

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



FIRST COMMITTEE  
43rd meeting  
held on  
Monday, 26 November 1979  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 43RD MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35, 39 AND 42 TO 45 (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.1/34/PV.43  
27 November 1979

ENGLISH

79-74255

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 35, 39 AND 42 TO 45 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.34 entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: Study on the relationship between disarmament and development". The draft resolution has 23 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 40th meeting of the First Committee on 23 November. The financial implications of this resolution are set out in document A/C.1/34/L.46, and I now call upon the Secretary of the First Committee to read these financial implications.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): This is a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

"Under the terms of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.34, the General Assembly, recalling further its resolution 33/71 M of 14 December 1978, in which it took note of the organizational report of the Group of Governmental Experts appointed by the Secretary-General to assist him with a study on the relationship between disarmament and development, and its resolution 33/71 I of the same date in which it requested the Secretary-General to transmit to the said Group for its consideration the proposal to establish an international disarmament fund for development, would take note of the interim report of the Secretary-General with respect to the above-mentioned study and would request the Secretary-General to provide the resources and expertise necessary successfully to complete the study on the relationship between disarmament and development in accordance with paragraph 23 of that interim report.

"The Secretary-General reports to the General Assembly that the related appropriations for the preparation of the study on the relationship between disarmament and development have been included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981 as follows: (a) travel and daily subsistence allowances for

(Mr. Banerjee)

the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development to participate in six meetings; (b) travel and daily subsistence allowances for the staff members from the Centre for Disarmament, Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, to be detailed to Geneva when such meetings are held there; (c) the Expert Group, as indicated in paragraph 23 of the Secretary-General's report (A/34/534), is convinced that strong support from suitably qualified consultants would be indispensable for the successful execution of its mandate. A minimum of three such consultants, one for each of the main aspects of the investigation, would be required, at the P-4 level, during the period from January 1980 to September 1981 when the Group is to complete its final report; (d) to provide secretarial assistance to these consultants for the same period, namely for 20 months in the 1980-1981 biennium, one additional General Service post, at the G-3 level, would be required.

"Thus, should the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.34 be adopted, the additional requirements under section 2 (b), Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, would be in the neighbourhood of \$258,500."

The document containing these financial implications will be in the hands of delegations by tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution are Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The sponsors have asked that this draft resolution be adopted without a vote. As there is no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.34 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom): My delegation has joined in the consensus on this item, and was happy to do so because we regard the work of the United Nations

(Mr. Marshall, United Kingdom)

Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development as making a valuable contribution to the understanding of a very complex problem in the field of disarmament, and we look forward to the successful conclusion of the work of the Group.

My delegation also listened as carefully as we could to the reading of the statement of financial implications which has just been heard, and we noted in particular what was said in connexion with operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution before us, which refers to the recommendation in paragraph 23 of the interim report of the Group for the recruitment of additional staff. We note that provision, should it be necessary, is being made by the Secretariat. But we should just like to record at this stage that we hope that the financial implications will be further looked at with regard to the possible additional requirements outlined in paragraph 23 and examined very carefully before a decision is reached on the number of consultants and supporting staff which will be required to complete the study satisfactorily.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.34, the delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to make the following statement.

In participating in the group of Government experts on the study of the relationship between disarmament and development, we proceed from the possibility of establishing within the United Nations framework some machinery to finance the purposes of development through disarmament, but only in circumstances in which such financing would be conducted in relation to real decreases in the military budgets of States, and, in the first instance, of States permanent members of the Security Council. That is, we are in favour of allocating funds for purposes of development - and this we emphasize - but exclusively as a result of genuine measures to halt the arms race and to bring about disarmament. That is precisely the approach that can be seen in the Soviet Union's proposals on questions of disarmament and, in particular, in its proposal of 1973 on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries.

In our opinion, implementation of the resolution on that subject (resolution 3093 (XXVIII)) adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session would open up possibilities for the directing of further funds to purposes of development, including the development needs of developing countries.

The Soviet delegation proceeds from its understanding that this position - namely, a position opposed to the financing of purposes of development without any corresponding related decreases in military budgets - will be taken into account in the preparation of the final report of the group of experts on the study on the relationship between disarmament and development, as is indicated in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.34.

Precisely on that understanding, the Soviet delegation did not object to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.34 without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.34.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.37,

(The Chairman)

which relates to agenda item 42, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session", and is entitled "Programme of research and studies on disarmament". This draft resolution has 31 sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of France at the fortieth meeting of the First Committee, on 23 November. The sponsors are: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

I shall now put draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.37 to the vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.37 was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We wish to express our views in connexion with the draft resolution just adopted, which was introduced by the representative of France, concerning the establishment of a research institute of the United Nations to make studies in the field of disarmament.

