

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 1046th
MEETING

Wednesday, 26 October 1966,
at 3.5 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 41:</i>	
<i>Activities in the field of industrial development (continued):</i>	
(b) Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development (continued)	151
<i>Agenda item 53:</i>	
<i>International Tourist Year</i>	153

Chairman: Mr. Moraiwid M. TELL (Jordan).

AGENDA ITEM 41

Activities in the field of industrial development (continued) (A/6433):

(b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development (continued) (A/6229, A/6303, chap. IV, sect. IV; A/6368, A/6369, A/6415, A/6468, A/6473, A/6474, A/6481, E/4203, chap. XII)

1. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) explained that at the previous meeting he had voted against the fourteen-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.868 and Add.1) because it was already covered by paragraph 35 of the draft resolution adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development (A/C.2/L.863 and Corr.1), because it restricted the freedom of action of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and because it ran counter to the agreement reached in the various groups that no amendments, apart from that of Algeria (A/C.2/L.869), should be submitted.

2. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) said that he had abstained on the fourteen-Power amendment not because he was opposed to its substance but because of the general agreement not to submit further amendments. His delegation had refrained from submitting an amendment to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution which would have emphasized other sectors besides manufacturing.

3. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) explained that his delegation had also abstained on the vote concerning the fourteen-Power amendment for the reasons adduced by the Algerian representative. His delegation now supported the draft resolution without reservations and intended to make such contributions as it had made to the operational programmes of UNIDO in the same way as in the past. It reserved its position on the financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (A/6481). He agreed with the representative of Italy

that the personnel of the new body should resemble that of a consulting firm with a small permanent staff relying principally on short-term contracts for specialists.

4. The United States naturally favoured New York as the site of the new body since it felt that only the United Nations Headquarters met all the important criteria which had been suggested. He hoped that the advantages of New York would be considered on their merits, together with those of the other cities offered.

5. Mr. INGRAM (Australia) explained that the fourteen-Power amendment was useful but not necessary since its substance was already covered in the draft resolution. Australia, too, would have liked to have submitted amendments (to reduce the size of the Industrial Development Board, for example), but had refrained in accordance with the unofficial agreement not to destroy the balance of the draft resolution adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee. His delegation therefore had had no alternative but to abstain on the amendment.

6. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and, in particular, of operative paragraph 1. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union maintained its reservations concerning the need for universality of membership and equality of access to the services rendered by the Organization, as well as the undesirability of holding a special pledging conference and the other reservations mentioned in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee (A/6229, para. 12). His delegation had voted in favour of the fourteen-Power amendment because it was the sovereign right of all delegations to submit amendments whenever they thought fit. Indeed, the amendment might have been rejected through the misguided attitude of certain delegations which considered that the draft resolution was in some way sacrosanct.

7. Mr. BACKES (Austria) said his delegation had abstained on the vote of the fourteen-Power amendment because it was fully covered in the original text of the draft resolution and because of the general agreement that no further amendments should be submitted.

8. Mr. Mohamed AL-ATRASH (Syria) recalled that his delegation had abstained on the Czechoslovak proposal, made orally at the previous meeting, to reword paragraphs 3, 13, 16, 22 (a) and 26 of the draft resolution in order to permit the inclusion of certain States. It had done so in a spirit of solidarity with the developing countries, although it would have preferred UNIDO to be universal in character. It had abstained on the fourteen-Power amendment because of the agreement not to submit further amendments.

9. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) said his delegation had voted against the amendment in question for the same reason as that given by the representative of Syria, although it was in full agreement with its purpose. It had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, although in many respects the compromise reached by the Ad Hoc Committee was unsatisfactory. The United Kingdom had already made a contribution of £300,000 through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as funds-in-trust for the special industrial services mentioned in paragraph 10 of document A/6070/Rev.1.^{1/} It expected UNIDO to draw its funds from UNDP; the needs of UNIDO and the use to which those funds had been put for the benefit of developing countries would be taken into account by the United Kingdom when considering the possibility of future contributions. He noted that, according to document A/6481, paragraph 35 (b), a special provision of \$750,000 was to be made in 1967 for additional staff for UNIDO. Such a provision was inconsistent with the decision reached in the Fifth Committee that there should be no increase in the manning table of the Secretariat. He therefore hoped that any increase in staff costs for UNIDO would be met from savings under other items. In any case, the financial implications of the establishment of UNIDO would have to be closely examined by the Fifth Committee.

10. Mr. SADI (Jordan) said he had voted against the fourteen-Power amendment for the reasons already explained by the representative of Argentina.

11. Mr. MIRGHANI (Sudan) explained that his delegation supported the principle of universality but, in the interest of general agreement, had abstained on the Czechoslovak proposal. It had also abstained on the fourteen-Power amendment for the reasons given by the Argentine representative.

