



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VERCELES (Philippines)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 69: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(h) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)

(j) ENVIRONMENT (continued)

(k) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 71: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

(c) UNIFIED APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS AND PLANNING (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 70: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

* 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 A-3530, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/36/569; A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.2, L.8, L.29, L.30)

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.2

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bangladesh, the Gambia, Indonesia and Mali had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.2. In the first line of operative paragraph 2, the word "appropriate" should be replaced by "relevant".
2. Mr. KHARMA (Lebanon) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution but proposed the insertion, after operative paragraph 4, of the following new paragraph:

"5. Requests further that the determination and execution of projects of assistance to the Palestinian people in the Arab host countries should be conducted in agreement with the Governments of the countries concerned".
3. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that he could not express any opinion on the amendment which had just been submitted, since he would have to consult with the other sponsors of the draft resolution.
4. Mr. ABU KOASH (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that he did not consider the Lebanese amendment appropriate. In his view, the problems impeding the execution of projects of assistance to the Palestinian people did not involve the Arab host countries, but the Israeli occupation authorities. The Lebanese delegation had already stated its reservations regarding the wording of the draft resolution in the Arab Group. He believed that the draft resolution should be adopted in its present version.
5. Mr. KHARMA (Lebanon) pointed out that his amendment referred specifically to assistance to the Palestinian people, which made it perfectly appropriate.
6. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev 2 should be postponed to give the sponsors time for consultations.
7. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.8 and A/C.2/36/L.29

8. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that, in view of the informal consultations which had resulted in the submission of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.29, the sponsors were withdrawing draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.8. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.29 without a vote.
9. It was so decided.

/...

10. Mr. FREYBERG (Poland), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, reiterated the reservations previously expressed with regard to the Manila Declaration of the 1980 World Tourism Conference.

Draft decision A/C.2/36/L.30

11. Mr. MULLER (Secretary of the Committee) said the Secretary of the Fifth Committee had informed him that there were some details of the draft decision which were still to be considered by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

12. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of the draft decision should be postponed.

13. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 69: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/36/L.12/Rev.1, L.16, L.17, L.22, L.24, L.31/Rev.1, L.34, L.35, L.40, L.41, L.45, L.51)

(h) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)

(j) ENVIRONMENT (continued)

(k) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued)

14. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to extend the deadline for the submission of proposals under item 69 until Monday, 16 November, at 6 p.m.

15. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.12/Rev.1

16. Mr. DHARAT (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) introduced the revised draft resolution and drew attention to the changes made in the original version. In operative paragraph 3, the words "and the presence of other remnants of war" had been added. In paragraph 4, the phrase "particularly those responsible for the presence of remnants of war in developing countries" and the words "and effective" had been inserted. In paragraph 5, the phrases inserted were "and to collate all relevant information received from States" and "including the possibility of convening a conference under the auspices of the United Nations".

17. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.12/Rev.1, in keeping with the position it had stated at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 35/71.

/...

18. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mauritania had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

19. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

20. Mr. FORNARI (Italy) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.12/Rev.1 because it was open to the same reservations as the similar draft resolution submitted at the thirty-fifth session. The Government of Italy was concerned about the problem of the removal of remnants of war but believed that the matters referred to in the draft resolution should be dealt with bilaterally. Moreover, there was no legal basis whatsoever for the notion of the responsibility of certain States in that respect.

21. Mr. ZIMMERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, although his Government fully appreciated the humanitarian aspects of the resolution, he had abstained from voting because the problem should be dealt with bilaterally. The acceptance of an obligation under international law with respect to the removal of remnants of war was out of the question, and convening a conference under the auspices of the United Nations for solving the problem was not the kind of action that could lead to a solution.

22. Miss EVANS (United Kingdom) said that her delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.12/Rev.1, as it had done in the case of previous resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme. In its view, such problems were better dealt with bilaterally. It should be mentioned, however, that the United Kingdom would continue to give sympathetic consideration to those problems, including the supply of maps, plans and technical assistance. But the United Kingdom did not accept the existence under international law of any obligation to provide assistance in the removal of remnants of war.

