

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

*Official Records**



FIFTH COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 2 November 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KUYAMA (Japan)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative
and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 114: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

OTHER MATTERS

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/38/SR.25
7 November 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 114: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES (continued) (A/38/32; A/C.5/38/31; A/C.5/38/L.6; A/C.5/38/CRP.1)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/38/3, chap. VI, sect. F)

1. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that, in the course of the Committee's discussion of item 114, members had put forward a number of amendments to the draft resolutions recommended by the Committee on Conferences in its report (A/38/32). At the request of the Chairman, he had co-ordinated informal consultations on those amendments with a view to reaching consensus on an agreed text of the resolutions to be adopted under the item. The various amendments were set out in document A/C.5/38/L.6, and Conference Room Paper No. 1 contained the amended text of the draft resolutions recommended by the Committee on Conferences.

2. It had been agreed to delete paragraph 3 of draft resolution A, since the existing mandate of the Committee on Conferences already clearly authorized it to take the action requested. There was consensus on draft resolution B and no changes to it had been proposed. Quite a few amendments had been proposed to draft resolution C, and, after considerable discussion, it had been concluded that it would be wiser to adopt a procedural resolution rather than to act hastily on the substance of the proposals. Accordingly, there was agreement to refer the various amendments and a summary of the discussion in the Fifth Committee to the Committee on Conferences for further consideration. He drew attention to a minor drafting change in the text of the proposed amendment to paragraph 4 of draft resolution D. In addition to the amendments to draft resolution E set out in document A/C.5/38/L.6, there had been agreement to delete the reference to "A, C and D" in the preambular paragraph. Draft resolution F was new, and he drew attention to a number of drafting changes in paragraph 1 (a). He expressed the hope that all the draft resolutions could be adopted by consensus.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A were set out in document A/C.5/38/31. If the Committee adopted the draft resolution, the Advisory Committee would proceed to consider in detail the Secretary-General's statement and report back to the Committee in due course.

4. Mr. RALLIS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community (EEC), said that the calendar of conferences referred to in draft resolution A provided that the regular sessions of ESCAP, ECA and ECLA in 1984 would be held away from their established headquarters. The 10 EEC States were not opposed to that arrangement, provided that it was formally endorsed by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, as required by section I, paragraph 4 (f), of General Assembly resolution 31/140. The Council, for its part, had approved in the summer the venues of the sessions of the three bodies in question. However, the delegations of the EEC countries that were members of the Council had at that time expressed their regret at the premature closure of the

(Mr. Rallis, Greece)

debate on that important question, and they had not supported specific provisions of the resolution adopted in order to underscore their concern that the Council should not merely rubber-stamp the decisions of the commissions. Since the approval of the General Assembly was still required and the relevant substantive committee, namely the Second Committee, had not yet considered the matter, it would be inappropriate for the Fifth Committee to take a decision at the current stage on to include in the programme budget appropriations related to the sessions in question. The position of the 10 EEC States did not in any way imply criticism of the countries which had offered to host the meetings of the regional commissions. However, at a time of budgetary stringency, the Fifth Committee must weigh carefully any proposal which had such considerable financial implications.

5. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) agreed with the preceding speaker that the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly should not merely rubber-stamp decisions by the regional commissions. General Assembly resolution 31/140 made it clear that exceptions to the rule that bodies should meet at their established headquarters was subject to the approval of both the Council and the Assembly. Obviously, the approval of the Assembly was still required. However, it was his understanding that the relevant section of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/38/3, chap. VI, sect. F) had been referred by the General Committee to the Fifth, not the Second, Committee.

6. The CHAIRMAN confirmed the understanding of the representative of Japan. In accordance with the decision of the General Committee, the section of the Council's report relating to the calendar of conferences was to be dealt with directly in the Fifth Committee.

7. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had serious objections to the calendar of conferences submitted by the Committee on Conferences. In drawing up the calendar, the Committee on Conferences should be guided by the decisions of the General Assembly with regard to the pattern of conferences, including the rule that bodies should meet at their established headquarters unless explicitly authorized to meet elsewhere by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. The draft calendar of conferences annexed to the Committee's report, which was dated 1 September 1983, had been drawn up before any decision had been taken to authorize the regional commissions to meet away from their headquarters. Moreover, the calendar of conferences included other meetings and conferences which, as at 1 September 1983, had not been approved by the General Assembly. Thus, the Committee on Conferences had clearly exceeded its powers.

8. The Secretary-General's statement of administrative and financial implications (A/C.5/35/31) was unprecedented. The General Assembly was being asked to consider the financial implications of a draft resolution recommended by the Committee on Conferences when it stood to reason that it should instead be considering the financial implications of the decisions of the Economic and Social Council regarding the venues of the annual sessions of three regional commissions. In that connection, his delegation endorsed the view put forward by the representative of Greece, and urged that the Committee should consider the matter thoroughly before taking any action.

/...

9. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his Government had formally offered to host the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women in 1985. His delegation intended to introduce a draft resolution on that subject in the Third Committee at either the current or the next session. Accordingly, he proposed that, in the draft calendar of conferences for 1985 annexed to the report of the Committee on Conferences (A/38/32, annex II), the venue of the World Conference should be given as either Nairobi or "to be determined", instead of Vienna.

10. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) said that he supported the views of the representative of Greece, which were not in conflict with the information that the Chairman had received from the General Committee. As a sovereign body, the Fifth Committee could refer the matter, if it deemed it necessary, to the appropriate committee for action.

11. The only action which the Committee on Conferences had taken had been to put together a calendar of conferences based on the information available to it at the time. At that juncture, the Economic and Social Council had taken a decision regarding the venues of the sessions of the three regional commissions. The Committee on Conferences had included that information in the calendar with a footnote to the effect that the venues were subject to the approval of the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session. In the view of his delegation, the matter should not have been taken up under the item on the pattern of conferences; it should have been raised under agenda item 12 since it concerned a recommendation of the Economic and Social Council.

12. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, said that the Committee on Conferences was not in a position to overrule decisions taken by intergovernmental bodies. It was not therefore reasonable to suggest that the Committee on Conferences had exceeded its responsibilities.

13. Mr. NKOUNKOU (Congo) said that there were precedents for the holding of meetings away from the headquarters of the bodies concerned. Perhaps a document listing such meetings could be circulated to the members of the Committee.

14. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the question at issue was whether the Fifth Committee approved the pattern of conferences, together with the departures from General Assembly resolution 31/140 which it contained. Draft resolution A, if adopted by the Committee, together with the statement of financial implications, would be transmitted to the plenary Assembly. There was no need to refer the matter to another committee.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that the item on the pattern of conferences had been allocated to the Fifth Committee and, as the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon had indicated, it was up to the Fifth Committee to take a decision. Unless delegations had specific proposals on the matter under consideration, namely the venues of the regular sessions of the three economic commissions, he would submit his own proposal for consideration.

16. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that his delegation reserved its right to comment at a later stage on any proposal which the Chairman might make.

17. The CHAIRMAN read out his own proposal for a draft decision:

"As recommended by the three commissions concerned and as approved by the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly approves the venues of the three commissions indicated in the report of the Committee on Conferences."

18. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the financial implications of the proposal should first be put to the vote.

19. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that, when the Fifth Committee was considering a draft decision on an item which was its specific concern, it acted in the same way as any other committee. The requirements of rule 153 of the rules of procedure had been met by the Secretary-General's statement of financial and administrative implications in document A/C.5/38/31. Once the Fifth Committee had taken a decision, the Advisory Committee would consider the financial implications.

20. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that, as he understood it, the Chairman's proposal was that the Committee should accept in principle the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Conferences but that a final decision should be deferred until the Advisory Committee had expressed its views. The Committee would accordingly have to take two separate decisions: the first on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Committee on Conferences and the second on the financial implications in document A/C.5/38/31. It could not take a single decision covering both issues.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would take a decision in principle at the current stage and that a final decision would be taken only after the Advisory Committee had had an opportunity to discuss the financial and administrative implications in detail.

22. Mr. RALLIS (Greece) inquired whether the Chairman's proposal came under item 114 or item 12.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that it affected both items but should be regarded as relating mainly to item 114.

24. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that his delegation maintained the position it had taken in the Economic and Social Council and therefore requested that the proposal should be put to the vote.

25. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) observed that General Assembly resolution 31/140, while providing for exceptions to the general rule that sessions should be held at the headquarters of the body concerned, stated that the host country should defray the additional costs of sessions held away from headquarters. Yet, document A/C.5/38/31 indicated that additional appropriations totalling approximately \$637,000 would be required if the changes in venue were

/...

(Mr. Keller, United States)

approved. His delegation questioned whether such additional expenditure represented a proper use of resources. His delegation therefore had serious doubts regarding the advisability of adopting the Chairman's proposal. It would, however, await with interest the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and the comments of the host Governments concerned, which might well be prepared to shoulder the additional costs.

26. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on his proposal.

27. The Committee adopted the Chairman's proposal by 65 votes to 18, with 14 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the Kenyan proposal to alter the venue of the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women.

29. It was so decided.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Fifth Committee wished to adopt the draft resolutions recommended by the Committee on Conferences (A/38/32, para. 4), as modified by the amendments submitted in document A/C.5/38/L.6.

31. It was so decided.

32. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation was not opposed to the convening of meetings away from headquarters duty stations, but felt that any additional costs should be borne by the host country concerned. With regard to the amendments in document A/C.5/38/L.6, his delegation regretted that the original version of draft resolution C had not been adopted, since it synthesized earlier General Assembly resolutions. His delegation also preferred the original wording of paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution E. Nevertheless, the draft resolutions, as amended, were generally satisfactory.

33. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of the amendments to the draft resolutions of the Committee on Conferences or the proposal made by the Kenyan delegation on the understanding that there would be no financial implications. Similarly, his delegation had not objected to the approval of the pattern of conferences for 1984 and 1985 on the understanding that the Committee on Conferences and the Secretariat would take account of the recent Fifth Committee decision on appropriations for the International Conference on Kampuchea. Items 186 and 191 of the draft calendar of conferences for 1984 and items 163 and 164 of the draft calendar for 1985 related to that Conference and its Ad Hoc Committee. The Committee on Conferences was not entitled to include those items before the General Assembly had taken a decision on the matter. It was his delegation's understanding that the Committee on Conferences would delete items 163 and 164 from the calendar of conferences for 1985. He trusted that that Committee would not, in future, include in the draft calendar any meetings for which a positive decision by the General Assembly was a prerequisite.

34. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had not objected to the Kenyan proposal to change the venue of the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women on the understanding that the Committee on Conferences would give the matter its full consideration, particularly with regard to additional costs.

35. Miss NIPATAKUSOL (Thailand) said that her delegation had voted in favour of changing the venues of the sessions of the regional commissions primarily because the facilities at ESCAP were not suitable. Normally her delegation would not endorse such a procedure in view of the additional costs which would be incurred.

36. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) said that his delegation regretted that the original version of draft resolution C of the Committee on Conferences had not been adopted. With regard to the change of venue for item 98 of the draft calendar of conferences for 1985, his delegation stressed that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 31/140 should apply, as in all such cases.

37. Mr. MOJTAMED (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had reservations concerning the venues for the ECWA session and the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, for reasons which he had already stated.

38. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said that his delegation had voted in favour of changing the venues of the sessions of the regional commissions, since it was clear that it would have been impossible to hold the fortieth session of ESCAP at its headquarters. By agreeing to the Kenyan proposal on the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, the Fifth Committee was not accepting any pre-conditions. Egypt regretted that draft resolution C of the Committee on Conferences had been amended.

39. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that his delegation had supported the Kenyan proposal on the understanding that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 31/140 would apply.

OTHER MATTERS

40. The CHAIRMAN said that he intended to invite the representative of Cuba to conclude the statement begun at the 24th meeting.

41. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada), speaking on a point of order, said that an unfortunate precedent would be established if the representative of Cuba was allowed to continue to deliver a statement which was totally unrelated to Fifth Committee matters. Accordingly, his delegation formally invoked the provisions of rule 113 of the rules of procedure and requested a recorded vote on the Chairman's ruling.

42. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), speaking on a point of order, said that the Chairman had ruled at the 24th meeting that the Cuban delegation might make a statement on a subject of current interest which was related to the work of the Committee. No delegation had opposed the ruling at that time. Consequently, the decision of the representative of Canada to invoke rule 113 of the rules of procedure gave rise to a new situation which might have adverse consequences for

/...

(Mr. Fontaine Ortiz, Cuba)

the work of the Committee. If the Committee decided to reverse the decision to permit him to speak during the current meeting, nothing would prevent it from following a similar course of action at any time in the future.

43. The CHAIRMAN said he was obliged to point out that, under the provisions of rule 113 of the rules of procedure, any appeal against a ruling made by the Chairman must be put to a vote immediately.

44. The meeting was suspended at 5.25 p.m. and resumed at 5.40 p.m.

45. At the request of the representative of Canada, a recorded vote was taken on his appeal against the ruling of the Chairman to permit the representative of Cuba to complete his statement.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Against: Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Chile, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates.

46. The Canadian appeal against the ruling of the Chairman to permit the representative of Cuba to complete his statement was rejected by 29 votes to 24, with 19 abstentions.

47. Mr. RALLIS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that the affirmative votes of those countries had been based solely on procedural considerations: the EEC countries were opposed to the introduction of extraneous issues into the work of the Committee; furthermore, the subject on which the representative of Cuba wished to speak was already being discussed elsewhere.

48. Mr. HOLM (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that those countries had voted in favour of the Canadian appeal because the subject of the statement which the representative of Cuba wished to make was not related to any agenda item under discussion by the Committee and because the Fifth Committee had a special obligation to uphold the principles of efficiency and optimum use of

/...

(Mr. Holm, Norway)

resources. Since the situation in Grenada was under discussion by the General Assembly in plenary meeting, he saw no need for the Fifth Committee to deal with the matter. However, the affirmative votes cast by the Nordic countries did not prejudice their position with regard to the situation in Grenada.

49. Mr. TRUSCOTT (Australia) said his delegation had voted in favour of the Canadian appeal because it believed that the Cuban statement was neither directly nor indirectly relevant to the work of the Committee. He shared the view that allowing statements of a political nature to be made in the Fifth Committee might open the way to wide-ranging political debates, which could only be detrimental to the Committee's discussion of financial questions.

50. Mr. ZIDOUEMBA (Upper Volta) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted against the Canadian appeal.

51. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Canadian appeal because the question of Grenada was under review by the General Assembly in plenary meeting and because that issue was not relevant to the items under discussion by the Fifth Committee.

52. Mr. JAGUARIBE (Brazil) said that his delegation's vote against the Canadian appeal had been made as an expression of support for the Chairman's original ruling.

53. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), continuing the statement which he had begun at the 24th meeting, said that at 5 p.m. on the afternoon in question, his Government had sent a note to the United States Government through the United States Interests in Section at Havana stating that the Governor-General of Grenada, acting without any legal authority and on the instruction of the United States Government, had called for the expulsion of all Cuban diplomatic personnel from Grenada within 24 hours. However, Cuban diplomatic personnel, with the exception of their families, had been instructed not to leave the island until all the other Cubans in Grenada, including prisoners, the dead and the wounded, had been evacuated. The Cuban Embassy in Grenada had been surrounded and cut off by United States troops and all persons were prevented from leaving or entering the Embassy compound. The Cuban Government held the United States fully accountable for any risk to the Cuban Embassy and Cuban diplomatic personnel in Grenada.

