

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**1978th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 3 November 1971,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement by the President regarding the health of the Secretary-General	1
Expression of sympathy in connexion with the recent cyclone in India	1
Agenda item 97: World Disarmament Conference	1

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

*Statement by the President regarding the health
of the Secretary-General*

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we turn to the agenda for this afternoon I should like to make a statement regarding Secretary-General U. Thant.

2. As members are aware, he was admitted to hospital yesterday afternoon for observation, after suddenly complaining of feeling extremely weak. I have been informed that he will not be with us for a few days. I am sure all representatives would want me to send on their behalf the following message of good wishes to the Secretary-General:

"Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

"On behalf of the General Assembly I should like to extend to you our warmest wishes for a full and speedy recovery."

*Expression of sympathy in connexion with the
recent cyclone in India*

3. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the members of the Assembly I should like to extend to the Government and people of India our sincere sympathy for the disaster caused by the recent cyclone and tidal wave which hit the northern part of the country a few days ago.

4. Mr. BANERGEE (India): Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation, the Government and people of India I should like to convey to you our most grateful thanks for and appreciation of your kind expression of sympathy concerning the most unfortunate calamity that has befallen my country. I shall convey your kind message of sympathy to the Government of India, and I am sure your words will be greatly appreciated and will be a source of comfort and strength to the suffering people of the affected area in India.

AGENDA ITEM 97

World Disarmament Conference

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to request representatives wishing to participate in the debate to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

6. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The twenty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly is starting consideration of the item regarding the convening of a world disarmament conference, which was included in the agenda of the session on the proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/8491]. In his statement in the general debate on 28 September, at the 1942nd meeting, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Comrade Gromyko, set out the main reasons which guided the Soviet Union in putting forward this proposal. In our statement today, the delegation of the USSR intends to spell out in greater detail the Soviet position concerning the specific objectives and tasks of the world disarmament conference, the membership of the conference, and the way in which it must be convened, as well as the role which must be played by the United Nations in such world-wide discussion on disarmament.

7. The Soviet Government has taken a new initiative in the field of disarmament, since it considers that the implementation of specific and effective measures to achieve disarmament and curb the arms race, which is exhausting humanity and is dangerous to peace, constitutes an important part of the common struggle of peoples and Governments of peace-loving States for the strengthening of peace and international security. The question of disarmament is the most important problem of international politics in the modern era. We cannot condone a situation in which the world becomes accustomed to the arms race as an inevitable, necessary and permanent evil. The attainment and consistent implementation of agreements on disarmament would not only make it possible to divert to constructive goals the enormous financial resources which are now being spent on the arms race and on preparations for war; they would at the same time contribute to reducing and eliminating the danger of a world-wide thermonuclear catastrophe, and would facilitate the limitation and termination of armed conflicts which are dangerous to the cause of peace.

8. Since the very beginning of the creation in Russia of the Soviet Republic, after the Great October Socialist Revolution, whose fifty-fourth anniversary we shall soon celebrate, the young socialist State has taken as a basis for its foreign policy the principles of peace, disarmament and co-operation between peoples. The great founder of the Soviet

State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, proclaimed: "Disarmament is the ideal of socialism".

9. The Soviet Union is constantly, firmly and unfailingly following that road. Recently, that policy was again confirmed in the programme of peace and international co-operation adopted by the twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Delivering the report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Congress, the General Secretary of the Party, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, declared that "The struggle for an end to the arms race, both in nuclear and conventional weapons, and for disarmament—all the way to general and complete disarmament—will continue to be one of the most important lines in the foreign-policy activity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet State."

10. The Soviet Union, in its relations with other countries and peoples, is guided by the fact that the intensification of the military threat can be slowed down and finally liquidated through the peaceful settlement of disputes which exacerbate relations between States, and through the development of such relations on the basis of strict adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. To eliminate the danger of the outbreak of war, it is very important that effective and widely supported agreement should be concluded to limit the arms race and achieve disarmament.

