

Similarly, we welcomed the decision to reconvene the intergovernmental group of experts on natural resources shared by two or more states, thus giving UNEP continued involvement in the development of principles of environmental law related to this specific question.

In conclusion, I would like to take this opportunity to speak about the Environment Fund. At its fifth session, the Governing Council endorsed the intention of Dr. Tolba to seek voluntary contributions for the next five-year cycle (1978-1981) from as broad a base of contributions as possible. The adequate financing of UNEP is a responsibility for all countries and we urge all those countries in a position to do so, to contribute to the Environment Fund. Since its inception five years ago, Canada has given five million dollars to UNEP. I am happy to announce that, subject to Parliamentary approval, the Canadian government will contribute one million dollars in 1978. Our future contributions will be based on our assessment of UNEP's performance. While Canada has already registered our concerns about the ability of UNEP to achieve the rates of expenditure set out for the medium term, there can be no doubt of my country's commitment to UNEP. Its concerns are universal. We have accepted the necessity for international environmental cooperation and we believe in the basic nature of UNEP and have confidence in its potential to achieve that cooperation.

The institutional follow-up to HABITAT has been raised in this debate. We have noted the proposal of one of our distinguished colleagues which appears to re-submit for our consideration an idea which much of the membership of this assembly has already demonstrated it cannot support. We respect the sincerity of the proposal and of the conviction that a Nairobi/UNEP solution is objectively and intellectually the preferable course. We equally respect the sincerity of the proposals of many other states in line with their conviction that New York/ESA is the preferable course. We must reiterate, that it would seem to us to be an ineffective use of the little time we have available for the proponents of either extreme to propose again a resolution setting forward that extreme for our consideration unless there is demonstrable evidence that opposition to their point of view has been won over. A compromise solution such as the Nairobi/ESA proposal Sweden and Canada advanced at ECOSOC 63, in our view, is the only basis for consensus. Moreover, it is the only solution which realistically recognizes that human settlements questions are neither exclusively environmental nor exclusively developmental in nature. They are a mixture of both. One can no more separate human settlements from their economic and social framework than one can separate the man-made environment entirely from the natural environment. The Sweden-Canada proposal recognizes this. Moreover, without a compromise there will be no human settlements follow-up at all. We do not propose at this point to develop the matter further except to add that the Canadian delegation will be devoting its energies at this session, as at the last, to reaching a consensus decision on the follow-up to HABITAT.