54. The Cuban Government had transmitted that information to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the British Government, whose Crown was represented by Sir Paul Scoon, and to the head of the Spanish Government and the President of Colombia, both of whom had been conducting negotiations with regard to the evacuation of Cubans and personnel from other countries from the island and who had stressed the need for contacts between the representatives of Cuba and the United States in Grenada to settle the matter.

55. A rationalization for the provocation of Cuba by the United States was contained in a cable from the FBI which stated that the United States diplomatic personnel accredited to a number of Central American and South American countries

/...

(Mr. Fontaine Ortiz, Cuba)

had been alerted to threats which, according to the Department of State, appeared to be emanating from Cuba. The United States Government considered those threats to be a matter of grave concern, according to the State Department spokesman, who, without providing further clarification, referred to recent anti-American terrorist acts which had taken place in Bolivia, Colombia, Puerto Rico and Venezuela.

56. On 29 October 1983, the Cuban Government had received, from the head of the United States Interests Section in Cuba at Havana, a memorandum stating that the United States had received reports that Cuba was planning to conduct terrorist acts against United States citizens residing abroad; while it was to be hoped that such reports were incorrect, the United States Government could not overlook the possibility that they might be true, and wished it to be known that it would not tolerate any terrorist acts committed against United States citizens or governmental or private installations abroad. Consequently, the memorandum continued, the Cuban Government would be held responsible for any terrorist acts which were the result of Cuban instigation; furthermore the United States Government would not hesitate to take appropriate action in the wake of any such acts.

57. On the same day, the Cuban Government had replied that the idea that Cuba had given instructions for the perpetration of terrorist activities against United States citizens abroad was a product of the United States Government's guilty conscience or simply one more crass lie from that Government. Any manifestations of solidarity which Cuba requested were always of a political nature. Acts of terrorism committed against United States citizens in other parts of the world might be a reaction on the part of millions of people throughout the world to the brutal and barbarous acts committed by the United States, but they could not be imputed to Cuba. Cuba had always maintained that innocent people should not be the target of reprisals.

58. The implicit threat to Cuba contained in the United States memorandum did not intimidate Cuba in the least; if the United States undertook any aggression against Cuba, it would have to contend with the entire Cuban people.

59. Since the United States Government considered that it had the right to make such provoking statements public, the Cuban Government also believed that it should make public the exchange of notes to which he had just referred. Moreover, it had been announced that very morning that a United States naval force headed by the aircraft carrier "America" was making its way towards the Cuban coast in order to carry out military manoeuvres. That constituted a clear violation of General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus which prohibited the conducting of military manoeuvres in conflict zones. Such action could only be intended to set the scene for a possible confrontation with Cuba, and he called on all delegations to take every possible step to halt United States activities in the Caribbean, and particularly near the Cuban coast. He concluded by quoting the words of General Maceo to the effect that anyone who attempted to take over Cuba must eat the dust of its blood-soaked soil if he did not first die in the attempt.

60. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said he wished to correct an inaccuracy in the statement made by the representative of Cuba. Since the independence of Grenada, the United Kingdom had ceased to exercise any responsibility for the internal affairs of that country. Sir Paul Scoon was the Governor-General of Grenada, and any questions with regard to his constitutional position, powers or authority were matters for him and his advisers and constituted part of the internal affairs of that country. Sir Paul was the representative of the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in Grenada; the Government of the United Kingdom was represented by a diplomatic mission to the Governor-General, just as the Cuban Ambassador in Grenada was accredited to the Governor-General. He wished to add that, since the matters raised by the Cuban representative were under discussion elsewhere, it was not appropriate to discuss them in the Fifth Committee.