11. The movement to control the arms race has grown continuously and on an ever-increasing scale since the end of the Second World War. In the last decade, positive results were achieved, in the form of the conclusion of international agreements concerning various aspects of the arms race, and particularly nuclear weapons, which met with wide acceptance and approval. These are the partial test-ban Treaty,¹ the Treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons in outer space, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. Recently, the Soviet Union and the United States signed an agreement on measures to reduce the risk of nuclear warfare, and certain other agreements. We hope that the near future will see the conclusion of the first agreement on actual disarmament—a convention on the prohibition and destruction of bacteriological weapons, a draft of which has been prepared by the Committee on Disarmament and now awaits consideration and approval by the General Assembly. The importance of these treaties lies not only in the fact that they settle a number of specific problems arising in each case. In the wider international arena, these agreements are important also because they clearly and convincingly confirm the possibility of limiting the arms race, given goodwill and a desire on the part of States to move in this direction. In addition—and this has definite practical importance—the agreements already concluded contain specific provisions which can be used in the future for other treaties and conventions bearing on wider aspects of the problem of disarmament.

12. We take note of the positive role in the conclusion of these agreements played by the United Nations, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and other international organizations, which have provided a forum in recent years for the examination of disarmament questions. At the talks on disarmament now being held in various forums, certain new measures have been evolved which could be taken with a view to a further relaxation of the arms race and of international tension.

13. Generally speaking, however, it must be admitted that fundamental progress towards controlling the dangerous practice of stockpiling and improving armaments has yet to be made. To the great regret of all peoples, the world continues to live in conditions of a continuing and ever-accelerating arms race.

14. According to available data, which are now generally known from the recently published report of the Secretary-General, drafted by a special group of experts, on the consequences of the arms race,² annual military expenditure in the world increased from \$120,000 million in 1961 to over \$200,000 million in 1970. That represents between 6 and 6.5 per cent of the over-all world gross national product, which means that mankind, by devoting such enormous resources to destruction and annihilation, is in fact undermining the material basis for its own existence.

15. In the 10 years from 1960 to 1971 almost \$1.9 million million were spent for military purposes. Tens of millions of people are now diverted from peaceful constructive labour. In 1970, according to the same report, the world total of armed forces amounted to between 23 million and 24 million people; it should be added that about 50 million people are now working in the military sectors of the economies of all States—scientists, engineers and workers.

16. In this connexion, we must also stress the fact that the whirlpool of the arms race has also drawn in many developing countries for which every single unit of currency and national resources is as indispensable for their economic development as air is for a living organism. The developing countries' military expenditures, according to preliminary data, amounted to more than \$12,000 million in 1970. That amount of unproductive expenditure is much higher than the resources received annually by these countries in external governmental aid for development.

17. These are the horrific facts and figures of the continuing arms race. According to the experts, if the arms race continues, by the end of the present decade annual military expenditure in the world may reach the sum of \$300,000 million—in other words, it will increase by about \$100,000 million as compared with its present level. Military expenditure as a whole in this decade could reach the astronomical sum of \$2.5 million million—in other words, it would become an even greater burden than in the previous decade, and would continue to retard the solution of economic and social problems confronting the peoples of the world.

¹ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under water.

² *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.72.IX.16).

18. All this makes it urgently necessary for all States, irrespective of their size or level of development, to take joint and collective measures to put an end to the arms race, to reduce military expenditure and to take other measures leading to general and complete disarmament. The adoption of measures to put an end to the arms race and significantly reduce military expenditure would help to promote the social and economic development of all countries, to improve international relations and to strengthen peace and security.

19. In these conditions, in the opinion of the Soviet Government, the problem of disarmament assumes a completely new and even more urgent importance. It is therefore advisable and necessary to take new, supplementary international measures in order to activate and mobilize the efforts of all States, without exception, in order to settle disarmament problems as soon as possible. That is precisely what the many resolutions adopted at previous sessions of the General Assembly urge us to do.

