

LOBBY BRIEFING

time:

date: 7.5.82

PRIME MINISTER'S DAY

The Prime Minister is working at No 10 all day and was in the House this morning.

At 9.45am she chaired a meeting of the Group of Ministers concerned with the Falkland Islands (Foreign Sec., Home Sec., Chancellor of the Duchy, Defence Sec., CDS and the Attorney General).

There could be a further meeting of this group during the day.

The Prime Minister plans to go to Chequers this evening for the weekend returning on Sunday evening.

PRESS NOTICE

President Gayoom of the Republic of Maldives will visit the UK from 10-15 May (including lunch and talks with the Prime Minister on Monday 10th)

PUBLICATIONS

White Paper on El Salvador election observers report at 2.30 pm (CFR yesterday).

McCarthy Report 2.30pm.

WHITE PAPER LIST

Distributed.

IN THE HOUSE STATEMENT

At 11.00am a Statement on the Falkland Islands was made by Mr Pym.

Mr Pym will hold a press conference at 12 noon at the FCO.

FALKLAND ISLANDS

On the UN proposals we were asked how long the Government was prepared to give the United Nations and we would not be drawn on a specific timetable and pointed towards our constructive response of yesterday and the fact that the focus of attention was now in New York. To suggestions that Mr Pym had sounded sceptical or pessimistic about the UN avenue for diplomacy we acknowledged that the mood was grim. There was no evidence that the Argentines were prepared to come off the Islands and no evidence that they would allow negotiations to go ahead unprejudiced. We emphasised that the UN initiative was procedural in nature and provided a framework. We would have to build on that framework. We would not encourage any Argentine idea that by going to the UN they would get a ceasefire and stay on the Islands. It was inconceivable that there could be any formula that did not implement Resolution 502 and we would ensure that the UN stuck to its own logic.

On the question of an Argentine role in an administration we said all was for negotiation and acknowledged that the suggestion they might have a role had been around at an earlier stage. However their attitude seemed to be "what we have got we hold". For our part we stressed again that we have our principles and sticking points and the first was that the Argentines should come off the Islands.

Asked if we were pressing the Americans to "beef up" their sanctions we pointed out that we had never suggested every country should take the same kind of sanctions. Nobody had offered material support of the kind the Americans had offered. We would not be drawn on the shopping list but indicated that the MoD was in close consultation with the US.

LOBBY BRIEFING

-2-

time:

date:

We repeated that we had never seen diplomacy as limiting what needed to be done militarily. All appeared to be quiet at the moment because the Argentines were not attempting to challenge the zone or put our Task Force at risk.

We were asked if an attack on Argentine airbases would require a declaration of war. We thought not as far as we knew but had not had final advice on this point.

To suggestions that the Government's position had moved away from the wishes of the Islanders being paramount we said people were entering into semantics. The point was that one simply could not ride roughshod over the wishes of the Islanders as the Argentines had done.

HC

PRIME MINISTER

Engagements

Q1. Mr. Cunliffe asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

The Prime Minister (Mrs. Margaret Thatcher): This morning I presided at a meeting of the Cabinet and had meetings with ministerial colleagues and others. In addition to my duties in the House, I shall be having further meetings later today.

Mr. Cunliffe: Does the Prime Minister agree that it would be catastrophic if nurses and ancillary workers in the National Health Service had to take strike action to achieve a just and living wage? Does she accept that there will be widespread support if nurses and ancillary workers have, reluctantly, to take industrial action? Does she consider that it would be wiser and more prudent if she were to meet Health Service unions to discuss a further improved offer, and will she arrange immediately to call such a meeting? *[Interruption.]* There is support on both sides of the House for such a course regardless of what Conservative Members are shouting now. That support is reflected in letters written to the *Nursing Mirror* in support of the nurses' cause.

The Prime Minister: I do not believe that nurses would do anything so detrimental to the interests of their patients as to go on strike. I believe that they are far more professional and far more dedicated to their work than that. Even before the present offer the Government are paying the nurses 76 per cent. more than was being paid on the day that we come into office. Part of the reason for that is because there are far more nurses now than when we took office. That shows that the Government have tried to have extra people in the NHS, especially when they are in direct contact with the patient.