23. Mr. RAKOTONAIVO (Madagascar) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted for draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.12/Rev.1.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.16 and A/C.2/36/L.34

24. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that, in view of the informal consultations which had resulted in the submission of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.34, the sponsors were withdrawing draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.16. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.34 without a vote.

25. It was so decided.

/...

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.17 and L.40

26. The CHAIRMAN said that, following the informal consultations which had resulted in the submission of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.40, it was his understanding that the sponsors were withdrawing draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.17.

27. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.40, but asked the Committee to consider the possibility of adding the words "through the Economic and Social Council" at the end of paragraph 3. That was in keeping with customary procedures in the United Nations and strengthened the role of the Council.

28. Mr. MONSHEMVULA (Zaire) accepted the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.17.

29. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.40, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.22 and L.51

30. The CHAIRMAN said that, following the informal consultations which had led to the submission of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.51, it was his understanding that draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.22, co-sponsored by the United States, was withdrawn. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.51 without a vote.

31. It was so agreed.

32. Mr. BLAIN (Gambia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, expressed his thanks for the adoption of the draft resolution.

33. Mr. FREYBERG (Poland), speaking on behalf of his own delegation and the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that those delegations joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.51 in accordance with their position of principle of supporting the efforts of the developing countries to combat desertification. He reiterated the statement made on behalf of those delegations when the draft resolution on the same subject had been adopted at the thirty-fifth session.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.24

34. The CHAIRMAN stated that the following countries were co-sponsoring the draft resolution: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Mali, Mongolia, Niger and Zaire. As other delegations wished to join the consensus, he suggested that consideration of the draft should be postponed.

35. It was so agreed.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.31/Rev.1

36. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the following countries had become co-sponsors of the draft resolution: Angola, Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan and Viet Nam. Cape Verde should be withdrawn from the list of sponsors.

37. Mr. LUFTI (Jordan) suggested that the words "with satisfaction" should be deleted in paragraph 1 because a good part of the report contained data supplied by Israel which were inconsistent with the conclusions of the Group of Experts on the Social and Economic Impact of the Israeli Occupation on the Living Conditions of the Palestinian People in the Occupied Arab Territories (A/35/533, annex I).

38. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections from the sponsors, he would take it that they accepted the amendment proposed by Jordan.

39. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union had always supported the rightful claims of the Palestinian people and had condemned the hostile acts committed against that people and Israel's occupation of the Arab territories. It was deplorable that tension was growing in the area owing to the increased aggressiveness of Israel which was supported by the imperialists, as proved by the recent measures of strategic co-operation between Israel and the United States. The Soviet Union was in favour of a just and comprehensive solution of the Middle East conflict. In his statement of 27 October in Moscow, the General Secretary of the Communist Party had said that the Soviet Union was prepared to co-operate with all those who upheld the ideals of justice and desired a lasting peace in the Middle East. That desire was specifically expressed in the proposal for convening an international conference on the Middle East, submitted at the Twenty-Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a proposal which had elicited the support of the Arab countries because it was a constructive measure which would contribute towards finding a peaceful solution through the collective efforts of all the parties and would benefit them all. The participants in that conference would be the Arab countries which had common frontiers with Israel, Israel itself and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

40. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.31/Rev.1 and hoped that the Secretary-General would continue to pursue the matter, using existing resources for the purpose, and would submit a comprehensive and analytical report on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session.

41. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that, while Israel had nothing against allowing United Nations experts to examine its record in the administered territories, since an open society existed there as also in Israel, it did object to the political substance of the one-sided resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and

/...

(Mr. Hillel, Israel)

Social Council mentioned in draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.31/Rev.1, because they presupposed consultations and co-operation with the so-called PLO, the sole aim of which was to destroy the State of Israel. The resolutions were allegedly designed to improve the living conditions of the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District, but they ignored many beneficial developments and productive activities carried out there by the Israeli authorities.