20. What is the best and most effective way to reach this objective? Striving to find an answer to this question, the Soviet Government carefully analysed the status of the disarmament talks conducted within the United Nations, in the Committee on Disarmament and in other bodies, and came to the conclusion that it was desirable to bring greater urgency to the consideration of disarmament problems, and to this end to convene a world disarmament conference in which all States would participate.

21. In proposing the convening of such a conference, the Soviet Union took into account the fact that the idea of a conference in which all States of the world would participate, a conference specially devoted to disarmament problems, is extremely popular and is widely supported by the world community and by the Governments of a majority of States. As early as 1964, the Heads of State and Government of non-aligned countries at the Cairo Conference spoke most decisively in favour of the convening of such a conference. A year later, the twentieth session of the General Assembly adopted a special resolution in which it endorsed a proposal "on the convening of a world disarmament conference to which all countries would be invited" [*resolution 2030 (XX)*]. Unfortunately, because of the negative position of certain individual States, that resolution was not implemented.

22. The question of the need to convene a world disarmament conference is becoming even more acute and urgent at the present time. The idea of convening such a conference continues to enjoy the support of a large number of States. In September last year, the participants in the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in the capital of the Republic of Zambia, Lusaka, expressed in the Declaration on Disarmament the unanimous opinion that "it may be useful to convene a World Disarmament Conference at an appropriate time open for participation to all States".

23. In the view of the Soviet Union, the time has come for the General Assembly of the United Nations again to give most careful consideration to the question of the convening of a world disarmament conference and take the necessary

decisions to that end. That is the aim of the Soviet proposal.

24. The convening of such a conference and consideration by it of a wide range of problems relating to disarmament is designed to highlight the problem of disarmament in contemporary international life and to draw the attention of Governments and public opinion in all States of the world to this important problem, the solution of which will determine the well-being and perhaps the very existence of many countries and peoples, and perhaps the very existence of all mankind. The conference should provide an opportunity for exchanges of views and planning of practical ways of halting and reversing the arms race, and of immediately prohibiting and abolishing nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction, their production and their use. The conference would be a forum where all countries of the world would, on a footing of equality and without any exceptions or discrimination, jointly discuss the problems of disarmament in all their ramifications and search for feasible and generally acceptable means of solving those problems.

25. The success of such a conference will largely depend on strict respect for the principle of universality in determining its membership. All countries, without exception and on a basis of equality, should be represented at such a world-wide meeting devoted to one of the most important problems of our day, the problem of disarmament. It goes without saying that it is vitally important to ensure the participation in the conference of all States which possess significant armed forces and armaments.

26. At present the overwhelming majority of States members of the United Nations are striving to make the Organization a truly universal international association of States. Year after year, this just principle, which must be the foundation of the United Nations, comes nearer to full implementation. However, we must recognize that within this Organization the principle has so far not achieved full realization. The world disarmament conference must not suffer from this shortcoming. Disarmament concerns each and every one. For that reason, the conference should be convened outside the framework of the United Nations, so that all States can take part in it irrespective of whether they are, or are expected to be, Members of the United Nations at the time the conference is convened. When conditions have been created in which the doors of the United Nations are open to all States without exception, then the category of countries which to this day have been prevented from taking part in the activities of the United Nations will naturally disappear. But for the time being we must take account of realities, and for that reason we must raise and settle the question of participation in the disarmament conference in such a way as to exclude discrimination against anyone.

27. With regard to the programme of work of the world disarmament conference, we should like to note once again that such a conference could consider the whole range of disarmament problems relating both to conventional armaments and armed forces and to means of mass destruction. Since the increase in thermonuclear weapons is a matter of the greatest concern for the peoples of all States, primary attention could be devoted, if the majority of the partici-

pants in the conference should so desire, to the questions of prohibiting and eliminating nuclear weapons, whose existence threatens the life of millions upon millions of people and the fate of entire States and continents.