Mr. John Page: During my right hon. Friend's extremely busy and responsible day, will she try to find a few moments to listen to the radio and watch television, and judge for herself whether she feels that the British case on the Falkland Islands is being presented in a way that is likely to give due confidence to our friends overseas and support and encouragement to our Service men and their devoted families?

The Prime Minister: Judging by many of the comments that I have heard from those who watch and listen more than I do, many people are very concerned indeed that the case for our British forces is not being put over fully and effectively. I understand that there are times when it seems that we and the Argentines are being treated almost as equals and almost on a neutral basis. I understand that there are occasions when some commentators will say that the Argentines did something and then "the British" did something. I can only say that if this is so it gives offence and causes great emotion among many people.

Mr. Foot: On the question of the diplomatic discussions about the crises itself, does the right hon. Lady agree that there appears to be a real chance of a move towards a sensible ceasefire, leading to other developments, and that there is also a chance of moving towards a real peace settlement? Does she agree that everything possible should be done to nurture that chance, and that

nothing should be done to injure it? In particular, will she say what is her response and that of the Government to the proposals from the Secretary-General of the United Nations? My right hon. Friend the Member for Leeds, East (Mr. Healey) suggested that we should respond at once to those proposals, and I hope that the right hon. Lady will give a full statement to the House about it.

The Prime Minister: Of course, we are doing everything possible to pursue the diplomatic path to a negotiated settlement. However, the right hon. Gentleman knows that at the moment there are two sets of proposals. There is the one that is being pursued by the United States through Peru, to which we have made a very constructive response, and we hope to hear more about that today. Whether the Argentines will respond in the same way, we do not know. The other one is being pursued through the Secretary-General, to which the right hon. Gentleman referred. There have been various rather conflicting reports about the Argentine response to that, but it seems clear—perhaps the right hon. Gentleman heard our ambassador on the news at 1 o'clock today—that they are very interested in a ceasefire. They may not accept withdrawal, and they may do it on a totally different basis, or require undertakings on sovereignty. So there is some doubt about what they have said. I believe that they have probably said that they are prepared to discuss it further with the Secretary-General.

The right hon. Gentleman asks me what our position is. We welcome the ideas that the Secretary-General has put forward, and can accept them as a framework on which more specific proposals could be built. We are sending a message to the Secretary-General today to that effect.

May I make one more observation. It would not be impossible—indeed, it may well be likely—that the Argentines are concentrating on a ceasefire without withdrawal. That would be a very evident ploy to keep them in possession of their ill-gotten gains, and we are right to be very wary of it. The whole of the mandatory resolution No. 502 has to be accepted, and there can be no ceasefire unless it is accompanied by a withdrawal that is fully and properly supervised.

Mr. Foot: Of course, I understand that it may very well be the case that there is—[HON. MEMBERS: "Agree with it."] I well understand that there may well be great ambiguity in the reply that has come from the Argentine Government, but can the right hon. Lady tell us whether the Secretary-General's proposals include a linkage between the withdrawal and the ceasefire? If so, presumably that is one of the reasons why she has given, I should have thought, a positive answer. Certainly, I welcome the tone in which she spoke about the response to the Secretary-General's suggestions. I very much hope that we shall be able to proceed along those lines.

May I also ask the right hon. Lady whether she will respond to what I said earlier on another aspect of the matter? In view of the considerable improvement that appears in the diplomatic exchanges that are now taking place—I am not referring to the Argentine Government now, but to the right hon. Lady's response—can she give us an absolute assurance—I am sure that the whole country would want that—that there will not be any deliberate escalation of the military action itself, any escalation that could injure the prospects that now appear to be much more hopeful of getting a real peace?

The Prime Minister: The right hon. Gentleman asked me first about the Secretary-General's proposals. It is, of course, for him to say what they are. May I stress that they are very much a framework. There are no specific details attached to them, and no timetable, but they link cessation of hostilities with withdrawal, as one would expect in view of the Security Council's resolution. Beyond that, I am afraid, there is no timing and no practical arrangements. They really are a basis for discussion.

