps on Puerto Rican territory because of the United States lack of sensitivity is once again being used as a centre for military training. The San Juan Star reports on its cover of 17 August that the new facilities in Fort Allen, which Governor Barcelo wanted to turn into a "super jail", would be shared by the National Guard, the Army Reserve and the Navy for their own purposes.

As recently as 23 August while the Special Committee was considering the question of Puerto Rico, a cable from the United Press International, published in The San Juan Star, reported that personnel and military ships stationed at the Roosevelt Roads naval base would give "logistic support" to naval manoeuvres to be held between 23 August and 17 September 1983 in the Caribbean and the western Atlantic, with the participation of 35,000 troops from the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Netherlands. These operations, which are known as Readex 2-83, will include the Independence and John F. Kennedy aircraft carriers, 16 cruisers, destroyers, frigates, seven support craft, two anti-mine craft, two attack submarines and a command ship, as well as two British craft and one from the Netherlands.

What is truly incredible happened a few days ago on 25 August, the same day that the Special Committee was in the process of adopting its most recent resolution on Puerto Rico. A Court in San Juan found "probable cause to accuse" for possession and concealment of property stolen from the Government. This concerned a citizen who had been involved in the exchange of 15 doses of heroin for 14 hand grenades from two American Marines from the Roosevelt Roads naval base, namely Christopher Guice and Moody. Here we have a transaction involving United States Navy explosives being traded for heroin. It was reported on the cover-page of El Mundo of 16 August last under the headline: "Hand grenade deal linked to drug traffic in Vieques".

While all this was taking place, the United States still tries to recruit young Puerto Rican workers for United States military activities. Indeed, the United States Selective Service reports the listing of 140,000 young Puerto Ricans for military service. However, Puerto Rico is the jurisdiction which has the lowest compliance with this imperialist demand.

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

Of course, a person who does not register cannot study; that becomes almost impossible without the loans, which go hand-in-hand with registration; and such persons do not receive the necessary benefits which were known as the CETA plan for job training. Moreover, failure to register is a very serious offence: \$10,000 in fines, jail term, or both. This is to be found in United States Statutes 50 United States Code, Appendix 462 (f); 20 United States Code 1070, et seq.; and 29 Code of Federal Regulations 1501, et seq.

The young patriots already have a long list of services for the cause of peace. Dozens of thousands of Puerto Ricans refused to join the United States forces during the criminal aggression against the sister people of Viet Nam. Representatives can check United States judicial opinions which are contrary to Puerto Rico, such as United States v. Manuel Amedee, Amy Valentine, et al. - 288 Federal Supplement 957, of the District of Puerto Rico, of 1968 - and United States v. Miguel Gonzalez Vargas, 370 Federal Supplement 908 of the District of Puerto Rico, for the year 1974.

The investigative file of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) about my own person reports that I began to be investigated precisely when the "Local Military Recruitment Board No. 62 of Santurce Puerto Rico" reported that on 24 May 1971 I had refused to join the United States Army. The same happened with tens of thousands of young Puerto Ricans, and the same will occur again in our history. To this end, the United Front Against Mandatory Military Service has already been established.

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

Revelations and scandals relating to United States military presence in Puerto Rico continue. In its issue of 13 June 1983, El Nuevo Día had an impact on public opinion when it reported that between 1963 and 1967 the United States Army conducted clandestine experiments in seven municipalities of my country with "agent orange" in a situation where 20 years later it is still not possible to know the nefarious effects of those experiments. It is already known that at least 128 pounds of a substance called dioxin -- 10,000 times more lethal than cyanide -- has been used. And that was done behind the back of the colonial Government of Puerto Rico.

On 25 July 1983, The San Juan Star reported that 4.3 per cent of the 127,000 Puerto Rican veterans of the United States Army residing in Puerto Rico are pensioners owing to psychiatric reasons. The percentage in the United States is only 1.1. A total of 56 per cent of all Puerto Rican veterans residing in Puerto Rico receive some kind of benefit owing to mental or occupational disability.

Finally, we should like to state in this Special Committee, as was done in 1982 by the independentist leader Juan Mari Brás, the fact that the United States is violating the spirit and the letter of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its Additional Protocol I, whose instrument of ratification was signed by United States President Ronald Reagan on 13 November 1981 and instruments of ratification deposited in Mexico City by the then Secretary of State Alexander Haig on 19 November of the same year.

Article 1 (b) of the Treaty of Tlatelolco forbids the contracting parties to receive, store, install, deploy or in any way possess any nuclear weapon, directly or indirectly. Article 1 of Additional Protocol I states that the contracting parties commit themselves to implement the Treaty "in territories for which, de jure or de facto, they are responsible".

As recently as in an article in El Mundo dated 22 January 1982, it was stated that a study conducted by the Centre for Defence Information revealed that:

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

"... P-3 Orion anti-submarine naval aircraft with capacity to transport nuclear missiles are periodically assigned to the Roosevelt Roads Base."

We do not need much more by way of proof to know the intentions of the United States in putting forward the theory that Puerto Rico was excluded from the mandate of the Treaty. I invite members' attention to Nobel Peace Laureate Alfonso Garcia Robles' Treaty of Tlatelolco, El Colegio de Mexico, 1967, p. 161.

In this statement we have confined ourselves strictly to data and evidence that in most cases had not been submitted to this Committee for consideration. We have deliberately omitted any analysis or interpretation, preferring to contribute to the Special Committee's dossier official and public information to which we have had access.

We urge the Rapporteur and the specialized Secretariat staff to continue to work to ensure that truth prevails and to be innovative with regard to their sources and ways of obtaining information, so that the historic task of the Special Committee may confront the clandestine and illegal acts of the administering Powers on such delicate matters as the military activities of administering Powers in the Territories which impede and prevent the speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

What we have considered is not only relevant to Puerto Rico: it will determine whether the Special Committee can continue carrying out its mandate with regard to the remaining Territories of the Caribbean to which the Declaration is applicable. We have in mind Territories such as Bermuda, the Cayman Islands, the Turks and Caicos, the United States Virgin Islands, the British Virgin Islands, St. Kitts, Nevis and Anguilla. We include also other colonial Territories which were incorrectly taken off the list of Territories more than 30 years ago. We refer also to young Caribbean republics, such as Grenada, Dominica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Belize, and Antigua and Barbuda, whose independence is

(Mr. Anglada Lopez)

threatened by the arrogant, haughty, imperialist presence of the United States of America in our Caribbean, which is no longer what it once was, namely, the mare nostrum of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. Anglada Lopez withdrew.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.