



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 7 August 1969

at 10 a.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 17:	
Development of tourism:	
(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 (<i>continued</i>)	225

President: Mr. SCHEYVÈN (Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 17

Development of tourism (E/4615 and Corr.1, E/4627, E/4629, E/4653 and Add.1 to 4, E/4716; E/L.1277, E/L.1278, E/L.1279, E/L.1280):

- (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 (*continued*)

1. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico), introducing draft resolution E/L.1278 on the development of tourism, pointed out that the preamble set forth a number of considerations that had been expressed in the report of the Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism held in Sofia in May 1969 (E/4653/Add.1).

2. The eighth paragraph of the preamble laid particular stress on the essential role hitherto played by IUOTO and on the considerable technical competence it had acquired; IUOTO was in fact making constant efforts to achieve its purposes despite very scanty resources, which did not exceed \$300,000 per annum. Since, however, the relations of IUOTO with the United Nations system were restricted by IUOTO's status as a body corporate under the Swiss Civil Code, the indications were that that non-governmental body should be made into an intergovernmental organization. As was stated in the last paragraph of the preamble to the resolution adopted by the Sofia Conference (E/4653/Add.1, annex), the establishment of an intergovernmental organization was the most effective way of strengthening national and international efforts to promote tourism.

3. As to the method of effecting that change of status, several countries, including the USSR and Mexico, had first

thought that it would be best to prepare an international convention that would be open for signature at the Sofia Conference. Since, however, up to one month before the date fixed for the opening of that conference only seventeen countries had expressed their intention of participating, the Executive Committee of IUOTO had drafted a formula which, it had hoped, would be acceptable to all, and which had formed the basis of the resolution adopted in Sofia. That resolution had been adopted by a majority of almost two-thirds, but several States had categorically opposed it. Fresh efforts, it had thus been found, would have to be made to arrive at the establishment of an intergovernmental organization, and such was the object of draft resolution E/L.1278, which differed from the Sofia resolution only as to the method to be followed; in Sofia, it had been thought that the intergovernmental organization could be set up by a resolution of the General Assembly, whereas in draft resolution E/L.1278 provision was made for the organization to be created by agreement among Governments.

4. As a first stage, IUOTO, at its annual session to be held in Dublin in October 1969, would undertake a modification of its statutes to meet the requirements of an intergovernmental organization. As a private law organization, however, IUOTO was not legally qualified to change its own statutes in that sense, and Governments would have to approve their amendment; that was the purpose of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. Such an agreement among Governments, which would not be expressed in the usual form of an international conference, was termed in international law an agreement in simplified form. The draft resolution in no way derogated from the principles enunciated at the Sofia Conference, and he saw no reason why those delegations which had shown interest in the establishment of an intergovernmental organization should not support it.

5. In conclusion, he announced that paragraphs 1 and 2 should start with the words: "*Recommends* to States whose national tourist organizations are members of IUOTO ...", the rest of the text remaining unchanged.

6. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs), replying to a point raised by the USSR representative at the preceding meeting, said that the question whether the Council was empowered to take the action proposed in draft resolution E/L.1278 had perhaps been obscured, for some representatives had thought the Council was being asked to establish an intergovernmental organization, whereas it could only set up a subsidiary organ or convene an international conference to establish such an intergovernmental organization. By the draft resolution under consideration, the Council merely re-

commended that Governments should take action for the purpose of changing a non-governmental organization into an intergovernmental organization; Governments were of course free to accept or reject the recommendation.

7. Furthermore, attention should be drawn to two documents. First, in its resolution 1363 (XLV), the Council had recommended a consideration in depth of the role and promotion of tourism and the co-ordination of the existing programmes on the subject. Since the Sofia Conference, however, attention seemed to have been concentrated on the future nature and role of IUOTO. Secondly, it was clear from a note by IUOTO (E/4653/Add.4) that the future organization would discharge an essentially technical, administrative and promotional function, and that the development of tourist facilities, investments and infrastructure would continue to fall within the purview of the international organizations that were already dealing with them. Once the question of IUOTO's status as an intergovernmental organization had been settled, therefore, the whole question of the responsibilities of the international organizations in matters of tourism would have to be dealt with. The fact that a large number of international organizations were interested in the subject, and the magnitude of the investments necessary to promote tourism, made that an extremely delicate task.

8. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the statement made by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs meant that the Council was competent to address recommendations to international organizations requesting them to modify their statutes. Such an interpretation of the Council's powers might prove to be extremely important in the future.

9. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that that was not exactly the meaning of his statement: the Council could only recommend that States Members of the United Nations should take certain action for the purpose of changing an organization to which some of them already belonged into an intergovernmental organization.