With regard to what the right hon. Gentleman said about there seeming to be a change in the climate of diplomatic negotiations, I think that it was not a justifiable comment. The Secretary-General's proposals are now the sixth set of proposals that I and my colleagues have pursued in detail over the past month. That is hardly a lack of diplomatic activity.

Mr. Foot: I am much more interested in getting progress in these discussions than in scoring any point off the right hon. Lady. We who have urged all through the crisis that this kind of response should be made to approaches from the Secretary-General have a right to say that. I fully understand that these are procedural proposals, first of all, from the Secretary-General, but we very much hope that over the next 24 hours or two or three days, the maximum possible support can be given to those original proposals.

The Prime Minister: These are framework proposals. We are making a positive response to them. We hope to hear more about the Peruvian-United States proposals today, but I stress again that any proposals, if they are to be acceptable, if they are to work and if they are to command confidence, must be precise as to the timing and sequence and verification of events.

Mr. Viggers: Does my right hon. Friend agree that the initial even-handed approach of the United States Government—constructive to settlement though it may have been intended to be—may have given the impression to the Argentine leaders and people—and, indeed to the world—that there is some justice in the Argentine cause? Does she agree that it is incumbent on the United States now to make quite clear its support for our attitude in resisting aggression, and that in this way it will assist the Argentine leaders and people to realise their true position?

The Prime Minister: As my hon. Friend knows, we have now the total support of the United States, which we would expect, and which I think we always expected to have. I doubt whether its activities as a mediator—which we supported, and we were grateful to Mr. Haig for what he did—would ever have led people to think that there was any justice in the Argentine cause. The condemnation of the Argentine was almost universal, because the Argentine became an aggressor. Now, in the remarks that are being made, we must always remember that the Argentine was the aggressor. Two days before that invasion, the same Mr. Costa Mendez, who is going to the United Nations, called in our ambassador in Buenos Aires and said to him "The diplomatic channels are now closed". That same

Government refused the plea of the Security Council not to invade. That same Government refused the plea of President Reagan not to invade. That same Government invaded, and have been piling in soldiers and equipment, against the United Nations Security Council resolution, ever since. That is the kind of Government with whom we are dealing.

Q2. Mr. Thomas Cox asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

The Prime Minister: I refer the hon. Gentleman to the reply that I gave some moments ago.

Mr. Cox: Is the Prime Minister aware of the growing views now being expressed by the British people that there must be no escalation of military intervention—*[Interruption]*—on the Falkland Islands issue? Against that background, is she prepared in the House today totally to repudiate those Conservative Members and the retired admirals and generals who now appear on television saying that, if need be, attacks must take place against the mainland of the Argentine? Is she aware that nothing would be more disastrous in trying to get a negotiated settlement through the United Nations than for that kind of action to be taken?

The Prime Minister: The hon. Gentleman refers to "no escalation". The escalation of the situation while negotiations were taking place was by the Argentine, in the invasion. There has been escalation ever since. In the meantime, our own British people remain on those islands under what I believe the Leader of the Opposition called in the first debate "foul and brutal aggression". We must continue with our military activities—

Mr. Dalyell: Answer the question.

The Prime Minister: I am answering it. We must continue with our military activities. Again, it would be too easy to say "No military activities during negotiations". What would happen? We should be hamstrung. The people would still remain under the heel of the invader, while the Argentines increased their activities on the mainland and increased their supplies and reserves in order to attack us at will.

Mr. Michael Hamilton: If current peace proposals do not succeed, will my right hon. Friend take comfort from the fact that Army wives at Fulford camp have called for no compromise and have stressed only their wish to save the islanders?

The Prime Minister: That is wonderful of them and I should be grateful if my hon. Friend would pass on that message. Everyone realises that the aggressor must not gain from his aggression. One hopes that the United Nations will be able to carry out the mandatory resolution that it passed. Mandatory resolutions under chapter 7 are comparatively rare in United Nations history. Unfortunately, those provisions have not been carried out. The important thing is that we should get the Argentines off the islands that they still occupy. If the United Nations cannot do that and if negotiations cannot do that, we shall have to.