12. Mr. KARMARKAR (India) said that he too had abstained on the amendment for the reasons given by other speakers.

13. Mr. THAWLEY (New Zealand) said that those same reasons had led his delegation to vote against the amendment.

14. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that the establishment of UNIDO was one of the finest achievements of the United Nations. In the interests of maintaining the compromise reached in the Ad Hoc Committee, his delegation had voted against the amendment to operative paragraph 2 (a), (x) (A/C.2/L.868 and Add.1).

15. Mr. AMMAR (Tunisia) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the Algerian amendment, it supported the reservation regarding its interpretation entered by the delegation of Senegal, since a division of the functions of UNIDO would be somewhat premature and might even hinder its operations.

16. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia), speaking on behalf of his own delegation and the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that the socialist countries had consistently advocated the establishment

of an industrial development organization and had therefore welcomed the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2089 (XX). Unfortunately, the need for a fully comprehensive organization open to all States was not covered in paragraphs 3, 13, 16, 22 (a) and 26 of the Ad Hoc Committee's draft resolution. The socialist countries had therefore voted for the proposal to reword those paragraphs.

17. Mr. WILMOT (Ghana) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the fourteen-Power amendment because it had considered it non-controversial. The agreement reached between the various regional groupings had been based on the fear that amendments other than that submitted by Algeria might snowball, thereby disrupting the delicate balance achieved in the Ad Hoc Committee.

18. Mr. O CLERIGH (Ireland) said that, despite the unsatisfactory nature of a number of points in the draft resolution, his delegation had voted for it because it represented a compromise. Ireland had abstained on the vote of the fourteen-Power amendment because it felt that its substance was fully covered in the draft resolution itself, and because it was bound by the inter-regional agreement. It maintained its reservations regarding the resolution's financial implications.

19. Mr. VILFAN (Yugoslavia) said that the Yugoslav delegation, too, had abstained on the amendment relating to industrial property (A/C.2/L.868 and Add.1) and on the Czechoslovak proposal, because of its desire to respect the compromise reached in the Ad Hoc Committee and the agreement between the regional groupings.

20. Mr. HUSSEIN (United Arab Republic) emphasized that his delegation's abstention in the vote on the Czechoslovak proposal had been based on the belief that there was a moral obligation to accept the compromise text submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee, and in no way implied any change in its support for the principle of universality.

21. Mr. GAILANI (Iraq) said that his country's abstention on the Czechoslovak proposal, which had been motivated by the consideration advanced by the previous speaker, did not mean that Iraq had ceased to hope that the principle of universality would soon prevail in all United Nations bodies. His delegation believed that the substance of the fourteen-Power amendment was already fully covered by paragraphs 35 and 36 of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. PARDO (Malta) maintained his delegation's reservations regarding the financial implications and the co-ordination of UNIDO's functions as established in the draft resolution. However, he stressed Malta's strong support for the new Organization, which he hoped would be of benefit to individual States. Malta did not wish to stand in the way of a unanimous adoption of the draft resolution and requested that his delegation's abstention should be changed to an affirmative vote.

23. Mr. FRANCO (Colombia) said that his delegation's vote against the fourteen-Power amendment did not imply disagreement with its substance, but reflected its respect for the agreement which had been reached in order to accelerate the Committee's approval of the draft resolution.

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 40.

24. U THET TUN (Burma) said that his delegation had voted against the fourteen-Power amendment for the reasons indicated by the previous speaker, and had abstained in the vote on the Czechoslovak proposal in accordance with its well-known stand on the universality of membership.

25. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that, although his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution as a whole, it had been forced to abstain on the amendment relating to industrial property because of the agreement which had been reached.

26. Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland) explained that his delegation had abstained on the fourteen-Power amendment because it had felt that the spirit of compromise which had prevailed among the regional groupings should be maintained.

27. Mr. PAPADOPOLO (Guatemala) explained that his country's vote against the fourteen-Power amendment had been based on the belief that the inter-regional agreement should be respected, that the statute of the new Organization should be rather flexible, and that the substance of the amendment was already covered in paragraphs 35 and 36 of the draft resolution.

28. Mr. GEORGE (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendment since its substance was uncontroversial. Furthermore, none of the fourteen sponsoring countries had participated in the negotiations which had led to the inter-group agreement. The French delegation welcomed the unanimous adoption of the resolution as a whole, but maintained its reservations regarding its financial implications.

29. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) said that his delegation had voted for the fourteen-Power amendment. It believed that every delegation had a sovereign right to submit amendments and that no informal agreements infringing on that right should be entered into.

30. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the fourteen-Power amendment, thanked those countries who had voted in favour of that amendment. It was clear from the explanations of vote by countries which had voted against or abstained that the large majority were not opposed to the substance of the amendment, and that the new Organization would therefore be able to begin its work on a foundation of agreement in the Committee.

31. The CHAIRMAN noted that the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution marked the completion of one of the major questions submitted to the Committee. He thanked all delegations, including the eight which had been especially active in promoting the establishment of the new Organization, for the spirit of co-operation and compromise which they had shown.