28. At this point we cannot fail to express satisfaction that, during the general debate at the present session of the General Assembly, many delegations touched upon the proposal for a world disarmament conference and pronounced themselves in favour of convening such a conference. We have seen positive reactions to the proposal on the part of the representatives of India, Iran, Poland, Austria, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Yugoslavia, Iraq, Mongolia, Afghanistan, Brazil and many others. This shows the timeliness of raising the question of the convening of a world disarmament conference and the need for all States and peoples to combine their efforts to implement this proposal.

29. However, we must draw attention to the fact that the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Rogers, referring to a world disarmament conference in his statement in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly [*1950th meeting*], expressed some scepticism concerning the convening of such a conference.

30. In this connexion we should like to explain that such a world disarmament conference could become the great and comprehensive representative international forum where the Governments of all countries, without exception, would have an opportunity of expressing their positions and their views and of putting forward ideas and proposals on all aspects of the disarmament problem. The work of such an important international forum would help States to identify and agree on the most urgent aspects of the problem of disarmament, and outline mutually acceptable and agreed practical ways and means of limiting and halting the arms race. At the same time, each State would have the opportunity to propound its views and its position both on partial disarmament measures and on the general and noble final objective in this field—general and complete disarmament. Such possibilities, offered by a world disarmament conference, could give useful impetus to talks on various specific aspects of this problem. We cannot but express regret at Mr. Rogers' statement. Let us hope that it was merely a purely preliminary view and that it will be reconsidered as a result of the discussion of this question at the present session of the General Assembly.

31. The usefulness of and the necessity for broad international consideration of all aspects of the problem of disarmament are not contested. That is proved by the historical experience of lengthy talks on this problem. Let us take as example such an important problem as the cessation of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. It should be remembered that the United Nations played an important positive role in solving the problem. It was in the United Nations that the delegation of India took the initiative as far back as 1954 of proposing measures to ban nuclear tests. All the subsequent discussions in the United Nations and in other international forums led to the beginning of concrete talks between the three nuclear Powers—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, which concluded the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear

Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water—a Treaty that was fully and unconditionally endorsed by the United Nations.

32. We are deeply convinced that the world disarmament conference proposed by the Soviet Union could be extremely useful in initiating large-scale and serious international discussion on disarmament. At the same time we wish to emphasize that the convening of such a conference should in no way detract from the importance of the forums and channels for disarmament negotiations which are being used at present, including the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. The recommendations and decisions of the world disarmament conference could become a new and effective incentive for continuing and activating such talks.

33. While holding this view, the Soviet Union takes into account the wide range of peculiarities, the complexity and the specific nature of individual aspects of the disarmament problem. In this connexion it is highly significant that the proposal to convene a world disarmament conference at which all disarmament problems could be fully debated, including nuclear disarmament, was put forward almost simultaneously with a proposal to convene a meeting of the five nuclear Powers—the USSR, the People's Republic of China, the United States of America, France and the United Kingdom. The complete prohibition and abolition of nuclear weapons will become possible only when all States which possess nuclear weapons agree on such a bold and important step. It is those States which bear a particular responsibility before mankind, and awareness of that responsibility must bring them to the negotiating table.

34. Preliminary indications which have emerged so far outside the framework of the United Nations have created the impression that not all the nuclear Powers are yet ready for such talks. Let us hope that this is a temporary phenomenon and not a final position.

35. A meeting of nuclear Powers could take decisions which would be in the interests of all peoples. This could make a big contribution to the success of a world disarmament conference. The proposals to call such a conference and to convene a meeting of the five nuclear Powers quite logically complement each other.

36. With regard to the co-ordination of the work of the world disarmament conference with that of other bodies active in this field, it could be borne in mind, for example, that draft treaties and agreements worked out in subsidiary organs—such as the Committee on Disarmament—would then be referred to the world disarmament conference for examination. The conference, having taken a decision of principle on a given matter, would then refer back to the Committee on Disarmament, which could work out the practical details and subsequently report to the conference.