Questions to Ministers

Mr. Tam Dalyell (West Lothian): On a point of order, **Mr. Speaker**. In view of the elliptical reply—*[Interruption]*—given yesterday by the Foreign Secretary to the hon. Member for Havant and Waterloo (**Mr. Lloyd**)—*[Interruption]*—on attacking the South American mainland—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I cannot hear the hon. Gentleman, but I hope that he is raising a point of order and not putting an argument about a Minister's reply. As he knows, I cannot rule on that.

Mr. Dalyell: It is a point of order in the sense that my hon. Friend the Member for Tooting (**Mr. Cox**)—*[Interruption]*—asked a direct question about a pre-emptive or retaliatory attack on the mainland. Cannot he receive an answer to that important question?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is clearly not something on which I can rule.

Mr. Andrew Faulds (Warley, East): Further to that point of order, **Mr. Speaker**.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I shall call the hon. Member for Warley, East (**Mr. Faulds**) in a moment, but the hon. Member for West Lothian (**Mr. Dalyell**) did not raise a point of order.

Mr. Faulds: On a new point of order, **Mr. Speaker**. Since it is quite likely, and appallingly likely, that this lunatic military venture will lead to more bloody deaths this weekend, would it not be in order—I am serious in making this point of order—to extend Prime Minister's Question Time so that we can discuss the implications of her adventure in the South Atlantic?

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. Gentleman and the House know, it is not for me to decide how long Prime Minister's Question Time should run. It usually lasts for a quarter of an hour.

Business of the House

3.32 pm

Mr. Michael Foot (Ebbw Vale): Will the Leader of the House announce the business for next week?

The Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons (**Mr. John Biffen**): Yes, Sir. The business for next week will be as follows:

MONDAY 10 MAY—Second Reading of the Northern Ireland Bill.

Motions on the Land Compensation (Northern Ireland) Order, which is a consolidation measure, and on the Probation Board (Northern Ireland) Order.

TUESDAY 11 MAY—Progress on remaining stages of the Criminal Justice Bill.

Motions on the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment) Regulations, for England and Wales and for Scotland.

WEDNESDAY 12 AND THURSDAY 13 MAY—Completion of remaining stages of the Criminal Justice Bill.

The Chairman of Ways and Means has named opposed private business for consideration at 7 o'clock on Thursday.

FRIDAY 14 MAY—Private Members' Bills.

MONDAY 17 MAY—Private Members' motions until 7 o'clock.

Afterwards, completion of remaining stages of the Local Government and Planning (Scotland) Bill.

Mr. Foot: I thank the Leader of the House for the arrangements that he has made for reporting to the House on the Falkland Islands crisis and for dealing with the problem in the House on Tuesday night? What he did greatly helped the House to deal with the matter properly and I thank him for it. Of course, I say that in prospect of future considerations! Will he give an assurance that if we wish to have a debate on this subject at any time next week he will consider it as a matter of urgency?

I raised with the right hon. Gentleman last week the subject of British Rail. We were expecting a statement from the Secretary of State for Transport, but no such statement has been made. No debate has yet been arranged, but I trust that the right hon. Gentleman understands how strong our feelings are and how vital it is to hold a proper debate on that subject before the Government proceed any further.

I asked the right hon. Gentleman to make a statement on Civil Service pay. I again ask for a statement. I trust that he will not resort to any of the subterranean methods of making such announcements, because they do not allow the House properly to cross-examine the Minister involved.

Will the amendments on the proposed restoration of capital punishment be debated during consideration of the Criminal Justice Bill on Tuesday? It would help if hon. Members knew when that debate will take place.

As I said last week, given the appalling unemployment that persists and seems likely to persist for many months, and indeed longer if the Government's policies are continued, may we have an urgent debate, in Government time, on the unemployment situation?

Mr. Biffen: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his kind remarks on how the House was approached on the matter of debating and making statements on the Falkland

course. Following normal custom the TSRB's report will be published when the Government's decisions are announced.

Civil Service

Q3. **Mr. Eggar** asked the Prime Minister if she will make a statement in response to the Treasury and Civil Service Select Committee report on efficiency and effectiveness in the Civil Service.

The Prime Minister: The Government will be making a full reply as soon as possible. The latest manpower figures, announce yesterday, show that we now have the smallest Civil Service for 16 years. We continue to work for improved efficiency, and I am confident that the report of the Select Committee will be of considerable help.