10. Mr. PAPIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that international tourism should be considered not only as an important source of foreign currency but also as a means of strengthening the economic, cultural and other links between countries.

11. From 1958 to 1967, tourist activities had increased by 150 per cent, reaching the figure of \$14,100 million (excluding transport). Tourism was mainly concentrated, however, in the countries of Europe and North America: the countries members of the OECD had alone absorbed \$10,800 million, while the rest of the world shared only \$3,300 million. Such a situation was obviously unsatisfactory for the developing countries, which would have to make considerable efforts to improve their tourist infrastructure, but necessarily with the help of the international community. It was gratifying to note that a large number of

organizations in the United Nations system had intensified their action in that sphere, particularly UNDP, which had increased the number of pre-investment studies for projects of tourist interest in the southern Adriatic areas.

12. Yugoslavia had fully supported International Tourist Year and the activities undertaken with a view to developing tourism. His Government had decided in 1966 to abolish tourist visas on a reciprocal basis; the nationals of European countries were no longer required to obtain such visas. For the nationals of more than twenty countries, moreover, visa fees had been abolished. His country had made heavy investments in infrastructure and in hotel services. In 1968, the number of tourists had increased by over 7 per cent, and the foreign currency returns by over 25 per cent. During the same year, Yugoslavia had received 26 million visitors; and 7 million Yugoslavs, representing over one-third of the population, had gone abroad.

13. There was at present only one international organization dealing with the promotion of tourism, namely, IUOTO, and its non-governmental status did not meet the requirements of the situation. His delegation was in favour of establishing an intergovernmental organization, and had voted for the resolution adopted at the Sofia Conference. Since the matter had come up for discussion at such a very late date in the Council's session, however, it seemed unlikely that the ideas expressed in the draft resolution submitted by Mexico (E/L.1278) could be sufficiently thoroughly discussed. He would therefore prefer to support draft resolution E/L.1277, under which the Council requested the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session on the implications of establishing an intergovernmental tourism organization.

14. The PRESIDENT announced that the United States and United Kingdom delegations had proposed a number of amendments to draft resolution E/L.1277. It would perhaps be advisable, in the circumstances, to suspend the discussion on agenda item 17 until those amendments had been distributed to delegations in all the working languages, and to proceed meanwhile with the consideration of agenda item 20.

15. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. VIDAL (Uruguay), Mr. KRISHNAN (India), Mr. POPOV (Bulgaria), Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) and Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) took part, the PRESIDENT concluded that it was the sense of the Council not to suspend the discussion on agenda item 17.

It was decided to continue the discussion of agenda item 17.

16. Mr. POPOV (Bulgaria) said that his Government had already indicated its attitude to the establishment of an intergovernmental tourism organization at the Sofia Conference: it supported the idea of setting up an international

organization of that kind based on the principles laid down in the resolution adopted at that conference.

17. Insufficient time seemed to have elapsed, however, since the Sofia Conference, for a thorough study of the legal and other problems raised by the establishment of such an organization. He therefore supported draft resolution E/L.1277, which would refer the question of the development of tourism to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session. That draft resolution did not deal with problems of substance connected with the procedure to be followed in establishing such an organization, or with the way in which the organization could be associated with the United Nations system. Moreover, the consideration of that matter in the Council could give rise to considerable difficulties.

18. Some delegations had expressed the opinion that the Council should give IUOTO guidelines for its next annual session, but it should be pointed out that that organization had already received all the guidelines it needed from the member States represented at the Sofia Conference.

19. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) announced that Congo (Brazzaville) and Indonesia should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1277.

20. That draft did not deal with the substance of the question and did not propose any action on the resolution adopted by the Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism (E/4653/Add.1, annex). The adoption of the draft resolution would not commit the Council in any way with respect to the guidelines contained in the resolution in question: the Secretary-General would merely be requested to study them in order to facilitate consideration of the question and enable the General Assembly to take an enlightened decision.

21. The sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1277 were unable to accept the Argentine amendments (E/L.1279), for it was very probable that the Council would be unable to complete its consideration of the matter in the short time provided for its resumed forty-seventh session.

22. There was a great deal in the Mexican draft resolution (E/L.1278) whose implications were not apparent; consequently, being unable to take a definite stand, he considered it preferable to postpone a final decision until the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. The problem could thus be studied more thoroughly, particularly at the government level. That was why his delegation had joined others in submitting draft resolution E/L.1277, which did not exclude any of the possible choices; and he appealed to the representative of Mexico not to press his draft resolution.