It is our conviction that this proposal unfortunately reflects the trend towards an unjustified increase in the number of various types of studies and research on disarmament, to which we have already referred here in the First Committee, when we indicated our negative view on the conducting of a study on the problem of the cessation of nuclear-weapons tests.

We wish once again to emphasize that today the main task in the field of disarmament is the achievement of practical agreements that would contribute to the limitation of the arms race and the bringing about of disarmament. To achieve such concrete results it is necessary first of all to have the political will and resolve of States. We feel that if there is a desire to come to agreement, agreement can be reached. Therefore, when they are genuinely

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

necessary, studies can play a useful role, though an auxiliary one. That is why we consider it superfluous to establish an independent institute that would deal with new studies in the field of disarmament on a standing basis. It is easy to foresee that the principal result of the activities of such a scientific institution would be the compilation of numerous rather costly reports and studies. Being divorced from practical results in this field, such studies would only complicate discussions on disarmament and would add further discord to the large number of divergencies of view that already exist.

At the same time, in defining our attitude towards the draft resolution just voted upon, we have taken the following considerations into account.

First, that the proposed institute is to be set up not as an independent institution but only as one of the subdivisions of UNITAR. Secondly, that the activities of that institute, like those of the whole of UNITAR, would be financed on the basis of voluntary contributions. Thirdly, that the institute would be established on a temporary basis and - I would stress this - before the special session that is to take place in 1982.

Taking those considerations into account, our delegation found it possible not to object to a consensus on the establishment of the institute, but since a vote was taken on the draft resolution we found it necessary to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1, entitled "General and Complete Disarmament". This draft resolution has 10 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 42nd meeting of the First Committee on 26 November. The sponsors are as follows: Argentina, Australia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sweden and Uruguay.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLIES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1 gave proof of the greatest receptivity and flexibility in the course of the many informal talks which we held with other representatives and, more specifically, with the representatives of the two nuclear-weapon States parties to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. As a result, the original informal or draft text, which served as the basis for those talks, underwent a series of changes.

However, in the light of last-minute talks - and by that I refer to talks that took place at a working lunch - it would appear that in order to obtain the consensus which we are trying to achieve, some delegations - and more specifically one of the participants in the strategic arms limitation talks - feel that further changes should be made in the text.

During the few minutes that have elapsed since the meeting was called to order, I have been able to consult six of the sponsors of the draft resolution - seven with Mexico - but one sponsor is still to be consulted. I would consult that last sponsor through you, Mr. Chairman, in order to avoid having to ask for a recess. My question is a very simple one. I would ask the representative of Pakistan whether he would agree, together with the other original sponsors of A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1, to the deletion of the last line and half the penultimate line of operative paragraph 4 (a) - in other words, everything following the word "weapons".

The text of operative paragraph 4 (a) would then read as follows:

"The Treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT II) will enter into force at an early date in accordance with the provisions of its article XIX, in as much as it constitutes a vital element for

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

the continuation and progress of the negotiations between the two States possessing the most important arsenals of nuclear weapons;".

If the representative of Pakistan does not object, the Committee would then consider A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1 with that omission as revision 1, on the understanding that by so doing we would garner the agreement of at least the two participants in the strategic arms limitation talks.

Mr. RIAZ (Pakistan): My delegation agrees with the modification suggested by the representative of Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union has carefully studied the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1 on the question of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. In connexion with the forthcoming vote on this draft resolution, we should like to put forward a few views concerning the substance of the matter.

Our delegation is most grateful to the sponsors of the draft resolution, the delegations of Argentina, Australia, Egypt, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sweden, Uruguay and Ethiopia, for the initiative that they have displayed. The provisions contained in this draft, whereby the agreement reached by both parties to the SALT II agreement is welcomed, and the hope is expressed that the Treaty will enter into force at an early date inasmuch as it constitutes a vital element for the continuation of the negotiations between the two States, like other provisions, are bound to have our full support and approval. Nevertheless, in the draft resolution as submitted there are provisions with which our delegation cannot agree.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

For instance in operative paragraph 2 there is an assertion that the SALT II agreement permits considerable increments both quantitatively and qualitatively, in relation to the levels of the nuclear arsenals existing at present. In our opinion, and I should like to draw this view to the attention of all the members of the Committee, such an assertion undermines the significance of the SALT II agreement and is inaccurate in fact.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The point is that the agreement, on the contrary, provides for a significant reduction in armaments, both as to the entry of the agreement into force and the future of the course of operations. Provision is made for concrete, qualitative limitations in the strategic means. The treaty provides that as it comes into force each of the parties shall limit the launching installations of intercontinental rockets which are based on land, launching devices in respect of rockets from submarines, heavy bombers, and also air-ground ballistic rockets with a range of more than 600 kilometres and in which no more than 2,000 units are involved.