42. In the administered territories, Israel had promoted commerce, industry, agricultural and other branches of economic life and, at the same time, had refrained from disturbing the infrastructure of the existing economy. Moreover, under international law Israel was obliged to guarantee the security of those territories and the safety of their inhabitants, and Israel's administration policy was in accordance with those requirements and had even gone further in promoting the economic and social development of the population. Israel was also doing its best to co-operate with United Nations bodies the aim of which was to assist and to improve the living conditions of the inhabitants of the territories administered by Israel and, in recent years, the Israeli authorities had co-operated with the United Nations Development Programme and specialized agencies, including the World Health Organization and the International Labour Organization.

43. The draft resolution under consideration was, however, even more extreme and negative than the 1980 resolution and included false allegations with no foundation in reality, in spite of the fact that, as indicated in the full and comprehensive report in document A/36/260/Add.1, substantial progress had been made in improving the living conditions of the Palestinian Arabs in the administered territories.

44. The sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee had decided on a negative approach and did not ask the Secretary-General to submit a report on the progress with regard to the living conditions of the Palestinians but rather on their deterioration, knowing full well that the draft would be accepted by an automatic majority whatever was inserted in it. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

45. The statement by the representative of the Soviet Union came as no surprise. For a quarter of a century the USSR had been trying to destabilize the Middle East and it was no coincidence that it was actively collaborating with a terrorist organization whose aim was the destruction of the State of Israel. Furthermore, the lengthy record of Soviet aggression, starting after the Second World War in the countries of Eastern Europe, had recently culminated in the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan.

46. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq) said that his delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.31/Rev.1. The Zionist and colonialist entity which spoke of international law was the same entity that repeatedly and constantly violated such law. That entity spoke of infrastructure; yet what it had done to the infrastructure of Palestine and the Palestinian people was clear: houses had been blown up and individuals had been forcibly expelled from Palestine. The Zionist entity spoke too of the improvement in the living conditions of the inhabitants of Palestine; it seemed, however, that it was seeking such improvement by forcing the inhabitants to leave Palestine. In that connexion,

/...

(Mr. Ziada, Iraq)

Mr. Begin himself had acknowledged in his memoirs that pregnant women and Palestinian children had been killed as a way of terrifying the survivors and getting them to abandon their land. All the Zionist entity had done had been to commit acts of genocide against the Palestinian people.

47. Mr. LUFTI (Jordan) said that the Secretary-General's report (A/35/533), which contained the report of the Group of Experts on the Social and Economic Impact of the Israeli Occupation on the Living Conditions of the Palestinian People in the Occupied Arab Territories, clearly showed what the situation was in those territories. The Group, consisting of one expert from Ghana, one from Mexico and another from the United Nations, had been denied entry into the open society that Israel supposedly was.

48. Even so, much of the information gathered by the Group of Experts came from official Israeli sources, although the report did not contain statistical data on the Palestinians living in Jerusalem; at the time of the preparation of the report, Israel had already annexed East Jerusalem. According to the report, there was no human settlements policy for Palestinians in the occupied territories and very little planning had been devoted to the resettlement of the refugees in the West Bank, who constituted 46 per cent of the population. The infrastructure of the occupied territories had deteriorated since 1967 and, as far as health was concerned, preventive activities and health checks for school children and workers remained weak or non-existent, as indicated in the report of the WHO mission that had visited the occupied territories in 1980.

49. Direct exports of products from the occupied territories was not allowed. Such exports had to be channelled through Israeli trade organizations. With respect to land, it was estimated, according to the report, that by September 1979 the occupying authorities had taken possession of approximately 1.5 million dunums in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, equivalent to approximately 25 per cent of the total area. It was currently estimated that 44 per cent of the total area had been confiscated by Israel. A comparison of water consumption levels in respect of agriculture gave some indication of the enormous difference between water consumption levels in Israel and the West Bank: the West Bank consumed only 0.6 per cent of the water consumed by Israel for agricultural purposes. With respect to the per capita domestic consumption of water, the figure for the West Bank represented only 16 per cent of the figure for Israel.