23. Mr. LAURELLI (Argentina) said that the only purpose of the amendment submitted by his delegation (E/L.1279) was to keep the question on the Council's agenda, and to give the Council a chance to settle a problem whose reference to the General Assembly would only complicate matters. Besides, it would be unfortunate if the

Council gave the impression of wishing to evade its responsibilities.

24. He did not think the Council would be able to take a decision on draft resolution E/L.1278 at the present session; it would therefore be preferable either to withdraw the draft or refer it to the resumed forty-seventh session.

25. Mr. KENNAN (Ireland) said that his delegation was in favour of strengthening IUOTO and against the establishment of an intergovernmental tourism organization. It was the Council's duty to consider the problem and find a solution to it. The discussions and informal consultations that had taken place during the present session had been very useful, and there was no reason why the Council should not be able to reach an agreement eventually. He therefore supported the Argentine amendment, which was designed to ensure that the consideration of the question would be resumed at a later date.

26. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that although he had doubts concerning the working of some of the provisions of draft resolution E/L.1278, he subscribed to its aims, which were to strengthen IUOTO by modifying the statutes of that body with a view to giving it an intergovernmental character; and he welcomed the possibility of establishing relations between that body and the United Nations system. But the Council was clearly not in a position to take a final decision at the present session, and it was preferable to refer the question, not to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session, but to the resumed forty-seventh session of the Council, as the Argentine amendment suggested.

27. However, together with the delegations of Japan and the United Kingdom, his delegation was submitting a number of amendments (E/L.1280) to draft resolution E/L.1277 which went a little further than the Argentine amendment. In particular, the insertion of a new paragraph in the preamble was suggested, in which it would be noted that the Council did not find it possible to complete its discussion of item 17 (a), (b) and (c). In addition, the sponsors of the amendments felt that the Secretary-General might usefully take into account, in his study, the discussions in the Council, and that the scope of the report he would be called upon to submit to the Council should be widened to include not only the implications of the possible creation of an intergovernmental tourism organization but also any other proposals designed to provide more effective machinery for the development of tourism.

28. Mr. PANGGABEAN (Indonesia) said that the tourist industry was taking an increasingly important place in the development programmes of the developing countries. Apart from the substantial contribution it could make to a country's economic growth, tourism promoted good relations among nations. His Government had taken steps to organize and develop the tourist industry, and the five-year development plan included definite targets in that area. In addition, however, to the substantial investment it required, the development of the industry called for skills and

experience which developing countries often lacked. Hence it was essential to mobilize the resources of the international community. He therefore supported the steps taken by the United Nations and the organizations within the United Nations system to help the developing countries to widen their knowledge of the problems raised by the organization of the tourist industry, and the steps taken to increase technical assistance for that purpose. Besides the United Nations, many regional and sub-regional, private and semi-private bodies were concerned with the promotion of tourism, and it was undeniable that the present institutional machinery was very dispersed and heterogeneous, and that duplication and overlapping were not avoided, even within the United Nations system itself. In view, particularly, of the international strategy for the Second Development Decade, he considered that the time had come to establish an international tourism organization within the United Nations system.

29. As one of the sponsors of the resolution adopted by the Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism held in Sofia in May 1969, Indonesia was convinced that the creation of an intergovernmental organization was the most appropriate and effective way of rationalizing and strengthening the efforts made at the national and international levels to promote tourism. While IUOTO had done much to encourage tourism in the past, its non-governmental character meant that its activities were bound to remain outside the programmes of the organizations in the United Nations system. What was needed at present was an international organization able to co-ordinate and harmonize the multifarious and often overlapping activities that were undertaken to promote tourism. Being within the United Nations system, the new organization whose establishment was envisaged would have more authority and be able to take full advantage of the technical resources and knowledge available to the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

30. It should not be forgotten that in most developing countries the tourist industry was in the hands of the State and not of private organizations. That was an additional reason why in Sofia the developing countries had called for the establishment of a new intergovernmental organization. It was regrettable in that connexion that the resolution adopted by the Sofia Conference had not been supported by some countries, which had preferred the solution of strengthening IUOTO.

31. The positions taken in Sofia were still difficult to reconcile, and his delegation felt that time was required to reflect on the problem and to study it more thoroughly. That was why it had co-sponsored draft resolution E/L.1277. To refer the matter to the General Assembly would avoid further delay while enabling a larger number of interested countries to consider it.

32. The Mexican proposal had constructive aspects, but more time would be needed to study it thoroughly. That was why postponement of the discussion, as proposed in draft resolution E/L.1277, was probably the best solution for the time being.