Engagements

Q4. **Mr. Alan Clark** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q5. **Mr. Neubert** asked the Prime Minister whether she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q7. **Mr. Skinner** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q8. **Mr. Joseph Dean** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q9. **Mr. Powell** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q10. **Mr. Dover** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q11. **Mr. Jim Marshall** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q12. **Mr. John Townend** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q13. **Miss Joan Lester** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q14. **Mr. Kenneth Carlisle** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q15. **Mr. Alton** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q16. **Mr. Newens** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q17. **Mr. Bowden** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q18. **Mr. Pitt** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q19. **Mr. Cryer** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q20. **Mr. Stanbrook** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q22. **Mr. Barry Jones** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q23. **Mr. Flannery** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q24. **Mr. Beith** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q25. **Mr. Geraint Howells** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q26. **Mr. Archie Hamilton** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q27. **Mr. Christopher Price** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q29. **Mr. Greenway** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q31. **Mr. Gordon Wilson** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

Q32. **Mr. Geoffrey Robinson** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 6 May.

Q33. **Mr. Bidwell** asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 6 May.

The Prime Minister: This morning I presided at a meeting of the Cabinet and had meetings with ministerial colleagues and others. In addition to my duties in the House I shall be having further meetings later today.

Falkland Islands

Q6. **Mr. Dalryell** asked the Prime Minister if she will make a statement on the latest position in relation to the Falkland Islands.

Q30. **Mr. Latham** asked the Prime Minister whether she will make a further statement on the Falkland Islands.

The Prime Minister: We are continuing to make intensive efforts to secure a diplomatic solution. We have made a constructive response to the latest proposals put forward by Mr. Haig. We have also replied constructively to the United Nations Secretary General. Any agreement must provide for the withdrawal of all Argentine forces from the Falkland Islands in accordance with Security Council resolution 502, and must not prejudice the nature of a possible final settlement.

Dr. Edmund Marshall asked the Prime Minister what representations she has received from within the Methodist Church about the Falkland Islands situation.

The Prime Minister: Amongst the many letters reaching me on the Falkland Islands situation, there have been several from Methodist Church groups. I also received, on 27 April, a telegram from the president's council of the Methodist Church.

Law and Order

Q21. **Mr. Soley** asked the Prime Minister if she is satisfied with the effectiveness of the policies on law and order which have been implemented since Her Majesty's Government took office in May 1979.

The Prime Minister: I remain satisfied that the measures put forward in our manifesto, on all of which swift and positive progress has been made, offer the best means of improving the effectiveness of our response to the problem of crime.

Argentina

Q28. Mr. Adley asked the Prime Minister whether she intends to undertake any direct contact with the Argentine junta; and if she will make a statement.

The Prime Minister: The first requirement is for the Argentine junta to indicate its willingness to withdraw all its forces from the Falkland Islands and to enter into negotiations without preconditions.

President Reagan

Mr. Cohen asked the Prime Minister if, in view of the role adopted by President Reagan in the Falkland Islands problem, she will take steps to cancel the invitation to him to address both Houses of Parliament.

The Prime Minister: No. We greatly appreciate the considerable efforts made by President Reagan and Mr. Haig to achieve a peaceful solution in accordance with Security Council resolution 502.

HOME DEPARTMENT

Special Branch

Miss Richardson asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many police officers are presently assigned to the Special Branch.

Mr. Whitelaw: The Metropolitan Police Special Branch at present numbers about 425 officers. The strength of special branches in other forces in England and Wales is about 850 altogether.

Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act

Mr. Parry asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department (1) which organisations will be invited to give evidence in the review of the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act; and if he will make a statement;

(2) if hon. Members will be invited to give written or oral evidence to the review of the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act;

(3) what is the timetable for written and oral evidence to the review of the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act.

Mr. Whitelaw: Lord Jellicoe has issued a general invitation for written evidence from any organisation or individual, including hon. Members, wishing to comment on any matter within his terms of reference. He has asked that material should be sent to him, by 31 May 1982 if possible, at the following address:

The Rt. Hon. Earl Jellicoe, DSO, MC
Home Office
Queen Anne's Gate
London SW1H 9AT

The conduct of the review is entirely a matter for Lord Jellicoe, but I understand that at a slightly later stage in his review he proposes to hold discussions on the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act with a number of individuals and organisations with particular knowledge of and interest in the legislation.