50. The Israeli occupying authorities were applying restrictive measures against Arab agricultural produce that competed with Israeli produce. With regard to employment, Palestinian workers occupied the lowest rungs of the employment ladder. As far as housing was concerned, since the beginning of the occupation the Israeli authorities had destroyed approximately 19,000 houses to make way for Israeli settlements. That had aggravated the housing problem in the occupied territories. It was clear that those facts completely refuted the data supplied by Israel that appeared in the Secretary-General's report (A/36/260/Add.1). His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.31/Rev.1.

/...

51. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.31/Rev.1.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Central African Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

52. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.31/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by 98 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions.

53. Mr. SHIBUYA (Japan) said that his Government, which felt deep sympathy for the plight of the Palestinian people, had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because the substance of some operative paragraphs was not appropriate for consideration by the Second Committee under item 69.

54. Mr. BRECHER (United States of America) said that for more than three decades his Government had constantly demonstrated its concern about the living conditions of the Palestinian people. For example, in 1981 it had contributed some \$62 million to UNRWA, which represented one third of the total contributions made by Governments of the Agency.

55. Despite that concern, his Government could not support the use of political rhetoric in the consideration of humanitarian questions. It rejected the unjustified and irrelevant criticisms made by some delegations, such as the

(Mr. Brecher, United States)

Soviet delegation, and believed that the draft resolution was unbalanced in its attacks against Israel. His Government maintained its frequently stated position that the Palestine Liberation Organization should not be recognized as the representative of the Palestinian people.

56. Miss EVANS (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community, said that the position of those States regarding the question dealt with in the draft resolution was the same as in 1980. They took the view that Israel should withdraw from the territories occupied since 1967 and believed that the occupation inevitably had an impact on the region's economic and social development. They also reiterated their appeal to Israel to end the proliferation and expansion of settlements in the occupied territories.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.35

57. Mr. DJABOUTOUBOUTOU (Benin), introducing the draft resolution entitled "Expansion of the conference facilities of the Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa", said that the sponsors had been joined by the following: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Swaziland and Togo. The Executive Secretary of ECA, in his statement to the Second Committee, had said that the existing conference premises and facilities were inadequate to meet the ever-growing needs of the Commission, whose importance to the development of Africa was obvious. The draft resolution before the Committee sought to remedy that situation. In view of the urgency of the matter, the sponsors hoped that the draft would be supported by the Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.45

58. Mr. HANSPAL (India) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.45 and announced that Senegal, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka were to be added to the list of sponsors. Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution referred to the session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, to mark the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. At that session, the Governing Council would have to take action on the Environmental Perspective document, for the preparation of which decision 9.3 of the Governing Council (A/36/25) envisaged either the establishment of an independent commission of eminent persons or an appropriate intergovernmental process. The possibility of combining both options or, in other words, of creating the commission and at the same time setting an intergovernmental process in motion, and establishing an appropriate link between the two methods, was also being studied. His delegation regarded such a link as very important and hoped that the intergovernmental process would have a universal character.

59. Paragraph 9 of the draft resolution called upon the United Nations Environment Programme to play an active role in the implementation of the Nairobi Programme

(Mr. Hanspal, India)

of Action for the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy. As his country's Prime Minister had pointed out at Nairobi, the energy problem was part of a wider concern for the environment and, while research and experience had indicated that new sources of energy created less environmental pollution than conventional ones, all countries had to remain on their guard.

60. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution dealt with the interrelationships between resources, environment, people and development; specific provision had been made in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade for work on that subject. In view of the importance assigned to the question in the Strategy and of the earlier decisions of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Governing Council of UNEP, it was to be hoped that adequate resources would be made available as soon as possible to enable the programme of work on those interrelationships to be effectively implemented.

61. Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution referred to the development of the System-wide Medium-term Environment Programme. He commended the conceptual base already agreed on for the Programme and looked forward to the consideration by the United Nations system of detailed substantive activities which would give that Programme specific content. In that context, the annual reports on environmental matters submitted by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination to the Governing Council of UNEP had proved to be a very useful instrument in framing the Medium-Term Programme and should be continued.