In other words, one of the most substantial merits of the new treaty resides in the fact that the range of limitations under SALT II is considerably greater than was the case in the previous temporary agreement of 1972 which related only to launching devices of intercontinental ballistic rockets and of ballistic rockets from submarines. Moreover, the SALT II treaty provides that during the course of its operation - in other words, before the end of 1985 - there should be a reduction - and I emphasize this point - in the sum total of 2,400 units. Thus, from 1 January 1981 each of the parties will undertake to reduce the number of strategic offensive weapons to a figure of 2,250 units. Thus, the new treaty provides not only for limitation but also for reduction of strategic offensive arms by 150 units. Therein lies one of the principal features of the new treaty which distinguishes it from the temporary agreement, which provided only for a freeze on strategic offensive arms - in other words, the maintenance of their levels without any change throughout the whole period of its effectiveness.

Another feature of the SALT II treaty is the substantial limitation of strategic offensive weapons provided with independently-targeted warheads. In other words, there is a qualitative limitation. Thus, each party agrees to 1,320 units, which would include the launching facilities of intercontinental ballistic rockets, of submarine-based ballistic rockets provided with individual MIRVs and of ballistic rockets of the ground-air type provided with such warheads, as well as heavy bombers carrying winged rockets with a range beyond 600 kilometres, and limitations of a qualitative

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

character. One would also include the mutual obligation concerning limitation on the number of warheads per rocket. In addition to that factor, the treaty also establishes that the armaments possessed by the parties over and above the quantities indicated here would be subject to dismantling or destruction - and I stress this point.

The treaty also provides for a number of limitations in respect of MIRVs. This has significant value in a qualitative sense in terms of the number of offensive weapons. Therefore, there is no foundation for paragraph 2 of the draft resolution because it underrates the significance of SALT II and in substance distorts its contents.

In providing an over-all appraisal of SALT II, I wish to refer to the joint Soviet-American communiqué dated 18 June 1978, set out in document A/34/414, in which in particular it is stated that the Soviet Union and the United States have set for themselves as a goal the adoption of special steps to limit the number of nuclear weapons, bearing in mind the ultimate liquidation of such weapons. It was also emphasized that the SALT II treaty and the Protocol to it were "a substantial contribution to the prevention of nuclear war and the deepening of détente" and would "thus serve the interests not only of the American and Soviet peoples, but the aspirations of mankind for peace."

In the light of what I have already said, the Soviet delegation requests that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 2. We intend to abstain on that paragraph. It may then be possible for us to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. GLAIEL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): I wish to draw attention to an error in the Arabic text. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative portion have been transposed. In other words, paragraph 2 should be paragraph 1.

Furthermore, the translation of operative paragraph 4 into Arabic when compared with the English text is not accurate. I shall submit to the Secretariat an accurate translation in the hope that the correct version will eventually appear.

The PRESIDENT: I hope that, as the representative of Mexico said, when the revised version of operative paragraph 4 appears the amendment will be included in the appropriate place.

The Soviet Union has asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 which reads:

"Notes that it has not been possible that the SALT II agreement go beyond certain limitations which, taken together, permit considerable increments both quantitatively and qualitatively, in relation to the levels of the nuclear arsenals existing at present".

Operative paragraph 2 will now be put to the vote.

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1 was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Mexico has asked that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1 now be adopted without a vote.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Since the Committee is now about to pronounce itself on the draft resolution as a whole, I would point out that the precise text will obviously depend on the announcement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union, namely, that once paragraph 2 had been approved his delegation would decide on its vote on the draft resolution as a whole. Would he be good enough to announce to us now, before the draft resolution as a whole is put to the vote, the conclusion to which his delegation has been led by the previous vote, because, as I indicated a few moments ago, the sponsors were prepared, in a final gesture of goodwill, understanding and flexibility, to delete the words "although it is an arms controls measure rather than a disarmament measure" from paragraph 4 (a), provided that the draft resolution would be adopted by a consensus including all delegations present.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to depart for a moment from the established rule, and to take this opportunity to thank the representative of Mexico, Mr. Garcia Robles, for his highly instructive and productive work in the preparation of this draft resolution.