Mr. Parry asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will publish the programme of visits to be made by Lord Jellicoe in his review of the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act.

Mr. Whitelaw: Lord Jellicoe's plans are not final, but in the course of his review he proposes to visit, among other places, the following:

Belfast; Dover; Edinburgh; Gatwick Airport; Glasgow; Hampshire; Heathrow Airport; Merseyside; New Scotland Yard; Stranraer.

It would not be proper for me to provide precise details of his programme.

Mr. Parry asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department when he expects Lord Jellicoe to report on his review of the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act.

Mr. Whitelaw: I expect to present Lord Jellicoe's report to Parliament before the Act is due to lapse, in March 1983.

NORTHERN IRELAND

Textile and Clothing Industries (Aid)

Mr. Nicholas Winterton asked the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland what financial aid was provided for the textile and clothing industries, respectively, by the Department of Commerce during the most recent convenient year for which figures are available.

Mr. Adam Butler: During the financial year 1981-82 the Department of Commerce paid standard capital grant of £6,501,000 to the textiles industry and £297,000 to the clothing and footwear industry in Northern Ireland. Details of the amounts of selective financial assistance paid to separate industrial sectors are not readily available and could be obtained only at disproportionate cost. However, during 1981-82 agreements were signed in respect of offers of selective assistance amounting to £5,773,000 to the textiles industry and £1,859,000 to the clothing and footwear industry.

Armagh (Arms Finds)

Mr. McCusker asked the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland what arms or explosive finds, if any, have been made on Church property in County Armagh during the past three months.

Mr. Prior: Police and Army records do not show any finds of arms or explosives being made on Church property in County Amargh during the past three months.

ENVIRONMENT

Reservoirs

Mrs. Renée Short asked the Secretary of State for the Environment (1) what information he has on the condition of reservoirs throughout the United Kingdom; and if he will give details;

(2) what are the current requirements for inspecting and ensuring the safety of reservoirs; and if he is satisfied that these are working adequately;

(3) if he will implement the Reservoirs Safety Act 1975.

Mr. Giles Shaw: The current requirements for ensuring the safety of reservoirs stem from the Reservoirs (Safety Provisions) Act 1930. This Act requires that reservoirs are designed, constructed and then inspected

UNCLASSIFIED

3855 - 1

OO UKMIS NEW YORK

OO BIS NEW YORK

OO WASHINGTON

PP OTTAWA

OO MEXICO CITY

GRS 470

UNCLASSIFIED

FM FCC 061500Z MAY 82

TO IMMEDIATE CERTAIN MISSIONS AND DEPENDENT TERRITORIES
GUIDANCE TELEGRAM NUMBER 87 OF 6 MAY 1982

FALKLANDS: ARGENTINE CLAIMS ABOUT PREVIOUS NEGOTIATIONS

1. ARGENTINE PROPAGANDA IS SEEKING TO JUSTIFY THE INVASION OF THE FALKLANDS IN PART ON THE GROUNDS THAT BRITAIN WAS UNWILLING TO NEGOTIATE A SETTLEMENT OF THE SOVEREIGNTY DISPUTE. YOU SHOULD DRAW ON THE FOLLOWING AS NECESSARY:

(A) THE MOST OBVIOUS REFUTATION OF THIS ALLEGATION IS THE FACT, CAREFULLY IGNORED IN ARGENTINE PROPAGANDA, THAT THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS WAS ACTUALLY IN TRAIN AT THE TIME OF THE INVASION: THE LAST ROUND OF TALKS WAS HELD, AT MINISTERIAL LEVEL, IN NEW YORK FROM 26-27 FEBRUARY.

(B) MOREOVER, THE JOINT COMMUNIQUE ISSUED AFTER THE TALKS, WHICH THE ARGENTINE PRESS ITSELF PUBLISHED ON 2 MARCH - ONE MONTH BEFORE THE INVASION - STATED THAT THE MEETING HAD TAKEN PLACE 'IN A CORDIAL AND POSITIVE SPIRIT' AND THAT BOTH SIDES HAD 'AFFIRMED THEIR RESOLVE TO FIND A SOLUTION TO THE SOVEREIGNTY DISPUTE'.