61. Mr. KELLER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he had thought that the Fifth Committee enjoyed a special standing in the General Assembly as a serious body that rarely strayed from the agenda items before it. However, much time had been wasted during both the previous meeting and the current meeting owing to a procedural wrangle and a diatribe that had no bearing on any item on the Committee's agenda.

62. With regard to the comments made by the representative of Cuba, it was noteworthy that he had attacked United States actions in Grenada, when Cuba systematically sought to subvert every free country in the Caribbean as well as countries in which it had no interest but acted only as a hireling. It was surely a shock for Cuba to see that neighbouring countries rejected Cuban machinations and that they were capable of uniting to do so. In that connection, he read out a statement made on 25 October 1983 by the Prime Minister of Jamaica, which stressed that, when necessary, democracy must be defended by force.

63. He wished to provide the most current information with regard to the repatriation of Cuban nationals. As of that very afternoon, the Caribbean peace force on Grenada had evacuated 57 wounded Cuban personnel and 10 Cuban medical personnel. They had left Grenada at 1.15 p.m. local time for Bridgetown, Barbados, and would travel onward to Havana, where they were scheduled to arrive at 5.15 p.m., local time. Representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross had arrived in Grenada during the previous week to begin the repatriation process in accordance with the Geneva Convention.

64. The Caribbean peace force had established security defences near the premises of the Cuban Embassy in Grenada as part of the general efforts to maintain security on the island and because many of the Cubans currently in the Embassy compound were not diplomatic personnel and might be hostile to the restoration of democracy in Grenada.

65. It should be recalled that the peace force was a collective force made up of personnel from Jamaica, Barbados, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines as well as from the United States. Upon landing in Grenada, members of the force had encountered fierce resistance from "airport construction workers", who had been heavily armed with a broad range of weapons.

(Mr. Keller, United States)

Cuban forces had been deployed at the airport, the medical school, the Governor-General's house and other strategic points throughout the island. The Governor-General himself had been rescued by United States troops and escorted to safety through Cuban fire. Over 300 well-equipped Cuban troops had been captured and had been accorded the protections guaranteed under the Geneva Convention. They would be returned to Cuba as soon as arrangements could be made. The United States Government was in frequent contact with the Cuban Government through both direct and indirect means. He concluded by noting that he had a significant amount of additional information which he could make known to the Committee but which he would withhold out of consideration for his colleagues.

66. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the additional documentation in the possession of the representative of the United States was undoubtedly filled with lies similar to the ones he had just presented to the Committee. His delegation had expected just such a response from the United States, which did not want the international community to be aware of the serious situation in Grenada. Only international public opinion and the joint action of peace-loving peoples could stop a world conflagration. His delegation wished to denounce the manoeuvres of the United States during the present meeting so that the international community might take prompt action; to delay even one more day would be dangerous.

67. Killing soldiers was within the rules of war; killing workers, medical personnel and teachers was equivalent to murder, and was in keeping with other actions of the fascist clique that governed the United States. However, the United States would not prevent Cuba from sleeping peacefully; even if it could defeat Cuba militarily, it would require the biggest massacre in history to do so. The representative of the United States had referred to the weapons ostensibly in the hands of the Cubans in Grenada. If only they had had such weapons, the United States troops might not have exercised their might against defenceless workers.

68. With regard to the evacuation of prisoners and the wounded from Grenada, his delegation wanted those activities extended to all prisoners, wounded and medical personnel on the island.

69. Concerning the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, he wished to point out that he had in fact referred to Sir Paul Scoon as the representative of the British Crown.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that before adjourning the meeting he felt duty-bound to repeat an appeal which he had made earlier, at the 2nd meeting. The Fifth Committee dealt with administrative and budgetary matters and should consequently refrain from engaging in political debate. He trusted that all delegations would co-operate in that regard, and he hoped that what had taken place during the present meeting would be an exception to the orderly conduct of Committee affairs.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.