37. The struggle for disarmament is not a transient short-term campaign, reflecting the demands of the current situation; the achievement of agreements limiting the arms race and leading to general and complete disarmament is a complex matter, requiring serious collective efforts on the part of all States and much time. In view of that actual situation and the particular importance of the problem of disarmament, the Soviet Union is of the view that the world

disarmament conference should probably be made a permanent international forum functioning over a period of time. We feel that the conference could be convened periodically to consider the state of affairs regarding the solution of disarmament problems. As the Soviet delegation has already proposed, sessions of the conference could be held once every two or three years.

38. In recent times, as is well known, the attention of all countries has been fixed on a number of important new problems, such as the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the use of sea-bed resources and the protection of the environment. Because of the universal significance of these problems, the United Nations, at sessions of the General Assembly and in its other organs, has carefully examined them and has decided to convene special international conferences for further detailed examination of these problems. At present, as is well known, work is being done to implement those decisions and to prepare for a number of such conferences—a conference on the law of the sea a United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. This year the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy was held successfully in Geneva. I doubt whether anyone would be bold enough to assert that the problem of limiting the arms race and achieving general and complete disarmament are of less importance and significance for the peoples of the world and for all mankind than, for example, the questions of the sea-bed and the environment, in connexion with which the General Assembly has already taken decisions and intends to convene special world conferences. The contrary would be closer to the truth. Quite correctly, many call disarmament the question of questions, meaning that progress in the field of disarmament will be crucial for the favourable solution of many other problems and, in fact, the main problem: in what direction will international events and international life develop? Towards the strengthening of universal peace and security for the peoples, or towards a growing threat of a world thermonuclear catastrophe? That is how history poses the question, and it is those considerations, in our opinion, which abundantly prove the need to convene a special international conference, with the participation of all States, to consider the problems of disarmament.

39. The Soviet delegation realizes that some time will be necessary to prepare and convene the first world disarmament conference since the end of the Second World War. The time will be needed for consultations between States and for all kinds of preparatory measures. In this connexion we have proposed that the General Assembly should request States to agree before the end of 1972 on a time for convening the conference and on its agenda. This proposal is contained in the draft resolution of the Soviet delegation on this item [A/L.631].

40. The Soviet Union is taking the initiative at this session of the General Assembly of proposing the convening of a world disarmament conference, following a thorough analysis by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the situation which has arisen in various talks on the curbing of the arms race and the problem of disarmament. The results achieved in this field have been carefully weighed and evaluated, and a long-term plan has been sketched for the specific tasks still to be accom-

plished. We feel that in the struggle to achieve one of the most noble and especially important objectives for mankind in the modern era—the objective of general and complete disarmament—the world disarmament conference can and must play an important positive role and be an important link in the chain of measures designed to protect human civilization from destructive and disastrous thermonuclear catastrophe.

41. Everybody remembers that before the Second World War attempts were made to hold world conferences on disarmament. But at that time, unfortunately for humanity, they did not produce constructive results, since in those years the world was dominated by forces which saw in war a means of attaining their selfish, expansionist and anti-popular goals. Now times have changed. The experience of the Second World War and subsequent armed conflicts has taught us much. Dozens of economically and militarily powerful States and peoples of all countries stand on the side of peace and disarmament. In such conditions, we are deeply convinced that a world disarmament conference can and must produce positive results reflecting the interests of all peoples and of all mankind.

42. The delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the instructions of the Soviet Government, urges all participants in the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly to approve the proposal to convene a world disarmament conference and thus make a useful contribution to the relaxation of the arms race and of international tension. The holding of such a conference will symbolize the portentous fact that the Governments of all States, deeply aware of their responsibility, will together attempt to solve the problem of disarmament, which is complex and vitally important for us all.

43. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Mexico, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

44. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation attaches very special importance to the item on the convening of a world disarmament conference. Accordingly we would wish that the debate on this item be held in conditions which can be the most favourable for a fruitful result.