2. ARGENTINE PROPAGANDA IS ALSO CLAIMING THAT BRITAIN DID NOT REPLY TO ARGENTINE PROPOSALS PUT FORWARD IN NEW YORK. THE FACTS, WHICH YOU MAY DRAW ON FREELY, ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(A) IN NEW YORK THE TWO SIDES CONSIDERED AN ARGENTINE PROPOSAL ON PROCEDURES, INCLUDING THE SETTING UP OF A NEGOTIATING

1

UNCLASSIFIED

COMMISSION AT MINISTERIAL LEVEL, FOR A MORE RAPID TEMPO TO NEGOTIATIONS. THE PROPOSALS WERE FAR-REACHING AND REQUIRED CAREFUL CONSIDERATION BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT. BUT IT WAS MADE CLEAR TO THE ARGENTINES THAT A REPLY WOULD BE SENT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. HOWEVER, HOURS AFTER ISSUING THE JOINT COMMUNIQUE (1(B) ABOVE), THE ARGENTINES ISSUED A SEPARATE UNILATERAL ONE WHICH RESERVED ARGENTINA'S RIGHT TO TERMINATE THE PROPOSED PROCEDURE IN FAVOUR OF OTHERS IF IT DID NOT APPEAR TO BE LEADING TO AN EARLY SETTLEMENT. IT WAS MADE CLEAR THAT SUCH A SETTLEMENT MUST BE IN ARGENTINA'S FAVOUR. EVEN THE ARGENTINE PRESS INTERPRETED THIS AS 'A VEILED THREAT'.

(B) THIS WAS FOLLOWED BY THE ILLEGAL ARGENTINE LANDING ON SOUTH GEORGIA (FOR AN ACCOUNT OF WHICH, INCLUDING HMG'S EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE MATTER BY DIPLOMATIC MEANS, SEE LORD CARRINGTON'S STATEMENT IN THE LORDS ON 30 MARCH - TEXT IN VS 029). AS THE THEN MINISTER OF STATE, MR LUCE, SAID IN THE COMMONS ON 23 MARCH IN ANSWER TO A QUESTION ON THE SAME INCIDENT: 'SINCE THEN (THE NEW YORK TALKS), I MUCH REGRET THAT SOME OF THE ACTION THAT HAS BEEN TAKEN HAS NOT CREATED A HELPFUL ATMOSPHERE. IN THAT CLIMATE I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT IT IS SENSIBLE TO DISCUSS MAKING FURTHER PROGRESS. IF WE WANT A PEACEFUL SOLUTION, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT WE SHOULD NOT PROCEED AGAINST A BACKGROUND OF THREATS AND PROVOCATIONS'.

3. YOU MAY ALSO FIND IT HELPFUL TO POINT OUT THAT NEGOTIATIONS ON THE DISPUTE WERE ALWAYS HELD ON THE FIRM UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY WERE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO EITHER SIDE'S SOVEREIGNTY POSITION.

PYM

SENT BY TELEGRAPH TO:

BONN
STRASBOURG (UKDEL)
STOCKHOLM
NEW YORK (UKMIS)

NEW YORK (BIS)
WASHINGTON
CARACAS
MEXICO CITY

BRASILIA
MONTEVIDEO
SANTIAGO

[ALL IMMEDIATE]

BRUSSELS
BRUSSELS (EEC)
BRUSSELS (NATO)
COPENHAGEN

THE HAGUE
PARIS
ROME
MADRID

MOSCOW
RIO DE JANEIRO(10)
BOGOTA
LIMA

OTTAWA
CANBERRA
WELLINGTON
NEW DELHI

[ALL PRIORITY]

ATHENS
LISBON
LUXEMBOURG
OSLO
REYKJAVIK
BERNE
GENEVA (UKMIS)

DUBLIN
HELSINKI
VIENNA
WARSAW
HAVANA
LA PAZ

PANAMA
QUITO
SAN JOSE
AMMAN
KUWAIT
DAKAR

[ROUTINE]