Mr. Boiko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 53

International Tourist Year (A/6303, chap. XIII, sect. V; A/6427, E/4218 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.867)

32. Mr. CHADHA (India) said that his delegation had been closely associated with the efforts which had led

to the adoption of Economic and Social Council resolution 1108 (XL). The purpose of so designating 1967 as International Tourist Year was to focus world-wide attention on the contribution tourism could make to economic development and to promoting international understanding. The basic aim of designating an International Tourist Year was to create or enhance an awareness of the value of tourism and thus stimulate the desire to travel and provide hospitality.

33. The report (E/4218 and Corr.1) of the International Union of Official Travel Organizations (IUOTO) indicated that adequate preparations were being made for 1967 by both national tourist organizations and commercial operators. Special tourist literature had been prepared, publicity campaigns for all information media had been arranged and the slogan for International Tourist Year, "Tourism, Passport to Peace", was being emphasized in all the planned activities. The report also contained suggestions for further measures which Governments and operators might take in order to make the Year an outstanding success; those measures were, of course, not mandatory, but the adoption of at least some of them would lead to very constructive programmes. The useful recommendations of the United Nations Conference on International Travel and Tourism, held at Rome in 1963,^{2/} had not yet been fully implemented, for instance, and International Tourist Year could well provide the opportunity for enforcing some of them, even on an experimental basis; such an experiment would also be a test of their usefulness.

34. Although the designation of an International Tourist Year was intended to benefit all countries, one of its basic objectives concerned the promotion of tourism particularly to the developing countries. A substantial increase in tourism would help those countries to reduce their balance-of-payments deficits. If such an increase was to be achieved, efforts would have to be made at the international level to encourage travel to the developing countries: special reductions in fares for travel to those countries would be one method, and his delegation hoped that the International Air Transport Association would give special consideration to it when it next considered international fares. The adoption of a special concessional fare for around-the-world air trips during International Tourist Year would be most helpful. It was also hoped that similar fare concessions would be made at the national level.

35. His country intended to give the widest possible publicity to International Tourist Year and had already planned a great many special activities for 1967. It had been proposed to hold country-wide celebrations for about one month during which seminars on tourism would be conducted to emphasize its role as an instrument of national integration and international peace. Efforts would also be made to relax travel formalities to the extent practicable.

36. Introducing the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.867), he announced that the delegations of Ecuador, Nepal, and Peru had asked to be co-sponsors. The preamble

^{2/} *Recommendations on International Travel and Tourism* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 64.I.6).

stressed the chief reasons for designating an International Tourist Year. The operative paragraphs were self-explanatory; members of the Committee should note, however, that operative paragraph 4 would involve no additional financial implications. The report requested in paragraph 5 was considered necessary in order to give the Economic and Social Council an opportunity to assess the extent to which the designation of 1967 as International Tourist Year would prove to be a success.

37. Mr. VILFAN (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation wanted to stress the importance of international tourism for the creation of conditions for neighbourly and peaceful co-operation, as the third and fifth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution only slightly referred to that aspect. His delegation had made it quite clear that its insistence on that point did not imply that it underestimated the significance of other equally important aspects of tourism. Thus, for example, his delegation was of the opinion that the economic activities of the United Nations should include the expansion of tourism in view of the valuable contribution that the earnings from tourism could make towards lessening the balance-of-payments difficulties of the developing countries.

38. Reverting to the influence of tourism on international relations, he said that the excellent relations his country maintained with most of its neighbours were due, in large measure, to a gradual easing of border formalities and he cited, in that respect, the example of his country's relations with Italy. At first, special arrangements for the border area population were made and, today, the stage had been reached where virtually no crossing formalities were required. His delegation believed that such trends were merely a reflection of profound changes in the structure of

the world itself. It was on that basis that his country viewed the recommendations contained in the document prepared by IUOTO.

39. The Yugoslav Parliament was discussing a draft law that would abolish visas for foreign tourists for the duration of the International Tourist Year and, thereafter, on a permanent basis for nationals of any country willing to reciprocate. His delegation hoped that widespread adoption of similar measures would produce the results which the International Tourist Year was designed to achieve.

40. Mr. USTUN (Turkey) observed that the world community was becoming increasingly aware of the potential economic advantages of increasing international tourism. His country was one of the many developing countries in which tourist revenues were an important source of foreign exchange. The development of tourism had been given high priority in Turkey's current five-year plan; the emphasis in the plan on infra-structural projects and promotional activities had, in fact, increased tourism by 22 per cent in 1965, as compared with the expected 8 per cent. The adoption of some of the recommendations of the Rome Conference and the conclusion of agreements on tourism with neighbouring countries had, of course, contributed to that success. The International Tourist Year would also serve the cause of peace, by fostering understanding and co-operation among nations.

41. In the light of those considerations, his delegation had decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution and expected that it would receive the utmost support from all members.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.