62. Paragraph 7 of the draft resolution stressed the need for additional resources to be made available so that the Fund of the Environment Programme might assist in solving the most serious environmental problems facing developing countries, such as land degradation and deforestation. The International Development Strategy singled out the problems of deforestation, soil erosion and desertification as needing special attention if the very basis of economic development was to be sustained and ecological disaster averted. He was therefore glad that the UNEP Governing Council, in its decision 9/24, had stressed the need for additional resources to be made available and requested the Executive Director to continue his consultations with Governments on arrangements for raising those funds.

63. Paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of the draft resolution also referred to the Fund of the Environment Programme, their wording being based on that used in paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of resolution 1981/73 of the Economic and Social Council. His delegation and those of other members of the Governing Council of UNEP had wished to see a higher contributions target than that ultimately adopted but had accepted the consensus of the Governing Council in a spirit of accommodation and co-operation. The same spirit had guided the negotiation of the wording of the paragraphs of resolution 1981/73 of the Economic and Social Council he had mentioned.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 71: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (A/C.2/36/L.20) (continued):

(c) UNIFIED APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS AND PLANNING (continued)

Draft decision A/C.2/36/L.20

64. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to approve draft decision A/C.2/36/L.20 without a vote.

65. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 70: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/36/3/Add.12 and Corr.1 and Part II and Add.29; A/36/101 and Corr.1 and Add.1; A/36/478 and Corr.1; E/1981/48, E/1981/61)

66. Mr. FREYBERG (Poland) said that the United Nations Development Programme was the most important instrument of multilateral technical co-operation and should continue its role as the central funding source, as well as a chief co-ordinating body, for that co-operation within the United Nations system. The effectiveness of all operational activities depended on the sound management of the Programme, and in that context he had been pleased to note the dynamism with which the Programme was being managed. One of the most important questions to be solved by the administration of UNDP was how to find the right balance between centralization and decentralization in the management of its machinery. In his delegation's opinion, a solution to that problem lay in the country programming approach, which safeguarded the sovereignty of the countries concerned and synchronized the assistance granted to them with their development objectives, while retaining UNDP's co-ordinating authority over the rational spending of the funds at its disposal.

67. Country programming required continuous planning and was strongly dependent on the stable growth of resources. For that reason, the fall in UNDP's share of global technical co-operation funding to less than 60 per cent in 1980 was a matter for concern. His delegation had often warned against the proliferation of special funds and the resulting dispersion of resources. The results currently being witnessed were contrary to the concept, supported by the General Assembly, of a central funding body for technical co-operation; it was therefore necessary for all existing funds to be administered by UNDP and for activities under those funds to be integrated within country and intercountry programming while retaining each fund's specialization in a certain field of activity.

68. In view of the seriousness of the financial situation of UNDP, the administrations of UNDP and of the executing agencies should reduce administrative and support costs and spare no efforts to utilize the contributions made in national currencies, thereby diversifying their sources of funds. As far as his country was concerned, the permanent shortage of its currency in the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund and the World Health Organization seemed to be the best

(Mr. Freyberg, Poland)

proof that contributions in national currencies could in fact be used, if the sincere wish to do that existed.

69. Training the national personnel of developing countries was a fundamental factor in strengthening their economic independence, and the training component should therefore be taken into consideration in the drafting of all programmes of technical co-operation. That concern had motivated his country's proposal to establish a United Nations Research and Training Centre in Warsaw University, with the exclusive task of training representatives from developing countries and studying the problems of the developing world.

70. His country had noted with interest the growing significance within UNDP of regional and global projects, and it particularly supported global projects in agriculture, food production, energy and health. It looked forward to the implementation of all the proposed interregional European projects and hoped that the experience gained in Europe would be utilized in other regions of the world.

71. His country had developed particularly close and fruitful co-operation with the United Nations Children's Fund and was looking forward to beginning more concrete co-operation with the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. UNICEF and UNFPA were very efficient agencies, carrying out activities of proven practical value.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.