



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Forty-eighth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 3 April 1970,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. J. B. P. MARAMIS (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 2

Development of natural resources (*concluded*):

- (a) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Survey Programme for the Development of Natural Resources (E/4797, E/4801 and Add.1; E/L.1306/Rev.1, E/L.1309);
- (b) Natural resources satellites (E/4779 and Corr.1-3)

1. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the draft resolution submitted by his delegation in document E/L.1309 reflected the position taken at the previous meeting by the representative of Kenya on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1. In accordance with draft resolution E/L.1309, the Council, recognizing the importance of the problem before it, would decide to postpone discussion of it to the forty-ninth session, at which time it would be taken up again on the basis of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1. That decision would leave the Council full freedom to decide on the latter draft resolution in the light of the debate at the forty-ninth session.

2. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that initially he had felt that the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution E/L.1309 would prejudice the Council's final decision on the question of the establishment of an intergovernmental body; however, the Tunisian representative's clarification of the meaning of his draft enabled him to support it.

3. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not be able to vote for draft resolution E/L.1309 unless the first preambular paragraph were amended to read:

"Recognizing the importance of the question raised in document E/L.1306/Rev.1".

That was not, however, a formal proposal.

4. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) expressed his delegation's appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1 for taking account of the difficulty that some delegations were having with the procedural and co-ordinating aspects of their draft and with its far-reaching implications and for agreeing to postpone the discussion of their proposal until the forty-ninth session on the understanding that their draft would constitute the basis for the discussion of the item. He was prepared to accept that condition and would be willing to vote for draft resolution E/L.1309 if he could be quite sure of the precise nature of the commitment in its first preambular paragraph. He would have no difficulty in voting for that paragraph if it meant only that the Council recognized the importance of

the problem and could not be construed as prejudicing the Council's decision on the most appropriate form of machinery to be set up for the development of natural resources, a decision which it was to take at the forty-ninth session after various aspects of the matter had been explored by other interested bodies.

5. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that a certain measure of agreement had been reached during the session that some kind of intergovernmental body should be established. That agreement could even be called a consensus, since there were no more than three delegations opposed to the establishment of such a body. However, the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1 realized that some delegations would have difficulty in taking a position on the question at the present session because they lacked instructions or needed further clarification. The desire to give those delegations time for further consideration was what had prompted the Tunisian proposal. The sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1 had agreed to that proposal because it recorded the progress made in the discussion at the present session. The misgivings expressed by some delegations were without foundation: to recognize the importance of establishing something was not the same thing as establishing it, and in any case the whole issue would have to be thrashed out at the forty-ninth session. If the Council adopted the amendment suggested by the USSR representative, it would leave the issue precisely where it had been before the present session. The sponsors did not wish the matter to be approached at the forty-ninth session as though nothing at all had been done with regard to it at the forty-eighth.

6. Mr. MARTIN-WITKOWSKI (France) said with regard to draft resolution E/L.1309 that there seemed to be a discrepancy between its first preambular paragraph and its operative paragraph. He wondered whether the sponsors had considered the possibility that the Council might, by a majority vote at its forty-ninth session, decide not to establish an intergovernmental body in the field of natural resources even though it had recognized the importance of establishing such a body at its forty-eighth session. He therefore proposed that the word "establishing" in the first preambular paragraph should be replaced by "the possible establishment of".

7. He asked whether the adoption of the Tunisian draft by the Council would in any way prejudice the action to be taken by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) when it discussed the item entitled "Natural resources" at its next session.

8. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) noted that differences of views had arisen not only on the establishment of an intergovernmental body but also on its scope and terms of reference as laid down in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution

E/L.1306/Rev.1. That, as he understood it, was why the sponsors of the draft were willing to give delegations time for further consultations. Draft resolution E/L.1309 was an attempt to embody that concession in the form of a draft resolution.

9. In reply to the question raised by the French representative, his delegation could not see how the discussion in CPC could be prejudiced by the adoption of the Tunisian draft, for CPC would surely be discussing, not the nature and terms of reference of the proposed body, but rather how its work could be co-ordinated with the work of other bodies in their related fields.

10. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) did not think it could be said that anything approaching a consensus had been reached on the desirability of establishing the intergovernmental body proposed in document E/L.1306/Rev.1. While his delegation was not opposed to the establishment of an inter-governmental body in the field of natural resources, it wanted the Council to leave the door open for the adoption of any of the three alternative solutions proposed by the Secretary-General in document E/4801/Add.1. However, draft resolution E/L.1309 would indirectly impose one of the solutions on the Council. That was precisely what his delegation wished to avoid, since it wanted time for a thorough evaluation of all the other possible solutions. While he could support the version proposed by the USSR representative, he himself would prefer the first preambular paragraph to read:

“Recognizing the importance of the question whether an inter-governmental body in the field of natural resources should be established”.

11. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) said that there had been a large measure of support in the Council for the proposal made at the previous meeting by the representative of Kenya, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1, not to press the text to a vote at the current session provided that the Council agreed to give urgent consideration to the question at its forty-ninth session. That proposal and the support which had been expressed for it could have been reflected in the Council's report and that would have disposed of the matter for the current session. Now, however, the Council had before it draft resolution E/L.1309, which had aroused opposition among a number of representatives, who felt that it tended to prejudice the position of their Governments with regard to the establishment of an intergovernmental body. Most Governments needed more time and information in order to consider the implications of the various alternatives before the Council. His delegation therefore supported the Soviet amendment, which would not commit the Council to any of the alternative courses open to it but would allow members time for further consideration. If, however, the Soviet Union amendment was not acceptable to the Council, the first preambular paragraph of the Tunisian text should be modified to indicate the importance of reaching an early decision on the question of establishing an intergovernmental body. He requested the Tunisian representative to withdraw his draft resolution and suggested that a reference should be made in the Council's report to its decision to postpone consideration of the question.

12. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that the majority of members of the Council had agreed to the Kenyan proposal that discussion of the question of establishing an inter-governmental body should continue at the forty-ninth session on the basis of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1. That agreement should not now be placed in jeopardy by making excessively cautious interpretations of draft resolution E/L.1309. Since the Tunisian text could not possibly be interpreted as committing the Council to a decision to establish an intergovernmental body at the forty-ninth session, his delegation was prepared to support it.

13. Mr. OSANYA-NYYNEQUE (Kenya), noting that the sponsors had already proposed a compromise arrangement whereby discussion of the question of establishing an intergovernmental body would be postponed until the forty-ninth session, said that draft resolution E/L.1309 represented a further concession by the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1. The Tunisian text used the words “importance of establishing” rather than “need to establish” in the first preambular paragraph, and the words “on the basis of document E/L.1306/Rev.1” in the operative paragraph allowed the Council a great deal of latitude. If, however, delegations felt that the words “importance of establishing” tended to prejudice the issue, they should bear in mind the counterbalancing effect of the relatively non-committal phrase “on the basis of”. He appealed to delegations which had expressed reservations with regard to the Tunisian draft resolution to reconsider their position, and he expressed the hope that their opposition did not mean that they were unwilling to endorse any of the measures proposed by the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1. The sponsors would be unable to support any amendment to draft resolution E/L.1309.

14. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1 for not pressing it to a vote. He did not oppose the establishment of an inter-governmental body, but felt that the case for one still had to be proved. In the light of the interpretations given by previous speakers, particularly the representative of Yugoslavia, he was prepared to support draft resolution E/L.1309 as it stood, on the understanding that the Council had not taken any decision to establish an intergovernmental body and that draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1 would be reconsidered by the Council at its forty-ninth session. The Council should also have before it at its forty-ninth session a paper outlining consultations which had taken place pursuant to rule 80 of the rules of procedure.

15. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that, in the light of the interpretations given by a number of previous speakers, in particular, sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1, his delegation would support draft resolution E/L.1309.

16. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the question of establishing an intergovernmental body was certainly an important one, as evidenced by the fact that the Council had been discussing it for three days. The French text of the draft resolution was quite clear: delegations were not being asked to commit themselves without government instructions, but would merely be taking a decision to the effect that discussions would continue at the forty-ninth session.

17. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) observed that recognizing the importance of discussing the question at the forty-ninth session was not the same thing as committing delegations to any particular action. His delegation was ready to vote in favour of the draft resolution, but would request a separate vote on the first preambular paragraph.

18. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) felt that it might only complicate the issue if delegations put forward new proposals. The Council should therefore proceed to vote on the Tunisian draft resolution.

19. Mr. OSANYA-NYYNEQUE (Kenya) thanked the representative of Tunisia for introducing a draft resolution which formally represented the final position taken as a result of the discussion of the item at the current session.

20. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that the sponsors had been unable to accept the amendment which he had suggested. In his view, the first preambular paragraph could be interpreted as prejudicing the question. Moreover, the wording of the operative paragraph implied that the matter could be discussed at the forty-ninth session only on the basis of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1, a stipulation which would have the effect of limiting the whole discussion. His delegation found itself unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

21. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the French oral amendment to the Tunisian draft resolution (E/L.1309).

The amendment was rejected by 14 votes to 10, with 3 abstentions.

22. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the first preambular paragraph of the Tunisian draft resolution.

The first preambular paragraph was adopted by 15 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

23. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Tunisian draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

24. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said in explanation of his vote that the clarification given had enabled his delegation to support the resolution, on the understanding that the first preambular paragraph recognized the importance of the question of establishing an intergovernmental body without prejudicing the issue.

25. Mr. OSANYA-NYYNEQUE (Kenya), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1,

expressed his appreciation to those who had voted in favour of the text proposed by Tunisia. As a result, the Council would have the opportunity to consider draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1 at its forty-ninth session. He particularly wished to thank the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom for the spirit of compromise which they had shown in spite of their strong reservations.

26. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) said that he had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole and had voted against the first preambular paragraph because of the mounting difficulties to which its interpretation had given rise. His delegation hoped for further clarification at the forty-ninth session.

27. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) said that in voting in favour of the draft resolution his delegation had not prejudiced his Government's final position, which he hoped to state at the forty-ninth session after fuller consideration of all aspects of the problem.

28. Mr. RAHMAN (Pakistan) said that if there had been a vote on draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1, his delegation would have voted in the affirmative. He understood, however, the misgivings expressed by those delegations who felt that further consultations and Government instructions were necessary, and he had decided to vote in favour of E/L.1309. He wished to express his delegation's thanks to the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1306/Rev.1 for their willingness to be co-operative and to the representative of Tunisia for having provided a means of concluding the debate in a spirit of compromise.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Development of tourism (E/4810):

- (a) International Tourist Year;
- (b) Implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on International Travel and Tourism;
- (c) Review of the programmes and activities of the United Nations system of organizations for the development of tourism

29. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the recommendations in paragraph 4 of the report of the Economic Committee on item 3 (E/4810). If there were no objections, he would assume that the Council wished to adopt those recommendations.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.