33. He hoped, however, that some means would be found of arriving at a consensus.

34. Mr. BENLER (Turkey) said that his delegation supported the arguments advanced by the Jamaican representative at the preceding meeting concerning, in particular, assistance to developing countries for the development of their tourist resources and the desirability of establishing a closer relationship between IUOTO and the United Nations system.

35. Moreover, as his delegation had stated during the Council's consideration of the UNDP programme (1619th meeting), it would be important to the developing countries to have access to United Nations technical assistance in training tourist-industry personnel, both for management and administrative posts and for subordinate employment. For the same reason, it would be useful to strengthen IUOTO.

36. At the preceding meeting, the Japanese representative had affirmed that in the final analysis the individual himself decided where to spend his holidays. That was true, but Governments could nevertheless play an effective part in providing information. He referred in that connexion to the important role played by the French radio and television organization, under the bilateral agreement between Turkey and France, in promoting tourism in Turkey; the number of French tourists going to Turkey was increasing from year to year.

37. Draft resolution E/L.1278 put forward ideas which accorded at many points with those of his delegation, but they should be given much more careful study. In particular, his delegation approved in principle the last operative paragraph, which differed from the proposal made in draft resolution E/L.1277. The task envisaged in that paragraph should, however, be assigned to the Economic and Social Council.

38. The idea advanced in the last operative paragraph of draft resolution E/L.1278—and repeated, incidentally, in the Argentine amendment—should be adopted, for then there would be submitted to the Council at its resumed session a report which would make it possible for the question under discussion to be studied in greater detail. In those circumstances it might be desirable to replace the last operative paragraph of draft resolution E/L.1277 by the last operative paragraph of draft resolution E/L.1278. Draft resolution E/L.1277 had the advantage of being short and precise, and, subject to certain amendments, would probably be acceptable to all members of the Council.

39. With reference to paragraph 18 of the report of the Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism (E/4653/Add.1, section B), he said that his delegation, too, considered that an international tourism organization should be based on the principle of universality, implying no political connotations and intended only to reflect the universal nature of tourism. In that connexion, his delegation's position was identical with that adopted by the Argentine and United Kingdom delegations at the preceding meeting.

40. He warmly welcomed the amendments in document E/L.1280.

41. His delegation, which had itself intended to submit a draft resolution, considered that it would be desirable, in order to save time in the event of IUOTO's becoming an intergovernmental organization, to study the following questions: whether an agreement between the United Nations and IUOTO could be concluded for the purpose of establishing close co-operation and relations and of defining the modalities of such co-operation and relations; whether IUOTO could be enabled to participate in the activities of UNDP by assisting in the preparation and implementation of pre-investment, technical assistance and other tourism projects; how IUOTO could play a useful part by helping the Council to co-ordinate activities relating to tourism entrusted to or falling within the purview of the United Nations system; and what kind of procedures could be elaborated to enable IUOTO to submit for the Council's consideration recommendations and proposals relating to international agreements to be drawn up in the tourism sector.

42. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country had long been applying a policy of encouragement to tourism, which it looked upon as a means of promoting peace through the establishment of relations between peoples. The Soviet Union had always been in favour of IUOTO initiatives, and the observations he was about to make concerning the draft resolutions, before the Council should in no way be taken to indicate a change of attitude concerning that organization. He recalled in that connexion the statement made by Mr. Kosygin, Prime Minister of the USSR, on the occasion of the twentieth conference of IUOTO, which had coincided with the fiftieth anniversary of the Soviet State. The proclamation of an International Tourist Year, too, had been widely acclaimed in the Soviet Union.

43. The IUOTO report (E/4627) presented a fairly complete picture of that organization's activities, and his delegation shared its conclusions. Tourism was not simply a question of travel, but should be considered at the national level, and in its social, economic and cultural aspects. In the Soviet Union it was, of course, dependent on the State, and some twenty ministries had consequently been involved in activities connected with International Tourist Year.

44. It would be realized that in those circumstances his delegation needed time for consultations and for seeking the advice of the competent national bodies on the subject of the new proposals for the establishment of an international organization for tourism.

45. The Soviet Union's interest in tourism was also demonstrated by the steps that had been taken to arouse greater interest in International Tourist Year, particularly among the young, by the organization of exhibitions, tours, meetings, seminars and festivals. Moreover, a law had recently been enacted concerning the organization of tours and tourist activities under trade-union auspices.

46. The International Conference on Tourism held in Sofia had produced positive results, although they were not exactly what the Soviet Union had hoped for, and the USSR had agreed to make a number of concessions to ensure the Conference's success. Nevertheless, constructive conclusions had been reached. In particular, the Conference had accepted the principle of universality, and the envisaged organization was to be open to all countries interested in the development of tourism without exception; and the methods of financing the organization had been defined.