As for the attitude of my delegation to the draft resolution as a whole, there is perhaps some sort of technical difficulty with the translation, because when I spoke I said that, while reserving its attitude towards operative paragraph 2, my delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: If I hear no objection I shall take it that it is the wish of the Committee that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1 be adopted without a vote?

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1 was adopted.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The delegation of the United States would not and did not block a consensus on this draft resolution. We ought to make the point clear, however, that the position of the United States in its acquiescence in the consensus is without prejudice to our domestic processes, which, as we have known since certain difficulties arose with the Treaty of Versailles some years ago, require Senate ratification before a treaty can enter into force. I am not apologizing for these processes - quite the contrary - but I ought to indicate that when we agree to a consensus on a document which calls for trusting that the treaty will enter into force at an early date we can only express that trust pursuant to our domestic processes.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.38 and Corr.1.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1, under agenda item 35, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Denuclearization of Africa", and "Nuclear capability of South Africa". This draft resolution has 24 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 39th meeting of the First Committee, on 21 November. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to give the financial implications.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the First Committee): This is a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General, submitted in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, on the financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.39.

Under the terms of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.39, the General Assembly would, inter alia, request:

"the Secretary-General with the assistance of appropriate experts to prepare a comprehensive report on South Africa's plan and capability in the nuclear field, and to submit the report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session."

The preparation of the requested report would require the holding of two meetings in 1980 of six experts with the possible participation of specialists from the International Atomic Agency. It is anticipated that the meetings would last two weeks each.

(Mr. Banerjee)

For co-ordination of experts' work, the Centre for Disarmament, Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, would expect to employ a consultant at the equivalent of the D-1 level for a total period of two months.

Conference servicing requirements would include: interpretation in three languages - namely, English, French and Russian - translation of in-session documentation, approximately 30 pages, and pre-session documentation, approximately 30 pages, in three languages, English, French and Russian, and post-session documentation, approximately 60 pages, into six languages.

Should the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.39 be adopted, additional expenditures based on the above-stated assumptions would have to be incurred in the following amounts. Conference servicing: interpretation, \$35,400; translation of pre-session documentation, \$6,700; translation of in-session documentation, \$6,700; and translation of post-session documentation, \$24,400; reproduction and distribution, \$2,000. Hence the total for conference servicing would be approximately \$75,200. The travel and daily subsistence allowance for six experts would amount to \$25,600; and the consultant fee to \$10,400. The grand total would come to \$111,200.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1 should now read as follows: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burundi, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of Cameroon, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire and Zambia.

I now call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

Ms. MURRAY (United States): The United States shares the deep concern of the international community at reports of the possibility of a nuclear explosion in the South Atlantic region. However, we must emphasize once again that there is no certainty that such an explosion in fact occurred; nor is there any indication, if there was a nuclear detonation, of which country may have been responsible for it.

The United States is continuing to investigate all available information on this matter and has also expressed its willingness to co-operate to the fullest possible extent with the Secretary-General's inquiry into the matter. In the meantime, the United States must make clear that our support for this draft resolution is based upon our concern at the possibility of nuclear proliferation and the fact that South Africa has so far failed to accept international safeguards on all its nuclear facilities and has not yet adhered to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been requested that draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1 be adopted without a vote. As I hear no objection, it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom): My delegation has just joined in the consensus on this draft resolution, since we share the common concern of the Committee about the report that South Africa may have detonated a nuclear device. At the same time, I should record the understanding of my delegation that the scope of this draft resolution, including the report contemplated in operative paragraph 4, applies to the report I have just mentioned - that is, to the specific question of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive technology.

Mr. de LA CORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation found it possible to associate itself with the consensus just reached on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1. In taking that position, we wished to demonstrate our concern over the prospect of South Africa's acquisition of nuclear arms and over the particularly destabilizing and dangerous effects which that acquisition would have.

Nevertheless, the French delegation understands that the report requested of the Secretary-General in the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee will relate to South Africa's plans and available means in the nuclear field, in so far as those plans and means are related to South Africa's acquisition of nuclear explosives. In our view, it is a question of the use of such technology and means for military purposes.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1 and the voting on draft resolutions for this afternoon.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I propose to close the list of speakers on items 122 and 126 tomorrow at noon so that we may have a better idea of the number of representatives who will be taking part in the debate on those items.

(The Chairman)

We have four draft resolutions before us that have financial implications, and I am not sure that the summary of those financial implications will be ready by tomorrow morning. For that reason I propose that our next meeting be held tomorrow afternoon, when we shall deal with draft resolutions A/C.1/34/L.9, L.3, L.35, L.30, L.33 and L.36. As I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

Finally, I wish to announce that Ireland has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.30.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.