45. We recall that in the past the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on a world disarmament conference: resolution 1011 (XI), which indirectly but very concretely referred to the possibility of convening such a conference, and resolution 2030 (XX), which was specifically intended to achieve that purpose.

46. Unfortunately the conditions then prevailing in the United Nations were certainly not the most propitious to realize that idea. Fortunately, today that situation has changed, and since on Monday, 25 October, the General Assembly adopted a resolution as a result of which we shall soon have among us the representatives of the People's Republic of China, we believe that today conditions are far more propitious for success than they were in the past.

47. My delegation was one of the 76 delegations which, if I am not mistaken, voted in favour of that draft resolution, and one of the basic reasons we so voted was that some

time ago we had reached the conclusion that the presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations was indispensable for the strengthening of international security, the consolidation of peace and, last but not least, quite the contrary indeed, for disarmament and nuclear disarmament.

48. That is why my delegation considers that, far from losing time, we would gain time—at least from the point of view of results—if the debate on this item were postponed until Monday of next week.

49. In the light of the telegram the Secretary-General has received from the competent authorities of the People's Republic of China, and in the light of the comments we have all been able to read in this morning's newspapers, it seems most likely that by next Saturday that country's delegation will be among us.

50. For all these reasons my delegation formally moves adjournment of the debate on this item until Monday of next week. I make this proposal under rule 76 of the rules of procedure, and I venture to hope that there will be no objection. If there is, in order not to waste time, I would ask the President to apply strictly the provisions of rule 76 in regard to the number of speakers for and against motions.

51. The PRESIDENT: According to rule 76 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly:

“During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule.”

52. Does any member wish to speak? If not, and if I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly adopts the motion.

It was so decided.

53. Mr. DIAZ-CASANUEVA (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to take up only one minute of the Assembly's attention to refer to a matter that has already been touched upon by my colleague, the Ambassador of Mexico.

54. The Ambassador of Mexico, quite rightly in the opinion of the delegation of Chile, has proposed adjournment of the debate on so important an item as the proposal of the Soviet Union until next Monday. I consider that the

proposal, which has been unanimously adopted, opens up the way for a calm and fruitful discussion of a question which radically affects not only the situation of the great Powers but also that of the developing countries.

55. My delegation considers that perhaps it would be possible for the Bureau to try so to arrange the schedule of meetings so that the Assembly would not be working at the same time as the main Committees, particularly the First Committee, which is dealing with an item closely connected with disarmament, so that delegations, particularly those which have small staffs, can concentrate on the work in this Assembly.

56. In this connexion, since the Ambassador of Mexico has referred to that memorable night when a historic event occurred, of such magnitude that we shall only be able to appreciate it in the future—that is to say, the recognition of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China and its participation in the work of the United Nations so as to strengthen the Organization—my delegation wishes to provide a basic clarification, aimed particularly at public opinion in the United States.

57. Because of propaganda which my delegation considers to be totally mistaken and at the same time harmful, the applause of some delegations which occurred on that memorable night has been the subject of false interpretations. Some magazines in particular have used photographs of parts of the General Assembly showing representatives applauding, smiling, waving their hands, expressing their happiness at the result of the vote. My delegation wishes to make the following perfectly clear: while it is true that the delegation of Chile applauded, it would be a deliberate misrepresentation to interpret the applause of the delegation of Chile as an offence to the delegation of the United States. At no time did we have in mind the delegation of the United States; at no time did we wish to offend it. We were not thinking of the United States delegation. Nor indeed were we thinking of the delegation of Albania. Just as we did not wish to offend the delegation of the United States, neither did we wish to award a distinction to the delegation of Albania.

58. The only thought we had in mind was the following: after so many years of discrimination and of injustice, the People's Republic of China is entering this forum with all its lawful rights to strengthen the Organization. And this historic event, of such magnitude and with such repercussions for all peoples, must bring profound happiness to all of us who believe in peace, friendship and the future of this Organization.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.