47. The Mexican draft resolution was unsatisfactory to his delegation precisely because, to some extent, it went back on the decisions of the Sofia Conference. In fact, by the first paragraph of the preamble, the Council would merely say that it had taken cognizance of the report of the Intergovernmental Conference of Tourism, thereby displaying a somewhat negative attitude. That would amount to calling in question the principle of universality as well as the methods of financing the envisaged organization. The adoption of the Mexican text would thus bring political factors into play, and the result would be to widen the differences among countries instead of seeking a generally satisfactory compromise.

48. There was also some reason to ask whether the Council was justified in going back on the decisions of a Conference the number of whose participants had exceeded that of its own members. Finally, there was the question whether the Council was empowered to make recommendations to a non-governmental organization. Operative paragraph 1 would actually have the effect of requesting IUOTO to modify its statutes. The latter might in fact agree to do so, perhaps even at the conference it was to hold shortly; but over-hasty decisions should be avoided. He therefore considered that the best course at present would be to adopt draft resolution E/L.1277.

49. He noted, moreover, that the United States representative had announced his delegation's intention of thinking the matter over and not making hurried decisions. That was a hopeful sign which should induce the Council to continue consultations with a view to finding a satisfactory solution to what, to many countries, was a difficult and important problem. His delegation was anxious to avoid delay, but it also wished a decision to be taken which would make it possible for all countries to take part in a truly international organization capable of contributing to the development of tourism. Only prudence and goodwill would make it possible to avoid a deadlock and find a quick solution.

50. Mr. ESTABLIE (France) recalled that at the Sofia Conference his delegation had been one of those most open to the various possibilities as well as to the wishes of the developing countries. Its attitude had not changed, and it therefore welcomed the efforts of the Mexican delegation, whose draft resolution it was prepared to support. Unfortunately, there would be no time to discuss the draft in its entirety.

51. Some delegations were in favour of referring the matter directly to the General Assembly. He for his part doubted whether that would be the best solution. In fact, the outcome of the Sofia Conference showed that the adoption of a resolution by a majority was not a satisfactory solution, particularly if the minority was appreciable.

52. He was therefore in favour of the Argentine proposal (E/L.1279) that the matter be referred to the Council at its resumed session, thus giving delegations the time for thought for which the Indonesian delegation in particular had appealed. In the event of a further setback, the Council could then seek another solution.

53. The amendments in document E/L.1280 came very close to those of Argentina, and the two series of proposals should be combined.

54. Lastly, unlike the Indian representative, he considered it necessary to maintain the amendment to draft resolution E/L.1277, which would consist in replacing the word "establishing" in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.1277 by the words "the possible establishment of".

55. Mr. HILL (Jamaica) said that, in view of the part played by tourism in its economy, Jamaica attached great importance to the adoption of an international policy of co-operation in activities relating to tourism. He wished in that connexion to emphasize the need for giving the developing countries financial and technical assistance in developing the infrastructure of their tourist industry (hotel construction, site development, training of personnel, transport and communications).

56. The national policy of the tourist "exporting" countries was also of interest to the developing countries, and Jamaica hoped that no new measures would be taken to limit the amount of currency that tourists could spend abroad. It was also desirable to ensure that sea and air fares were not prohibitive and that restrictions on the amount of goods which tourists could take back to their countries were made more liberal.

57. Moreover, a plan for supplementary financing in which tourism would be considered as an export should also be drawn up. Under such a plan, the countries which had made substantial investments in the tourist infrastructure would be compensated in case of unexpected shortfalls in their receipts from tourist activities.

58. The consideration of item 17 and its three subdivisions should really, had the Council had enough time, have resulted in two resolutions, one on the main issue and the other on organizational questions. In the present circumstances, he considered that it would be advisable to take as a basis draft resolution E/L.1277, in which, however, the order of the operative paragraphs should be reversed, as suggested in amendment E/L.1280.

59. In paragraph 3 of the same amendment, he would like to see the words "effective machinery" replaced by "effective measures", which would give the Secretary-General more scope.

60. The Council should also recognize in its resolution the need for considering the question anew; it could decide during that fresh consideration when to refer the matter to the General Assembly, should that course be adopted.

61. His delegation would also like the Council's report to reflect as fully as possible the views expressed during the discussion; and in particular some reference should be made to the subjects which the Turkish representative had proposed for consideration. As thus supplemented, the report would assist the Secretary-General in drawing up the document requested of him.

62. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the various interested parties should be invited to hold informal consultations for the purpose of drawing up a compromise text.

63. Mr. LAURELLI (Argentina) withdrew the amendments he had proposed (E/L.1279).

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.